

SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 24, 1921.

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., the Chaplain, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, for our land we pray. For all who bear official trust under the Government, or of a State, or city, we pray, asking for each direction and wisdom and guidance continually. Grant to our citizenship that there may be realized higher and holier motives and impulses. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, February 14, 1921, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND LETTERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the acting secretary of American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting a report of its activities during the year ended December 1, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8038) to amend section 4 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act, extending its provisions to Porto Rico.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 14, 20, 25, 28, 35, 37, 41, 42, 43, 45, 54, 55, 56, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83 to the bill, and had agreed to the same; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 40, 52, 53, and 62 to the bill, and had agreed to each thereof with an amendment; and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

S. 3225. An act for the relief of bona fide settlers who intermarry after having complied with the homestead law for one year;

S. 4436. An act to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act;

S. 4682. An act to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended;

S. 4683. An act to amend section 11 (m) of the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the acts approved September 7, 1916, and March 3, 1919;

S. 4897. An act to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended;

H. R. 8038. An act to amend section 4 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act, extending its provisions to Porto Rico;

H. R. 11945. An act for the relief of W. C. Stewart; and

H. R. 12005. An act for the relief of Henry P. Corbin.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Sam A. Kozar, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify:

That I have carefully compared the annexed copy of House joint memorial No. 9 with the original thereof adopted by the senate and house of representatives of the thirty-first legislative assembly of the State of Oregon and filed in the office of the secretary of state February 15, 1921, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 17th day of February, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.]

SAM A. KOZAR,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 9.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent that—

Whereas that heretofore by act of June 9, 1916, the Congress of the United States revested the titles to what is commonly known as the Oregon and California land grant in the Federal Government, which said grant consisted of over 2,000,000 acres of lands in the State of Oregon; and

Whereas by the terms of said revestment act provision was made for the sale and disposition of said granted lands by the Federal Government, the proceeds from the sales of said lands to be divided between the Federal Government and the State of Oregon, the common school fund of the State of Oregon to receive 25 per cent of the proceeds from the sale of said lands, and the counties within which the revested lands are situate to receive 25 per cent of the proceeds from the sale of said lands, to be apportioned to the common schools, the roads and highways and the port districts within said respective counties; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by act of May 31, 1918, authorized and empowered the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to exchange lands formerly embraced within the grant to the Oregon-California Railroad Co., and revested in the United States by said act of June 9, 1916, for privately owned lands of approximately equal value, within or contiguous to the former limits of the said Oregon and California grant; and

Whereas it has come to the attention of this body that numerous and divers applications have been filed with the Secretary of the Interior by individuals and corporations, proposing to exchange lands held in private ownership for lands title to which was revested in the Federal Government by said act of June 9, 1916, and that said applications are now pending before the Department of the Interior; and

Whereas some of such individuals and corporations are endeavoring by said exchange of lands to procure from the Federal Government the best and most available timbered lands within said grant, tendering in exchange therefor widely scattered, inaccessible, and unmarketable holdings, and these exchanges have been tentatively recommended by the local Government agent; and

Whereas by the terms of said original revestment act it is provided that the timber on said grant lands shall be sold for cash by the Secretary of the Interior to citizens of the United States, associations of such citizens and corporations, at such times and in such quantities, and under such plan of public competitive bidding as, in his judgment, may produce the best results. And, provided further, that said timber shall be sold as rapidly as reasonable prices can be secured therefor in a normal market; and

Whereas much of those grant lands sought to be procured by some of said citizens and corporations, under their applications now pending, are situate along railroads and water routes of transportation, are now in demand by sawmills, now operating, and others wanting to operate, but are withheld from sale by the Department of the Interior pending consideration of applications for exchanges; and

Whereas it is apparent that the Government has made no careful and detailed cruise of the timber standing upon the revested lands as a basis for determining the respective values of the lands sought in said applications for exchange. The records of the Commissioner of the General Land Office show a report from a Government cruiser as to one particular body of timber in Lane County, to the effect that the estimated quantity of timber on the revested lands in this section as originally cruised by the Government is not to exceed 60 per cent of the true amount of timber standing upon said lands; and

Whereas a large quantity of these revested lands has been set aside and withdrawn from sale and settlement, under the provisions of said revestment act, as power-site lands without due or any consideration as to their real value for water-power purposes; that the said lands so withdrawn are mostly timbered lands lying along the streams, and much of which is good agricultural land after the timber has been removed; that the withdrawal from sale and settlement of these power-site lands are materially obstructing the development of our streams for logging purposes and the logging of privately owned timber situate on said streams; and

Whereas the State of Oregon and its political subdivisions have a pecuniary interest in the disposition and sale of the timber on said revested lands, and is entitled under said revestment act to one-half of the sales price of said lands, after payment of certain charges provided for in said act; and

Whereas a conservative estimate of the merchantable timber on said lands is approximately 40,000,000,000 feet, board measure, which at present market value, is reasonably worth \$60,000,000; and

Whereas on November 12, 1918, the Coos Bay Lumber Co. and the Pillsbury Lumber Co. filed applications for exchange under said act of Congress of May 31, 1918; and

Whereas it appears that the lands of the United States involved in such exchange have been fully and finally cruised, and that the application of the Coos Bay Lumber Co. was on July 8, 1920, approved for advertisement for objection thereto, and that such advertisement was had and concluded on November 25, 1920, and no objection thereto filed, and that part of the land to be surrendered by the Coos Bay Lumber Co. is to be acquired by the Pillsbury Lumber Co., and it appearing that delay in said application might embarrass financing efforts of the Coos Bay Lumber Co.; and

Whereas these two applications were not in contemplation at the time of the introduction of this memorial: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, the senate and house of representatives of the State of Oregon, do respectfully and urgently protest against the granting of all of the other applications now pending before the Department of the Interior for the exchange of privately owned lands, for lands belonging to the Federal Government, as now recommended; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States take some action by amendment of the exchange act of May 31, 1918, H. R. 5489, to protect the interest of the State of Oregon, so as to provide that in all applications for exchange under said act the State of Oregon shall be a party to such exchange and given the right to ratify or disapprove all exchanges; and be it

Resolved further, That action be taken by the Congress of the United States to confer jurisdiction upon the Department of the Interior with full power and authority over the lands heretofore withdrawn and set apart as water-power reserves, to the end that the Secretary of the In-

terior may cause a reclassification of said lands to be made and to eliminate from said water-power withdrawals all lands more valuable for the timber standing thereon or for agricultural purposes than for water-power sites; and further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby directed, to forward a copy of this joint memorial, under the certificate and seal of his office, to the Vice President of the United States, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; and further, that a copy be sent to the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the General Land Office, requesting from said officers that further action on such other applications for exchange now pending be withheld pending further investigation by the Department of the Interior, and by the State of Oregon, and pending action by Congress on this memorial.

Adopted by the senate February 14, 1921.

(Signed) ROY W. RITNER,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house January 26, 1921.

(Signed) LOUIS E. BEAN,
Speaker of the House.

Indorsed: House joint memorial No. 9. Introduced by Mr. Bean.

W. F. DRAGER,
Chief Clerk.

Filed February 15, 1921.

SAM A. KOZER,
Secretary of State.

Mr. McNARY presented duplicate copy of the preceding joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, favoring a reclassification of lands heretofore withdrawn and set apart as water-power reserves, so as to eliminate from water-power withdrawals all lands more valuable for the timber and for agricultural purposes than for water-power purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Sam A. Kozer, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 11 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon and filed in the office of the secretary of state February 17, 1921, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 17th day of February, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.]

SAM A. KOZER,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 11.

To the honorable Senators and Representatives in Congress assembled:

Whereas many of the men and women from the State of Oregon who served in the military or naval service during the late war received injuries or suffered impairment of health while in such service; and Whereas many of those so suffering are being referred by the Government authorities to the various public-health officers and boards of pension examiners and hospitals for reconstruction work; and Whereas many physicians and dentists entered the military service for the period of the war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby memorialized to pass at the earliest possible moment some legislation which shall direct the United States Bureau of Public Health and the United States Commissioner of Pensions to appoint physicians and dentists who are now in the military service or who have been honorably discharged from the same as public-health officers and on board of examining surgeons in preference to those who are not in the military or naval service, or have not so served and been honorably discharged; be it further

Resolved, That the United States Bureau of Public Health and the United States Commissioner of Pensions are urged, irrespective of such legislation, to give preference in the making of appointments as hereinabove stated; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this memorial to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon, and also a copy to the United States Bureau of Public Health and a copy to the United States Commissioner of Pensions at Washington, D. C.

Adopted by the senate February 12, 1921.

ROY W. RITNER,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house February 15, 1921.

LOUIS E. BEAN,
Speaker of the House.

Endorsed: Senate joint memorial No. 11. Introduced by Senators Jap Upton and J. B. Bell.

JNO. P. HUNT,
Chief Clerk.

Filed February 17, 1921.

SAM A. KOZER,
Secretary of State.

Mr. McNARY presented a duplicate copy of the preceding joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, favoring legislation directing the United States Bureau of Public Health and the United States Commissioner of Pensions to appoint physicians and dentists who are now in the military service, or who have been honorably discharged therefrom, as public health

officers and on boards of examining surgeons in preference to those who are not in the military or naval service or have not so served and been honorably discharged, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a memorial of sundry members of St. Peter and St. Paul congregations of Morrison Bluff, Ark., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CAPPER presented a memorial of sundry members of St. James's Church of Augusta, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition of the Indiana State Association of Dyers and Cleaners, of Marion, Ind., favoring enactment of the truth in fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution of Local Union No. 821, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, of St. Libory, Ill., favoring legislation prohibiting gambling in grain products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WILLIS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of sundry women members of the First Methodist Church of Van Wert, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution of the Farmers' Institute of Ottoville, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, and favoring a barge canal connecting Cincinnati, Toledo, and Chicago, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TOWNSEND (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented memorials of sundry citizens of Detroit, Vassar, Plymouth, Ypsilanti, Houghton, Owosso, Royal Oak, Three Rivers, Grand Rapids, Niles, Sturgis, Newaygo, and Otsego, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for physical education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CURTIS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10105) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate claims which the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, and Seminole Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 813) thereon.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on Manufactures, to which was referred the bill (S. 4828) to promote the general welfare by gathering information respecting the ownership, production, distribution, costs, sales, and profits in the coal industry and by publication of same, and to recognize and declare coal and its production and distribution charged with public interest and use, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 815) thereon.

Mr. KENYON, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 260) appropriating \$500,000 to convey cereals for the relief of China, reported it with amendments.

SUSPENSION OF NAVAL BUILDING PROGRAM.

Mr. KING. I submit a minority report (Rept. No. 766, pt. 2) in relation to the suspension of the naval building program for a period of six months and ask that it be printed with the majority report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

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. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 5035) authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of the production, consumption, and stocks of animal and vegetable fats and oils in addition to those now being collected and published on cotton seed and cottonseed products, authorized by the act of August 7, 1916; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 5036) to transfer officers of the Coast Guard to the regular line of the Navy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 262) authorizing the preservation of noteworthy motion-picture films and graphophone, phonograph, and talking-machine records; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

AMENDMENTS TO ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN submitted an amendment proposing to authorize the issuance of the distinguished service cross or medal to certain officers in certain contingencies, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. ROBINSON submitted an amendment providing that payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States to the Lonoke (Ark.) Chamber of Commerce, under and pursuant to a lease dated March 20, 1919, providing for the use and occupation by the United States of certain lands near Lonoke, Ark., for aeronautical purposes and for an increased rental from January 1, 1919, be ratified and confirmed, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

SALE OF SHIPS.

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 461), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Whereas the merchant marine act of 1920 directs that the United States Shipping Board shall sell the vessels belonging to the Government to establish a privately owned permanent American merchant marine; and

Whereas it is claimed that the said Shipping Board intends allocating ships to various corporations which now have a large number of ships under their control and upon a basis which would prove unprofitable to the Government of the United States and to the Shipping Board; and

Whereas, on February 21, 1921, a hearing was held by said board for the reallocation of certain ships to corporations which own and control a large number of ships, and it is claimed that said corporations, appearing at said hearing, stated that they expected to operate these ships which they sought to have reallocated to them at a loss to the Government; and

Whereas it is claimed that at said hearing and prior thereto application had been made by other persons and corporations for the purchase of a portion of said ships, the reallocation of which was sought at said hearing on said February 21, 1921, and that by the terms submitted by said proposed purchasers it is claimed the Government and the board would have received a considerable sum of money immediately and that the sale of such ships would have been profitable to the Government and advantageous to the public; and

Whereas it is alleged that the sales division of said Shipping Board recommended that a sale of at least five of said vessels so sought to be reallocated be made to said parties who sought to purchase the same; and

Whereas said board has not acted upon said application to purchase, and it is claimed that said board intends to reallocate said ships upon a basis which will result in loss to the Shipping Board and to the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That said Shipping Board be directed to immediately inform the Senate of all matters hereinbefore set forth, and particularly to inform the Senate whether it intends to reallocate said ships, and whether in so doing the Government and the Shipping Board would sustain an annual loss; and also whether a bona fide offer for the purchase of said ships, or any of them, was submitted, the reason for its rejection, if said offer has been rejected, and also what the policy of the Shipping Board is with respect to the sale of ships when suitable offers are made by private corporations or individuals to purchase the same.

COLD-STORAGE FOODS.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on House bill 9521.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9521) to prevent hoarding and deterioration of and deception with respect to cold-storage foods, to regulate shipments of cold-storage foods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes, and requesting a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GRONNA. I move that the Senate accede to the request of the House of Representatives for a further conference and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GRONNA, Mr. McNARY, and Mr. SMITH of South Carolina conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS—CONFERENCE REPORTS.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the conference reports on the pension bills previously submitted by me and which were ordered to lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the report of the committee of conference on House bill 11554, which will be read.

The reading clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11554) 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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 9, 12, 14, 16, 39, 66, 67, 71, 76, 80, 85, 87, 91, 96, 97, 101, 111, 140, 151, 152, 156, 172, 192, 194, 196, and 197.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 81, 83, 84, 86, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 98, 100, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 153, 154, 155, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 195, and 198, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Emma R. Foster, widow of Benjamin Foster, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Charles H. Heimlich, alias Charles H. Henderson, late of Company E, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of May A. Sanders, widow of William J. Sanders, late of Company F, Thirty-fourth Regiment Michigan Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said William J. Sanders until they reach the age of 16 years."

And the Senate agree to the same.

P. J. McCUMBER,
REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

SAM R. SELLS,
EDGAR R. KIESS,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The reading clerk read the following conference report previously submitted by Mr. McCUMBER:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7775) 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, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 8, 12, 16, 18, 19, 26, 28, 29, 30, 42, 43, 48, 67, and 73.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41,

44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, and 74, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Sophie Reimuller, widow of George Reimuller, late of Company C, Forty-seventh 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 the said George Reimuller until he reaches the age of 16 years."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Jean N. Roach, widow of Ernest S. Roach, late First Lieutenant of Company A, First Regiment Oklahoma Infantry, National Guard, border defense, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said Ernest S. Roach until they reach the age of 16 years."

And the Senate agree to the same.

P. J. McCUMBER,
REED SMOOT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

SAM R. SELLS,
EDGAR R. KIESS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The reading clerk read the following conference report, previously submitted by Mr. McCUMBER:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9281) 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, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 22, 28, 30, 34, 35, 40, 50, 55, 57, 61, 66, 79, 83, 85, 92, 98, 99, 102, 106, 112, 113, 127, 130, 142, and 148.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80, 81, 82, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 97, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 107, 108, 109, 110, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 129, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, and 161, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Jasson Adkins, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Martha E. Waldsmith, widow of William A. Waldsmith, late of Twenty-first 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 each of the minor children of said William A. Waldsmith until they reach the age of 16 years."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Ethel A. Kane, widow of William M. Kane, 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 the minor child of said William M. Kane until she reaches the age of 16 years."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Fanny Weill, widow of Julius Weill, late of Battery M, Fifth 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 Julius Weill until they reach the age of 16 years."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Susan J. Purcell, widow of John J. Purcell, late of Company E, Twenty-first 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 John J. Purcell until they reach the age of 16 years."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Katherine G. Manning, widow of Michael Manning, 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 Michael Manning until they reach the age of 16 years."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Sarah J. Holley, widow of Charles W. Holley, late of Tenth Company, United States Coast Artillery, and Company M, 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 Charles W. Holley until they reach the age of 16 years."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Alice F. Travis, widow of Charles T. Travis, 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 Charles T. Travis until they reach the age of 16 years."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Christine E. Geiger, widow of Austin Geiger, late of the Fortieth and Eighty-fifth Companies, 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 Austin Geiger, until she reaches the age of 16 years."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Mary Michel, widow of John N. Michel, late of Company A, Twelfth 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 the minor child of said John N. Michel, until she reaches the age of 16 years."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Anna M. Neill, widow of Jesse A. Neill, late of Company E, Eleventh 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 Jesse A. Neill until they reach the age of 16 years."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 155, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Bridget Reynolds, widow of James C. Reynolds, late of Company F, Thirty-fifth Regiment, Michigan Infantry,

and Company H, Forty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said James C. Reynolds, until they reach the age of 16 years."

And the Senate agree to the same.

P. J. McCUMBER,
REED SMOOT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

SAM R. SELLS,
EDGAR R. KIESS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The reading clerk read the following conference report previously submitted by Mr. McCUMBER:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10515) 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, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 12, 21, 22, 34, 53, 64, 66, 91, 94, 104, and 107.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, and 111, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Islay T. Pittman, widow of George L. Pittman, late first lieutenant, Second Regiment North Carolina National Guard Infantry, border defense, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said George L. Pittman until they reach the age of 16 years."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert:

"The name of Mary Furfey, widow of Edward A. Furfey, late Battery I, 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 Edward A. Furfey until they reach the age of 16 years."

And the Senate agree to the same.

P. J. McCUMBER,
REED SMOOT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

SAM R. SELLS,
EDGAR R. KIESS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

RELIEF OF DISTRESS ABROAD.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and with accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate:

In further reference to Senate resolution No. 416 I transmit a report by the Secretary of State, inclosing additional information on the subject of "actual conditions and the needs and necessities of the women and children of various distressed nations, countries, or foreign dependencies," as contained in copies of dispatches from the American minister at Belgrade and the American commissioner at Berlin, dated January 18 and January 26, respectively.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
24 February, 1921.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 17, 1921.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House:

In further reference to Senate resolution No. 416, requesting the Secretary of State "to obtain at once, through the consular or other representatives of the United States in foreign lands, accurate information as to the actual conditions and the needs and necessities of the women and children of various distressed nations, countries, or foreign dependencies and transmit the same to the Senate at the earliest possible moment," the undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate if the President approve thereof, additional information concerning this matter as contained in dispatches from the American minister at Belgrade and the American commissioner at Berlin, dated January 18 and January 26, respectively.

Respectfully submitted.

BAINBRIDGE COLBY.

Inclosures: Two as above.

(Dispatch No. 695.)

BELGRADE, January 18, 1921.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,

Washington.

SIR: Your circular telegram of January 7, 7 p. m., received through the embassy in Paris on the 9th instant, instructed me to forward by dispatch a statement regarding conditions in the country where I am stationed, regarding what legitimate calls might be made on charity, regarding the efficiency and economy of the administration in this country of funds being received from the United States, and regarding the steps being taken by the Government and local organizations to meet the need. On the 15th instant I received a further telegram from the embassy at Paris stating that the department now instructed me to telegraph immediately a summary of the relief situation and of the needs. On the 17th instant I accordingly telegraphed the department (telegram No. 5, of January 17, 3 p. m.) giving such a summary. I now avail of the courier to send to the department a somewhat fuller report on these subjects. I confine my reply to Serbia and Montenegro, as I understand the department's inquiry to refer to these portions of Yugoslavia which have especially suffered during the war and as American relief has practically been limited to them.

CONDITIONS IN SERBIA.

It is generally admitted that conditions in Serbia have greatly improved during the two years which have followed the armistice. As usually happens in a primitive agricultural country, two years of good crops have to a great extent set the country on its feet again. There is still shortage and want in certain remote districts, but this is owing to the still extremely defective means of transportation. There is no longer any need for general relief measures.

While this is undoubtedly so, the frightful destruction of human life and of national wealth occasioned by the war has left burdens which have by no means been provided for and which require greater resources to provide for them, except after a number of years, than Serbia possesses. These burdens are of many kinds, but the most important and urgent of them are (1) the care of the war orphans; (2) the repair and equipment of schools; and (3) the repair, equipment, and maintenance of hospitals and dispensaries.

CONDITIONS IN MONTENEGRO.

My information as to conditions in Montenegro is less detailed, but, judging from a number of reports, conditions there show the need for the same specific relief as in Serbia, and also a general shortage of food. Montenegro has never been self-supporting, and added to the usual shortage there is now a still greater one because of the poor crops of the last two years. The Jugo-Slav Government is, however, making efforts to supply this general food shortage and has already accomplished a good deal. Whether it will be able to supply Montenegro adequately is chiefly a question of administration and transportation, as ample supplies of foodstuffs exist in Yugoslavia.

WAR ORPHANS.

Official statistics of the Yugoslavia department of child welfare, which, although probably not very accurate, are the best obtainable, give the total number of war orphans in Serbia and Montenegro as 200,000, classified as follows:

Ninety-five thousand living with relatives.

Forty thousand living with families, the Government contributing to their support.

Ten thousand living in institutions either established by foreign relief missions or by Serbian private initiative; many of these institutions are now closing for want of funds.

Five thousand living in families who receive compensation for their support from the American Commission to Serbia of the Serbian Child Welfare Association of America.

Fifty thousand as yet wholly unprovided for, most of whom have been taken in by very poor peasants. These peasant families are generally too poor to support the children adequately. In most of them the children perform such tasks as they can for their living, thus being unable to attend a school, and live in extreme poverty and neglect.

I am, of course, unable to vouch for the accuracy of this classification, and some well-informed persons with whom I have talked consider that the estimate of 50,000 unprovided orphans is too high. Dr. R. R. Reeder, the director here of the Serbian Child Welfare Association, I understand, considers this classification to be fairly correct. The Jugo-Slav Government is now undertaking a more accurate census of the orphans, which will also give considerable detail regarding their condition. What in any case is certain is that there are many thousands of war orphans in extreme poverty and living in conditions very detrimental to their health and future usefulness.

SCHOOLS.

A very large number, probably practically all the schools of Serbia and Montenegro, suffered more or less during the war. A large number of the buildings were totally destroyed or seriously damaged and probably an equally large number were completely stripped of their furniture and equipment. During the last two years much has been done to repair and reequip these schools, but much still remains to be done. The preliminary survey recently made by the ministry of public instruction states that there are still 130 schools in Serbia entirely unequipped. This figure is probably too low and leaves out of account a considerable number of schools in Montenegro. The ministry of commerce and industry reports that there are 95 trade schools whose normal number of students is 3,805, whose work is wholly or partially stopped through lack of equipment. The ministry of agriculture reports that of the 14 agricultural schools in Serbia, several (number not given) are unable to resume work for want of equipment and repairs.

In this connection it should be remembered that even before the war schools in Serbia and Montenegro were far too few for the population and that the percentage of illiteracy was high.

HOSPITALS AND DISPENSARIES.

I have been unable to obtain figures as to the destruction of hospitals and dispensaries in Serbia and Montenegro during the war. Such destruction has, however, undoubtedly been great, and a large number have not yet been replaced in operating condition. A number of districts, containing many thousand inhabitants, are without a single hospital or dispensary. This situation, however, existed, though to a less extent, before the war, as Serbia was then also very short of hospitals and dispensaries. There is also a shortage of physicians, nurses, and medicines. Serbia had too few physicians before the war, and it is generally estimated that nearly one-half of them died or were killed during the war. Trained nurses were unknown in Serbia before the war, and even now there are practically no really trained Serbian nurses.

ADMINISTRATION OF FUNDS RECEIVED FROM THE UNITED STATES.

As stated in my telegram No. 5, my duties in Belgrade have made it impossible for me to see much of the actual administration and expenditure of the funds sent from the United States, the bulk of which are expended in central and southern Serbia and in Montenegro, where the needs are greatest. The American consuls at Belgrade and Zagreb, the only consuls in Jugoslavia, are similarly situated in this respect. Nevertheless, through conversations with members of charitable societies I have been able to follow their work to a considerable extent, and I have also had the advantage of numerous conversations with disinterested persons, both Americans and Serbs, concerning their activities. From these conversations I have gained the impression that present administration of the funds received from the United States is as a whole efficient and economical. The problem of conducting relief for orphans, schools, and hospitals on so large a scale and under such conditions as are found here is an extremely difficult one and one requiring experience, which was lacking at first, not only for foreigners but even for the Serbs themselves. Efforts have been made to determine the best methods for relief, and as a result of these and of the experience gained great improvements in efficiency have resulted.

As of probable interest in this connection, I may give here a brief statement regarding the activities of the various organiza-

tions working with funds received from the United States. These organizations are the following:

Serbian Child Welfare Association of America: This organization is now the largest private relief organization in Serbia. It began by establishing an orphanage, but has now given up the policy of placing orphans in institutions in favor of placing them in private families, who receive 50 dinars per child per month on condition that the children are sent to school. Children pensioned in families are registered through the regular Government child welfare committees, through which also the pensions are paid. The registration and payments are, however, supervised by the organization. The organization is also repairing and equipping schools wherever it is necessary, so that registered children can go to school. It is also establishing child-welfare centers for groups of from 300 to 500 children, which look after their health. Each center has two nurses—one for the dispensary or center and one for visiting—with two or three Serbian apprentices. Every four centers are grouped together into a unit, to each of which a physician and dentist are attached, who give one-fourth of their time to each center. In all its work the Child Welfare Association has adopted the principle of cooperating with the Government in such a way that eventually the association can gradually withdraw and leave its work wholly in Serbian control. The director of the association, Dr. R. R. Reeder, has created a committee, including representatives of the interested Government departments and leading Serbian health and social welfare organizations to advise him. Similar committees have been formed at all the centers to assist in their operation.

In addition the association is planning to reequip agricultural and trade schools and to found a training school for nurses.

American Women's Hospitals: Maintains a hospital of 40 beds and a children's hospital of 150 beds at Veles; another hospital of 50 beds at Prishtina, a further hospital of 40 beds at Prilep, and dispensaries at Prishtina, Podeavo, Gilane, and Ferisovic. Its director is Dr. Etta Gray.

Serbian Aid Fund: This society aids by small monthly grants some 2,400 children, including the children of officers, State officials, 400 children of the laboring class, and the children under 15 years of the priests who were killed during the war. The money is administered by the Serbian society, known as the Society of Serbian Sisters (Serpski Kola Sestra), which distributes the money through its local chapters or the local child-welfare committees of the Government. Its director is Mrs. Slavko Grouitch.

Serbian American Children's Orphanage: Maintains an orphanage for 150 children at Kamenitza, near Novi Sad. Its president is Mr. John W. Frothingham, and its director in Serbia is Mrs. Darinka Grouitch.

American Red Cross: Maintains an orphanage for 150 children at Podgoritza and an orphanage and trade school for 150 children at Danilograd, both in Montenegro. The representative of the Red Cross in Montenegro, Capt. Whiting, is cooperating with the child-welfare department of the Government in feeding 1,100 children in Montenegro, 5,000 in Herzegovina, and 7,000 in Dalmatia.

Methodist Episcopal Church, European relief: Is contributing about \$500 a month to the support of the Anglo-Serb Hospital in Belgrade and has just purchased for £2,000 a building at Novi Sad for a trade school. The director for Europe is Bishop Edgar Blake, and the representative in Serbia is the Rev. Samuel W. Irwin.

The American Friends' Service Committee, Serbian section: Is maintaining a hospital of 40 beds at Petsch, has constructed about 110 small houses for refugees, and has given exhibitions in model farming. The representative in Serbia is Mr. Andrew R. Pearson. It is understood that this mission will soon retire.

The Serbian and American Hospital and Relief Association: The object of this society is said to be to assist the children of the district of Stepojevat, to extend agricultural work there, and establish a hospital and carry on instruction along public-health lines. The president of the association is the Rev. C. S. Knight. Field directors are Mr. and Mrs. Paul Yeffich. The latter is in the United States, and the former is at Stepojevat. I am informed that this association has as yet not begun any activities.

STEPS BEING TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT OR LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS.

As stated in my telegram, the Jugo-Slav Government is probably doing about as much as it can at present to meet the needs. It should be borne in mind that the Government is confronted with many great problems of State organization resulting from the union of Serbia with the Jugo-Slav Provinces of the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy and with Montenegro. At the same time great calls upon its resources are being made

for many other than charitable or educational objects. Among these may be mentioned the railroads and roads which will have practically to be rebuilt. Moreover, all these problems and expenses are thrust upon the Government at a time when the country has only partly recovered from the physical and financial exhaustion of seven years of war.

The Government has created for the especial care of children the child welfare department, which is attached to the ministry of social reform. Very considerable grants of funds have been made to this department, which has committees and inspectors throughout Serbia. This department, as above stated, is, among other matters, already contributing to the support of 40,000 orphans. American workers with whom I have talked speak favorably of the zeal of many members of the child welfare department. The Government has also repaired and reequipped a large number of schools, hospitals, and dispensaries.

Regarding private local organizations, there are a number of such which have grown up all over the country. Among them may be mentioned the Serbian Red Cross, which, however, confines itself to military relief, and the Society of Serbian Sisters, above mentioned, which already existed before the war and which has now largely extended its work. Such private organizations are, however, comparatively new in Serbia and without much experience. They have gained considerable experience from associating with foreign missions, but they can not as yet be said to fill the same large place in charity work as similar societies do in less primitive countries.

Undoubtedly in time the Government would be able fully to care for all the needs of the country without foreign help, but these needs are so extensive that in its present situation the Government would not be able to care for them fully at present or for some time to come. Meanwhile, unless outside help is given, irreparable injury will result to thousands of children and sick persons whose needs are immediate and can not be postponed. The means at the Government's disposal are undoubtedly increasing, and it should accordingly also be able to increase its activity for relief progressively and in the near future considerably.

I have the honor to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

H. PERCIVAL DODGE,
American Minister.

(File No. 84S/Quin.)

(No. 836.)

AMERICAN COMMISSION,
Berlin, January 26, 1921.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In compliance with the department's unnumbered circular telegraphic instructions of January 7, 1921, I have the honor to give below information regarding conditions in Germany, a brief report on the American organizations now operating in Germany, and particulars as to German efforts for alleviating distress.

Actual living conditions, as demonstrated by a comparison of income and expense, are shown by figures given in Annex "B," which have been prepared for me by one of the largest private relief organizations in Berlin. These figures I have also checked up with the monthly bulletin of statistics for Berlin, prepared by Dr. Silbergleit, which gives the cost of food supplies necessary for the sustaining of life—in other words, based on the usually accepted norm of 3,000 calories.

That the whole population of Germany is still suffering greatly from undernourishment due, principally, to the effect of the blockade as well as the present financial situation can not be questioned. This fact, however, is best proved by the following statistics on the death rate, indicating particularly the resisting power of the individual.

Up to October 1, 1920 (later statistics are not yet available), in 375 German towns with a population of 15,000 or more, totaling 27,700,108 inhabitants, the maximum number of deaths occurred in the month of February, totaling 47,739. Of these 15 per cent were children under one year of age, 9 per cent were tubercular cases, and 35 per cent due to various lung troubles. The births in this month amounted to 51,922, of which 1,988 were stillborn. The minimum number of deaths occurred in the month of September, totaling 25,903, of which 22 per cent were children under one year of age, 11 per cent tubercular cases, and 8 per cent from various lung diseases. The births in this month totaled 46,273, of which 1,562 were stillborn. This latter figure represents also the minimum number of births in any one month up to October 1. The maximum number of births occurred in

the month of March, totaling 55,092, of which 1,985 were stillborn. The deaths in this month reached the figure 46,885.

I must point out early in this report that all statistics are not only difficult to obtain, due to disorganization following the revolution, as well as shortage of funds for preparing compilations, but also lack certain comparative value until analyzed and revised. For example, the population of Germany decreased during the war from 67,000,000 to 60,000,000 (the loss of the districts of Alsace-Lorraine and Posen must be taken into consideration), the hardships of the war affected particularly the old people and the young children, all of which facts particularly change the interpretation of statistics. Again, tuberculosis mortality figures show a decrease over those of 1917 and 1918 (the high point), while actually the extent of the disease is increasing. According to experts, this is due to the fact that only deaths are recorded, and the weaker citizens died off during the most difficult years of the war. No system exists in Germany to-day for officially recording the number of those afflicted with the disease.

Undernourishment is playing a large part in the spread of disease, particularly tuberculosis and rickets among the smaller children. It is reported from Berlin that in 1920 one-third of all children entering the orphan asylums were tubercular, as against one-twelfth before the war. Other figures show a 67 per cent increase of deaths from tuberculosis in Prussia between 1913 and 1918. In Prussian cities alone it reached 72.6 per cent.

Another contributing condition to be considered is the congestion in the large cities and shortage of dwellings. Before the war it was figured that there was a yearly increase in the population of Germany of 800,000, thus necessitating the yearly construction of 200,000 dwellings. As in other countries during the war, little or no building was done in Germany, and in 1919 only 30,000 houses were built. In the city of Berlin alone there are 100,000 families without homes, 22,000 of which are urgent cases requiring immediate relief. Steps have been taken by the authorities to meet this situation, but during the year it has only been possible to build 10,000 additional dwellings, many of which are of only a temporary character. It must be realized that building costs are estimated as having increased fourteenfold. For instance, where before the war there were 18,000 brickyards in operation, there are now but 300. This is due largely to the high cost of coal as well as that of labor. While there is a general movement of people throughout the world to the large centers, Germany has particularly suffered in this respect through enormous emigration from the east and also from the west, where many German families have left Alsace-Lorraine and come to other parts of Germany. It can be safely said that this congested condition plays also a large part in the alarming spread of tuberculosis. I have seen several families crowded into small quarters where oftentimes parents and children are forced to sleep together in the same bed. Furthermore, cases have been reported to me of such shortage of beds that mothers have been forced to give birth to children in the same bed in which their other children were also lying. Before the war such conditions were almost unheard of in Germany.

I can safely say that the most serious condition exists among the children who are suffering not only from lack of proper clothing, but principally from a shortage of milk and proper foodstuffs. The coming generation is truly threatened. From figures prepared by the Quaker Mission, now feeding children throughout Germany, it is shown that the maximum milk ration distributed through official sources in Munich is as follows:

Liters per day:	
Age:	
0-2 years	1½
2-6 years and nursing and expectant mothers, on an average	2

The minimum ration in Elberfeld is as follows:

Liters per day:	
Age:	
0-2 years	1
2-6 years	1½
Nursing and expectant mothers	2

In this city the schedule calls for a distribution of 9,000 liters, of which only 7,500 liters are available.

In an average of 131 cities with a total population of 13,350,000, of which 440,000 were children up to 2 years of age and 565,000 children from 2 to 6 years of age, the following quantities of milk were distributed:

Liters per day:	
Age:	
0-2 years	1
2-4 years	1½
4-6 years	2
Nursing and expectant mothers	2

In 500 cities of 10,000 or more inhabitants, the following percentage of the scheduled milk ration was reached:

Seven cities, 80 per cent.
Seventy cities from 50 to 80 per cent.
Thirty-eight cities from 30 to 50 per cent.
Thirteen cities less than 30 per cent.

Of 193,692 sick people in the city of Berlin, 188,244 were allotted no milk at all. In explanation of this great shortage, it may be added that there are no doubt many cases included in these figures of unscrupulous people, who have claimed sickness in order to obtain a small supply of fresh milk. This lack of milk in Germany can be attributed not only to fewer milk cows but also to lower productivity of these cows. For example, figures show that in 1913, 2,700 liters per cow per year were produced as against 1,100 liters per cow per year in 1919. Shortage of fodder has contributed materially to this result. Furthermore hoof-and-mouth disease is raging throughout Germany at the present time, 99,272 head of cattle being reported as infected on December 30, 1920, of which 9,833 were recently reported as new cases.

The German Government is taking all possible steps to meet this milk shortage, but the lack of purchasing power of the mark prohibits the necessary importation of both condensed and fresh milk and fodder from abroad. However, from January 1, 1920, to November 1, 1920, the following quantities of milk were imported into Germany:

	Liters.
Fresh milk	12,251,749
Condensed, evaporated, and powdered milk (about)	97,000,000
Additional through philanthropic organizations (about)	16,000,000

These figures represent an average increase over the importation of condensed milks in 1913 of 361,000 liters of milk daily, of which figure 50,800 liters come from philanthropic sources.

Naturally, the basis of these conditions described above is that of economic and financial difficulties. With the decrease in the purchasing value of the mark, the purchase of raw materials for importation for German factories has become extremely difficult, if not in many cases impossible. The coal deliveries set under the Spa agreement of July have necessitated considerable reduction in manufacture and transportation. The great decrease in domestic demand due to high prices and the lack of markets, especially Russia, has greatly crippled manufacturing industries. All of this has contributed to an increase in unemployment, figures for which, including the total payments made by the German Government, were on December 15, 1920, as follows:

Men	290,911
Women	74,396
Total	365,307
Dependents	380,384

Total payments made from December 1-15, 1920—49,540,420

The maximum number out of employ of men and women during 1920 was:

January 15	men	347,783
August 1	women	109,017

and the minimum was:

January 1	men	209,930
May 15	women	59,983

In cities of 200,000 population or over, on December 15, the number of unemployed per 1,000 was as follows:

Greater Berlin	24.6
Neukoeln	39.0
Berlin	27.0
Leipzig	22.2
Hamburg	20.3
Koenigsberg	22.3
Dresden	17.5
Munich	16.2
Chemnitz	15.6

Only the first seven on the list are given, and it is interesting to note that in the coal regions of Dortmund, Essen, and Dusseldorf, the figures run, respectively, but 0.1, 0.4, and 2.8. It is from this district that most of the coal is being delivered to the Allies under the Spa agreement.

In quoting figures on unemployment it must be pointed out that to meet the situation the Government has taken on many more employees than are actually needed, many industries have done the same, or are working several short shifts in order to keep men employed and others are finding it cheaper to pay their men than attempt to manufacture at present cost prices. Even so, the figures for December 15, given above, indicated 0.06 per cent of the total population of Germany actually out of employment, and including their families and dependents, 1.24 per cent of the population are affected thereby.

I have had many people passing through Germany ask why it is that Germany's agriculture is not meeting the needs of the

country more successfully. According to Prof. Warmbold, German agriculture before the war furnished (deducting the food produced by the aid of imported fertilizers and feeds) about 90 per cent of her vegetable foods, 67 per cent of her meats and fats, 50 per cent of her milk and dairy products, and 70 per cent of her poultry. In other words, about one-sixth of the population depended on foreign countries for food.

First, it must be remembered that under the peace treaty, Germany lost 25 per cent of her former grain crops, from 10 to 12 per cent of cattle raised, 14.9 per cent of the total farm lands as against but 7.5 per cent of her population. Although the blockade during the war brought about more intensive cultivation of agricultural lands, the impossibility of importing necessary fertilizing phosphates and nitrates caused the productive character of the lands to decrease. Figures show the following decline in agricultural productivity from 1913 to 1919:

1913:		
Grains	million tons	30.7
Potatoes	do.	50.0
Raw sugar	do.	2.7
1919:		
Grains	do.	15.1
Potatoes	do.	20.0
Raw sugar	tons	700,000

While it can rightfully be said that since the armistice there should have been sufficient opportunity to bring in the necessary fertilizing materials, it must again be remarked that the purchasing power of the German mark is so low that such importations are practically prohibited.

To the conditions described above a line on the general demoralization of the people should be added. First, one sees a decline in physical vigor due to the hardships and lack of nourishment during the war. It has been estimated that human efficiency has declined at least 30 per cent. Second, the youth of Germany has markedly deteriorated, due to lack of home discipline during the war. Petty thefts are rife, committed particularly by juvenile offenders. The chief of police of the city of Berlin recently made the statement to a member of my staff that unless a reported theft was over 200,000 marks it was impossible for his office to take up the matter, as they had so much more work than they could possibly accomplish. Third, the revolution removed the former head of the German machine, and the result has been that the machine has only been carrying on through its own inertia, without efficient central direction, and the former famous organization has gradually been crumbling and becoming ineffective. This is evidenced by the willingness on the part of officials of all classes to accept bribes, and by the thefts of baggage in railway trains, hotels, etc. To the German who took such pride in his former efficiency and honesty this has a most disheartening effect. Fourth, the desperate financial and economic situation, the uncertainty of the reparations to be demanded under the Versailles treaty, all of which result in a constant fluctuation of exchange with the consequent difficulty of making and maintaining contracts and purchasing raw materials in foreign countries. In explanation of this last point, I am attaching hereto (Annex "A") four examples of the burden of taxation to be borne by German citizens, and am giving the following brief statement of the financial situation of the country:

On December 1, 1920, the total debt of the Commonwealth was estimated at 233,000,000,000 marks. In this fiscal year (the estimated income (37,700,000,000 marks) was calculated to cover the ordinary expenses. The extraordinary expenses (39,000,000,000 marks) was left uncovered. The income for the first seven months of the year falls short of the estimated income by 8,600,000,000 marks for the entire fiscal year. The shortage of 8,600,000,000 marks is already included in the 233,000,000,000 marks mentioned above. Therefore we must add to this amount the uncovered extraordinary expenses of 39,000,000,000 marks and the sum of 7,500,000,000 marks representing the deficit on the estimate from November 1 to March 31, or a total of 35,500,000,000 marks. The total debt therefore at the end of this fiscal year, exclusive of indemnity and expenses of troops of occupation will be approximately 279,500,000,000 marks.

On December 31 the total note circulation of commonwealth bank notes and loan bank notes amounted to 80,838,300,000 marks, as against on December 31, 1919, 49,279,600,000 marks and in June, 1914, 2,500,000,000 marks. Thus the amount of paper money in circulation during 1920 showed an increase of over 60 per cent. In addition to the above notes are 313,000,000 marks of Reichskasse notes and 200,000,000 marks notes issued by individual banks, such as the Bavarian, Saxon, and so forth. Therefore the total amount of paper money in existence—in circulation and held in the Reichsbank reserve—at the close of the year 1920 was approximately 105,000,000,000 marks. In

December, 1920, the reserve of precious metals held by the Reichsbank equaled but 1,097,409,000 marks.

The most important of the American relief organizations operating in Germany is the American Friends' Service Committee, or better known as the Quaker Mission for Child Feeding, working in conjunction with the American Relief Administration European Child Feeding Fund. This committee is feeding to-day in Germany over 600,000 children daily and 30,000 nursing and expectant mothers. Of these children those between the ages of 6 and 15 years are selected from schools and those under 6 years of age from institutions and day nurseries. The means of selection for feeding is through a medical test, standardized as nearly as possible by a central committee of leading child specialists of Germany, meeting regularly for this purpose, this test being applied by the local city or school doctor. It consists roughly of measuring the height and weight of the child and determining the general condition of the fat layers on the body. The following four general class have been drawn up:

- Class 1. Normal children.
- Class 2. Slightly undernourished.
- Class 3. Badly undernourished.
- Class 4. Dangerously undernourished.

Only the children in classes 3 and 4 are fed, and in most districts sufficient food is provided to entirely cover the children in class 4 and in many districts class 3 as well. In some districts the need is completely covered. The period of feeding is limited to three months, at the end of which time the children are reexamined and reclassified. The feeding consists of one daily ration averaging 667 calories. This ration is given as a supplementary meal, and supposed to be one-third of the normal 2,000 calory ration for children. The Quaker work is now so organized as to cover all cities of 10,000 inhabitants and over and a few rural districts, such as the industrial districts of the Ruhr and Saxony. Otherwise small towns and agricultural districts are not included.

Besides the child-feeding work the Quakers are giving one meal a day of 800 calories to 30,000 nursing and expectant mothers. This feeding begins three months before confinement, and is continued as long during the nursing period as the doctor in attendance believes necessary.

I realize that this is but a brief sketch of an enormous task, and I can not speak too highly of the quiet, tactful, and efficient manner in which the representatives of the American Friend' Service Committee have carried on their work during the past year in Germany. I hear nothing but praise from officials of the German Government as well as from the various German societies cooperating or assisting the Quakers in their work, and I believe that there is no doubt but that this feeding of German children has had far-reaching effect in preventing a further spread of radicalism, particularly among the working classes and unemployed.

The next American effort of importance is that of the American Relief Administration Warehouses with headquarters in Hamburg and delivery stations in Berlin, Dresden, Frankfurt-on-Main, Munich, Stuttgart, and Leipzig. A station will also be opened shortly at Breslau. The details of this package distribution system are no doubt already known to the department, but it is of interest to give here a few general figures regarding the work accomplished by this organization since its beginning in January, 1920. Up to December 13, 1920, \$1,879,850 worth of drafts had been sold for Germany. These drafts are divided among the four categories of packages, as follows:

\$10, "A"	89,381
\$50, "B"	23,130
\$10, "C"	9,866
\$50, "D"	1,020

In the month of December in Berlin alone the following number of packages were delivered:

"A"	1,693
"B"	161
"C"	269
"D"	6

It is interesting to note that while the German American Relief Association Warehouses now stand only second to Vienna in size, at first considerable difficulty was experienced in getting this scheme started in Germany. This was due particularly to the pride of the German people and a certain reluctance to ask for assistance from friends in America, as well as hesitation in making a general appeal in the United States for fear of possible rebuff. This hesitancy has now been successfully overcome and, besides the personal drafts, the warehouses here are receiving so-called "general-distribution" drafts as well. These drafts come from individual organizations in America, without specification of a particular beneficiary, distribution being left to the discretion of the American Relief Association

representatives in Germany. In such cases the German Red Cross is generally asked to suggest beneficiaries, such as needy orphan asylums, etc. It is interesting furthermore to note that many drafts are purchased by casual travelers in Germany who have become so impressed with the general need that they wish to contribute in some way. The case was quoted of one gentleman in particular who had bought well over 100 food drafts in this way.

The American Red Cross, while maintaining an office in Berlin, is doing no relief work in Germany at the present time. The office here is purely one for transmission of mail and telegrams to the Red Cross units working farther to the east.

The American Young Men's Christian Association, while having a considerable staff in Germany, is devoting its efforts entirely to assisting the Russians confined in the prison camps of Germany and cooperating with other organizations in the general relief of prisoners being exchanged by the bolshevist and German Governments. No direct relief of the German civilian population is undertaken by this organization.

Another American activity that has shown considerable development recently is that of the feeding of university students. This work was originally organized by the British Quakers, who contributed most of the funds, but who are now being assisted by the American Quakers. At the present time 13,000 students in 31 universities and technical high schools (technische hochschulen) throughout Germany are being helped to obtain one good meal daily. This help consists of giving to the messrooms of the universities raw food to the value of 1.50 marks per day per student, this food to increase the value of the meal already being given. The great need of these university students has not received the publicity that has been given to the condition of the children in Germany, but as many of these students are sons of the middle and professional classes, who are, perhaps, suffering most under present conditions, it goes without saying that they have but scant means with which to pursue their education. Many are existing on as little as 200 marks a month or less, out of which sum must come expenses for food, clothing, academic fees, etc.

The work now being conducted by the British and American Quakers is to be turned over some time in March to the World's Student Christian Federation, an organization formed in 1894, representing 42 countries and having headquarters in Switzerland. At a meeting of this federation in August, 1920, at which all countries were represented, it was voted to undertake the relief of students, and to raise a tentative budget of \$1,000,000 for this purpose. The American representatives of the federation pledged themselves to \$800,000, and, as I understand, have joined in the relief campaign now being conducted in the United States under the direction of Mr. Hoover. Through agreement, they are to make use of the Hoover stores and organizations in Europe and to take over any student feeding that is now being conducted by such organizations. Two hundred thousand dollars worth of these stores have been guaranteed for immediate use, it being understood, however, that where these stores are used the work will be under American supervision. The effort of the federation in Germany will be to make use of existing organizations as much as possible, and the first step has been to unite the two big German associations—the student unions and the German Christian student movement.

Other large German charitable organizations are the Caritas Verband, representing the Catholic effort, the Zentral Wohlfahrtsstelle der deutschen Juden, representing the Jewish effort, and the Deutscher Hilfsbund. These organizations are receiving contributions directly, supplies simply passing through the hands of the central committee as a matter of record and in order to obtain entry free of duty.

Mention should be made of the work of the Central Committee for the Relief of Distress in Germany and Austria, headed by Dr. Lieber. This organization, working to a large extent through the American relief section of the German Red Cross, had up to October 15, 1920, sent gift packages to Germany amounting to approximately 350,000,000 marks. At the present time the contributions from this committee are passing through the hands of the Central Committee for Foreign Relief, the organization which I shall speak of later.

Other American organizations are the American Welfare Association (Charity Bazaar Association of Milwaukee), which, with a fund of approximately \$2,000,000, have been distributing milk, money, etc., throughout Germany. This association does not work in conjunction with other associations and has no particular office. Die Deutsch-Amerikanische Frauenhilfe (quarterly collection) had up to May 20 distributed about 430 cases of clothing and placed \$21,000 at the disposal of the German Red Cross, through which organization they are working. I understand, however, that this arrangement with the Red Cross is

not entirely satisfactory to the members of the Frauenhilfe. Other funds from America have come from the Methodist, Catholic, and Jewish associations, this relief being paid over directly to the corresponding religious organizations in Germany. From these sources gifts amounting to approximately 13,000,000 marks had been recorded in the central committee up to October 15, 1920.

A word should be added as to the part that the German Government has played not only in assisting these American philanthropic efforts, but also in attempting itself to meet the situation.

Perhaps the most satisfactory effort toward meeting the situation has been the organization of a semi-official committee for foreign relief (Zentral Ausschuss fuer Auslands Hilfe). This body was formed in the beginning of 1920 for the purpose of coordinating foreign relief for Germany and collecting information from the various parts of Germany as to general conditions and need of relief. To this central committee belong members of most of the large charitable organizations in Germany, and there are representatives of the committee in every district throughout the country. From the Government the committee has obtained free import for all supplies passing through their hands and assurance of financial support providing current expenses are not covered by the slight charges added to the insurance and transport costs on the various goods received. Unfortunately, at the start the central committee came into conflict with the efforts of the German Red Cross, but matters have now been smoothed out, so that I consider the former the most efficient organization for the distribution of future relief supplies. A good example of their activity is shown by the recent gift of 700,000 yards of flannel cloth by the American Red Cross to the American Quakers for distribution in Germany. The Quaker organization, which works through the central committee and is also an ardent supporter of this organization, immediately placed the disposition of this flannel cloth in the hands of the central committee, and in the weekly meeting of this committee the reports of needs for clothing throughout Germany were gone over carefully and the flannel cloth distributed where the need was greatest.

By a recent agreement with the American Friends' Service Committee, the German Government contracts, beginning October 1, 1920, and lasting until June 1, 1921, to add to the child-feeding supplies flour and sugar necessary for the rationing of an average of 500,000 children. This represents approximately 45 per cent of the total feeding costs, as based on American prices. In addition to this, the German authorities pay for the unloading of the food supplies in Germany, the warehousing of these supplies, the freight charge across the interior of the country, insurance, expenses of local warehousing, transferring supplies from local warehouses to the individual kitchens, and the cooking and serving of all meals. This work, of course, is done under Quaker supervision. One-third of the cost of the first four items is paid by the national Government, one-third by the State governments, and one-third by the local city organizations. Twenty-five thousand Germans are employed in this work, of whom one-fourth are volunteers. The others are paid by the cities and local organizations. To help toward the payment of these charges, those children who can afford it pay from 25 to 40 pfennigs per meal to the various local German organizations. It is estimated that the cost per meal is approximately 35 pfennigs. No child, however, is refused food on account of inability to pay.

In the case of the American Relief Administration the German Government gives free entry of all food supplies, free transportation on all bulk shipments to the local American Relief Association delivery stations, and has modified postal regulations so as to accept the small type "A" and type "C" packages.

Among the various measures for relieving distress, perhaps the most important is the effort of the German Government to reduce the price of rationed foods. During the fiscal year 1919-20 7.75 billion marks were appropriated for this purpose, and 3,000,000,000 marks in 1920-21. This total of 10.75 billion marks is divided as follows:

	[In billions.]	Marks.
Bread, flour	-----	4.50
Meats	-----	3.20
Fats	-----	2.20
Local potatoes	-----	.70
Other foodstuffs	-----	.15
		10.75

In view of the bad harvest, it will now be necessary to make up the unexpected deficiency in bread flour with larger purchases from abroad and an additional appropriation of 7,000,000,000 marks is anticipated, thus making a total of 10,000,000,

000 marks for the year 1920-21. Future developments in the exchange rates will naturally affect this expenditure.

The general laws for social betterment or assistance of the German population are as follows:

(1) Commonwealth law for the assistance of citizens: A law dating back to 1870, which provides for the care of the poor and destitute.

(2) Weekly aid: Introduced in 1919, providing assistance for nursing and expectant mothers with incomes under 4,000 marks per year. Under this law, for 10 or 12 weeks, each mother receives 1.50 marks per day, 75 pfennigs for nursing her child, and 50 marks for expenses of birth.

(3) Assistance to unemployed: A law introduced in 1918, shortly after the revolution, providing for payments to all people out of employ. The rates of payments vary in different localities.

(4) Assistance for the war maimed and war widows and orphans: A law introduced in 1920 providing for a definite monthly pension, a certain percentage of which is paid to the beneficiaries according to the merits of their case. Under this law also is a provision covering the care of health and the education of children. This law affects 1,500,000 cripples and 3,500,000 widows, orphans, etc., a total of 5,000,000.

(5) Care of cripples: A law introduced in 1920, providing no pension, but care and training for cripples of daily life. This law cares for those not provided for under No. (4).

(6) Social insurance—a law introduced in the nineties, but recently revised. This is a straight insurance system to which monthly payments are made. It covers three classes:

(a) Sickness insurance bureau, allowing pensions for a maximum of 26 weeks yearly.

(b) Invalid insurance, providing pensions for the permanently injured.

(c) Employees' insurance—a revision of the law of 1913, providing separate insurance for salaried officials.

(7) Colonization law of 1920—to assist in the building of dwellings. This assistance was designed for use particularly in the industrial districts, and to date has been put into effect only in the coal regions.

(8) Law for child protection—this law is under discussion at the present time, and contemplates measures assuring every child attention and instruction necessary for its development. This will, however, involve considerable expense, and for this reason there is much opposition thereto.

Aside from these general laws it may be added that the public throughout Germany has made a general attempt to meet the distressing situation of the children by collecting by general subscription a children's fund. This fund to-day stands at 20,000,000 marks. A particularly interesting development is one started by the workmen in several districts, in which two extra hours of work per week are advocated, devoting the funds thus obtained to philanthropic purposes, with the object of making workmen's philanthropic organizations self-supporting. This movement is now already in effect in the district of Waldenburg, Silesia.

In closing this report I should like to make several suggestions for possible relief in Germany. In the first place, I trust that the American Friends' Service Committee will receive sufficient funds to enable them to complete their schedule as outlined to June 1, 1921. If, however, funds could be provided enabling them to increase their feeding to cover 1,000,000 children, they would then be fully supplying the needs of classes 3 and 4. Further relief should then take the form of shoes and clothing.

In the city of Gratz, to take an example at random, of 1,842 school children, 50 per cent had but two shirts, 25 per cent had but one shirt, 7 per cent had no shirt, 25 per cent had but two pairs of stockings, 30 per cent had but one pair of stockings, 15 per cent had no pair of stockings, 30 per cent had neither coat nor warm jacket, 8 per cent had but wooden or cloth shoes, 1 per cent had no shoes whatever.

In the case of the American Relief Administration warehouses, I believe that the idea of general distribution drafts could be further increased to great advantage, for in this way the middle class, which is severely affected by present conditions, could be most successfully reached. I have had brought to my particular attention the cases of various musicians, who have profited by a fund of this sort raised by Kreisler in America.

As to further efforts, a member of one of the largest private relief organizations in Berlin informed me that at the present time above all cash funds were necessary. It seems that many private institutions have been forced to close their doors, and of the Caritas Verein, the great Catholic organization comprising all Catholic charitable undertakings, 800 institutions

cares for 17,000 children are in immediate danger of bankruptcy. In this connection I made inquiries into the overhead costs of a large charitable institution, and found that where in 1913 administration expenses were 80,000 marks, during 1920 it was necessary to pay out 500,000 marks. Even with this tremendous increase many special statistical bureaus had to be given up as it was impossible to pay for the necessary clerks and secretaries. Where before the war a clerk received 250 marks monthly, he now receives from 1,000 marks to 1,100 marks. Stenographers' wages have increased from 200 marks to 1,000 marks monthly, and secretaries from 400 marks to 1,500 marks.

I have pointed out above the great shortage of milk, which, of course, carries particular hardship for the children and diminishes the successful chances of fighting sickness and disease. In passing, I also mentioned in connection with the congestion in cities the shortage of beds. This point was particularly brought out by the charitable organization referred to above. The minimum cost to-day for one complete bed is 700 marks, a sum quite beyond the reach of the great majority of the people.

While I realize that the demands for assistance from all parts of the world to-day are very great, I nevertheless desire to emphasize the particular importance of the part that Germany plays in the general European reconstruction problem and the consequent advisability of assisting these people. Normal tasks and normal ways must be resumed at the earliest possible moment in order that the economic "switchboard" of Europe, as Germany has been so aptly called, may again start functioning. With the switchboard in shape, it is fairly safe to say that the distress in the surrounding countries, caused largely by the upset of normal trade and commercial conditions, will be all the sooner alleviated.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

ELLIS LORING DRESEL,
American Commissioner.

ANNEX A.
EXAMPLE 1.

A private man owns on June 30, 1919, property worth 100,000,000 marks; hereof 25,000,000 marks are an increase during the war. The tributary dies in the year 1920 and bequeaths his property in equal parts to his two nephews. One of them has no property, while the other possesses 1,000,000 marks. Assessment will be as follows:

	Marks.
Property on June 30, 1919	100,000,000
1. Tax on property increase during the war	24,828,000
Remainder	75,172,000
2. Commonwealth sacrifice levy on property	47,779,550
	27,392,450
3. Tax on inheritance	1,332,622
4. Tax on legacy to be paid by the nephew who hitherto had no property	5,032,245
5. Tax on legacy to be paid by the nephew who owns property worth 1,000,000 marks	7,548,367
Total of tax on inheritance and legacy (3, 4, and 5)	13,913,234
Remainder of the property of 100,000,000 marks	13,479,216

EXAMPLE 2.

A private individual owns property worth 10,000,000 marks, whereof 4,000,000 marks are invested with an industrial company which could have declared a 20 per cent dividend for 1920 were it not subjected to a corporation tax. The remaining property capital bears 5 per cent. No increase of property. Without taxes this man would have a yearly income of 1,100,000 marks.

	Marks.
Commonwealth sacrifice levy	5,417,750.00
Property remaining	4,582,250.00
Virtual income (income without taxes from remaining property):	
Dividends	800,000.00
Interest on capital	29,112.50
	829,112.50
This income is diminished by—	
Corporation tax	160,000.00
Tax on capital yield	64,000.00
Income tax	315,160.00
	539,160.00
The income remaining amounts to	289,952.50

As a consequence of the new taxes, the property is diminished from 10,000,000 marks to 4,582,250 marks, and the income from 1,100,000 marks to 289,952.50 marks.

EXAMPLE 3.

A private individual owns property worth 1,000,000 marks. No war profits. The invested capital bears 5 per cent interest. One-third of the Commonwealth sacrifice levy (rounded up to 82,250 marks) is paid and 6½ amortization for the remainder.

	Marks.
Commonwealth sacrifice levy	244,250.00
Hereof paid one-third	82,250.00
Debt remaining	162,000.00
Remaining amount of property	917,750.00
Income therefrom	45,887.50
From this income are to be deducted—	
1. 6½ per cent of M. 162,000 annual amortization	10,530.00
2. Levy on capital yield	4,588.00
3. Income tax	7,272.00
	22,390.00
Income remaining	22,497.50

This man, who prior to the war had an income of about 45,000 gold marks, after deduction of taxes, now, if the depreciation of German currency is estimated at 10.1, after deduction of taxes, disposes of an income of only 2,250 gold marks, which is what an ordinary workman earned before the war.

EXAMPLE 4.

Assessment of companies.
[E. g., joint-stock company.]

	Marks.
Invested capital	200,000,000
Value of the whole property of the company	300,000,000
Net profit	50,000,000
Hereof 10,000,000 marks are placed in the reserve fund; 40,000,000 marks, or 20 per cent, remain.	
The company has to share in the commonwealth sacrifice levy with 10 per cent of the property exceeding the invested capital. Accordingly the company pays:	
Commonwealth sacrifice levy	10,000,000
Corporation tax, 10 per cent of net profit	5,000,000
Corporation tax, 10 per cent of dividend distributed	4,000,000
The total corporation tax amounts to 9,000,000 marks.	

Apart from the above taxes there must be taken into account additional taxes on yield of property, i. e., ground and building taxes and license taxes, which are levied by the various States and communities and differ in amounts.

ANNEX B.

Income tax rates on the income of an unmarried workman.

Income (marks):	Tax rate (per cent.)
15,000	14.6
16,000	15.2
17,000	15.7
18,000	16.2
19,000	16.7
20,000	17.2
21,000	17.6
22,000	18.1
23,000	18.5
24,000	19.0
25,000	19.5

Married workmen are accorded abatements inconsiderable in figure.

THE ACTUAL BUDGET OF FOUR DIFFERENT HOUSEHOLDS IN BERLIN.

(1) A man injured in war, who is now employed in a gas plant, supporting a sickly wife and three daughters of 11, 13, and 14 years. Living quarters consist of one small, dark room with kitchen, and with but three beds for the five people. Children have but two much-patched skirts apiece and no shoes, two wearing wooden clogs and one felt shoes:

Expenses for five persons:	Marks.
Food	725
Heat and light	50
Soap	45
Rent	30
Total (against receipts of 710 marks)	850

Receipts:	Marks.
Wages	600
War pension	110
	710

(2) A man out of work, with wife and eight children. Wife is partially incapacitated by one lame arm. This family have but three beds for the 10 people, and quarters consisting of two rooms and a kitchen. Clothing is particularly lacking:

Expenses for 10 persons:	Marks.
Food	1,450
Heat and light	80
Soap	90
Total (against receipts of 910 marks)	1,620

Receipts:	Marks.
Unemployment allowance.....	740
Earnings of wife.....	20
Earnings of daughter.....	150
	910

(3) A widow and two children largely dependent on charity:

Expenses for three persons:	Marks.
Food.....	435.00
Heat and light.....	34.50
Soap.....	27.00
Rent.....	29.00
Total (against receipts of 460 marks).....	525.50

Receipts:	Marks.
Charity.....	70.00
Invalidity pension.....	80.00
Earnings of son.....	100.00
Earnings of wife.....	150.00
	400.00

(4) A widow without family:

Expenses for one person:	Marks.
Food.....	550.00
Heat and light.....	30.00
Soap.....	18.00
Rent.....	32.50
Total (against receipts of 520 marks).....	630.50

Receipts:	Marks.
Salary.....	500.00
Orphan pension.....	20.00
	520.00

These figures given above are simply for the bare expenses of existence, taxes, car fare, shoes or clothing being out of the question, and in all four cases—and they are typical of many thousands of families—the earnings fall short of expenses, so that unless help comes from other sources some of the necessities have to be gone without.

Dr. Silbergleit's figures on food costs for Berlin, based on the calorie norm of 3,000, are as follows:

Per week:

	Man.	Man and wife.	Man, wife, and 7 to 12 year old child.
Ration.....	\$15.43	\$30.86	\$48.48
Open market.....	46.09	75.23	82.88
Total December, 1920.....	61.49	106.09	131.36
In August, 1920 (lowest month).....	57.20	97.64	116.32
In April, 1920 (highest month).....	71.43	121.25	138.37

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WARREN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 15, 29, 34, 65, and 74.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 27, 31, 32, 36, 38, 39, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 77, 78, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, and 98; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the matter inserted by said amendment, insert as a separate paragraph the following:

"Sixty per cent of the foregoing sums for the District of Columbia shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent out of the Treasury of the United States."

And, on page 3 of the bill, strike out lines 23 to 26, inclusive.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the

sum proposed insert "\$1,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$85,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$70,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 14, 20, 25, 26, 28, 33, 35, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 62, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83.

F. E. WARREN,
CHARLES CURTIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

JAMES W. GOOD,
J. G. CANNON,
JOHN M. EVANS,

Managers on the part of the House:

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the list of disagreements which the Secretary has just read covers 25 or 26 matters which were taken back to the House under the House rule. The House has agreed to every one of that lot, with the exception of five. Four of the five are simply little changes of language and do not change the effect or the amount. That leaves only one which they have disagreed to that carries any amount of money or is of any significance, and that one is with reference to repairs of the Coast Guard ship *Onondaga*. Since the House must be advised of our action, I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments numbered 40, 52, 53, and 62, which are simply changes of language, and that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 33, being the disagreement of the House on the repairs of the ship *Onondaga*.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the first motion should be on agreeing to the conference report so far as agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. I ask that the report be agreed to.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. I now renew my motion with reference to the amendment referred to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming, but the Chair thinks the action of the House should first be read.

Mr. WARREN. Very well; let it be read.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 14, 20, 25, 26, 28, 35, 37, 41, 42, 43, 45, 54, 55, 56, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83 to the bill (H. R. 15962) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes," and agrees to the same.

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 7 of said amendment, after "in," insert "House Documents Nos. 986 and 997 and."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 52, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"So much as may be necessary of that part of the sum of \$46,000,000 appropriated in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921 for medical and hospital services of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance allotted to the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers is made available for the erection of quarters for the medical staff at the various branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 53, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of lines 1 to 7, inclusive, of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided, That the limitation specified in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921 on expenditures for pay of chemists and for clerical, inspection, and messenger service in the supply and accounting departments of the navy yards and naval stations and disbursing offices for the fiscal year 1921, under 'Maintenance, Supplies and Accounts,' is increased by \$750,000."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 12 of said amendment strike out "\$312,811.27."

That the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I wish to understand the effect of the motion of the Senator from Wyoming. Is it the purpose of the Senator by the motion to bring the two Houses into accord? Will a further conference be necessary if the motion prevails?

Mr. WARREN. If my motion prevails no further conference will be necessary.

Mr. ROBINSON. There was an amendment referred to in the action of the House read relating to a fund appropriated last year of \$46,000,000 in connection with the treatment of sick and disabled soldiers. I desire to understand the effect of that amendment. Was it a Senate amendment or a House provision or an amendment inserted in conference?

Mr. WARREN. There was a Senate amendment which provided that of that sum, \$46,000,000, a certain amount could be used to build quarters for the physicians who are in the service of caring for those unfortunates. The comptroller has ruled that the language as carried would provide for the soldiers themselves, but that legislation is required in order to give quarters to the surgeons. The amendment was to take out the sum which the Senate said should not be exceeded in building each set of quarters; that is all.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, this bill carried a provision on page 43 for completing the Government free bathhouse at Hot Springs, Ark.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. The sundry civil bill carried a similar provision, inserted as a Senate amendment, and an additional provision changing the name of the reservation to the Hot Springs National Park.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. Am I correct in the assumption that the appropriation stays in the urgent deficiency bill, and the provision changing the name to the Hot Springs National Park remains in the sundry civil bill?

Mr. WARREN. The amount appropriated happens to be in one of the two bills. I have forgotten which one of the two, but it is in one bill and has been taken out of the other.

Mr. ROBINSON. Clearly the appropriation goes out of the sundry civil bill?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. That was the proper bill in which to carry it, although it makes no difference so far as the results are concerned which bill carries it. The sundry civil bill, in addition to the appropriation, also contained a provision in which I am interested.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator refers to the provision changing the name of the reservation?

Mr. ROBINSON. I refer to the provision changing its name.

Mr. WARREN. That stands in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well.

Mr. WARREN. So that both the matters in which the Senator from Arkansas is interested have been favorably acted upon. One of the two—the one for building the bathhouse—was left in this deficiency bill so as to render it immediately available.

Mr. ROBINSON. But one of them is cared for in the urgent deficiency bill and the other in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. In view of the explanation of the Senator from Wyoming, I have no objection to the motion made by him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN].

The motion was agreed to.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill.

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

The Senate proceeded to consider 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. 15682) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, which 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. 15682) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 9, 11, 19, 28, 33, 39, 50, 56, 57, 66, 67, 71, 75, 78, 79, 88, 90, 91, 99, 107, 110, 111, 113, 114, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, and 126.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 12, 15, 16, 29, 30, 35, 41, 47, 52, 54, 55, 63, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 80, 84, 85, 86, 98, 100, 105, 115, 116, 117, 125, 127, and 128, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$13,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$7,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$65,000, of which sum \$15,000 shall be immediately available"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$273,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$380,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 112: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,222,004"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 53, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 76, 77, 81, 82, 83, 87, 89, 92, 93, 94, 95, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 108, 109, 129, and 130.

CHARLES CURTIS,

A. J. GRONNA,

HENRY F. ASHURST,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. A. ELSTON,

S. WALLACE DEMPSEY,

W. W. HASTINGS,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CURTIS. I move the adoption of the conference report. The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The reading clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 13, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 31, 34, 36, 37, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 58, 59, 76, 77, 81, 87, 89, 92, 93, 103, 108 to the bill (H. R. 15682) entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922," and agrees to the same.

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum of \$460,000 named in said amendment insert "\$400,000."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 17, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum of \$200,000 named in said amendment insert "\$150,000."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 20, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and after the word "Oklahoma" in the matter as restored insert a colon and the matter inserted by said amendment.

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 25, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In line 9 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "hereafter."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "prescribed," at the end of said amendment, insert: "Provided, That this provision shall not apply to the Five Civilized Tribes."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 27, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "buildings," insert "at the Indian School, Phoenix, Ariz."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 32, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum \$1,000 named in said amendment insert "\$500"; and at the end of said amendment, after "United States," insert "and if authorized to be paid, to be reimbursed from the tribal funds of the Navajo Indians."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"IOWA.

"Sec. 5a. For the construction, maintenance, and operation of a drainage system for lands of the Sac and Fox Indians in Iowa, \$10,000, payable from the tribal funds of such Indians: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into agreements, or make other suitable arrangements, with owners of adjacent lands benefited by the construction of such drainage system as will insure from such owners payment, on a per acre basis, of a proportionate part of the construction, operation, and maintenance of said drainage system."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 42, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "for new heating and power plant, \$55,000; for repairs and construction of drain, ditches, and dikes on the Haskell School farm, \$18,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 43, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$245,600."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: After "necessary," at the end of said amendment, insert "and reimbursable from any fund of said Blackfeet Tribe that may be now or hereafter placed in the Treasury of the United States to their credit."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 61, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "for improvement of domestic water supply and irrigation system, \$5,000."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 62, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$99,900."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 64, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert ", to be immediately available, and the amount of \$7,000 heretofore appropriated for this purpose shall be available until expended."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 82, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to report to Congress at the beginning of the next regular session what necessity there is, if any, for new buildings and the enlargement and remodeling of present buildings at the Chilocco Indian School, Oklahoma, and if he finds such necessity to exist to make such recommendations therefor as he may deem appropriate, together with a statement of the cost of carrying them into effect."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 94, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "for heating plant, \$40,000."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$187,400."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of said amendment, strike out "support" and insert "education."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 102, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out "\$12,000" and insert "\$8,000."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 109, and agrees to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States, so much as may be

necessary of the tribal funds of the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin, arising under the acts of June 12, 1890 (26 Stat., p. 146), and March 28, 1908 (35 Stat., 51), and to make therefrom a per capita payment or distribution of not to exceed \$50 to such Indians entitled thereto under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe. And the authority granted in this paragraph shall be effective immediately upon the approval of this act."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 8 of said amendment, after "January," insert "15."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 10, after the figures "1895," insert a period and strike out the remainder of said amendment.

That the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 53, 65, 83, 104, and 106.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the Senate amendments numbered 14, 17, 20, 25, 26, 27, 32, 40, 42, 43, 60, 61, 62, 64, 82, 94, 95, 101, 102, 109, 129, and 130.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. I now move that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 53, 65, 83, 104, and 106.

I will state to the Senate that two of these amendments involve items in regards to totals; one relates to an item of \$50,000 for irrigation in Montana; another to an item of \$50,000 pertaining to an irrigation project in Washington; and another to a claim of Stevens and Ferry Counties, in Washington, amounting to \$115,000. At first it was my intention to ask that these items go back to conference, but I have been informed by the House managers that unless the conference report be agreed to to-day it is very doubtful if the Indian appropriation bill can be enrolled in time. These items were discussed for more than a day in conference; they were then taken back to the House, and there voted on. The vote against them was about two to one. So that I feel it will be useless to again take them back to conference. Therefore I ask that the Senate recede from the amendments, which will bring the two Houses together on all of the items. I may add that the items which have been left out may very well go over until the next session without any great harm being done.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I desire to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs as to the item pertaining to the Chemawa Indian Training School at Salem, Oreg.

Mr. CURTIS. That amendment was agreed to by the House with an amendment, which has already been adopted, eliminating one of the items inserted by the Senate and retaining the other item.

Mr. McNARY. Did the item which has been eliminated embrace the construction of the boys' dormitory?

Mr. CURTIS. The dormitory item was the one that was eliminated, while the other item was retained; but the officials of the Department stated that they thought they could get along without the dormitory for another year.

Mr. JONES of Washington. As I understand the Senator, it is his judgment that the House would not recede from its disagreement to the two Senate amendments covering Washington items to which he has referred, and that if an agreement should not be reached upon the bill to-day the entire bill is likely to fail.

Mr. CURTIS. That is my information.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Is that the Senator's opinion?

Mr. CURTIS. That is my opinion. I am satisfied from the contest made in conference that the conferees on the part of the House would not agree, especially in face of the vote of two to one against the items in the House.

Mr. JONES of Washington. While I am very anxious to see those two items agreed to, I do not feel, of course, that I should retard the passage of the bill on that account under the circumstances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that concludes the Indian appropriation bill.

CLASSIFICATION OF CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I submit the following motion, which I ask may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

I move that the Committee on Appropriations, to which, on March 22, 1920, was referred Senate bill 4106, to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and the standardization of compensation therefor, and for other purposes, together with the report of the Congressional Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries, be discharged from the further consideration of said bill and report, and that said bill and report be referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. KING. I object.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I object. I understand that that is a proposition to discharge the Committee on Appropriations from the further consideration of the reclassification bill and papers in connection therewith which have been referred to that committee. I do not wish to work against the ambition or the good work of my friend from South Dakota. I hope that his committee, as well as other committees, may enter upon a work which has been neglected to some extent, first, because of the short session; second, because of the amount of work that has been imposed upon the different committees; and, third, because of the changes up and down in the matter of salaries, living expenses, and so forth.

It has become necessary for the Appropriations Committee, in connection with the matter of the bonus which has been before that committee, to declare what is its intention hereafter in regard to the bonus and additional payments to Government employees. I have been instructed by that committee to declare that after the present session we will not entertain further the proposition of granting bonuses in addition to the regular pay. That, of course, will necessitate a rearrangement, so far as may be necessary, of the salaries paid Government employees, and such rearrangement will, of course, require a great deal of attention from several directions.

All of the salaries paid the Government employees are known to the Committee on Appropriations, because it is their duty to recommend the appropriations for the various employees, with only small exceptions. That committee has to inform itself as to the salaries paid to thousands of men and women which are not stated in terms, because the persons affected do not occupy what are called statutory positions. Of course, there should be some coordination and some consideration as between the salaries of the two classes of employees.

The Appropriations Committee has stated that, unless other committees having it in charge shall present a bill, the Appropriations Committee expects to be obliged to take up the reclassification work and bring in at the next session some proposition covering this matter. We have already expended considerable work on it, and, since it makes no difference to any committee, with the exception perhaps of the Appropriations Committee, where the technical possession of the papers may be, for they are all printed and at the disposition of any committee which may require them, and inasmuch as some additional help has been asked for and received by the Committee on Appropriations, it is rather necessary, in order to avoid expense and for other reasons, that the matter should remain where it is for the present. In the meantime, the Appropriations Committee will welcome any and all bills drawn or suggestions, information, and help in working out the problem.

So I hope, Mr. President, that the motion of the Senator from South Dakota will not prevail, and that for the present the matter may rest where it now is, with the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question, if I may. It is my understanding that there was placed in one of the appropriation bills an item to aid and assist the committee, or one of the organizations of the Government, in securing data with reference to this very matter. Is that so?

Mr. WARREN. That is true.

Mr. CURTIS. And a report is to be made to the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. WARREN. That is true.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I understand that there is no objection to the present consideration of this motion.

Mr. KING. I objected to its consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. It is out of order now, anyhow.

Mr. WARREN. I could have made the objection.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator from Wyoming, who is the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, could have made the objection, but I understood that he waived the objection.

Mr. WARREN. I can waive nothing which would prevent other Senators from making the point of order.

Mr. STERLING. I know that the motion must go over until to-morrow unless there is consent to its present consideration, but I inferred that the Senator from Wyoming was willing that it might be considered now.

Mr. KING. I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will lie over one day under Rule XXVI. The regular order is the presentation of petitions and memorials.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 14063, the private pension bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair orient himself. There was just a call for the regular order.

GREAT FALLS WATER-POWER PROJECT.

Mr. MOSES. I present a favorable report from the Committee on Printing and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from New Hampshire asks that the vote by which Senate resolution 452 was adopted be reconsidered. It is to print as a public document the report of the Federal Water Power Commission.

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

Mr. MOSES. I ask that the amendment reported by the committee to the resolution may be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The committee report to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert:

That the report of the chairman of the Federal Water Power Commission, submitting plans and estimates of costs necessary to secure an increased and adequate water supply for the District of Columbia, laid before the Senate and referred to the Committee on Commerce on February 16, 1921, and the report on the investigation of the Great Falls water-power project and plans by Maj. M. C. Tyler, United States Army, submitted to the Senate by Senator Norris and referred to the Committee on Printing on February 15, 1921, be printed as a document, together with accompanying illustrations.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

UINTAH RESERVATION, UTAH.

Mr. MOSES. From the Committee on Printing I make a favorable report, which I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from New Hampshire, on behalf of the committee, reports an original Senate resolution (S. Res. 462), as follows:

Resolved, That the report of the Secretary of the Interior on leasing of irrigable Indian land on the Uintah Reservation, Utah, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

REPORT OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

Mr. MOSES. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote whereby Senate resolution 456 was agreed to on February 18.

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

Mr. MOSES. I offer the amendment to the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The committee reports to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert:

That the Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1920, transmitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution pursuant to law, be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

APPLICATIONS FOR LETTERS PATENT.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Patents I report back favorably House bill 15062, and ask that the Secretary may read the title of it, and then I desire to make a brief statement and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the title of the bill.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 15062) to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for letters patent, for taking actions in the United States Patent Office with respect thereto, for the reviving and reinstatement of applications for letters patent, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, this is an emergency measure arising out of the war. During the war applications for patents of course were entirely interrupted between the various countries. No alien enemy could file an application for a patent in this country, nor could we file application for patents abroad. In many cases the applications were made to foreign countries with which we were at peace, and the ships on which the applications were being transported were destroyed.

The general effect of this bill, which has been passed by the House, is to extend the time within which applications for patents may be made in various countries. It is the outgrowth of a treaty made by some of the foreign nations with each other, in which they have agreed, provided different countries adopt reciprocal legislation, to extend the time within which applications may be made. The time is extended by the bill for a period of only six months, and the bill is conditioned upon the fact that other countries pass similar legislation.

The point of the entire bill is simply to extend the time within which applications for patents may be made. The report is a unanimous one from the Committee on Patents, a quorum being in attendance. I see that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] is here now, but he was unable to be present at the committee meeting. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] was there, and I am making this request on behalf of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, does this affect the provisions of the bill that is in conference now?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Oh, no.

Mr. KIRBY. This is a different matter?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It is an entirely different matter. As I say, it grows out of this treaty made by the foreign powers. In order for us to avail ourselves of their promise to extend the time within which Americans may make their applications in foreign countries, we must do it also for them. It is a reciprocity measure. Unless foreign countries pass similar legislation, this bill does not operate as to them.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether this is a Senate bill or a House bill?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It is a House bill, unanimously reported by the House committee. I have here the hearings. It is unanimously supported by all the patent-law associations, the Patent Commissioner, the patent lawyers, and, in fact, every person who has to do with the patent situation in the country. If it is not passed before Congress adjourns untold losses will result to American citizens who were unable to complete the process of obtaining a foreign patent because the war interrupted the procedure between the different countries.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think it a very, very wise measure. I was wondering, however, whether we were not just taking up unnecessary time, because if it is a Senate bill we would never get it through anyhow. If it is a House bill we may be able to complete the legislation.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes; it is a House bill.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOX. I merely wanted to inquire whether the testimony did not disclose that this bill is more for the advantage of American inventors than for foreign inventors, because there are about four applications abroad by Americans for patents to one by foreigners in this country.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes; that was the testimony of the former Commissioner of Patents this morning before the committee.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am a member of the committee, but on account of other duties I have not been able to meet with the committee as I should. As I understand, this bill simply extends the time for filing those applications that were interrupted by the war, and that under the treaty would lapse if this extension of time were not granted.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes; but it also extends the time within which applications may be made, as I understand, although they have not been actually made. It is an endeavor to accord to our citizens principally, as the Senator from Pennsylvania says, the right to complete their applications which were interrupted by the war, where they have made applications for patents in foreign countries.

Mr. President, before I weary the Senate with making any further explanation, except the reading of the House report, or the Commissioner of Patents' testimony, if that be required—if not, I shall ask to have it printed in the RECORD—I want to know whether I have unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 15662) to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for letters patent, for taking actions in the United States Patent Office with respect thereto, for the reviving and reinstatement of applications for letters patent, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I send to the desk the Revised Statutes of the United States and ask the Secretary to read section 4887, which is the basis of this whole proceeding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

Sec. 4887. No person shall be debarred from receiving a patent for his invention or discovery, nor shall any patent be declared invalid, by reason of its having been first patented or caused to be patented in a foreign country, unless the same has been introduced in public use in the United States for more than two years prior to the application. But every patent granted for an invention which has been previously patented in a foreign country shall be so limited as to expire at the same time with the foreign patent, or, if there be more than one, at the same time with the one having the shortest term, and in no case shall it be in force more than 17 years.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the pending bill extends the provisions of that section. The Senate passed a bill somewhat similar to this on June 19, 1918—S. 3524—but it did not get through the House.

I ask that the testimony of the Commissioner of Patents contained in the House report which I have sent to the desk, and also the House report itself, be printed in the RECORD in connection with what I have said.

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

The report is as follows:

Mr. NOLAN, from the Committee on Patents, submitted the following report (to accompany H. R. 15662):

The Committee on Patents, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 15662) to extend temporarily the time for filing application for letters patent, for taking actions in the United States Patent Office with respect thereto; for the reviving and reinstatement of applications for letters patent, and for other purposes, respectfully report that they have had the same under consideration and recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill H. R. 15662 is a committee substitute for H. R. 13681, introduced April 19, 1920, at the request of the then Commissioner of Patents, Hon. James T. Newton.

Hearings were held on this measure, at which time a large number of people interested in the passage of this measure appeared before the committee. Among them the Commissioner of Patents, Mr. Whitehead; former Commissioner of Patents, Mr. Newton; Mr. Otto R. Barnett, Mo-nadnock Block, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. William S. Pritchard, Mr. Thomas E. Robertson, chairman of the committee on laws and rules of the American Patent Law Association; Mr. John H. Brickenstein, Washington, D. C.; Mr. Wilson J. Vance, New York, representing the Aztec Yarn Spinning & Manufacturing Co.; Mr. Felix Stern, of Chicago, Ill.; Mr. William W. White, editor and publisher of the Patent and Trade Mark Review, New York City; Mr. W. A. Darby, New York City; and a number of other gentlemen, all in favor of the passage of the measure, but suggesting certain modifications. At the request of the Patents Committee, these gentlemen held a meeting and submitted certain amendments, which have been incorporated in the bill H. R. 15662 and reported to the House favorably.

Summed up, the following statement by Mr. Whitehead, then Commissioner of Patents, gives the substance of the bill as it relates to sections 1, 2, and 3:

"STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT F. WHITEHEAD, COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS.

"Mr. WHITEHEAD. The first three sections of the bill were drafted on the lines of sections 307 and 308 of the peace treaty to carry into effect the provisions under which patents which had lapsed or which could not be availed of during the war could be taken advantage of. Foreign countries have granted extensions, have made rules or regulations under which extensions were granted.

"My information is (not official) that in certain countries our citizens have been granted extensions, and in certain other countries they have not because we have made no provision for granting extensions to the citizens of those countries.

"Section 4887 of the Revised Statutes provides at the present time for what is known as the right of priority; that is, it provides that an application filed in this country within 12 months after the filing of an application in a foreign country shall have the same force and effect as though application had been filed in this country on the same day as the application was filed in the foreign country, provided it was filed within 12 months from that date. That 12 months is usually referred to as the period of priority, or, as is referred to in here, the right of priority.

"During the war it was impossible in many instances for applications to be filed within that period, and the first clause of this section provides that priority which had not expired on the 1st day of August, 1914—that is, where the 12 months was running at that time—or which had arisen since that date—that is, where the foreign application has been filed since that date—should be extended to six months from the passage of this act. That period of six months from the passage of the act was taken because article 308 provided for six months for the going into force of the treaty, which date is fixed by the treaty itself as being the date when the treaty had been ratified by Germany on the one hand and three of the principal allied and associated powers on the other. My understanding is that that date was the 10th of January, 1920; so your period of six months, according to that, has really run out.

"Certain of the European countries subsequently entered into a treaty in which they made arrangements along this same line, fixing the time as from the 30th of September, I think it is, in 1920, to make the six months expire the 30th of March, 1921. This treaty also provided that that right should be extended to favor citizens or subjects of countries which have extended, or which shall extend within that period of six months, substantial reciprocal privileges to citizens of those countries.

"So far as the citizens of this country are concerned, the important thing in this bill is to enable them to revive their lapsed patents, or to get these rights of priority in the foreign countries; and my understanding is that there are numbers of cases in which rights of American citizens have lapsed and which can be restored only by the passage of some reciprocal legislation.

"The question was raised by one or two people as to whether the first section of the bill would apply in cases where the patents had already been granted in this country—not in the case where the patent had

been granted particularly and rights were pending, but where patents had been granted. I have proposed an amendment, or I will propose an amendment, to make it specifically apply to that case. The question was raised in view of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Cameron Septic Tank Co. against the people of Knoxville, in which there was discussion as to whether certain phases of private property would apply to patents already granted. So I see no objection to making that clear, and for the same reason they suggested that throughout the bill the word 'validated' be added after 'patents granted' in certain places, not to take care of any new patents which may be granted hereafter, but patents which have been granted and which are validated by the bill."

Sections 4 and 5 are supplementary in reference to the filing of applications.

Section 6 provides for the protection of those persons who served abroad during the war with either the civil or military branches of the Government and gives them the same rights of priority with respect to their inventions as if they had been made in the United States, and extends the time for this protection for six months from the passage of this act.

Section 7 protects the Government from any action by an alien enemy regarding the use of any patent or process used by the Government during the war.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, this can be made a long story if anybody wants to make it long. I think the Senate will understand the situation when the Secretary reads the bill, and I shall not attempt to make any speech about it. I am doing what I am doing at the urgent request of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NOAKS], the chairman of the Senate Committee on Patents, who is detained at his home by illness. If, after the Secretary has read the bill, Senators want to ask any questions, I shall do my best to answer them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does any Senator desire the bill read?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think the bill should be read, not because I want to hear it, but because I think it is an important matter. If the Senate is willing to pass it without its being read, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does any Senator desire it read?

Mr. PITTMAN. I should like to have the bill read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the rights of priority provided by section 4887 of the Revised Statutes, for the filing of applications for patent for inventions and designs, which rights had not expired on the 1st day of August, 1914, or which rights have arisen since the 1st day of August, 1914, shall be, and the same are hereby, extended until the expiration of a period of six months from the passage of this act in favor of the citizens of the United States or citizens or subjects of all countries which have extended, or which now extend, or which within said period of six months shall extend substantially reciprocal privileges to citizens of the United States, and such extension shall apply to applications upon which patents have been granted, as well as to applications now pending or filed within the period herein; *Provided*, That such extension shall in no way furnish a basis of claim against the Government of the United States; *Provided further*, That such extension shall in no way affect the right of any citizen of the United States, who, before the passage of this act, was bona fide in possession of any rights in patents or applications for patent conflicting with rights in patents granted or validated by reason of such extension, to exercise such rights by itself or himself personally, or by such agents, or licensees, as derived their rights from it, or him, before the passage of this act, and such persons shall not be amenable to any action for infringement of any patent granted or validated by reason of such extension.

A patent shall not be refused on an application coming within the provisions of this act, nor shall a patent granted on such application be held invalid by reason of the invention having been patented or described in any printed publication or in public use or on sale in the United States prior to the filing of the application, unless such patent or publication or such public use or sale was prior to the filing of the foreign application upon which the right of priority is based.

Sec. 2. That the time now fixed by law for the payment of any fee or for the taking of any action with respect to an application for patent, which time had not expired on August 1, 1914, or which commenced after August 1, 1914, is hereby extended until the expiration of one year from the passage of this act, without the payment of extension fees or other penalty in favor of the citizens or subjects of countries which have extended, now extend, or shall extend during a period of one year from the passage of this act substantially reciprocal privileges to citizens of the United States, provided that no extension herein shall confer such privileges on the citizens or subjects of a foreign country for a longer term than the term during which such privileges are conferred by such foreign country on the citizens of the United States, but nothing in this act shall give any right to reopen interference proceedings where final hearing before the examiner of interferences has taken place.

Sec. 3. That no patent granted or validated by reason of the extensions provided for in sections 1 and 2 of this act shall abridge or otherwise affect the right of any citizen of the United States, or his agent or agents, or his successor in business, to continue any manufacture, use, or sale commenced before the passage of this act by such citizen, nor shall the continued manufacture, use, or sale by such citizen, or the use or sale of the devices resulting from such manufacture or use constitute an infringement.

Sec. 4. That all applications for patent filed since August 1, 1914, and prior to June 15, 1920, which were executed by an agent of the applicant, and in which a petition, specification, and oath, signed by the inventor, or his executor or administrator, had been filed or shall have been filed within a period of one year from the passage of this act, and the patents granted on such applications, shall have the same force and effect as if the papers signed by the inventor, or his executor or administrator, had been filed on the date on which the papers signed by the agent were filed.

Sec. 5. That all applications for patent filed since August 1, 1914, in which the oath was executed before or authenticated by a consular

officer, or other representative qualified to administer oaths, of a Government acting in the interest of the Government of the United States, shall have the same force and effect as if said oath had been executed by the applicant before a consular officer of the United States.

Sec. 6. That where an invention was made by a person while serving abroad, during the war with the forces of the United States, civil or military, the inventor thereof shall be entitled, in interference and other proceedings arising in connection with such invention, to the same rights of priority with respect of such invention as if the same had been made in the United States, and where an application became abandoned or forfeited, during the time the applicant was serving with the forces of the United States, by reason of his failure to take action or pay a fee within the time now required by law, such action may be taken, or the fee paid, within six months from the passage of this act.

Sec. 7. That no claim shall be made or action brought in respect of the use since August 1, 1914, up to the passage of this act, by the Government of the United States, or by any persons acting on behalf of, or under contract with, or with the assent of the Government of the United States or of Governments or their representatives associated with the United States, under any patent rights owned in whole or in part since August 1, 1914, by an alien enemy, nor in respect of the use of any process during such period, or the sale, offering for sale, or use, at any time, of any products, articles, or apparatus whatsoever manufactured during such period to which such patent rights applied.

Sec. 8. That nothing in this act shall affect any act done by virtue of the special measures taken during the war under legislative, executive, or administrative authority of the United States in regard to the rights of an enemy, or ally of an enemy, as defined by the trading with the enemy act of October 6, 1917, in patents for inventions and designs.

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

BRIDGE OVER THE RIO GRANDE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am authorized by the Committee on Commerce to report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 15769) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Rio Grande, between the cities of Del Rio, Tex., and Las Vacas, Mexico, and I submit a report (Rept. No. 814) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Del Rio and Las Vacas Bridge Co., a corporation organized and created under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Texas, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto over the Rio Grande between the cities of Del Rio, Tex., and Las Vacas, Mexico, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the consent of the proper authorities of the Republic of Mexico shall have been obtained before said bridge shall be built or commenced.

Sec. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL BANKS.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Banking and Currency I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 11307) to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes.

The bill proposes to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes in relation to the qualification of directors of national banks. Under the present law not more than 25 per cent of the directors of national banks can live outside the State. The bill amends the statute so that they may live outside the State if living within 50 miles of the place where the bank is located. It has passed the House, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5146 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be so amended as to read as follows:

"Sec. 5146. Every director must, during his whole term of service, be a citizen of the United States, and at least three-fourths of the directors must have resided in the State, Territory, or District in which the association is located, or within 50 miles of the location of the office of the association, for at least one year immediately preceding their election, and must be residents of such State or within a 50-mile territory of the location of the association during their continuance in office. Every director must own in his own right at least 10 shares of the capital stock of the association of which he is a director, unless the capital of the bank shall not exceed \$25,000, in which case he must own in his own right at least 5 shares of such capital stock. Any director who ceases to be the owner of the required number of shares of the stock, or who becomes in any other manner disqualified, shall thereby vacate his place."

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

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF SHARON, PA.

Mr. KNOX. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 10598) for the relief of the First National Bank of Sharon, Pa. It is a House bill, having passed the House.

The nature of the case is that a certificate of indebtedness of the United States amounting to \$10,000 was destroyed, and the bill authorizes the Treasury Department to pay the certificate

without presentation. The bill is drawn in the usual way, requiring that a bond shall be given to the United States in double the amount of the certificate, with sureties to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. SMOOT. Would not the Senator just as soon wait until the morning business is closed, and call up the bill then?

Mr. KNOX. If it provokes any discussion, I will withdraw it. It can be passed in less time than we can talk about it, if there is no objection to it.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to redeem certificate of indebtedness of the United States of America, No. 3240, of the denomination of \$10,000, of the issue dated April 10, 1918, and maturing July 9, 1918, with interest from April 10, 1918, to July 9, 1918, in favor of the First National Bank, Sharon, Pa., without presentation of said certificate, the certificate of indebtedness having been lost or destroyed: *Provided,* That the said First National Bank of Sharon, Pa., shall first file in the Treasury Department of the United States a bond in the penal sum of double the amount of the principal and interest of said certificate of indebtedness of the United States of America in such form and with such sureties as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury to indemnify and save harmless the United States from any loss on account of the lost or destroyed certificate of indebtedness hereinbefore described.

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

NOMINATIONS OF EX-SERVICE MEN.

Mr. FLETCHER. Some days ago, as Senators will recall, the President sent to the Senate a number of nominations for postmasters, among them the names of some former service men, and widows of former service men. A resolution of the Senate was passed calling on the Postmaster General to furnish a list of those nominations, and that list was furnished and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5. The list of the former service men and widows of former service men appointed as postmasters appears on pages 2621, 2622, and 2623 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that, as in open executive session, those nominations be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection.

LOUISA FROW.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3129) for the relief of Louisa Frow.

Mr. SMOOT. I was hoping that we could take the calendar up after the morning business is closed.

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

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

Mr. TRAMMELL. If the bill provokes any discussion I will withdraw it.

Mr. SMOOT. I object because if we take the calendar up, the bill will be reached in its regular order.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do not know whether it will be reached or not. The Senate has just passed a bill for the relief of a bank for the loss of a certificate, and this measure provides for compensating the widow of a man who was killed by a seaplane of the Navy. It is a unanimous favorable report of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. There may be no objection to the bill at all when it comes up in its regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I object.

INTERNATIONAL NAVAL BUILDING PROGRAM.

Mr. BORAH. Is the morning business closed yet?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not yet.

Mr. BORAH. I give notice of a suspension of the rules under Rule XL.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be considered given.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I would like to hear it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The READING CLERK. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] gives the following notice:

I hereby give notice that under Rule No. XL, I will move to suspend paragraph 3 of Rule No. XVI, in order that I may propose to the act (H. R. 15975), making appropriations for the Naval Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, the following amendment:

"The President is authorized and requested to invite the Governments of Great Britain and Japan to send representatives to a conference, which shall be charged with the duty of promptly entering into an understanding or agreement by which the naval building program of each of said Governments, to wit, the United States, Great Britain, and Japan, shall be substantially reduced annually during the next five years to such an extent and upon such terms as may be agreed upon, which understanding or agreement is to be reported to the respective Governments for approval."

OFFICERS OF COAST GUARD CUTTER "TAMPA."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, there were four officers killed in line of duty on the *Tampa* in Bristol Channel, and at the time they died they were entitled to promotion, but promotion had not gotten to them.

There is on the calendar House joint resolution 215, authorizing the legal heirs of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard who lost their lives when the Coast Guard cutter *Tampa* was destroyed in Bristol Channel, September 26, 1918, to receive pay and allowances that would have accrued to said officers. The joint resolution appropriates a small amount, the difference in their wages, which amount will go to the widows of the men killed. It has been passed by the House, unanimously reported favorably by the Senate committee, and I ask for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Will not the Senator let us take up the calendar, and then have the joint resolution acted on?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not often make a request of this kind, but this is a joint resolution relating to four men who died in line of duty in the Bristol Channel on an American ship. The session is about to expire and the joint resolution has not been passed. We have let a bank bill go through this morning and bills for the relief of individuals who are living. If any Senator wants to take the responsibility of saying that justice can not be done to the dead, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no objection to the joint resolution that I know of.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We could have passed it in less time than we have taken to talk about it.

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

Resolved, etc., That the appropriate accounting officers are authorized to pay to the legal heirs of the following-named officers of the Coast Guard, late of the Coast Guard cutter *Tampa*, which was destroyed in Bristol Channel September 26, 1918, the pay and allowances which would have accrued to said officers to and including September 26, 1918, had said officers received and accepted the temporary commissions on the respective dates that they became eligible for advancement, as follows: First Lieutenant of Engineers John Thomas Carr to be a temporary captain of engineers from and including July 1, 1918; Second Lieut. John Farrell McGourty to be a captain from and including July 1, 1918; First Lieut. Roy Ackerman Bothwell to be a temporary captain from and including September 21, 1918; Second Lieut. James Marsden Earp to be a temporary first lieutenant from and including July 1, 1918, and to be a temporary captain from and including September 21, 1918.

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

THE CALENDAR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent to take up the calendar under Rule VIII, beginning with No. 659, where we left off.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Before unanimous consent is given, I want to ask if the bill the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] desires to call up will be included in the order?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; it is beyond No. 659.

Mr. KELLOGG. I ask the Senator from Utah why he does not ask unanimous consent to take up all the bills on the calendar?

Mr. SMOOT. The only reason is that these bills never would be reached if we did not begin at No. 659. As far as I am concerned, I hope that when the hour of 2 o'clock comes the Senator having the rivers and harbors bill in charge will agree to lay it aside and let us go through the calendar to-day, because it will be perfectly useless to pass any bills which are on the calendar at a later time than to-day.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to say that, as far as I am personally concerned, I shall be perfectly willing to ask unanimous consent, when 2 o'clock comes, to lay aside the unfinished business temporarily, in order that we may go through the calendar and take up any of the bills we have passed over that are unobjected to.

Mr. SMOOT. All bills unobjected to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the calendar will be proceeded with.

The bill (H. R. 11377) for the relief of Warren V. Howard was announced as first in order on the calendar.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 382) declaring that certain acts of Congress, joint resolutions, and proclamations shall be construed as if the war had ended and the present or existing emergency expired was announced as next in order.

Mr. FLETCHER. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection, and the joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. STERLING. I do not know what Senator objected, but I hope there will be no objection. This is a House joint resolution, amended by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and I hope it may be considered and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection; that is the trouble.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to address the Senator who made the objection and ask him to withdraw his objection.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. May I inquire of the Senator to what the joint resolution pertains?

Mr. STERLING. To all the war-time legislation, or emergency legislation, as it was called, with certain exceptions; and then it provides distinctly for the repeal of section 3 of the espionage act as amended.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Is it a lengthy measure?

Mr. STERLING. No; it is not lengthy.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. May we not have it read?

Mr. STERLING. I should like to have it read.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think the legislation is important.

Mr. STERLING. I want to suggest a verbal amendment to the joint resolution.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, unanimous consent has not yet been given.

The VICE PRESIDENT. According to the rule, upon a single objection a measure goes over.

Mr. BORAH. I do not desire to object, but I understand the Lever Act is not included in this joint resolution?

Mr. STERLING. It is excepted from the resolution.

Mr. BORAH. I should want to have it included. At the same time I do not wish to prevent the passage of the joint resolution so far as the other laws are concerned. If unanimous consent is given, I shall attempt to have it included.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have asked that the joint resolution may be read, so that we can be informed as to just what is included in it.

Mr. STERLING. I assume that the Senator from Florida, who made the objection, will not insist upon it.

Mr. FLETCHER. I objected mainly for the reason that I supposed the consideration of the joint resolution would lead to some discussion, and for that reason we would not have time to consider it. I am willing to withdraw the objection, but I think we are going to spend all the forenoon on it.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces that he is going to enforce the five-minute rule if the Senate is going to take up such measures.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have hastily looked at the substitute for the House joint resolution, and it is a very important matter. I do not think we can consider it under the rule limiting debate to five minutes. I shall therefore object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. A motion to proceed, notwithstanding the objection, would be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The only reason why I do not make the motion is because there are a number of other measures which we can dispose of to-day. But this joint resolution ought to be disposed of in the next day or two. I do not think there is a more important question now pending than that of getting rid of the war legislation.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is true, but we must be very careful not to be too hasty about the consideration of a joint resolution which is reported as a substitute for the one referred to the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. My request was that we take up the calendar under Rule VIII and consider those bills to which there was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But a Senator can move to proceed to the consideration of a bill notwithstanding the objection.

Mr. SMOOT. Not after it is objected to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was listening carefully to the Senator from Utah and would have objected if that had been included in his request. I was unwilling to have that limitation put on it.

Mr. SMOOT. I was very careful in putting it that way because I wanted to get through to-day with all the bills on the calendar to which there is no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state the request again. Is there objection to proceeding to the consideration of the calendar, no bill to be considered to which there is an objection?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of 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.

I wish to say in reference to the bill that it embraces the bill which passed the Senate last May, went over to the House, but which could not be considered by the House because they have had no pension day there of late. Therefore I asked that the House bill, which was on the calendar, be rereferred to the Committee on Pensions, and I attached as an amendment thereto the bill which passed the Senate at the last session.

I will say, while the bill may appear to have a large number of names in it, between one-third and one-half of the names have been stricken out because the parties interested have either died or are included under the general bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the bill, as I understand, is one which is designed for the relief of members of the Regular Army and the Regular Navy. I have not been very conspicuous here as an advocate of pension legislation, but I think that legislation designed for the relief of soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and their widows is entitled to the same consideration at least which is given to pension bills for other classes of military and naval service.

At the last session of Congress several pension bills were passed by the Senate and went to the House. If my information is correct, the House has passed all those bills except the one which covered the class of military service which I have mentioned. This bill is designed to make effective the bill which we passed then, and which will die in the House if this bill is not passed.

I have personal knowledge of one of the items of this pension bill, which I know to be more than meritorious. It gives a small pension of \$50 to the widow of a brigadier general who gave his life to the service of his country, and who died leaving practically nothing for her support. In view of the fact that the bill was passed last year by the Senate and failed in the House, I sincerely hope that the Senate will consent to take it up at this time.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I am in favor of the motion of the Senator from North Dakota and agree with the Senator from Colorado that the bill ought to be disposed of. I wish to ask the Chair, however, in the event the Senator's motion should prevail, after the Senate has acted upon the pension bill would the calendar, under Rule VIII, be the regular order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; before 2 o'clock.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I think, in view of the statement I made awhile ago with reference to the unfinished business, I ought to say that I made the statement with the understanding that we were to proceed with the calendar and consider bills not objected to. I could not agree, at this time at any rate, to ask unanimous consent at 2 o'clock to lay aside the unfinished business if bills are to be taken up on motion.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota whether the bill that he proposes now to consider covers Senate Calendar No. 729, Calendar No. 730, and Calendar No. 328?

Mr. McCUMBER. Of the last calendar that is on the Senator's desk to-day.

Mr. KING. I understand the Senator from North Dakota now moves to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 780, being H. R. 14063.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will say to the Senator that the bill as now reported contains the items reported by the committee originally, shown by Senate Report No. 760, and there have been added to the bill H. R. 15900 (Rept. 780), and Senate bill 4985 (Rept. 759), and Senate bill 3747 (Rept. 375). It does not contain the others. I do not recall that the Senator mentioned any of the reports which cover the items in this bill.

Mr. KING. As I understand the Senator, and I desire to be put right if I am in error, the items embraced within the bill for which he is now asking consideration were passed upon a former occasion by the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; I do not know just what proportion, but a large proportion of them were passed at the last session.

Mr. KING. The Senator will recall that at the last session we had up Calendar No. 730.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; that is not in this bill.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator what items are included within Calendar No. 730? Is that a different list?

Mr. McCUMBER. There is no Calendar No. 730. That bill was recommitted to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator from North Dakota will yield a moment, I understand that he will not press his motion if we can go on with the calendar and dispose of unobjected bills. I understand also that there are a number of Senators who have measures on the calendar that they wish disposed of, and I withdraw my objection to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from North Dakota, because I do have the Calendar No. 730 before me in a very voluminous report, to what bill it refers?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Calendar No. 730 was disposed of several days ago. It was recommitted to the committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. A portion of it is in this bill.

Mr. KING. Then, if I understand the Senator, the bill which we are about to consider if his motion prevails embraces items found within Calendar No. 730?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think that is correct.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator allow me to submit a request for unanimous consent? In view of the statement just made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], I renew the request made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOR] some time ago.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have a motion pending now to proceed to the consideration of a bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And under the rule the motion is not debatable, notwithstanding it has been debated for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON. I understand that. My object was to expedite the consideration of bills on the calendar and to reach the bill suggested by the Senator from North Dakota. I am satisfied we will reach that bill much more quickly by proceeding with the call of the calendar where we left off on the last occasion when the calendar was considered. Of course, the Senator has the floor, and I can not submit the request unless he yields for that purpose.

Mr. McCUMBER. It will take no more time to dispose of the pension bill now. I do not think it would be reached before 2 o'clock under that arrangement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to proceed to the consideration of House bill 14063.

On a division, the motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider 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, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator will not make that request. I think we ought to be advised as to the character of the pension sought. There are hundreds of items here.

Mr. ROBINSON. That settles it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. To read the bill will require practically the entire day and prevent the consideration of other bills on the calendar. Of course, if Senators desire to accomplish that purpose they can do it, but there are a large number of bills on the calendar that have never received any consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. KING. What the Senator states, perhaps, may be true as to the length of time that would be consumed in reading the bill, but, Mr. President, we have passed during the last year a pension bill under which persons who have suffered no disability whatever receive \$50 per month and their widows receive large sums.

Mr. McCUMBER. If there are any such cases they are not included in this bill.

Mr. KING. That law is so comprehensive that it seems to me that substantially all who should receive pensions could find relief under it.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from Utah is mistaken. This bill covers those who served in the Regular Establishment, none of whom are receiving \$50 a month under the law to which the Senator refers. This is not a bill that relates to the veterans of the Civil War, but it relates only to those of other wars and who served in the Regular Establishment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, the law to which I have referred carried provisions for the relief of those who served in the Mexican War, and we also passed a bill providing for those who served in the Spanish-American War.

Mr. McCUMBER. None of those are included in this bill.

Mr. KING. Although they may have seen no service they are entitled to \$30 per month pension. Now, let me inquire of the Senator, with all of those comprehensive measures which have been enacted, under which we are appropriating more than \$200,000,000 annually, and I think the bill this year will carry perhaps \$230,000,000—the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] advises me it will carry \$265,000,000—what persons or what classes of individuals should now receive attention and be paid pensions?

Mr. McCUMBER. Those who were not in the Civil War at all; those who were not in the Mexican War; those who derive no benefit whatever under the law to which the Senator has referred under which we granted to the veterans of the Civil War and their dependents certain sums. This bill covers only the Regular Establishment and the Spanish War veterans, but not those of the Civil War.

Mr. KING. May I not inquire of the Senator concerning the Spanish-American War pension bill which we passed if provision was not made that all persons who had been in that war and had served 90 days, notwithstanding they had never left the United States, perhaps, but had only been in an Army camp a few weeks, should be pensioned at \$30 per month?

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, no.

Mr. KING. That is my recollection of the bill.

Mr. McCUMBER. The pension bill passed at the last session was for the widows of soldiers of the Spanish-American War who had an income of less than \$250 per annum.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows that the Sells bill, as it was called, grants a pension to those who were in the Spanish-American War regardless of injuries.

Mr. McCUMBER. No. It grants a pension to those who were injured; but that pension ranges from \$12 to \$30 per month; and it does not cover those who were in the regular service.

Mr. KING. Now, may I inquire of the Senator—

Mr. McCUMBER. I may be mistaken. I am told that I am in error; but the pension, I think, runs from twelve to thirty dollars a month.

Mr. KING. My understanding is that that bill practically covered all who served in the Spanish-American War.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. KING. So we have made provision for those who were in the Spanish-American War, for those who were in the Mexican War, and for those who served in the Civil War. May I inquire of the Senator what other classes are there to be cared for by way of pensions?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Regular Establishment.

Mr. KING. That is, those who are now in the Army?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; those who have been members of the Army from 1805 but who were not in the Spanish-American War and who were not in the World War.

Mr. KING. Then, do I understand the Senator to mean that it is the policy of the Government, regardless of the fact that they have not participated in any war, to grant pensions to those who served in the Army between the close of the Civil War and the breaking out of the Spanish-American War, but who did not participate in either?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; if they were injured in the service.

Mr. KING. May I inquire what wars there were between the close of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War in which any injuries could have been suffered?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator asks me as to those who were not in any war, and I say that if they suffered any disability by reason of their service the bill covers them.

Mr. KING. Then, do I understand the Senator to announce that it is the policy of the Government to grant a pension to every person who has been in the Army, though such person may never have been in any military undertaking or expedition?

Mr. McCUMBER. It has always been the policy of the Government to do that.

Mr. KING. Persons who enlisted 20 or 30 years ago for a year and immediately after their service went back to private life and have been engaged in private activities from that time until the present are to be pensioned?

Mr. McCUMBER. No.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator's statement imply that?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; if a person was injured in the service, he would be entitled to a pension.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator aver that all of the persons named in the pending bill of 112 pages come within the class that would be covered by the statement just made by the Senator?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. KING. Take, for instance, the first name which my eye falls upon in the bill, on page 29:

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.

What service did John T. Weaver render that would entitle his father to a pension during the remainder of his life?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will turn to the report to obtain that information. The report is very voluminous, but I find in connection with the case referred to by the Senator the following statement:

H. R. 11787. Richard J. Weaver, Hillsboro, Ky., dependent father of John T. Weaver, who served in the Regular Establishment, Company M, First United States Infantry, from January 13, 1910, to February 9, 1911, when he died from pulmonary tuberculosis contracted in service and line of duty. He had prior service which was continuous almost from April 15, 1901, to December 30, 1909. (F. O. 985611.)

The claimant filed a claim for pension as soldier's dependent father April 27, 1912. The reviewer approved the claim for admission but the re-reviewer would not concur and it was rejected on the ground that claimant, soldier's father, was not dependent within the meaning of the law, as he was in possession of some property and was still able to earn an adequate support.

The evidence submitted with the claim showed that the soldier was never married and that his mother died in 1889, that claimant owned a farm worth about \$600, being disqualified for work about two-thirds of the time, and that he was about 56 years of age (now 64), and that he had an invalid wife to provide for, who is now 67 years of age.

With this bill claimant files his sworn statement to the effect that his property is valued at about \$350 and that he has an income of about \$100 per annum. Lay witnesses verify his statement as to property and income and further testify that he has no children or other relatives who contribute to his support, and that he has no income except from what little he can earn on his small farm. A physician testifies that he is totally unable to perform any manual labor by reason of rheumatism and disease of heart.

A pension of \$12 per month is recommended.

That is the report.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, then, if I understand the Senator, we are committing the Government to this sort of a policy—that as to every person who has served in the Army, no matter how limited that service may have been, and though it may have been entirely in time of peace, if he dies his widow or dependents shall receive a pension if it may be averred that the soldier received injuries or incurred some disability while in the service which proximately contributed to his death.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the law now. We are not changing the law; we are not creating any new law. The only question in this case was whether the soldier came under the law. The Pension Bureau first found that the father was dependent, but on a rehearing it was decided the other way. Additional evidence was submitted to the Committee on Pensions of the House, upon which that committee acted, in which action the Senate committee concurred, to the effect that the father was dependent and that he should receive the \$12 provided by law.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator whether pensions would be granted under existing law to persons who died after a few months of service in times of peace and whose death could not by any possibility be traced to their service?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; not in the Regular Establishment.

Mr. KING. Are there any other establishments under which in cases of the character to which I have just referred pensions would be granted?

Mr. McCUMBER. In the case of a veteran of the Civil War the widow would be entitled to a pension or the dependent child or mother and father would be entitled to a pension.

Mr. KING. Then, as I understand the Senator, this bill is merely for the purpose of interpreting existing law more liberally in behalf of pension claims than the officials of the Government have interpreted the law.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; the bill does not interpret the law at all. The bill, so far as it relates to this particular item, finds that the father is dependent and is entitled to a pension under the terms of the existing law. It is the finding of a fact rather than the construction of the law.

Mr. KING. Then, as I understand the Senator, the officials of the Government have found differently from the committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. They have found both ways; they have found with the committee and they have found contrary to the finding of the committee; but the conclusion of the committee was that the father was dependent, and the evidence which sustains the committee has just been read to the Senator.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that it is a wise thing, after we have established tribunals for the purpose of hearing

evidence and deciding controversies and have authorized them to reach conclusions, for the legislative branch of the Government in an ex parte way to overrule their decisions and to legislate for the purpose of overturning their decisions?

Mr. McCUMBER. It has been done, I will not say thousands of times, but probably hundreds of thousands of times. I do not think that even the finding of a bureau here should preclude a committee of the Senate from finding differently from the bureau. I think practically every day in our legislation we are overruling their decisions and their views in a great many matters, and I think the Senator has joined with the other Members of the Senate in overruling their conclusions.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I confess that the decisions of bureaus and executive officials do not have very much sanctity, so far as I am concerned. Prima facie, the decisions of many of these bureaus are wrong, judging from the multitudinous efforts which have been made, and successfully made, to overturn them. Yet where we have set up a Pension Bureau, and the Pension Bureau, so far as I can determine, has acted wisely and with due consideration in the determination of the cases which have been brought before it, it seems to me that it is a rather unfortunate precedent to overturn them, and we find evidences of the results of that course in the constant importunities made to the House and to the Senate to pass private and special pension bills.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me say to the Senator that it is only in cases where the committee finds that the bureau has acted unwisely that it overturns its decisions. Remember that the action of Congress does not affect a decision in one case, perhaps, out of one hundred thousand that is passed upon by the bureau.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it is so seldom that Government bureaus act in the interest of economy and fail to respond to demands which are made for contributions from the Treasury of the United States, that when they do take that course I am inclined to follow them and to assume that there must be merit in their decision, because the Senator knows the disposition on the part of Government officials to grant, and grant still more, and to contribute still more from the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. McCUMBER. Take the case that the Senator has just brought up. I read the testimony. From that testimony which I read, would the Senator draw the conclusion that the father was dependent? If he would, he must agree with the committee. If he would not, of course he would disagree with the committee. Now, it is assumed that the committee has acted fairly and justly in the matter.

Mr. KING. Of course, it depends upon the construction which is placed upon the word "dependent." I fancy that if the view of the Senator, as I understand it, should prevail, the majority of fathers and mothers would be found to be dependent because of the lack of any great resources and the fact that work is required on their part for sustenance, so that they are in a sense dependent.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have an idea that in most cases where the son is over 65 years of age, which would probably bring the father over 85 years of age, the father would be more or less dependent.

Mr. KING. Of course, this legislation will mean that within the next 25 years the Government of the United States will be compelled to pay not \$1,000,000,000, but, in my opinion, the Government of the United States during the next 25 years will be compelled to pay from \$20,000,000,000 to \$30,000,000,000 in pensions.

Mr. McCUMBER. In how many years?

Mr. KING. In 20 or 25 years.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the figure is somewhat exaggerated. There is no question but that they will pay a large sum.

Mr. KING. With the demands that are being made and with the statements which are attributed to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, the able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], it seems to me the statement I have made is in the interest of verbal exactitude rather than exaggeration. I think the total will, perhaps, exceed that stupendous sum, so that the cost of the war is just beginning instead of being nearly over.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am satisfied that during the next 25 years the American people will be taxed to the limit to pay the costs resulting from this war and the other appropriations and extravagances of Congress. There will not be much question about it. We will pay all we can.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator how many items there are in this bill and what is the amount that it will cost the Government per annum? I have examined the report, and it furnishes no information on the subject.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think there are in the neighborhood of 500 items, with an average of about \$12 each, as nearly as we can estimate it offhand, without counting them.

Mr. KING. The average, I think, if the Senator will examine the report, will be found to be very greatly in excess of \$12.

Mr. McCUMBER. Possibly \$15.

Mr. KING. I find that most of them are \$17, \$20, and \$25.

Mr. McCUMBER. Most of them, I think, are \$12.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am opposed to this bill. I have been opposed to a number of the pension bills which we have passed. It seems to me that we are pursuing a policy which will impose upon the American people burdens that will be almost intolerable. We talk about the burdens imposed upon Germany under her military system. Those burdens are light in comparison to the burdens which the American Congress is placing and will continue to place upon the shoulders of the men who toil in this Republic.

Mr. President, we are pursuing a course which within a few years will result in a pension list so large that no country in the world has ever dreamed of approximating it. We will have upon our pension rolls within the next five years not 1,000,000, but 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 of names, and the burdens resting upon the American people will not be \$200,000,000 or \$300,000,000, as they were last year and year before, but they will annually exceed \$1,000,000,000, possibly \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not think the bills that we pass in special legislation will amount on an average now to a difference of \$200,000 a year. Some time ago I had occasion to make the estimate, and the amount was about \$225,000 then; but the number that we are now putting through the two branches of Congress is much less than we put through at that time. What I mean by that is, that much is in addition to what is being paid without the special legislation.

Mr. KING. Under general appropriation bills we are appropriating substantially two hundred and fifty or two hundred and sixty million dollars, and that does not include any of the pensions that may have resulted and will result from the World War.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; there are some of the pensions of the World War within those figures.

Mr. KING. Very few.

Mr. McCUMBER. All those that were injured in any way were entitled to a pension prior to the time that we enacted the war risk insurance law.

Mr. KING. The Senator will recall that in 1917 the general pension bill—that was before the World War—carried substantially \$220,000,000.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. KING. Since then we have increased the pensions I do not remember how many millions of dollars.

Mr. McCUMBER. Anyway, enough so that it now amounts to \$265,000,000.

Mr. KING. And we added to that general bill what was called the Sells bill, providing for those who were in the Spanish-American War, so that those general pension acts carry appropriations aggregating about \$265,000,000 annually. Then, in addition, appropriations are being made, and larger ones will be made in the future, to cover cases arising out of the World War. So I can only repeat to my friend, the Senator, that he is participating in legislation which will impose upon the American people within a very short time pensions, in my opinion, of approximately \$750,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000 per annum.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course, we can get little comfort out of deaths; but the soldiers of the Civil War, for whom the vast amount of pensions is being paid out, can last but a very few years longer. I think now they are all getting along about 80 years of age, while the widows, of course, are somewhat younger; but a few years will remove entirely this vast sum of, say, two hundred and forty or two hundred and fifty million dollars that is being paid to the veterans of the Civil War and their dependents.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will permit me as to that, I should just like to add that the deaths which occur annually now are sufficient to remove from the pension rolls enough to take care of half a dozen such bills as the one which is now under consideration. Not only that, but the Senator from Utah speaks of the \$265,000,000, and then to that he adds the so-called Sells bill, the Spanish-American War bill, this bill, and various other bills, as though the expenditures under them were added to the total of \$265,000,000. They are not. The \$265,000,000 includes everything. It is the gross amount.

Mr. KING. If I conveyed that impression, I did not so intend. When I stated the maximum amount of \$265,000,000, I intended

to state, and think I did state, that that embraced the pensions that came under the general legislation; and in the general legislation I included the Sells bill as well as the bill which we passed at the last session providing \$50 per month for the veterans of the Civil War.

Mr. NEW. The \$265,000,000 was the gross amount.

Mr. KING. But let me say to the Senator from Indiana that there appears to be no diminution. When President Garfield was a great factor in public life, just before he became President, he made the prophecy that the pension roll would never exceed, as I recall, \$27,000,000 per annum. President Garfield was a great statesman, but he did not have in mind the voracious appetites of the American people for pensions. Twenty-seven million dollars! Why, we have swollen those figures until, as stated by the Senator, the appropriations under general legislation will carry \$265,000,000, and then the appropriations directly and indirectly from the World War for the coming fiscal year I think will aggregate three or four hundred million dollars.

Mr. McCUMBER. The time of which the Senator speaks was the good old time when we used to think in pennies and make appropriations in hundreds of dollars. We are now thinking in hundreds of dollars and making appropriations in millions.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator that some of us are interested in some important legislation upon the calendar, and probably no other opportunity will be afforded to consider it; and I trust these general discussions may be postponed until some other time.

Mr. McCUMBER. I thank the Senator for his good and timely suggestion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON. There is a request pending to that effect, and it has been pending for some time. I submitted the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEELING in the Chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read the bill.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 1, to strike out lines 6 to 9, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, to strike out lines 1 to 3, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, to strike out lines 14 to 24, both inclusive, in the following words:

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. Sawin, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, to strike out lines 5 to 13, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, to strike out lines 18 to 22, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, to strike out lines 3 to 6, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, to strike out lines 10 to 13, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, to strike out lines 21 to 24, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, to strike out lines 1 to 4, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 23, to strike out "\$12" and insert "\$30," so as to make the paragraph read:

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 \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, to strike out lines 1 to 10, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, to strike out lines 21 to 23, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, to strike out lines 13 to 19, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, to strike out lines 24 and 25, and, on page 9, to strike out lines 1 to 6, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, to strike out lines 11 to 16, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 17, after the words "widow of," to strike out "the late" and, after the word "Hart," to insert a comma and the words "late of the," so as to make the paragraph read:

The name of Mary Hart, widow of James Hart, 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 James Hart until they shall reach the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, to strike out lines 4 to 6, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, to strike out lines 22 to 24, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, to strike out lines 8 to 12, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, to strike out lines 3 to 21, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, to strike out lines 1 to 3, both inclusive, in the following words:

The name of Harry W. Feldman, late of the 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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, to strike out lines 13 to 15, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, to strike out lines 20 to 22, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, to strike out lines 5 to 11, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 Jacob P. Marling, late of Company C, 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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, to strike out lines 11 to 13, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, to strike out lines 22 to 24, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, to strike out lines 1 to 4, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, to strike out lines 8 to 14, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, to strike out lines 19 to 25, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, to strike out lines 20 to 23, both inclusive, in the following words:

The name of Dell W. Stinchcomb, late first lieutenant Company A, Seventh Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, to strike out lines 4 to 10, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, to strike out lines 15 to 18, both inclusive, in the following words:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 8, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 22, to strike out "M" and insert in lieu thereof "U," so as to read:

The name of William A. Morris, late of Company U, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 18, to strike out the following:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, to strike out lines 5 to 7, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 3, to strike out "\$17" and insert in lieu thereof "\$30," so as to read:

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 \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, to strike out lines 20 to 23, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, to strike out lines 16 to 18, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, to strike out lines 1 to 7, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 11, in the allowance to Lena Mauter, to strike out "\$25" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 15, in the allowance to Susan Chittenden, to strike out "\$25" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, to strike out lines 3 to 5, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, to strike out lines 9 to 11, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, to strike out lines 3 to 5, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, lines 23 and 24, and page 30, lines 1 to 18, inclusive, to strike out the following:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, to strike out lines 8 to 13, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, to strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Stephen Lyttle, 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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, to strike out lines 16 to 22, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, to strike out lines 7 to 16, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, to strike out, in the allowance to Mary Plum, as follows:

And that the Commissioner of Pensions be directed to pay the claimant the pension that accrued to the soldier.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 11, in the allowance to Betty Lentz, to strike out "\$25" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, to strike out lines 22 to 24, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, to strike out lines 10 to 13, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, to strike out lines 9 to 12, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, to strike out lines 16 to 19, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 20, to strike out the words "late of band"; on line 21, to strike out the words "and band, Eleventh and," and the word "regiments," and to insert the word "regiment"; and on line 22, after the word "Spain," to insert the words "and in band, Eleventh United States Infantry"; so as to read:

The name of James A. Fullen, Company G, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and in band, Eleventh United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, to strike out lines 19 to 21, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, to strike out lines 8 to 10, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, to strike out lines 19 to 22, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, to strike out lines 6 to 8, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, to strike out lines 13 to 16, inclusive, as follows:

The name of William J. Degan, 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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, to strike out lines 11 to 14, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, to strike out lines 7 to 11, inclusive, as follows:

The name of Emma F. Buchanan, widow of Francis A. Buchanan, late of Capt. Child'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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 20, in the allowance to Alexandra Mackenzie, after the words "widow of," to strike out "Egbert" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Egbert," so as to read:

The name of Alexandra Mackenzie, widow of Egbert G. Mackenzie, late assistant surgeon, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, to strike out lines 18 to 20, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 15, to strike out "Williams's" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Williams'," so as to read:

The name of John S. Robison, late of Capt. James Williams' 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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, to strike out lines 18 to 26, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, to strike out lines 8 to 10, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, to strike out lines 15 to 22, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, to strike out lines 1 to 3, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, to strike out lines 8 to 17, inclusive, as follows:

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. Gahret, 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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, to strike out lines 11 to 14, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, to strike out lines 11 to 14, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, to strike out lines 6 to 8, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, to strike out lines 3 to 9, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, to strike out lines 18 to 24, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 14, in the allowance to Elizabeth Peters, to strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, to strike out lines 22 to 24, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 16, in the allowance to Louisa Johnson, to strike out "\$25," and insert in lieu thereof "\$20."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, to strike out lines 20 to 23, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, to strike out lines 5 to 7, inclusive, as follows:

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 amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from North Dakota, who has this bill in charge, a question? This is one of the regular pension bills, I understand?

Mr. McCUMBER. It is.

Mr. HARRISON. Can the Senator tell the Senate what is the status now of the soldiers' bonus bill, which is pending in the Finance Committee? I noticed in the papers several days ago that the Senator from North Dakota gave a statement to the press saying, in substance, that he expected the Finance Committee to report out that bill before the 4th of March, and also that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], gave out a similar statement. I saw, too, where a delegation of the representatives of the American Legion conferred with the Senator from Pennsylvania and, I think, with the Senator from North Dakota, and they left here under the impression, at least, that the bill would probably be reported to the Senate. I am wondering if the committee is going to report it, if they intend to press it, and if the Senator has any idea that between now and the 4th of March to get any action on that bill?

Mr. McCUMBER. I had hoped to report it two or three days ago, but I did not want to report it without presenting to the Senate something definite as to exactly what it would cost and over what years that cost would be spread, in order that the Senate might fully understand exactly what they were voting for, and also to cover the assertion often made that it will throw a billion or two immediately upon us for payment. I found from the testimony which was taken that it was so indefinite that it was almost impossible to present from the facts before us an exact statement of just what it means to the soldiers and sailors and what it means to the Treasury.

I immediately began my work with the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Treasury Department, and I am now making out my tables, and I hope to have them completed, with the assistance of the actuary of the Treasury Department, and to be able to present the facts fully and clearly to the Committee on Finance by to-morrow. Then I hope it will be reported into the Senate, and, if possible, passed at this session.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand from what the Senator says that the committee has not yet taken final action on this bill, but they have left it to the Senator from North Dakota to get up certain facts to report back to the Finance Committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. To ascertain certain facts and report to the committee.

Mr. HARRISON. But the Finance Committee has not yet taken definite action to report the bill out?

Mr. McCUMBER. They have not, and will not, of course, until I get the final figures. I can only give my conclusion as one, but from the talk I have had with other members, in all probability as soon as I can present the facts the bill will be reported out.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator thinks he will make his report to the Finance Committee to-morrow?

Mr. McCUMBER. I hope to be able to do it.

Mr. HARRISON. To-morrow will be the 25th.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am doing the very best I possibly can to get the figures. I have not lost a moment of time since the matter was turned over to me to get a statement.

Mr. HARRISON. I am sure the Senator has been very diligent.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is more difficult than I anticipated.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, the Senator has more knowledge of this question than anyone else, and I am seeking real information, because there is no use giving the impression to the country that Congress is going to do something if it is impossible to accomplish it. The Senator thinks, then, from the conferences in the committee, that they will take favorable action on some bill touching the soldiers' bonus?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think so.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator does not think, however, whatever favorable action they may take, that it is possible to pass the bill during this session of Congress?

Mr. McCUMBER. I can not say that. I hope we will be able to do it.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand. I hope that, too. The Senator and myself are together on that.

Mr. McCUMBER. But it must be subject to some doubt, of course. However, we will have had our facts ready, and we will meet again within a month; and if it so be that we can not get it through both branches during this session, we will be able to take it up immediately at the beginning of the next session. I hope we can pass it at this session.

Mr. HARRISON. But under the peculiar circumstances existing now, Congress adjourning on the 4th of March, and all legislation dying with the expiration of this Congress, there only remaining now eight or nine days, it looks as though it would be impossible to pass any soldiers' bonus legislation at this time, does it not?

Mr. McCUMBER. It is not impossible, of course, but it looks doubtful about getting it through at this session. However, I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that if it is reported out of the committee it will be reported out without any tax provision whatever, so as to make it an obligation which must be met in taxes in the future, and imposing upon the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the House the obligation to make proper provision to take care of that, together with the other expenses of the Government.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senate Finance Committee should take that action and strike out the policy incorporated to raise money to pay the bonuses, that would change the bill in such a way that if the Senate should pass it then the bill would go to conference (unless the House, of course, concurred in what the Senate did) and that would delay the matter probably until after the 4th of March, and there would be no legislation.

Mr. McCUMBER. But, inasmuch as we would not in all probability change the bonus feature, and inasmuch as we are to meet in a month, or a little over a month, to consider the subject of finances to meet the requirements of the Government in the future, I can see no reason why the House should not accept the amendment to defer the fixing of the method by which it is to be paid until we decide that in the final revenue act.

Mr. HARRISON. The House might take just the opposite view.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course they might.

Mr. HARRISON. They might think that they had given full consideration to that question, and had suggested a plan in the bill, and that the way to pass the bill was for the Senate to pass it as the House had passed it. We will take up presently a river and harbor bill. The House passed that bill, and the Senate Commerce Committee just took it as it was, and we will get it just as it passed the House.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will not the Senator let us finish the pending bill before 2 o'clock, when the unfinished business comes up? I ask that in all courtesy, and I hope the Senator will not take up the time with this other matter.

Mr. HARRISON. I am not trying to delay this bill; but the impression has gone to the country, from the chairman of the Finance Committee and from other members of the committee, that the soldiers' bonus bill will be passed during the present session of Congress. That bill has been before the Senate Finance Committee for months and months for action, and these men throughout the country should not be given a false hope and false impression of action by Congress, because we know, under the present parliamentary status, that if that bill is not reported almost immediately to the Senate and passed in the wording passed by the House, it will not become a law. I do not believe, under the present condition of things, and the deferring of this bill for action by the Finance Committee, that it is possible to pass it during this session of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There are a great many people who hope it can not be passed.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand that. I merely want to get the right light on the situation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I hope it will not pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the Committee on Pensions.

The READING CLERK. On page 59, after line 12, insert the following:

The names of Mercedes Slocum, Patricia Slocum, and James Slocum, minor children of William A. Slocum, late of Companies F and I, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay them a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the three minor children of the said William A. Slocum until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Frances E. Herlehy, widow of Patrick Herlehy, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Leonard Ripple, late of Company L, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Jacob Johnson, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Elissa Bahklow, widow of Rudolph Bahklow, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Anna M. Carroll, widow of Daniel P. Carroll, late of Company K, Third Regiment Nebraska 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 Daniel P. Carroll until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Henrietta A. Brewer, widow of Rustin C. Brewer, late of Capt. R. L. Williams's Company E, Second Regiment Oregon Mounted 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 James A. Childers, late of Company I, Eighteenth 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 Bronislawa Wypiewski, widow of Jacob Wypiewski, late of Company C, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James G. Whalin, late of Troop L, Third United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Christina Holden, widow of Patrick Holden, late of Troop B, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary Sheridan, widow of John Sheridan, late of Company F, First Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Barbara Jones, widow of Lafayette Jones, late of Troop A, First Regiment Kentucky Cavalry, and Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John T. Mockabee, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Belle Cannon, widow of Benjamin Cannon, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, 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 Benjamin Cannon until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Martha Wallace, widow of Thomas Wallace, late of Company B, Instruction General Service, United States Army, 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 Samuel A. Holt, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, 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 Lucile D. Murphey, widow of William R. Murphey, late of Company K, 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 the minor child of said William R. Murphey until he reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Gilbert G. Hornsby, late of the Twenty-second Company United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ida C. Brandan, dependent mother of Arthur A. Brandan, late of Company D, Thirtieth 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 Marle A. Colby, widow of Charles H. Colby, late of Battery D, 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 Charles H. Colby until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Ida M. Zimmerman, widow of Charles A. Zimmerman, late of the United States Navy, 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 John Donovan, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Harriet E. Brown, dependent mother of Philip S. Brown, late major, United States Marine Corps, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary E. Turner, former widow of Oscar B. Armstrong, late of Companies H and C, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Rufus S. Hataway, 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 William H. Ratliff, late of Troop H, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Sarah A. Scott, dependent mother of Virgil D. Scott, late of Company M, Nineteenth 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 Mary Wantz, dependent mother of John Wantz, late of Company I, Third Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Margaret L. Williams, widow of Owen L. Williams, late of Company D, Second Regiment Wisconsin Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Antonette Dierken, widow of Frederick Dierken, late of Troop D, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Corydon W. Clark, late of Company B, Third Regiment New York National Guard Infantry, Regular Establishment, border defense, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Ellen S. Palmer, dependent mother of Arthur R. Palmer, late of Companies F and E, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas H. Crocker, late of Troop I, Tenth 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 Catherine Burke, dependent mother of George F. Burke, late of Company I, First Regiment California Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Susan E. Strevel, dependent mother of Lafayette Brewer, late of Companies A and F, Twenty-sixth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Annie J. Peters, widow of Edward Peters, late of the One hundred and eighth Company, United States Coast Artillery, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elizabeth A. Brown, widow of Martin W. Brown, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Orville George, late of the Supply Company, Third Regiment Missouri National Guard Infantry, Regular Establishment, border defense, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Christian Hess, late of Company H, Thirty-first Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of David W. Graves, late of the United States Marine 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 Margaret E. Murren, dependent mother of Henry J. Murren, late of Company E, First Regiment Maine 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 Anna M. Hughes, widow of Michael W. Hughes, late of Battery F, Second Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James L. Phillips, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Bessie Wood, widow of Luther Wood, late of Company G, Seventh 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 Luther Wood until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of William W. Burke, late of Troop D, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, 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 Kit Smith, late of Company I, First Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of John Frund, late of Troop L, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Harry L. Wilson, late of Company E, Twenty-second Regiment, and Company F, Eighteenth 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 Mathilde E. Ames, widow of Howard E. Ames, late surgeon, ranking with Lieutenant, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, to include and provide for Anjanette Gregory Ames, helpless and dependent child of Howard E. Ames, at the rate of \$20 per month; *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Anjanette Gregory Ames, helpless and dependent child of the said Howard E. Ames, the additional pension of \$20 per month shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mathilde E. Ames the name of the said Anjanette Gregory Ames 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 death of said Mathilde E. Ames.

The name of Eleanor W. Massey, widow of Arthur W. Massey, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Laura E. Gardner, widow of Andrew S. Gardner, late of the United States Marine Corps, 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 Andrew S. Gardner until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Grace A. Kimmer, widow of David J. Kimmer, late of Battery A, Fifth Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jacob Mandelbaum, late of Troop H, Seventh Regiment United States 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 Malissa M. A. Carlson, dependent mother of Carl F. Carlson, late of Company D, Forty-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 Gertrude G. Brown, widow of Dan A. Brown, late of Company E, First Regiment Ohio 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 Dan A. Brown until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Sallie C. Goodman, dependent mother of James S. Goodman, late of Company C, Eleventh 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 Mary E. Lynde, widow of Henry Lynde, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Bridget Margaret Geraghty, widow of Michael Geraghty, late of Company C, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edwin Fager, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Albert Young, late of Company C, Twenty-sixth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, 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 Indiana Abbott, dependent mother of Nathan J. Abbott, late of Company B, Seventh 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 Alice M. Burke, widow of John J. Burke, late of Battery H, Third Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Amelia J. Barnard, widow of Henry Barnard, late hospital steward, United States Army, Indian wars, 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 Sarah E. Cottrell, widow of Arthur Cottrell, 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 Arthur Cottrell until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Sadie Judith Tharp, widow of John A. D. Tharp, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Anna M. Shannon, widow of Mathew Shannon, late of Company C, Two hundred and third Regiment New York Infantry, and Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Bridget Kuhlman, widow of John F. Kuhlman, alias John F. Coleman, late of Company K, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Teresa M. Strain, widow of John A. Strain, late of Company H, First 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 the minor child of said John A. Strain until he reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Clifton L. Fenton, late captain and assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers, 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 Margo, late of Troop C, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, 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 Annie F. Hickey, widow of Simon P. Hickey, late of Companies M and H, Eleventh 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 Simon P. Hickey until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Paul L. Bahr, late of Company A, 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 Cornelius Meek, late of Company A, Second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Belle Sturgill, widow of Andrew J. Sturgill, 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 Andrew J. Sturgill until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Alice G. Hudson, widow of Edward A. Hudson, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William A. Johnson, late of Lieut. J. J. Willingham's Company U, Montague County, Texas Minute Men, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of John A. Napier, late of the One hundred and eleventh Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Lydia Vickers, dependent mother of Samuel G. Vickers, late of Company F, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, 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 Ida Cohen, dependent mother of William Cohen, late of Troop A, Fourteenth 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 name of Mary Rooney, dependent mother of William R. Rooney, late of Company G, Two hundred and third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas Bunion, late of Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Sophia E. McKinney, widow of James L. McKinney, late of Company I (Capt. W. W. Chapman), Second Regiment Oregon Mounted 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 Flora E. Tyler, former widow of Samuel N. Hudson, late of Company D, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteers, 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 Lulu S. Fitzsimmons, widow of William Fitzsimmons, late of Company K, Second Regiment Alabama 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 William Fitzsimmons until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Margaret M. Agan, widow of Michael E. Agan, 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 Michael E. Agan until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Emma M. Gardner, widow of Stephen B. Gardner, late of Capt. D. W. Keith's Company C, Second Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edwin M. Thomas, late of the Ninety-fifth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, 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 Albert Putnam, late of Company E, Twenty-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 Rose C. Isaac, widow of Eugene McC. Isaac, late of the United States Navy, 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 Elizabeth Skaggs, widow of Ferit E. Skaggs, late unassigned, Twentieth 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 Ferit E. Skaggs until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Mollie Bradford, widow of Samuel Bradford, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William L. Basket, late of Company F, Fifth 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 Mary Ann Smith, widow of Samuel D. Smith, late of Companies I and A, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Henrietta A. Hewett, dependent mother of Elmer M. Hewett, late of Company F, First Regiment Maine Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Rushie Peterman, widow of Charley Peterman, late of Company A, Second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James H. Reed, late of Company F, Thirtieth 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 Mary E. Wiggin, widow of Charles H. V. Wiggin, late of Troop K, First Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Veronica Deckarz, widow of Ignatz Deckarz, late of Companies A and K, Thirtieth 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 the minor child of said Ignatz Deckarz until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Ophelia Matthews, widow of Ely V. Matthews, late of Troop H, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Caroline Haines Willis, widow of William R. Willis, late of Capt. P. C. Noland's Company B, Second Regiment Oregon Mounted 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 Minerva A. Ellis, dependent mother of Jesse W. Ellis, late of Company E, Sixth 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 Mary Rita Moon, widow of Henry B. Moon, late lieutenant colonel Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sylvester J. Fisher, late of Company K, Nineteenth Regiment, and Company G, Eleventh 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 Isaac Trent, late of Company L, Eighteenth 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 James Foley, late of the Signal Corps, United States Army, 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 Lennie R. Rutherford, late of Company K, Eighth 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 William Abt, late of the Eighth Company United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth M. Kuhns, widow of Ralph B. Kuhns, alias Bert R. Kuhns, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania 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 Ralph B. Kuhns until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The names of Beatrice Mabel Baker, Lester Belford Baker, and Anna Elizabeth Baker, minor children of Oscar M. Baker, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay them a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said Oscar M. Baker until they reach the age of 16 years. Payment to be made to duly appointed guardian.

The name of Catherine E. Hartman, widow of Irving B. Hartman, late of Company K, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joshua C. Carney, late of Company K, Twenty-fourth Regiment, and Company C, Eleventh Regiment, United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Mary A. Gooden, dependent mother of William H. Gooden, late of Company F, Twenty-first 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 Thomas McGinnis, late of Troop D, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Isabell Deloch, widow of Milbern Deloch, late of Troop K, Sixth 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 name of Tivis C. Simmons, late of Company E, Nineteenth 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 Mace Wise, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John C. McCoy, late of Company K, 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 James W. Fisher, late of Company H, Eighth 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 James G. Shockley, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment, and Company M, Eleventh Regiment, United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Ellen C. Giddens, widow of Ezekiel J. Giddens, late of Capt. McNeill's and Capt. Durrance's Companies, Florida Mounted 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 Mary McEvoy, widow of Thomas McEvoy, late of Company A, First Regiment United States Infantry, 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 Mary Crawford, widow of John W. Crawford, late lieutenant, United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Cornelia de Camp Croxton, widow of Richard C. Croxton, late colonel, United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Floyd L. Green, late of Company K, Thirty-fifth Regiment Michigan 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 John C. Trent, late of the Twenty-ninth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Nancy M. Wagner, dependent mother of Kyle Wagner, late of Company F, Thirtieth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Clarence Matchett, alias Harry J. Reed, late of the United States Marine Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles T. Bowman, minor child of Thomas E. Bowman, late of the One hundred and tenth Company, United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Thomas E. Bowman until he reaches the age of 16 years, payment to be made to duly appointed guardian.

The name of Joseph T. Moore, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Martin O. Fraundorf, late of the Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Emma L. Williams, widow of Joseph B. Williams, late of the Sixteenth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, 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 Joseph B. Williams until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Harris Dreelin, late of the United States Navy, 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 Nathaniel B. Taylor, late of Company K, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dury M. Craft, late of the Fifty-seventh Company, United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles M. S. Ronsholdt, late of Company C, First Regiment Illinois Cavalry, 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 Charles W. Anderson, late of Company H, Signal Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Freida Steinert, widow of Richard C. Steinert, late of Company G, Second Regiment Wisconsin 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 Richard C. Steinert until he reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Gustav F. Breiter, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Louisa M. Walker, dependent mother of William A. Walker, late of Company C, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, 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 Nannie Jackson Mitchell, dependent mother of George C. Mitchell, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank C. Miller, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Robert Bales, late of Company E, 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 Sarah V. Cribb, dependent mother of Edward M. Cribb, late of the United States Navy, 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 Wyman Cottle, late of Battery C, Third Regiment United States Artillery, 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 Wood C. Wilson, late of Troop L, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Miller, alias Frank Smith, late of Company G, Tenth 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 Polly E. Thompson, dependent mother of Charles H. Thompson, late of Company K, Sixteenth 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 Mathew Dudley, late of Company A, Forty-first Regiment, and Company G, Twenty-fourth Regiment, United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Margaret A. Warren, widow of George W. Warren, late of Company D, Nineteenth Regiment Kansas Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of former allowance, which amount shall not be subject to any deduction or recovery on account of previous erroneous issue.

The name of Louisa E. Schindling, widow of Lorenzo Schindling, late of Troop G, United States Mounted Riflemen, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, which amount shall not be subject to any deduction or recovery on account of previous erroneous issue.

The name of Sarah Ann Cornwell, former widow of John L. Temple, late of Capt. Warfield's Company A, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of William H. Martin, late of Battery E, Third Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William M. Golden, late of Company E, First Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Constable, helpless and dependent daughter of Jacob H. Constable, late of Company D, First Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Leonora E. Wright, widow of Henry H. Wright, late major, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Smith Richards, late of Company I, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Prater, late first lieutenant of Company E, Second Regiment Infantry, Kentucky National Guard, Regular Establishment, border defense, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hyman Mendelson, late of Company G, Second Regiment United States Infantry, and Companies L, M, and C, United States Signal Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of George W. Vineyard, late of Company M, Third Regiment Georgia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Margaret Daley, widow of John Daley, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment, and Company G, Fourteenth Regiment, United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William M. Lillard, late of Company G, 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 Belle Kirgan, dependent mother of Thomas H. Gregg, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Catherine N. Wilson, widow of Green G. F. Wilson, late of Company C, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of David Burns, father of James F. Burns, late of Company C, Fifty-third 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 Homer T. Ragsdale, late of United States Navy, 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 George F. Behymer, late of Company F, Fourth 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 John N. Skidmore, late of Capt. Hembree's Company E, First Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory, Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Mygatt, late of Company E, Fourteenth 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 Josephine M. Bourke, widow of James Bourke, late major, Medical Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said James Bourke until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of William W. Ferguson, late of Company H, Thirteenth 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 Julia McMains, widow of Andrew McMains, late of Company G, Nineteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Isadora Richardson, dependent mother of Marion N. Richardson, late of Troop E, Fourteenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Emma S. Ervin, widow of William A. Ervin, late of Troop E, Ninth 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 William A. Ervin until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Alexander C. Powell, dependent father of Marvin J. Powell, late of Company B, Twentieth Regiment Kansas 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 John A. Bohman, late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Paul B. Gomoll, late of the field hospital, Utah National Guard, border defense, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of H. Frederica Olcott, widow of Frederic W. Olcott, late passed assistant surgeon, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Charles L. Stevens, late of Troop E, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Barbara A. Munger, dependent mother of John Munger, late of Company G, Twenty-first Regiment Kansas 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 Lucy L. Whiteaker, widow of David J. Whiteaker, late of Capt. F. M. P. Goff's Company K, Second Regiment Washington Territory Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John C. Holsapple, dependent father of Radford Holsapple, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Kentucky 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 Marie G. Harding, widow of Arthur E. Harding, late captain, United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Hartman, late of Company H, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles C. Chadwick, late of Troop A, First Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Milton I. Woodard, late of Company A, Thirty-fourth 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 James W. McKay, late first lieutenant Battery A, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Scheitler, late of Fifty-second Company, Coast Artillery, United States Army, 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 William Russell, late of Companies H and A, Second Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Annie F. Rountree, widow of Frank M. Rountree, late of Troop M, Seventh 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 Frank M. Rountree until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Mary S. Brown, dependent mother of William Brown, late captain Company E, Forty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer 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 Ruth E. Hartfel, widow of Ray Hartfel, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, 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 Ray Hartfel.

The name of Isabella C. Weber, widow of Julius H. Weber, late second lieutenant, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$15 per month.

The name of Ellen Burdick, widow of Lutellus Burdick, late of Maj. Ferguson's regiment, Nauvoo Legion, Utah Volunteers, Utah Indian disturbances, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George W. James, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment United States Volunteer 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 Harry Coyan, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, 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 Sarah G. Bloxom, dependent mother of Harry W. Bloxom, late of Company B, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Emma Jennings, dependent mother of Ashley J. Jennings, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana 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 Edgar E. Rich, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Mattie M. Trussell, dependent mother of John C. L. Trussell, late of U. S. S. *Marblehead*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Kenney, dependent father of William J. Kenney, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment Minnesota 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 Hollie Britton, widow of David Britton, late of Troop H, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Sophrona J. Spencer, alias Owen, dependent mother of James Owen, late of Battery L, Third Regiment United States Artillery, 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 Charles W. Pierce, late of Troop A, Second Regiment, and Troop B, Sixth Regiment, United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mike A. Langeneck, late of Company D, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Engineers, 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 Howard, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha E. Hawes, former widow of Charles Wickliffe, late major Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alexander Wilson, late of Company I, Third 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 Watson D. Smith, late of Company II, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Anna J. At Lee, widow of William E. At Lee, late of the United States Revenue-Cutter Service, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph B. Owens, late of Battery E, First Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Jane M. Cowan, widow of Alexander Cowan, late of Capt. L. Steven's company, Col. George A. Smith's regiment of cavalry, Nauvoo Legion, Utah Volunteers, Utah Indian disturbances, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Anton Merk, dependent father of Albert Merk, late of Company M, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Milo D. Heath, late of Company G, Twenty-second 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 Anne G. Robinson, widow of John M. Robinson, late commodore, United States Navy, retired, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Michael Urell, alias Charles Welsh, late of Company K, Seventeenth 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 Annie Van Ogle, widow of Van Ogle, late first lieutenant Company B, Washington Territory Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Woodville G. Staubly, late hospital steward, 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 Earle H. Philbrick, late of the First Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, 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 Emille Deetz, widow of George Deetz, late of Company G, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John H. Edge, late of Company L, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, 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 Ellen M. Leary, widow of Peter Leary, jr., late brigadier general, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henrietta M. Reeves, widow of Isaac S. K. Reeves, late commodore, United States Navy, retired, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Herbert S. Coheley, late of Troop A, First Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louis H. Buehle, late of the Ninety-fourth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Martineau, late of the United States Army, War with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louise R. Stevenson, widow of Charles M. Stevenson, late lieutenant colonel First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William H. Turner, late of Troop K, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Harriet S. Mansfield, widow of Henry B. Mansfield, late rear admiral, United States Navy, retired, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Arabella G. Walker, widow of Asa Walker, late rear admiral, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Fanny W. Arnold, widow of Conway H. Arnold, late rear admiral, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Diven, dependent mother of Edward T. Diven, jr., late of Company I, First Regiment Maryland 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 Amanda A. Birch, widow of Elijah R. Birch, late of Company C, First Regiment United States Dragoons, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ray Cope, late of the Forty-ninth 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 George F. Chambers, late of United States Marine Corps, 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 George F. Ludl, late of One hundred and fourth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Eddie Thomas, late of Twenty-fourth Battery, 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 Nannie M. Franks, widow of William H. Franks, late of Troop F, First Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary Leahy, dependent mother of Cornelius J. Leahy, late of Company A, Thirty-sixth 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 Harriet B. Hart, widow of Charles L. Hart, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, 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 John B. Senecal, late of Company G, Twenty-second 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 Nettie M. Chittenden, widow of Hiram M. Chittenden, late brigadier general, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Susan A. Hackett, dependent mother of Powhatan Hackett, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Kansas 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 Mary L. Pope, widow of James W. Pope, late brigadier general, United States Army, retired, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Charles F. Doepel, late of Company I, Eighth 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 Adelaide V. Lamson, dependent mother of Harold Lamson, late of Company D, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elise Seabel, widow of Adolph Seabel, late of U. S. S. *Massachusetts*, 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 Adolph Seabel until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Johanna McElliott, dependent mother of Daniel P. McElliott, late of Company A, First Regiment Montana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Austella Stephenson, now Bledsoe, dependent mother of William O. Stephenson, late of Company I, Fourth 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 Louisa A. Thomas, widow of Joseph M. Thomas, late of Col. Markham's Nauvoo Legion, Utah Volunteers, Utah Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Stephen S. Joyce, late of Troop C, Sixth 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 Charles C. Perkins, dependent father of Charles E. Perkins, late of Company G, First Regiment Maine 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 Charles Smalle, late of the United States Marine Corps, 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 Cornelia A. Forbes, widow of John B. Forbes, late of Capt. Oliver Shedd's company, Second Regiment Washington Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McCUMBER. I suppose that at 2 o'clock the Senator from Washington will ask that the Senate proceed with the un-

finished business. I have one more of these bills, but I think there is no use asking to have it taken up now, unless the Senator would yield until we should finish it. Therefore I will not move it at this time, but at the first opportunity I will do so.

THE CALENDAR.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar, under Rule VIII, beginning with No. 663, and consider only bills to which there is no objection, and at 2 o'clock I shall ask the Senator having the river and harbor bill in charge to temporarily lay it aside.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is practically 2 o'clock now. The request might come now. I did not, however, rise for that purpose. I wish to ask the Senator if the bill he has named is at the point where the call of the calendar was left off the last time it was called.

Mr. SMOOT. It is.

Mr. KENYON. What is the calendar number of the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. Calendar No. 663, that was to come up this morning following the one last considered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The idea is to go ahead with the call of the calendar?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 15935) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] if he will not lay aside the unfinished business for the purpose of considering the unanimous-consent agreement which I have already presented.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand the unanimous-consent agreement refers to unobjected bills?

Mr. SMOOT. It does.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If the Senate can proceed in an expeditious way with the unobjected bills, and there is not what might be called unnecessary discussion with reference to them, I am perfectly willing to lay aside the unfinished business for a time and give an opportunity to take up unobjected bills on the calendar. I wish to state, however, that I hope after we go through to the end of the calendar we may go back to Calendar No. 637, a bill which has gone over two or three times and to which I think there will be no objection now.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I hope we can go through the calendar, and then begin at the beginning and go through it up to the point where we began to-day. This is the time to do it if we are going to do it at all. It would do no harm if we spent the balance of the afternoon in that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think that is probably correct. I shall ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, with the understanding, however, that if any unnecessary discussion is had with reference to any particular bill I shall take the liberty of calling the unfinished business again to the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The calendar, under Rule VIII, is therefore in order. The Secretary will report the first business on the calendar.

RELIEF OF DISTRESS ABROAD.

Senate concurrent resolution 35 was announced as the next business on the calendar, and the Senate proceeded to consider it. The concurrent resolution had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Congress of the United States earnestly calls upon the people of the United States to contribute out of their substance to the humanitarian activities in behalf of the needy of the world.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee recommends striking out the preamble. Without objection, the preamble will be stricken out.

INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 225) authorizing the President of the United States to advise the Governments of Great Britain and Japan that the Government of the United States is ready to take up with them the question of disarmament, etc., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution was reported with amendments, which will be stated in their order.

- The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The first amendment of the Committee on Foreign Relations is, on page 2, in line 8, before the word "disarmament," to insert the word "naval."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The next amendment of the committee is, on page 2, in line 9, to strike out the words "quickly coming to an understanding" and insert in lieu thereof the words "promptly entering into a treaty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The next amendment is on page 2, in line 10, before the word "naval," to strike out the word "building" and insert after the word "naval" the word "bullding."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The next amendment is, on page 2, in line 12, before the word "reduced," to insert the word "substantially."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The next amendment is, in lines 13 and 14, where the committee proposes to strike out "50 per cent of the present estimates or figures," and to insert in lieu thereof "to such an extent and upon such terms as may be agreed upon."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I think the joint resolution should be read as reported. I ask that it be so read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the joint resolution as requested.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there are a number of Senators absent who have been sent for, and in order that they may all come at once or have a chance to do so, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gay	Kirby	Simmons
Ball	Gerry	Lodge	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Glass	McKellar	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Gooding	Moses	Smoot
Brandegge	Gore	Myers	Spencer
Calder	Gronna	Nelson	Stanley
Capper	Hale	New	Sterling
Chamberlain	Harris	Overman	Sutherland
Culberson	Harrison	Phelan	Thomas
Curtis	Heffin	Phipps	Trammell
Dial	Hitchcock	Pittman	Underwood
Dillingham	Jones, N. Mex.	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell	Warren
Fernald	Kellogg	Robinson	Willis
Fletcher	Kenyon	Sheppard	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	Keyes	Shields	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Secretary will read the joint resolution as proposed to be amended by the committee, as requested by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW].

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, etc. That the President of the United States is requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to advise the Governments of Great Britain and Japan, respectively, that this Government will at once take up directly with their Governments and without waiting upon the action of any other nation the question of naval disarmament, with a view of promptly entering into a treaty by which the naval building programs of each of said Governments, to wit, that of Great Britain, Japan, and the United States, shall be substantially reduced annually during the next five years to such an extent and upon such terms as may be agreed upon.

Sec. 2. That this proposition is suggested by the Congress of the United States to accomplish immediately a substantial reduction of the naval armaments of the world.

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

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 2 the Committee on Foreign Relations propose to strike out lines 16, 17, and 18, in the following words:

Second. That it is the sense of the Congress, in case such an understanding can be had, that it will conform its appropriations and building plans to such agreement.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is still in Committee of the Whole and open to further amendment.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, has the entire joint resolution been read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been read, and it is still as in the Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the joint resolution will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. PITTMAN. I should like to have read to the Senate the provision of the joint resolution with regard to the suspension of the naval program.

Mr. BORAH. That is not in this joint resolution at all.

Mr. PITTMAN. As I understand, then, the joint resolution deals only with the proposition of entering into a discussion for a reduction of armament?

Mr. BORAH. That is the sole subject of the resolution.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, this is a joint resolution which has been reported with amendments from the Foreign Relations Committee. The provisions in regard to a specific limitation and requiring future appropriations to conform to any agreement which may be reached have been stricken out. If I am correctly informed, the amendments which have been reported by the committee have been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All of them have been agreed to. The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, some days before this joint resolution was offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] I submitted a resolution for the consideration of the Senate, in substance requesting the President of the United States to appoint a representative to sit with the commission appointed by the council of the League of Nations to devise a plan to be submitted to the several governments looking to a general reduction in armaments.

That contemplated a reduction in the land forces as well as in the naval forces of the various nations. The council of the League of Nations appointed an advisory commission upon naval, military, and air questions, consisting of a representative from each of the eight countries represented in the council of the league, one being an officer of the navy, one an officer of the army, and another an officer of the air forces of the various Governments. They were afterwards instructed to prepare for the consideration of the council a draft of a plan for a general reduction of armaments. In proceeding with that work they were embarrassed, of course, by reason of the fact that the United States was not represented upon the council.

Then an invitation came from the president of the council, through its direction, to the President of the United States, asking that representatives be sent from the United States to sit with the committee thus appointed to consider the plan for a general reduction of armaments. That invitation was declined by the President. The purpose of the resolution introduced by me was to draw out from the Senate, and possibly from the other House, an expression as to whether or not this Government ought to be represented in that connection.

Subsequently, Mr. President, a resolution was considered by one of the committees of the House—and, I believe, by the House itself—requesting the President to request a conference of the leading nations of the earth under the provisions of the act of 1916, looking to the draft of a plan for a general reduction in armaments.

So in addition to the plan proposed by the resolution of the Senator from Idaho for a conference between the three Governments named in the resolution, namely, the United States, Great Britain, and Japan, for a reduction in naval armaments alone, two other propositions are before the Congress, or one branch of the Congress, for consideration, namely, the plan of joining with the commission already appointed by the council of the League of Nations, and now operating, for the purpose of devising a plan for general reduction of armaments, and, second, the extension of an invitation to all of the nations, pursuant to the act of Congress of May, 1916.

Mr. President, I venture to express the view that the appropriate action, the wisest action, to take in the present situation of affairs is to adopt one of the other two plans proposed rather than that offered by the Senator from Idaho. There are two purposes to be subserved in this connection. The one, of course, is to promote the cause of peace, to reduce—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PHIPPS in the chair). Under Rule VIII, the time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I exceedingly regret that no opportunity is afforded by the way this matter is presented for a real consideration by the Senate of the question that is before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that we are proceeding under Rule VIII, and that there can be no debate on the part of any Senator exceeding five minutes.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator certain questions in regard to the matter he is now discussing, and I ask him to answer me in my own time. I ask the Senator if there is anything inconsistent in the adoption of both the resolution of the Senator from Idaho and the resolution of the Senator from Montana? Can he not offer his resolution either as a substitute for or as an amendment by way of addition to the resolution of the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should think there would be nothing inconsistent in such action, and it is my purpose, Mr.

President, to offer either or both of the resolutions to which I have referred as an amendment to the resolution offered by the Senator from Idaho. The Senator from Idaho contemplates operating within a field very much narrower than that contemplated by my resolution or by the resolution which has had the consideration of the committee of the House, although perhaps it is possible to get more speedy action with reference to the subject covered by the resolution of the Senator from Idaho. However, what I desired to say was that the great peril to the peace of the world, in my estimation, arises not from naval armament but from military forces on land. Likewise, Mr. President, only a comparatively small fraction of the horrible burden resting upon the world to-day by reason of military armament arises from the Naval Establishment, the greater burden arising from the land forces. Accordingly, we would proceed but slightly in the direction which everybody has in mind if we simply attempted to secure a reduction in naval armament, and particularly in the building program.

Let me remark that the building program of the United States contemplates during the ensuing year the expenditure of something like \$160,000,000. I am not advised just exactly the amount reported for building purposes by the Naval Affairs Committee, as I was unable to attend its session this morning, but if the building program should be cut in two the saving in expenditure to the Government of the United States would not be in excess of \$100,000,000, while the total estimates for the Navy during the current year run to something like \$679,000,000; in other words, so far as the United States is concerned, the saving, should we be successful in negotiating a treaty such as is proposed by the resolution of the Senator from Idaho, would not result in any case in excess of \$100,000,000.

Mr. President, we shall accomplish at least that much saving by the reduction that is proposed in our Army. The reduction from 280,000 men to 175,000 men will accomplish a saving which is estimated at about \$1,000 per man. So, while I shall be very glad to enter into any kind of arrangement that, without imperiling our national defense, at the same time will accomplish a saving of \$100,000,000, it occurs to me that in a total of appropriations that will perhaps amount to \$1,000,000,000 or thereabouts for the current year for the Army and Navy, a saving of \$100,000,000 is a relatively small amount.

The great trouble with the world to-day is that it is endeavoring to carry a burden in the way of military establishments that is entirely beyond its capacity to carry. Accordingly I desire to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have an amendment to offer. To the joint resolution I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to add the following:

Second. That the President be, and he hereby is, requested to express to the council of the League of Nations the earnest desire of the Government of the United States to cooperate with the commission so by the said council appointed and with the said council in the formulation of plans looking to a general reduction of armaments, for submission to the several Governments for their consideration and action, and that he be, and he hereby is, further requested promptly to designate with due authority such representative.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator from Montana has offered that amendment. I know that the Senator from Montana is entirely sincere in his desire to accomplish something in the way of disarmament, and the difference between us lies in the method by which to accomplish that result.

I am very clear in my own mind that this amendment attached to this particular resolution would destroy the effect of the resolution which I have had the honor to offer.

As an illustration, for instance, the representatives of France declared at the Geneva Conference that she was not in a position to consider the question of disarmament at this time if it involved the question of land disarmament, and that they would not even vote for the principle of disarmament under present conditions. If, therefore, we include universal disarmament, or disarmament by land as well as by sea, of course it sounds the death knell of the movement at this time by reason of the condition in Europe, which France says makes it absolutely impossible for her to consider the question. We can afford to lead, and in order to lead we must limit our present program to naval disarmament.

The resolution which I have offered had in view the sole question of seeing if we could not arrive at an understanding which would prevent naval competitive building from this time on, dealing with one phase of the subject. The only three nations now engaged in naval building of any moment whatever are the United States, Great Britain, and Japan. As said by

Admiral Huse in New York night before last, in a speech which he made, the only three nations which have any navy whatever of any moment or consideration are the three nations which I have just named. There is no doubt but that these three powers are really girding themselves for a race of naval supremacy. It is perfectly apparent, it is perfectly plain, to those who have studied the situation, that that is the real condition of affairs at this time. Let us make haste and deal with this situation.

Mr. President, I simply desire to bring those three powers together for the purpose of effectuating an understanding and an agreement by which the naval race which is now being begun may be stopped. If universal disarmament could be had, as suggested by the Senator from Montana, it would be infinitely better; but it is perfectly apparent that at this time we can not make any progress in that respect. If the Senator from Montana would offer his resolution upon its own strength, disassociated from this resolution, of course it would receive tremendous support; but it occurs to me that if we can make progress in stopping naval competition we will have accomplished a vast amount along the line of disarmament and for the peace of the world.

If there is any conflict within the time of the Senator from Montana and myself in which the United States shall be engaged, the probabilities are that it will arise out of the naval competition which is now about to begin.

I want to deal with the situation as it really confronts us and deal with it in a practical way. We must have a beginning, and the beginning is to stop this naval race which is fraught with all kinds of danger.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. ROBINSON obtained the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this resolution is going to lead to discussion—

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I have the floor, and the Senator will please permit me to occupy it for just a moment.

I do not desire to speak further than to reply to the implied suggestion of my friend the Senator from Idaho that the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana is inconsistent with his proposal.

The Senator from Montana does not seek, by the amendment which he has offered, to change in any respect the proposal of the Senator from Idaho, as modified by the committee and by the Senate in Committee of the Whole. If the amendment of the Senator from Montana is agreed to, the proposal of the Senator from Idaho will stand unchanged. The adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana has this advantage: While it detracts in no respect from anything contained in the resolution of the Senator from Idaho, it permits this Government to go forward in an effort to secure general disarmament or reduction of armament, while the resolution of the Senator from Idaho is limited to an effort to procure an agreement to reduce naval armament on the part of Japan, Great Britain, and the United States.

It may be desirable in the interest of the United States that Great Britain, Japan, and the United States suspend the enlargement of their navies. It is also desirable, as every Senator will concede, that all the nations of the world combine, if they can be induced to do so, to reduce other forms of armament. I ask the Senator from Idaho how the adoption of the amendment as an additional provision can detract in any respect from the value of his proposal, if it has value? The authority in the resolution of the Senator from Idaho vested in this Government to propose partial naval disarmament to Japan and Great Britain is not changed in any particular. This Government, if the amendment of the Senator from Montana is agreed to, will still have that power, but it will have the additional and far more important power, considered from the standpoint of the interest of this Nation and of the world, to say to Germany and Austria and France and Italy and Russia and all the other Governments of this earth, "Notwithstanding the fact that we declined to enter into the League of Nations, we are willing to take the initiative in a program of general disarmament"; and if they refuse to enter upon that program the United States will not be prevented from carrying out the purposes of the resolution of the Senator from Idaho.

Ah, Mr. President, this resolution in the form that it comes to the Senate from the committee is a poor substitute, a subterfuge, in part, for the proposal which the Senate rejected some months ago, that this Government, in consonance with the other nations of the world, advance abreast in the march of progress and of civilization to the limitation of all armaments by common agreement among the nations. The Senator from Idaho more than any other Senator is responsible directly for the failure of

the United States to proceed in agreement with other nations for disarmament.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I object to the further consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made, and the joint resolution will be passed over.

TRANSPORTATION FOR DESTITUTE DISCHARGED SOLDIERS.

The bill (S. 4889) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish free transportation and subsistence from Europe to the United States for certain destitute discharged soldiers and their wives and children was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to add at the end of the bill the following proviso:

Provided further, That the authority conferred by this act shall cease and determine six months after the approval thereof.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to furnish transportation on United States Army transports from Europe to the United States, and subsistence en route, to any person who served in the Army of the United States and was honorably discharged therefrom in Europe, and who is now in Europe and is or becomes destitute, and to the wife and children of such person: *Provided*, That if such person, his wife or children, are not at a port of embarkation of United States Army transports the Secretary of War is further authorized to furnish transportation to such person, his wife or children, to such port of embarkation and subsistence en route: *Provided further*, That all such transportation and subsistence shall be furnished without cost to such person, his wife or children: *Provided further*, That the authority conferred by this act shall cease and determine six months after the approval thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I hope no objection will be made to this bill. We found a recommendation from the War Department, insisted upon by the Secretary and those in authority who knew, that there ought to be an appropriation made authorizing them to bring home certain members of the American Expeditionary Forces, or, rather, men who had been demobilized on the other side of the ocean. They are over there. The conditions are bad. They are unable to support themselves, and they are bringing the Army into disrepute. They are going into crime and vagabondage, and it is thought necessary on the part of our Government that we should bring these men home, and this bill simply authorizes the Secretary of War to do so.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

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

Mr. KIRBY. I yield.

Mr. KING. My recollection is that the Government already has authority to bring back to our shores all soldiers who were there and within the Army.

Mr. KIRBY. There is no doubt about that proposition, but these men for some reason, perhaps because they preferred it, were demobilized on the other side of the ocean. Some of them married over there; some of them preferred to stay there. The conditions have grown so difficult, however, that they are not able to procure any employment. They are not able to sustain themselves. They have gone into crime; they are going into crime and into vagabondage, and they are bringing the Army of the United States into disrepute. Under those conditions the Military Affairs Committee considered the matter with all the facts before them, and by unanimous agreement they have recommended that this bill pass with this amendment, and I hope there will be no objection to it.

Mr. KING. After soldiers have been demobilized and have received the bounty of \$60, if they prefer to be demobilized in France or any other part of the world, will the Senator explain what obligation rests upon the Government of the United States to bring them back to the United States?

Mr. KIRBY. It may be that there is no especial obligation; but we sent these men across the sea to represent this Government of ours in the greatest fighting army that ever has been transported. We allowed them to be demobilized over there. They have gotten into this unfortunate condition, and they are bringing the Army of the United States into disrepute and the United States, too, because of this condition. We can bring them home without a great deal of expense on these transports of ours, and I believe it ought to be done.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator know how many of them there are?

Mr. KIRBY. A good many. I have forgotten the exact number, but quite a number.

Mr. THOMAS. Enough to make quite a large vote if they are over here?

Mr. KIRBY. I do not urge the bill on that ground, but they ought to be brought home under the circumstances.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, this is a unanimous report from the committee, and I hope the bill will pass.

Mr. KIRBY. I make this statement in view of the absence of the chairman of the committee. It is a unanimous report, and the condition is serious and deserves immediate attention, and I hope the bill will pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

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

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

JOHN CHICK.

The bill (H. R. 567) for the relief of John Chick was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING and Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, this is a bill which has passed the Senate several times, and finally has come from the House. I am perfectly familiar with it, and I hope it may be allowed to pass.

Mr. THOMAS. I will look at the report. I should like to have it passed over for the present.

HEIRS OF AGNES INGELS, DECEASED.

The bill (S. 4692) for the relief of the heirs of Agnes Ingels, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator who made the objection will kindly withhold his objection for a moment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will only read the concluding paragraph of the letter of the Secretary of War. He says:

The two accidents were immediately investigated by the board of officers, which found that the accidents were unavoidable and not due to neglect or carelessness on the part of the driver of the Dodge truck.

Mr. ROBINSON. Notwithstanding the statement in the letter, which is correctly quoted by the Senator from Utah, the Committee on Claims by unanimous vote thought, after careful consideration of the matter, that the accident was due solely to negligence, and gross negligence, on the part of agents of the Government; and, if I may do so, I will make a brief statement of the facts. I am thoroughly familiar with the facts.

This is the case as to which the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] stated on the floor recently that it was his intention, when the bill reached the Senate, to move to increase the amount authorized by the committee from \$5,000 to \$25,000 because of the facts in the case. The facts are these:

Mrs. Ingels was crossing a street in Hot Springs, Ark., when she was run down and killed by a motor truck operated by a private soldier. The motor truck had been inspected and pronounced utterly unfit for use. Notwithstanding this inspection and finding by the officers of the Government, the private was directed by the officer in charge of the motor-truck service to continue the use of the truck. The truck was passing down the street in Hot Springs and ran over another person. The private soldier operating the truck looked back to see the damage that had already been done, and swerved his car to the opposite side of the street, running over Mrs. Ingels and killing her.

The undisputed evidence is that the truck was in such a condition that it could not be stopped under a distance of 65 feet; that the condition of the truck was known to the officer in charge of the motor service; that the private soldier was operating it under protest, and under these circumstances the committee unanimously reported the bill. We reduced the amount, however, to \$5,000. I hope that under the facts stated the bill may be permitted to pass.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, all I know about the case is what the Secretary of War says, and I certainly could not allow the bill to pass on the statement of the Secretary of War.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Secretary of War found this fact, that the motor truck could not have been stopped because of the condition of the brakes; but the negligence consisted in the officer compelling the private soldier to use the truck after it had been condemned and pronounced unfit for use. There is no question about the facts in the case. The committee had the evidence of the officers and of the private before them in the form of affidavits.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I read every word of the letter of Secretary Baker, and there is not a word

said about the brakes in his whole letter, nor that there was anything the matter with the truck. He said it had been examined thoroughly. He said in his letter:

The two accidents were immediately investigated by the board of officers, which found that the accidents were unavoidable and not due to neglect or carelessness on the part of the driver of the Dodge truck.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, notwithstanding the adverse report of the Secretary of War, the Committee on Claims went into the case fully and found the facts as I have stated them, and the evidence supporting this finding is printed in the report of the committee. The expression of opinion on the part of the Secretary of War that the accident was unavoidable was contradicted by all the facts in the case. If the truck had been in a state of reasonable repair, the accident would not have occurred. If the driver had not looked back to observe the injury done to the man who had already been run over, the accident would not have occurred. It was the grossest sort of negligence, from the facts presented to the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If the Senator will permit me, from the statement of the Senator from Utah, I judge the Secretary of War says that the driver was not negligent. I understand the Senator from Arkansas to put it on the ground of the absolute unreliability of the machine.

Mr. ROBINSON. That conclusion was based on the theory that being a private soldier, notwithstanding the fact that he protested, as the evidence in this case showed, against being compelled to use a truck that had no brakes, he was acting on the orders of his superior officer, and therefore he was not guilty of negligence. That is the theory of the War Department. There is no dispute about how the accident occurred. He first ran down a man, and then pulled to the wrong side of the street, the driver looking back the while to observe what injury had been done to the man already run over.

Mr. SMOOT. On this report, I shall have to object to the bill. The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

JOHN CHICK.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, when a previous bill for the relief of John Chick was called up, I interposed objection. At the request of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], I have examined the report, and I will make no further objection to the consideration of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 567) for the relief of John Chick, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws and the laws conferring rights and privileges upon honorably discharged soldiers, John Chick, late of Company K, Third Regiment United States Artillery, shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of said company and regiment on the 2d day of August, 1865: *Provided*, That no pension shall accrue prior to the passage of this act, and no pay nor bounty shall become due or payable by virtue thereof.

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

EMBASSY BUILDINGS IN LONDON.

The bill (S. 4916) to acquire land and buildings in London, England, for the use of the diplomatic representative of the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. That was taken care of in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, and I ask that it be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be indefinitely postponed.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 4666) to amend section 13 of an act known as the Federal reserve act, approved December 23, 1913, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask that this bill may be passed over without action either way, as the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], is at home. If he wishes to have it to go over, I do not desire to press it, and I hope to hear from him in a few minutes.

The bill (H. R. 1299) for the relief of George Le Clear was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ALFRED E. LEWIS.

The bill (H. R. 1300) for the relief of Alfred E. Lewis was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. SWANSON. I hope the Senator will not object to this bill. I have a report here which I think will convince the Senator, if he reads it, that this bill should pass. It is a case

where a young fellow was a drummer boy in New York, was too young to enlist, his father would not consent to his enlistment; he was not mustered in, but he went and took part in the battle of Malvern Hills, and was in five or six battles. He went all over Virginia and served for one year in the war, and all that is asked is that the service he did shall be counted as service. I think the facts in this case show it to be a very meritorious one. The bill has passed the House. My interest in it is due to the fact that he has a brother living in Virginia, and it is a very worthy case.

Mr. THOMAS. I will look at the report; but let the bill be passed over for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1949) for the relief of George F. Reid was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

WILSON CERTAIN.

The bill (H. R. 13319) for the relief of Wilson Certain was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

Mr. KENYON. I would like to appeal to the Senator from Colorado to withdraw his objection to the consideration of this bill. Let me just say that I never like to appear here and apparently plead for a man who, technically, on the record may be considered a deserter. If the Senator will read the House report, he will see that the committee found that the charge of desertion was unfounded.

I know this man. He is an old soldier. He can not live very much longer. The one thing now with him is this stain upon his military record. He does not ask for any pension, or anything of that kind.

When he was a mere boy in the Army he was furloughed, and went home on account of sickness. He was sick for a long time, in fact, nearly the balance of the war. He started out and went to St. Louis and tried to have himself reinstated, and was there informed by a party in the Army in whom he had confidence that he should go back home and he would be discharged. I think it is unjust, it is cruel, to punish that man now in his old age. He was then a mere boy, could not read or write, did not understand the situation, and was sick and was furloughed. I appeal to the Senator, as he is leaving this body in a few days, much to the regret of all of us, to permit this justice to be done this old soldier.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, in nine cases out of ten these bills reveal the fact that the beneficiary of the bill either deserted or was dishonorably discharged from the military service, and the applications for clearing the record, generally speaking, come after the sources of Government evidence have disappeared and gone to the grave. In nearly all of them the purpose is to secure pensions. The pension roll ought to be a roll of honor. It is, theoretically, however much we have departed from the theory.

I am satisfied that the common judgment of the ordinary man will accept without question the proposition that we have already carried too far the practice of awarding pensions to those who have given some service, or think they have given some service, to their Government, who afterwards apply for and receive pensions. But there is a line that ought to be drawn, even in this degenerate day, and that is between the man who gave some service and was honorably discharged and the man who gave service and then deserted or was dishonorably discharged, and who postponed his application for relief until his old age, and then comes before the committees and requests their consideration, upon grounds rather of sympathy than of justice.

Of course, there are exceptions. The case mentioned by the Senator from Iowa may be one of them. I will read the report, as he has requested it, and then determine. But let it be passed over for the present.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the House report says:

A study of the evidence furnished by this soldier leads the committee inevitably to the conclusion that the record of desertion appearing against the soldier is an error.

I do not think there will be another chance this session to take it up.

Mr. THOMAS. I will give the Senator my final answer before the calendar is laid aside.

ALBERT HAMILTON.

The bill (S. 4699) to place Albert Hamilton on the retired list of the United States Navy was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

RETIRED ARMY OFFICERS.

The bill (S. 2637) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. FLETCHER. I hope the Senator from Utah will not insist on his objection to Senate bill 4699. That bill affects only one retired officer of the Army. It simply provides that he shall be entitled to credit for the time he was detailed by the War Department to the Philippine government in his promotion. There is only one officer affected by it, and he is entitled to it under all the rules that should govern proper consideration of the merits of a case like this, and the War Department has favored it and reported on it, and the bill is amended in accordance with their directions as to how it should read. There is no one in the department opposing it that I have heard of, or anyone acquainted with the facts. The committee considered it very carefully.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether it applies to only one officer or not, but I do know that there ought to be a halt called somewhere to putting officers on the retired list and paying commutation and allowances for longevity, and if we do not stop somewhere I do not know where we are going to land.

Mr. FLETCHER. An officer who served in the Regular Army some thirty-odd years, and was detailed by the War Department to the Philippine government and served there, under the present law is entitled to no credit for that service. This bill simply provides that he shall have that credit. There is only one officer in the whole Army affected.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask that it go over for the time being.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

WILSON CERTAIN.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, after consultation with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], I will withdraw my objection to Calendar Nos. 673 and 675. I do so at the request of those Senators.

Mr. KENYON. I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to the consideration of House bill 13319, Calendar No. 675.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 13319) for the relief of Wilson Certain, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Wilson Certain, who was a private in Company A, Thirty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a private of said company and regiment on the 27th day of June, 1865: *Provided,* That no bounty, pay, or allowances shall be held as accrued prior to the passage of this act.

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

ALFRED E. LEWIS.

Mr. SWANSON. I ask that Calendar No. 673 may be considered.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1300) for the relief of Alfred E. Lewis, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Alfred E. Lewis, who was a drummer boy in Company I, One hundred and first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been mustered in and mustered out as a member of said company and regiment on October 1, 1861, and honorably discharged therefrom September 7, 1862: *Provided,* That no bounty, pay, pension, or other emolument shall be held as accrued prior to the passage of this act.

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

NORTH PLATTE IRRIGATION PROJECT.

The bill (S. 4859) for the relief of certain ex-service men whose rights to make entries on the North Platte irrigation project, Nebraska-Wyoming, were defeated by intervening claims, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the ex-service men qualified to make entry under the homestead laws, who were successful at the drawing held March 5, 1920, for farm units on the North Platte irrigation project, Fort Laramie unit, Nebraska-Wyoming, and to whom approved water-entitlement applications were duly issued, but who were prevented from making homestead entries for the lands covered by such applications because of the reinstatement of certain conflicting homestead entries, shall each have a preferred right of entry under the homestead laws at the next opening of lands under said project, for not less than 30 days before the date set for the opening of such lands to other entry: *Provided,*

That this act shall not be considered as entitling any person to make another homestead entry who shall have received the benefits of the homestead laws since being prevented, as aforesaid, from exercising the right acquired at the said drawing on March 5, 1920.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, by a law that gave returning soldiers 60 days' preference right to make entry on reclamation lands, and so forth, certain men made entry and paid their money for water rentals and other requirements, some of whom have completed their entries, and have been settled with; but two men are out the money and out the land, and this is simply to give an opportunity, when the next unit is opened, for them to take their places as provided by law.

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

LOSSES ON IMPORTATION OF SUGAR.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 238) authorizing the President to require the United States Sugar Equalization Board to take over and dispose of 13,902 tons of sugar imported from the Argentine Republic, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read as follows:

Resolved, etc. That the President is authorized to require the United States Sugar Equalization Board (Inc.), a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, to take over the importation of 13,902 tons of sugar from the Argentine Republic procured by the Department of Justice and the Department of State from the agencies used by them for that purpose, and to distribute or dispose of any of the sugar so imported, and to liquidate and adjust the transaction in such manner as may be deemed by said board to be equitable and proper in the premises.

And for this purpose the President is authorized to vote or use the stock of the corporation held by him, or otherwise exercise or use his control over the said corporation and its directors, and to continue the said United States Sugar Equalization Board for such time as may be necessary to carry out the intention of this resolution.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to have some explanation in regard to this measure. It seems to be rather extraordinary.

Mr. SMOOT. I can tell the Senator in a few words what it means, although the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is not here to explain it. The Government entered into an agreement with these importers to import sugar into the United States to break the sugar market. For some reason, before the shipment arrived in the United States, the price declined so that the importers would lose money if they sold the sugar, and the Government of the United States is asked to protect them.

Mr. KING. May I inquire whether the importers acted upon their own initiative and expended their own money or whether they were agents of the Government in the transaction?

Mr. SMOOT. They were asked by the Sugar Equalization Board to do this, so Mr. Figg, the assistant to the Attorney General, said. That is the real reason of it. The Department of Justice makes a favorable report upon the measure and acknowledges that it was through that department that they arranged for the importation of the sugar into the country for the purpose of breaking the price on the sugar market.

Mr. GRONNA. They were limited to a profit of only 1 cent a pound; in other words, they were really the agents of the Government.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from North Dakota if the same firms were not at that time importing sugar from Argentina and elsewhere in order to supply their customers?

Mr. GRONNA. They were unable to get any sugar from Argentina. It was through the Government of the United States that they were able to have the sugar exported from Argentina, because there was an embargo placed upon the exportation of sugar from that country, and so the matter was taken up with the Department of Justice and with the Department of State. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held public hearings on this particular question, and the Attorney General, Mr. Palmer, appeared before the committee, as did also members of the Sugar Equalization Board, and all of them agreed that the joint resolution ought to pass.

Mr. KING. I am not quite clear from the Senator's statement that the individuals did not initiate the movement themselves.

Mr. GRONNA. Oh, no.

Mr. KING. They found themselves unable to get further sugar from Argentina and utilized the Government as an instrumentality to secure the sugar?

Mr. GRONNA. No; that is not the case.

Mr. KING. And because of their losses they want the Government to recoup them?

Mr. GRONNA. The Attorney General stated that he, together with other officials, asked the corporation which deals in sugar to go to foreign countries and buy sugar in order that the price of sugar might be made to decline. They did so, and

letters to that effect are published in the hearings, with photographic copies of what I call real contracts approved by the Department of State and by the Department of Justice, so that the men were in fact agents of the Government of the United States.

I realize that it would be bad practice to begin to allow claims where the Government of the United States itself was really not responsible for the loss. The committee hesitated in taking up the matter at all until hearings had been held and until Mr. Palmer had made his statement, but he said there is no question about the matter and recommended strongly that the Government of the United States should pay. I think the amount will be somewhere about \$2,750,000, which was the loss to those people.

Mr. KING. Under the joint resolution will they obtain their 1 cent a pound profit on the sugar?

Mr. GRONNA. No; they are not asking for any profit at all, I will say to the Senator, but simply a reimbursement for the actual loss.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator whether or not in operations of the corporation there have been losses to the Government heretofore?

Mr. GRONNA. No; there have not; at least that was not brought out before the committee, and I do not believe there has been any other loss. This is the only instance where the Government is asked to pay a loss of this kind.

Mr. KING. In my opinion, the Government of the United States is not responsible for the loss. The officials of the Government had no authority to undertake the expenditure, and I hope the measure will be defeated. I shall not object to its consideration, but I shall vote against it.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I inquire if the joint resolution has the recommendation of the department? Does the department recommend it?

Mr. GRONNA. The Department of State and the Department of Justice both recommend that the loss be paid.

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

WATER POWER COMMISSION.

The bill (S. 4640) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to create a Federal power commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. The bill had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the bill was read in full, I think, the other day. There is one amendment I desire to offer to the committee amendment. In line 17, on page 2, after the word "restriction," I move to insert "except as to salary increases."

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are committee amendments not agreed to ahead of the one proposed by the Senator from Washington. The committee amendments will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The first amendment of the Committee on Commerce is on page 1, line 3, to strike out the words "An act entitled 'An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes,'" and to insert in lieu thereof "The Federal water power act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce is on page 2, in line 7, after the word "authorized" to insert the words "within the limits of appropriations made therefor by Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The next amendment of the committee is on page 2, line 11, to strike out the words "and as may be from time to time appropriated for by Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The next amendment is on page 2, after line 16, to insert the following:

And the restrictions on transfers from one executive department or independent establishment to another imposed by the acts of Congress approved June 22, 1906, and October 6, 1917, shall not apply to such transfers so made; and the commission may have such printing and binding done and purchase such equipment, supplies, law books, books of reference, periodicals, and directories, as may from time to time be appropriated for by Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator from Washington, but I should like to have the bill read in full as amended before we vote on it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish, first, to renew my offer of the amendment.

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

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 2, line 17, after the word "restrictions," the Senator from Washington moves to insert the words "except as to salary increases."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama requests that the bill as amended be read. The Secretary will read it.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Federal water power act, approved June 10, 1920, is hereby amended by adding thereto an additional paragraph as follows:

"The commission, if it is unable to perform the duties imposed upon it by this act through and by means of employees of the Departments of War, Interior, and Agriculture as provided in the second paragraph of this section, is hereby authorized within the limits of appropriations made therefor by Congress to employ in the District of Columbia and elsewhere such additional expert, technical, clerical, and other personnel as may be necessary for the purpose of performing the duties imposed by this act. The detail of persons for such purpose from the Departments of War, Interior, and Agriculture, or the transfer from such departments of any persons engaged in duties which by this act are conferred upon the commission, is hereby authorized; and the restrictions, except as to salary increases, on transfers from one executive department or independent establishment to another imposed by the acts of Congress approved June 22, 1906, and October 6, 1917, shall not apply to such transfers so made; and the commission may have such printing and binding done and purchase such equipment, supplies, law books, books of reference, periodicals, and directories, as may from time to time be appropriated for by Congress."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the water-power law, and I do not wish to do anything that will impede the possibility of the development of water-power plants in the United States. I am not going to object to the pending bill, I will say to the Senator from Washington, but I wish to say a few words for the Record.

Mr. President, we waited for 15 years, under the idea of conservation, before we could pass a bill that would allow the people of the United States to dam the running rivers of the country and convert into electricity the water power which would thereby be created for the service of the people of the United States. The delay thus occasioned was the greatest crime ever perpetrated by any set of men in the United States and involved the greatest waste, and it was all done under the plea of conservation. At last we passed a bill, a very good bill—I did not agree to it in all its details, but in the main it was a good bill—for the purpose, under certain restrictions, of allowing the people of the United States to go ahead and develop the water power which was being wasted. We put one restriction in the legislation which always will protect the people of the United States, namely, the provision that no grant shall be made extending beyond 50 years. I now understand it is the policy of the Water Power Commission to survey and review the entire system of rivers in the United States before it grants a permit; that it is going into a general survey of every power possibility in the country before one citizen may have the opportunity to develop the water power that is in his neighborhood.

I am not going to object to this bill, for its passage may be necessary in order that the commission may employ clerks outside of those provided for in the original measure; but I wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, if the commission now intends to block the process of the development of the great water powers of the country by undertaking a survey that will require another 15 years to complete, I shall certainly resist appropriations along that line. I am perfectly willing to give the commission all the appropriations which it needs to afford a reasonable opportunity to perform its functions and to serve the people of the United States, but if it is to allow ambition to run away with it and is to reach out and cover the whole United States and cause further delay, I am certainly opposed to any such procedure.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I simply wish to say to the Senator from Washington that I am not ready to have this bill considered to-day.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Just a word, and then I think the Senator will not object to the consideration of the bill. I merely wish to say that I agree with everything the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has said. It does seem that whenever we vest in some organization of the Government the power to carry on some work it then tries to devise some way by which it can not do the thing we want done.

However, the situation with reference to this matter is just this: The usual provision in a bill creating a body of this kind

authorizing them to employ personal service in the District of Columbia was left out of the water power bill. I proposed the provision in the committee, but the committee did not put it in. We have authorized the expenditure—and I hope the Senator from Utah will pay especial attention to this—

Mr. KING. I am listening for the authorization.

Mr. JONES of Washington. We authorized the expenditure of \$100,000 under language that, I think, authorizes its use for any purpose which is necessary under the act, but the Comptroller of the Treasury held that the commission could not use a dollar of that \$100,000 in the employment of clerks and necessary officers in the District of Columbia, and that all the commission can use are clerks detailed from the War Department, the Agricultural Department, and the Interior Department. Some clerks have been detailed from those departments, but those departments can not spare enough clerks to conduct the work of the commission. This proposed legislation is to meet that situation, and that alone. We put the limitation into the legislation in the way I have indicated, and this bill simply makes in order such appropriations as Congress thinks wise for that purpose hereafter; in other words, according to the comptroller's decision, there is no law under which we can appropriate for these clerks, and under our rule, if any Senator should see fit to resort to it, a point of order would lie against an item in an appropriation bill for this purpose. This is simply to make basic law under which the necessary appropriations can be made; and we have tried to be careful, so as to place in the hands of Congress hereafter such limitations as it may see fit to impose.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, of course the operation of this amendment, if it shall become a law, will be that vacancies will be created in other departments by withdrawing from them for use by the power commission so-called technical or other personnel, and that will give opportunity for the other departments to put upon their rolls additional employees of the Government. So we shall be increasing by this proposed act of Congress the number of employees of the Government to the extent at least of the appropriation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But the commission say that they can not do the work without some sort of help; that they can not get enough help from the departments. I want to relieve that phase of the situation, at any rate. I do not want to give the commission an excuse indefinitely to hold up permits. Now they say they can not pass on the permits because they have not the force. The result is that the law which we passed is being practically defeated. They say—and I do not see how we can get around it—that under the comptroller's decision the only force they can employ is that detailed from the other departments. The other departments have temporarily loaned employees, whom they are going to take back; they say they can not spare the employees. If we want the act which created the commission carried out, if we want the water power developed, if we want the permits granted, we must at least provide the force that is necessary to pass upon them. That is the sole purpose of the proposed amendment to the law. I think it ought to be passed. That is all I have to say.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington knows that this organization has ceased to function, so far as granting permits is concerned.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It has not yet even started.

Mr. KING. It is doing just like every other bureau or executive organization which we create. It reaches out and extends its authority and refuses to act until its personnel is swollen far beyond the dreams of Congress when the act creating it was passed.

This bureau refuses to grant permits where the technical evidence is before it—where, indeed, it needs no technical evidence. It wants to establish a so-called broad and comprehensive system and to apply to little streams a general comprehensive red-tape system which it seeks to spread over the entire United States. It is trying to see how it may not act rather than effectively acting and facilitating the development of the water power of the United States. I have had many complaints against the inactivity and the bureaucratic methods of this organization. It is standing there doing nothing except interposing obstacles to the development of water power within the United States.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am afraid the Senator from Utah is right; and yet we have got to have some kind of agency of a human character and bureaucratic nature to carry the work on. We can not do it ourselves. Now, are we going to give them a good excuse for not doing these things by not providing them the necessary help? That is the only point in my mind.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator from Washington ought to incorporate in the bill an amendment requiring the commission

to act upon every application that is made within a specified period not exceeding six months. As it is now, they do not act and they never will act.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But we have got to give them the force.

Mr. KING. Oh, they have had a sufficient force; but they want to build up a great bureaucracy; they want to swell their personnel until they have scores and hundreds of employees.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I wish to say as to the objection the Senator from Utah has made with reference to the transfer of employees from Government departments to the Water Power Commission, that that is already provided for in the law; they already have authority to do that; so that objection does not lie to the pending bill. They already have authority to reach out into the departments and secure such help as they need; but there are not in the departments trained, experienced, and expert men necessary to furnish the help that the commission really needs in their office, and therefore they are unable to proceed with their work. This bill simply enables them to employ other people whom they can not employ now under the ruling of the Comptroller of the Treasury without some authority by Congress.

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

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. KING. Is there any limitation as to what they shall pay and as to the number of their employees, or may they employ as many as they please and pay them just what they please, so long as they do not exceed the aggregate appropriation made from year to year?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, may I answer that question?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. We specifically provided in the last sundry civil bill for the employment of clerical assistance. The Senator could have made a point of order against that provision if he had seen fit, because there was no basic law under which it could be sustained; but under the bill now pending every man for whom we provide may be employed and his salary will be named in the act.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think that is sufficient protection, and I think it is very important to give the commission that authority so that no excuse may be afforded them for not proceeding with their work.

Mr. KING. Is there any power lodged in the commission to create a deficit and to employ additional men?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows that even when we place a limit on an appropriation the departments proceed, regardless of the limitation, so that within a few months we are compelled to provide a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. We ought to enforce the law against creating deficits.

Mr. KING. There is a penal statute against them.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; and it ought to be enforced.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California will state his question of order.

Mr. PHELAN. I understand that under the rule debate may not be continued for more than five minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct; the rule limits debate on the part of any one Senator to five minutes.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I happen to have some knowledge of this matter. I think the distinguished Senator from Utah is wrong in his surmise as to the intention or desire of the Federal Power Commission to build up a bureaucracy, as he charges. It simply desires sufficient clerical help to do its necessary work here in the District of Columbia. It has not such help at present, as the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] has explained, for, under a ruling of the Comptroller of the Treasury, it has been unable to use any of the money heretofore appropriated for clerical help and assistants in the District of Columbia. The commission is sitting here with not much help of any kind, except a secretary and what little is detailed to them by odd lots here and there from various departments. I know it is very greatly hampered in its work. The Congress appropriated \$100,000, and I think some provision ought to be made for putting it to the use for which it was intended.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington is correct in stating that the provision to which he refers has been adopted as an amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill. That removes any emergency for the present; that situation has been taken care of.

Mr. JONES of Washington. This bill simply authorizes the expenditure for the purpose named whenever there are appropriations in the future.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think that is very objectionable, more particularly in view of the short time allowed for the consideration of the bill, and, therefore, I object to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 4933) to amend the interstate commerce act by adding thereto a new section, No. 20b, and to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1917, by adding a new paragraph to section 10 thereof, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KELLOGG. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4899) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I inquire what became of Calendar No. 681, being Senate bill 4640.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill went over on objection.

SOUTH DAKOTA LIEU LAND SELECTION.

The bill (H. R. 397) to authorize a lieu selection by the State of South Dakota for 160 acres on Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

It authorizes the State of South Dakota, acting through its proper officials, to select 160 acres of unappropriated, unreserved, nonmineral lands within the boundaries of the former Pine Ridge Reservation, S. Dak., or an equal area of public land of like character within the boundaries of that State, in lieu of the northeast quarter of section 16, township 38 north, range 40 west, sixth principal meridian, in South Dakota, upon due and proper showing that the lands authorized to be surrendered by the State have not been sold or otherwise encumbered by it, and that the selection of such lieu lands by the said State shall be a waiver of its right, title, and claim in and to the 160-acre tract in section 16 above described; but in case the exchange herein contemplated shall be perfected the lands so surrendered by the State shall be held to be a part of the present Pine Ridge Reservation and subject to the laws enacted for or applicable to that reservation.

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

JAMES E. ADAMS.

The bill (H. R. 5081) for the relief of James E. Adams was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to James E. Adams, of Oakland, Calif., for the lands hereinafter described, provided he shall pay therefor the sum of \$2.50 per acre within six months after approval of this act, the lands being the east half of the southeast quarter of section 21, township 8 north, range 1 east, of the Willamette meridian, Clarke County, Wash., formerly patented to the Oregon & California Railroad Co., and the title to which was reverted in the United States by the provisions of the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. L., p. 218).

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

SANDPOINT (IDAHO) WATER SUPPLY.

The bill (H. R. 9702) granting certain lands to the city of Sandpoint, Idaho, to protect the watershed of the water-supply system of said city was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the city of Sandpoint, Idaho, is hereby authorized to purchase, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to issue, in his discretion, patent to the city of Sandpoint, Idaho, for certain public lands in the Sand Creek and Sweitzer Creek Basins for the protection of the watersheds furnishing the water supply for the said city, the lands being described as follows: Lots 6 and 7, the south half of the northwest quarter and the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 4; lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and the south half of the north half of section 5; lots 1, 2, 3, and 8 in section 6, all in township 57 north, range 2 west, Boise meridian; also lots 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8 in section 2, township 57 north, range 3 west, Boise meridian; also the east half of section 34, the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 28; the west half of the southwest quarter and the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 28; the east half of the southeast quarter, the east half of the northeast quarter, the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter, the east half of the northwest quarter, the southeast

quarter of the southwest quarter, and lot 1 in section 30; the south half of the southwest quarter, the north half of the northwest quarter of section 20; the east half of the southeast quarter of section 18, all in township 58 north, range 2 west, Boise meridian.

Sec. 2. That the said conveyance shall be made upon the payment by said city for lands purchased at the rate of not less than \$1.25 per acre: *Provided*, That the conveyance hereby authorized shall not include any lands which at the date of the issuance of patent shall be covered by a valid existing bona fide right or claim initiated under the laws of the United States: *Provided further*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all oil, coal, and other mineral deposits that may be found on the lands so granted and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same: *And provided further*, That said city shall not have the right to sell or convey the land herein granted, or any part thereof, or to devote the same to any other purpose than as hereinbefore described; and if the said land shall not be used for such municipal purpose, the same, or such parts thereof not so used shall revert to the United States; the conditions and reservations herein provided for shall be expressed in the patent: *And provided further*, That the grant herein is made upon the express condition that within 30 days of the receipt of any request therefor from the Secretary of the Interior, the mayor of said city shall submit to the said Secretary of the Interior a report as to the use made of the land herein granted the city, during the preceding period named in such request showing compliance with the terms and conditions stated in this act, that in the event of his failure to so report or in the event of a showing in such report to the Secretary of the Interior that the terms of the grant have not been complied with, the grant shall be held to be forfeited, and the Attorney General of the United States be instructed to institute suit in the proper courts for the recovery of said lands.

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

FINAL PROOF OF SOLDIER HOMESTEADERS.

The bill (H. R. 13592) to authorize certain homestead settlers or entrymen who entered the military or naval service of the United States during the war with Germany to make final proof of their entries was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

It provides that any settler or entryman under the homestead laws of the United States, who, after settlement, application, or entry and prior to November 11, 1918, enlisted or was actually engaged in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps during the war with Germany, who has been honorably discharged and because of physical incapacities due to service is unable to return to the land, may make proof, without further residence, improvement, or cultivation, at such time and place as may be authorized by the Secretary of the Interior, and receive patent to the land by him so entered or settled upon; but no such patent shall issue prior to the survey of the land.

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

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (H. R. 740) for the relief of John W. Baggott was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 12161) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stats. L., p. 1134), was announced as next in order.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not know what that is about. It seems to be a very important measure. I ask to have it go over until the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] comes in. I will send for him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT, 1920.

The bill (S. 4898) to amend the transportation act, 1920, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This bill is similar to the House bill on the subject recently passed by the Senate. Without objection, it will be indefinitely postponed.

LANDS IN OREGON.

The bill (S. 4511) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant a right of way over certain Government lands to the State of Oregon for the Columbia River Highway was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to grant to the State of Oregon, for the purpose of constructing, maintaining, and operating the Columbia River Highway, a permanent right of way over and across portions of the lands of the United States acquired and held in connection with the improvement of the Dallas-Celilo section of the Columbia River: *Provided*, That the exact location and dimensions of the right of way shall be fixed by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That the grant shall be subject to the express condition that the right of way shall be used solely and exclusively for the roadway purpose aforesaid, and any part thereof not so used shall revert to the United States.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon whether or not there is a general statute which provides that upon the abandonment of a road such as it is pur-

posed here to permit the State to construct the land shall revert to the Government?

Mr. McNARY. That is the purpose of the amendment proposed by the Secretary of the Interior, which is incorporated in the bill as a substitute for the one offered by the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. KING. I was not sure that that language was broad enough. It seems to imply that if a grant of a certain width, for instance, is made, and only a part of the grant is used, the residue would revert to the Government. But suppose that subsequently, 25 or 50 years from now, the State of Oregon should abandon the road entirely. What I am trying to get at is whether the title then would revert to the Government of the United States.

Mr. McNARY. As I understand, the title to the whole of the land, including the user, would revert to the Government.

Mr. KING. If the Senator has made some investigation, and is sure of that, I have no objection.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It is expressly so provided in the bill.

Mr. KING. I am not sure of that.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It says:

Provided further, That the grant shall be subject to the express condition that the right of way shall be used solely and exclusively for the roadway purpose aforesaid, and any part thereof not so used shall revert to the United States.

Mr. KING. I had not seen that proviso.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JURISDICTION OVER BOUNDARY WATERS.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 233) giving consent of the Congress of the United States to the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Nebraska, or any two or more of said States, to agree upon the jurisdiction to be exercised by said States over boundary waters between any two or more of said States, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the consent of the Congress is hereby given to the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Nebraska, or any two or more of them, by such agreement or compact as they may deem desirable or necessary, or as may be evidenced by legislative acts enacted by any two or more of said States, not in conflict with the Constitution of the United States or any law thereof, to determine and settle the jurisdiction to be exercised by said States, respectively, over offenses arising out of the violation of the laws of any of said States upon any of the waters forming the boundary lines between any two or more of said States, or waters through which such boundary line extends, and that the consent of the Congress be, and the same is hereby, given to the concurrent jurisdiction agreed to by the States of Minnesota and South Dakota, as evidenced by the act of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota approved April 20, 1917, and the act of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota approved February 13, 1917.

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

COAL LANDS IN ALASKA.

The bill (S. 4864) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 24, 1914, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 24, 1914, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding to said section the following proviso:

And provided further, That where prospecting or exploratory work is necessary to determine the existence or workability of coal deposits in any unclaimed, undeveloped area in Alaska, the Secretary of the Interior may issue prospecting permits for a term of not to exceed four years, under such rules and regulations and conditions as to development as he may prescribe, to applicants qualified under this act, for not to exceed 2,500 acres, and if within the time specified in said permit the permittee shows to the Secretary of the Interior that the land contains coal in commercial quantities, the permittee shall be entitled to a lease under this act for all or any part of the land in his permit."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

DISPOSITION OF TRUST FUNDS.

The bill (S. 4710) to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office to dispose of certain trust funds in his possession, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of the General Land Office is hereby directed to deposit with the Treasurer of the United States as miscellaneous receipts the sum of \$623.59, which by virtue of the act of July 7, 1898 (30 Stats., p. 674), is now in his custody as ex officio trustee of certain Oklahoma town sites created under the act of May 14, 1890 (26 Stats., p. 109), and the joint resolution of Congress approved September 1, 1893 (28 Stats., p. 11).

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

DISPOSITION OF BORON DEPOSITS.

The bill (S. 4749) to provide for the disposition of boron deposits was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

OREGON & CALIFORNIA RAILROAD CO., ETC.

The bill (S. 4865) fixing the taxable status of lands received in exchange for lands formerly embraced in the grants to the Oregon & California Railroad Co. and the Coos Bay Wagon Road Co. was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of May 31, 1918 (40th Stats., p. 593), and section 3, act of June 4, 1920 (41st Stats., p. 758), are hereby amended by the addition to each of said sections the following:

"Provided further, That for purposes of Federal taxation the lands received from the United States in such exchange shall in all respects be deemed substituted for the lands transferred to the United States, and such exchange shall not be construed to create a gain to or loss by the person receiving such lands from the United States."

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

WEISER NATIONAL FOREST, IDAHO.

The bill (H. R. 1430) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Weiser National Forest, Idaho, was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any lands within the following-described areas found after examination by the Secretary of Agriculture to be chiefly valuable for the production of timber or the protection of stream flow may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, be included within and made a part of the Weiser National Forest by proclamation of the President, said lands to be thereafter subject to all laws affecting national forests:

Sections 6, 7, 18, 30, and 31, township 14 north, range 4 west; sections 1, 12, 13, 23, 24, 25, 26 (the south half and the northeast quarter of sec. 27), sections 34 and 35, township 14 north, range 5 west; sections 1 to 12, inclusive, township 13 north, range 5 west; sections 1 and 2, township 13 north, range 6 west; all of the Boise meridian and base, Idaho.

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

RIGHTS OF WAY THROUGH PUBLIC LANDS.

The bill (H. R. 2946) to amend acts to permit the use of the right of way through the public lands for tramroads, canals, and reservoirs, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in addition to the rights of way granted by sections 18, 19, 20, and 21 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891 (26 Stats., p. 1095), as amended by the act of Congress entitled "An act to amend the irrigation act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stats., p. 1095, sec. 18), and to amend section 2 of the act of May 11, 1898 (30 Stats., p. 404)," approved March 4, 1917 (39 Stats., p. 1197), and, subject to the conditions and restrictions therein contained, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to grant permits or easements for not to exceed 5 acres of ground adjoining the right of way at each of the locations, to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior, to be used for the erection thereon of dwellings or other buildings or corrals for the convenience of those engaged in the care and management of the works provided for by said acts: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to lands within national forests.

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

NEZ PERCE NATIONAL FOREST, IDAHO.

The bill (H. R. 9028) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Nez Perce National Forest, Idaho, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any lands within the following-described areas found by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to be chiefly valuable for the production of timber or the protection of stream flow may be included within and made a part of the Nez Perce National Forest by proclamation of the President, said lands to be thereafter subject to all laws affecting national forests:

North half of township 26 north, range six east; the south half of township 27 north, range 6 east; the southwest quarter of township 27 north, range 7 east; and the northwest quarter of township 26 north, range 7 east, Boise meridian.

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

TARGHEE NATIONAL FOREST.

The bill (H. R. 10434) to add certain lands to the Targhee National Forest was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all unappropriated public lands within the following-described areas, found by the Secretary of Agriculture to be chiefly valuable for the production of timber or the protection of stream flow, may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, be included within and made a part of the Targhee National Forest, in Idaho, by proclamation of the President, said lands to be thereafter subject to all laws affecting national forests: Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 9 to 16, inclusive, 21 to 28, inclusive, 34, 35, 36, township 12 north, range 32 east; all township 13 north, range 32 east; all township 13 north, range 33 east; all of Boise meridian and base: *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall not affect any existing valid adverse claim heretofore initiated.

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

DOWNEY, IDAHO, WATER SUPPLY.

The bill (H. R. 11004) to grant certain lands to the board of trustees of the village of Downey, State of Idaho, for the protection of its water supply, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed, in his discretion, to issue patent to the board of trustees of the village of Downey, in the county of Bannock and State of Idaho, for the northeast quarter, north half southwest quarter, southeast quarter, section 8, west half southwest quarter and northwest quarter, section 9, in township 11 south, of range 38 east, Boise meridian, in said county and State, containing 640 acres, in consideration of a sum not less than \$1.25 per acre, to have and to hold said lands for the protection and promotion of the water supply and water-works system of said city: *Provided*, That the grant hereby made is, and patent issued thereunder shall be subject to all legal rights heretofore acquired by any person or persons in or to the above-described premises or any part thereof and now existing under and by virtue of the laws of the United States: *Provided further*, That the lands hereby authorized to be conveyed as hereinbefore set forth, and all portions thereof, shall be held and used by or for the said grantee for the purpose herein specified; and if the said lands shall cease to be so used they shall revert to the United States, and this condition shall be expressed in the patent to be issued under the terms of this act: *And provided further*, That the grant herein is made upon the express condition that within 30 days of the receipt of any request therefor from the Secretary of the Interior the chairman of the board of trustees of said village shall submit to the said Secretary of the Interior a report as to the use made of the land herein granted to the village during the preceding period named in such request showing compliance with the terms and conditions stated in this act; that in the event of his failure to so report or in the event of a showing in such report to the Secretary of the Interior that the terms of the grant have not been complied with, the grant shall be held to be forfeited, and the Attorney General of the United States be instructed to institute suit in the proper courts for the recovery of said lands: *Provided further*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all oil, coal, and other mineral deposits that may be found on the lands so granted and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same.

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

LEMHI NATIONAL FOREST, IDAHO.

The bill (H. R. 13051) to add certain lands to the Lemhi National Forest, Idaho, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TAXES AND SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS.

The bill (H. R. 8535) to provide for the redistribution of general taxes and special assessments due and payable on real estate in the District of Columbia, in cases of subdivision or sales of land therein, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 5 of "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, is hereby amended following the word "and," in the fourth line thereof, by substituting the following for the remaining six lines of that paragraph, namely: "Whenever a subdivision of any lot or parcel of land in the District of Columbia, or any portion of any such lot or parcel, is made during the months of July, August, September, October, November, or December, the general tax due and payable upon such lot or parcel of land for prior years and for the first half of the then current fiscal year shall then be paid, and all water main and sewer assessments and special assessments of any kind thereon shall then become due and payable, and be paid before such subdivision shall be admitted to record in the office of the surveyor of the District of Columbia; and the general tax thereon for the last half of the then fiscal year shall be due and payable in the following May."

SEC. 2. That whenever such subdivision is made during the months of January, February, March, April, May, or June, the total general tax assessed against the original lot or parcel of land for prior years and for the then current fiscal year, and all water main and sewer assessments and special assessments of any kind thereon shall become due and payable and be paid before such subdivision is admitted to record in the office of the surveyor of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. That whenever application is made in writing to the assessor of the District of Columbia by the owner of any tract of land in said District not subdivided into lots and of record as a subdivision in the office of the surveyor of said District for the redistribution of any general or special taxes or assessments then levied or due thereon,

or whenever such application is made by the owner of any parcel of such tract for such redistribution, any such general or special taxes or assessments levied or due against the entire tract of which such parcel is a part shall be redistributed so that the owner of any such parcel may pay the proportion of such entire taxes or assessments equitably chargeable thereon.

SEC. 4. That any reassessment or redistribution made under this act shall be as valid and effectual upon the various parts of the property in the same manner and to the same extent as if the tax or assessment so reassessed or redistributed had been laid originally thereon under the various laws appertaining thereto. No payment or failure to pay a tax or assessment upon any such part shall change or affect the liability of the other parts of such property for any tax or assessment so reassessed or redistributed.

SEC. 5. That the board of assistant assessors charged with the assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia is hereby authorized and directed to reassess or redistribute any such general or special assessment or tax levied or due and unpaid in accordance with the provisions of laws for the assessment and equalizations of the valuations of real estate in the District of Columbia for taxation, after notice to owners of record of the land to be assessed, with right of appeal within 10 days to the board of equalization and review, as prescribed in section 9 of "An act to provide an immediate revision and equalization of real estate values in the District of Columbia; also to provide an assessment of real estate in said District in the year 1896 and every third year thereafter, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1894; and the assessor of said District is hereby authorized and directed to promptly reassess or redistribute any general or special assessment of any kind levied or due and unpaid, as hereinbefore provided.

SEC. 6. That all acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed to the extent that same are inconsistent herewith.

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

Mr. KING subsequently said: Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] what disposition was made of House bill 8335? Did it pass?

Mr. JONES of Washington. That bill was passed. I will state to the Senator briefly just what the bill provides.

Mr. KING. No; I am not asking for that. I simply wish to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that I think there is an error on page 2, line 12. It reads, "That whenever such subdivision is made." It should be "is."

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; that word should be "is."

Mr. KING. I suggest that the Senator have that correction made, and that the action on the bill be reconsidered for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask for a reconsideration of the vote whereby the bill was passed in order that word "in" may be changed to "is."

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is a typographical error.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will be authorized to correct it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Very well.

LANDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The bill (H. R. 12045) to provide for the conveyance of lots on the low grounds of Washington, D. C., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, on page 1, line 12, after the word "evidence," to insert "and the buildings are now upon such lands that comply with or exceed the original building requirements," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in carrying into effect the provisions of the act of July 1, 1879, entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance of the low grounds in the city of Washington, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 7, 1822" (21 Stats., 47), the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized at his discretion to execute and deliver the deeds therein provided for without proof of compliance with the building conditions under which the lands were sold, upon a satisfactory showing of inability to supply such evidence and the buildings are now upon such lands that comply with or exceed the original building requirements.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER.

The resolution (S. Res. 422) directing the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the Senate copies of official correspondence and documents in regard to negotiations for the payment of interest on obligations of foreign Governments to the United States, etc., was announced as next in order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over. The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 245) prohibiting the exercise, without the consent of Congress, of the authority conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury relative to obligations of

foreign Governments acquired by the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 427) authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to investigate the sending of United States soldiers to and the condition of citizens of the United States in Siberia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 428) authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to investigate the participation of Americans, civilians or members of the Military or Naval Establishments in the governmental affairs of Haiti and Santo Domingo, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4478) to create a bureau of aeronautics in the Department of the Navy, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I suggest that perhaps it would take too much time to-day to consider that measure. I will inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs if he desires a consideration of the measure to-day. [A pause.] I suggest that it go over. I desire to say, however, that I am in favor of some legislation upon that subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3246) for the relief of Hugo Stamm, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

INDIANS OF NISQUALLY RESERVATION, WASH.

The bill (S. 4159) for the relief of dispossessed allotted Indians of the Nisqually Reservation, Wash., was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$85,000, in full settlement of the claims against the United States of 25 heads of families of the Nisqually Reservation in Washington, said sum being compensation for the difference between the appraised value and the compromise price paid for approximately 3,300 acres of allotted Indian land taken for military purposes, and for surrender of treaty rights and removal expenses, as set out in Senate Document No. 243, Sixty-sixth Congress, second session, containing the report dated February 28, 1920, of the Acting Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to the act of Congress approved June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. L., pp. 3-28).

SEC. 2. That said sum of \$85,000 hereby appropriated shall be immediately available and shall be expended, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, for the benefit of the said dispossessed families or individual Indians, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Washington why provision was not made in the Indian appropriation bill for this matter?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say to the Senator that the matter was not called to the attention of the Indian Affairs Committee until after the Indian appropriation bill was reported to the Senate, and the chairman of the committee felt that he ought not to try to put it in that bill then; but he was impressed with the merits of the measure and reported it favorably.

Mr. KING. Was the committee unanimous in its action?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand so.

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

INDIANS OF TURTLE MOUNTAIN RESERVATION, N. DAK.

The bill (S. 4352) authorizing the Indians residing on or belonging to the Turtle Mountain Reservation, N. Dak., to submit claims to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all claims of whatsoever nature which the Indians residing on or belonging to the Turtle Mountain Reservation, N. Dak., may have against the United States, which have not heretofore been determined by the Court of Claims, may be submitted to the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States by either party, for determination of the amount, if any, due said Indians from the United States under any treaties, agreements, or laws of Congress, or for the misappropriation of any of the funds of said Indians, or for the failure of the United States to pay said Indians any money or other property due; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims, with the right of either party to appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, to hear and determine all legal and equitable claims, if any, of said Indians, against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon.

SEC. 2. That if any claim or claims be submitted to said courts they shall settle the rights therein, both legal and equitable, of each and all the parties thereto notwithstanding lapse of time or statutes of limitation, and any payment which may have been made upon any claim so submitted shall not be pleaded as an estoppel, but may be pleaded as an offset in such suits or actions, and the United States shall be allowed credit for all sums, including gratuities, heretofore paid or expended for the benefit of said Indians or any band thereof. The claim or claims of

the Indians, or band or bands thereof, may be presented separately or jointly by petition, subject, however, to amendment; suit to be filed within five years after the passage of this act, and such action shall make the petitioner or petitioners party plaintiff or plaintiffs and the United States party defendant; and any band or bands of said Indians, or any other tribe or band of Indians the court may deem necessary to a final determination of such suit or suits, may be joined therein as the court may order. Such petition, which shall be verified by the attorney or attorneys employed by said Indians, or any bands thereof, shall set forth all the facts on which the claims for recovery are based, and said petition shall be signed by the attorney or attorneys employed, and no other verification shall be necessary. Official letters, papers, documents, and public records, or certified copies thereof, may be used in evidence, and the departments of the Government shall give access to the attorney or attorneys of said Indians or bands thereof to such treaties, papers, correspondence, or records as may be needed by the attorney or attorneys for said Indians or bands of Indians.

SEC. 3. That if it be determined by the Court of Claims in the said suit herein authorized that the United States Government has wrongfully appropriated any lands belonging to the said Indians, damages therefor shall be confined to the value of the said land at the time of said appropriation, together with interest at 3 per cent per annum, and the decree of the Court of Claims with reference thereto, when satisfied, shall annul and cancel all claim and title of the said Indians, or any other tribe or band of Indians in and to said lands, as well as all damages for all wrongs and injuries, if any, committed by the Government of the United States with reference thereto.

SEC. 4. That upon the final determination of such suit, cause, or action the Court of Claims shall decree such fees as it shall find reasonable to be paid the attorney or attorneys employed therein by said Indians or bands of Indians, under contracts negotiated and approved, as provided by existing law, and in no case shall the fee decreed by said Court of Claims be in excess of the amounts stipulated in the contracts approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, and no attorney shall have a right to represent the said Indians or any band thereof in any suit, cause, or action under the provisions of this act until his contract shall have been approved as herein provided. The fees decreed by the court to the attorney or attorneys of record shall be paid out of any sum or sums recovered in such suits or actions, and no part of such fee shall be taken from any money in the Treasury of the United States belonging to such Indians or bands of Indians in whose behalf the suit is brought unless specifically authorized in the contract approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, as herein provided: *Provided*, That in no case shall the fees decreed by said court amount to more than 10 per cent of the amount of the judgment recovered in such cause.

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

CLOSING OF WATER STREET, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The bill (S. 4645) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close upper Water Street, between Twenty-first and Twenty-second Streets NW., was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to close upper Water Street, between Twenty-first and Twenty-second Streets NW., lying between Potomac Park and square 88, provided that the consent in writing of the owners of all private property in square 88 is first had and obtained; and upon the closing of said street between the limits named the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to transfer the land contained in the bed of said street to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, as a part of the park system of the District of Columbia.

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

CORPORATIONS ORGANIZED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The bill (H. R. 5416) to authorize corporations organized in the District of Columbia to change their names was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I should like to have a statement of the purpose of this bill.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, under the existing laws of the District of Columbia the court of appeals has held that there is no power given to corporations to change their names. This bill is intended to give corporations that power, the board of directors first having acted, and their action having been confirmed by a two-thirds vote of the stockholders of the corporation.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator state the circumstances which make it necessary for a corporation to change its name? I can conceive of some conditions wherein a corporation ought not to be authorized, perhaps, to change its name.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I will simply say that this bill passed the Senate once under the number "S. 4000," and was sent to the House, and favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee of the House. It was not passed, however, because of want of time. It was not reached on the calendar.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. It is recommended by the commissioners.

Mr. STERLING. Yes; it is recommended by the commissioners.

Mr. ROBINSON. What is the object of it? Why should a corporation be allowed to change its name without limitation? Take, for instance, a case like this: Suppose a corporation should, through mismanagement of its affairs, acquire a bad

reputation; is it desirable, in the opinion of the Senator from South Dakota, that it should be permitted to escape the offense of its mismanagement, and the reputation it acquired, by changing its name? What benefit accrues to anyone by allowing it to do that?

Mr. STERLING. No benefit, Mr. President; nor do I think the mere change of name would permit any corporation to escape any liability it incurred. But I can conceive of a case wherein it would be very desirable for a corporation to be allowed to change its name, and I think that the law of nearly every State permits the change of name on the part of corporations. It may have inadvertently adopted a certain name without consideration of all the circumstances, or circumstances may arise thereafter under which it would be very desirable to have a change of name of a corporation. This has received consideration at the hands of committees of both Houses; it has passed the Senate once, and has been favorably reported by the House committee to the House.

Mr. ROBINSON. I understand that. It would not be on the calendar, in all probability, if it had not been favorably reported by the Senate committee. I do not know that the matter is of very great importance, but I think some additional reason ought to be given for the legislation. I do not think it is sufficient, in asking Congress to pass this legislation, to say that the bill has been approved by committees of Congress from time to time.

Mr. KELLOGG. I think the Senator will find that the laws of every State in the Union which provide for corporations have principally only one limitation upon the name which may be adopted, and that is that the name shall not be one which has been adopted by some other corporation.

Mr. ROBINSON. Is that limitation in this bill?

Mr. KELLOGG. It is in the original act, as I understand it. But they are always allowed to change their names on filing amended articles. I know of no State law that does not permit that.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection.

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

BROADWATER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, MONTANA.

The bill (S. 4186) to authorize the Broadwater Irrigation District, a Montana corporation, to construct a dam across the Missouri River was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments, as follows:

On page 1, line 4, after the word "Montana," to strike out the word "corporation" and insert in lieu thereof the word "organization"; on line 6, after the word "point," to strike out the words "to be approved by the Secretary of War, in townships 5, 6, 7, and 8 north, range 2 east," and to insert in lieu thereof the words "in section 6, township 4 north, range 3 east"; and on page 2, line 1, after the numerals "1906," to insert the words "as amended by act approved June 23, 1910," so as to read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of the Government is hereby given to the Broadwater Irrigation District, a Montana organization, its successors or assigns, to construct across the Missouri River, at some point in section 6, township 4 north, range 3 east, Montana meridian, a dam for irrigation purposes, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by act approved June 23, 1910: *Provided*, That no dam constructed under the consent hereby granted shall be used to develop water power nor to generate electricity, but the use of the dam by the construction shall be limited to irrigation.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Broadwater Irrigation District, a Montana organization, to construct a dam across the Missouri River."

MARINE HOSPITAL SERVICE.

The bill (H. R. 11841) to amend "An act granting additional quarantine powers and imposing additional duties upon the Marine Hospital Service," approved February 15, 1893, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I hope the Senator will not object. Has he examined the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; I have not had time yet to examine it, and I want to read the report.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think it is very necessary that this should be enacted.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will allow it to be passed over temporarily, I will read the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

The bill (S. 4729) to amend section 7 of the act approved December 23, 1913, and known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the act of March 3, 1919, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. At the time that bill was introduced, I understand, the Secretary of the Treasury had already used the drafts of the Federal reserve banks of last year for retiring the certificates.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt of it. I am informed by the department that that is the case.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the bill ought to be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

IRRIGATION PROJECTS.

The bill (S. 4421) securing rights of way and easements over public land in connection with Federal irrigation projects was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That where a right of way or easement of any kind over public land heretofore or hereafter withdrawn under the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat., p. 388), is required in connection with a Federal irrigation project the Secretary of the Interior may cause to be executed and recorded in the office of the recorder of deeds of the county in which the land is located, an instrument stating the purpose of the right of way or easement with a description of the same, in which event entry thereafter made for such land and the patent issued therefor shall be subject to the right of way or easement so described in such recorded instrument.

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

WAR CONTRACTS.

The bill (S. 4900) to amend section 5 of the act approved March 2, 1919, entitled "An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Mines and Mining with an amendment, on page 2, line 4, after the words "are in," to insert the words "justice and equity," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act approved March 2, 1919, entitled "An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," be, and the same is hereby, amended as follows:

"Add to section 5 the following proviso: 'Provided, That this section shall be liberally interpreted, and that all claimants who in response to any personal, written, or published request or demand from any of the Government agencies mentioned in said act in good faith expended money in producing or preparing to produce any of the ores or minerals named therein and have heretofore filed their claims within the time and in the manner prescribed by said act, shall be reimbursed such net losses as they may have been found to have incurred and are in justice and equity entitled to from the appropriation in said act, and that the unexpended portion of the appropriation carried in said act be continued available for the purposes named above until all claims in said act shall be finally settled or disposed of.'

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Montana, for the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], reported this bill from the Committee on Mines and Mining. I can not see why the words on line 8, "that this section shall be liberally interpreted," should be used? Why not strike out those words and simply say, "Provided, That all claimants," and so forth.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have not the slightest objection to that.

Mr. SMOOT. I have never seen those words used in any bill or any law. There is only one way to interpret the law, and that is to interpret it correctly. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that on line 8, page 1, the words "That this section shall be liberally interpreted, and" be stricken out and that the word "that" commence with a capital "T," so as to read:

Provided, That all claimants who, in response to any personal, written, or public request or demand from any of the Government agencies, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. I would like to inquire of the Senator from Montana the purpose of this bill. Shortly after the armistice Congress passed an act appropriating something like \$8,000,000 for the relief of citizens of the United States who had been induced to go into the production of unusual or rare metals, and that was passed after a very full consideration of the whole subject. The original bill, I think, was very much broader than the one enacted. Of course a vast number of claims against the Government which, while morally of some importance, have no legal justification were filed, and a bill like this, I think, would tend to encourage and to promote the filing of vast numbers of claims against the Government, particularly by that class of claimants whose claims have been

filed with and investigated by the board charged with the administration of the law to which I have referred. The fruit of every war, great or small, is an enormous number of claims against the Government, a comparatively small proportion of which upon investigation are found sufficiently serious to require the Government to pay them.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I interrupt the Senator to say that the bill expressly provides that none except those who have already filed claims shall be entitled to the benefits of the act.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator know how extensive the claims are which have already been filed?

Mr. ROBINSON. I can state approximately, between seven and eight million dollars. The necessity for this legislation arises out of a construction placed upon the act of March 2, 1919, which has had the effect of barring nearly all claims. There are something like a total of 1,200 claims filed under the provisions of the original act. The language of the act germane to the construction I refer to is as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized to adjust, liquidate, and pay such net losses as have been suffered by any person, firm, or corporation by reason of producing or preparing to produce either manganese, chrome, pyrites, or tungsten, in compliance with the request or demand of the Department of the Interior, the War Industries Board, the War Trade Board, the Shipping Board, or the Emergency Fleet Corporation—

And so forth.

The department has construed the words "request or demand" to mean that the request must be individually made or specifically made, so as to exclude all cases where any of these boards urged by published appeals to mineral claimants of the class benefited by the bill to engage in the production of the minerals named, and have limited it in the application made by the Interior Department to only those who were asked by an agent of the Bureau of Mines in the field to engage in production. The construction placed upon the act has been held by the committee in charge of the matter at the other end of the Capitol to be inconsistent with the original purpose of Congress, and this act merely writes into the law the meaning which I think Congress intended the act should have in the beginning.

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

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

MARINE HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Mr. SMOOT. I now ask that we revert to Calendar No. 722.

The bill (H. R. 11841) to amend "An act granting additional quarantine powers and imposing additional duties upon the Marine Hospital Service," approved February 15, 1893, was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That first paragraph of section 2 of the act granting additional quarantine powers and imposing additional duties upon the United States Public Health Service, approved February 15, 1893, be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. That any vessel at any foreign port clearing or departing for any port or place in the United States or its possessions or other dependencies or any vessel at any port in the possessions or other dependencies of the United States clearing or departing for any port or place in the United States or its possessions or other dependencies, shall be required to obtain from the consul, vice consul, or other consular officer of the United States at the port of departure, or from the medical officer where such officer has been detailed by the President for that purpose, a bill of health in duplicate, in the form prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, setting forth the sanitary history and condition of said vessel, and that it has in all respects complied with the rules and regulations in such cases prescribed for securing the best sanitary condition of the said vessel, its cargo, passengers, and crew; and said consular or medical officer is required, before granting such duplicate bill of health, to be satisfied that the matters and things therein stated are true; and for his services in that behalf he shall be entitled to demand and receive such fees as shall by lawful regulation be allowed, to be accounted for as is required in other cases."

Mr. SMOOT. I find that the only change made in existing law is by adding the words in line 8 of the bill "or departing," and in line 9 "or its possessions or other dependencies." The balance of the bill is the law as it exists to-day, and there is no objection to those amendments to the law that I can see.

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

MARIVELES QUARRY, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 229) authorizing the Secretary of War to investigate the claims of private parties to the Mariveles quarry within the limits of a United States military reservation in the Philippine Islands and to permit the working thereof by the persons entitled thereto, provided military necessities permit, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments:

On page 1, line 5, to strike out the words "the rights, claims, or equities" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "any equitable claims," and on page 2, line 5, after the word "consider," to strike out the words "the rights or" and to insert the word "such," so as to read:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to make or cause to be made such inquiry and investigation into any equitable claims of such private parties in and to the stone quarries at Mariveles, Province of Batnan, in the Philippine Islands, within the limits of the United States military reservation as set aside by the President of the United States in Executive order of June 7, 1904, as may have filed claims with the War Department or in other offices under its jurisdiction, and to permit the resumption of private operations therein by license or otherwise and to the extent that he may consider such claims of such parties entitle them to, with due regard to military necessities: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein authorized shall be deemed to remove the site of said quarry from the jurisdiction and control of the military authorities of the United States under and by virtue of the reservation made by the President as aforesaid.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

AMENDMENT OF PENAL LAWS.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to recur to calendar No. 692, a bill (H. R. 12161) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stats. L., p. 1134). I asked that it go over until the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] should be present. He is now present, and I withdraw all objection thereto.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JENNIE GARRETT.

The bill (S. 1721) for the relief of Jennie Garrett was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the bill go over.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Utah to withhold his objection just a moment until I make an explanation of the bill?

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. CALDER. The bill was introduced for the relief of Jennie Garrett. Her husband, Nathaniel Garrett, lived near my home in Brooklyn. He was ordered out with the Fourteenth New York Regiment for service on the Mexican border on June 3, 1916. He went to the border with the regiment. Before he could be mustered in, in fact, before the regiment could be mustered in a week or two later, he met with an accident while in the service of the regiment and while in the service of his country, and died as a result of that accident. His wife applied for a pension, but the Pension Bureau refused a pension on the ground that the man had not actually been mustered into the service. A week later he would have been mustered in.

The bill does not give the widow a pensionable status, and that is not the purpose of the bill, unless she can prove all the facts surrounding his service. It simply places him in the position he would have occupied had he lived a week longer, and had been mustered into his regiment. It seems to be a meritorious case, and I hope the Senator will not object.

Mr. KING. I think the bill perhaps ought to go to the Committee on Pensions, and for the present I shall insist on my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

RICHARD PARKE.

The bill (S. 2340) to amend the military record of Richard Parke was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection until I make an explanation of the matter?

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. CALDER. Richard Parke had two enlistments in the United States during the Civil War. During the first enlistment, as a boy of 17, he went home on a furlough, and while in New York City he deserted. Meeting some other boys, he entered another regiment, then being formed in New York City. He went back with the second regiment and served two years in the war, performed valiant service, and came out of the war with an honorable discharge. Some years ago when applying for a pension he discovered that his record had been marked, showing him to be a deserter, as I have explained.

He is now a man 78 years of age. He is without widow or dependent family, and even if the bill should pass, at the very most he could obtain a pension only for the remaining days of his life, probably a year or two. He had two years of honorable service, and now resides in Brooklyn with his family. The old

man dislikes to pass away without having his record cleared, I hope the Senator will withdraw his objection.

Mr. KING. Why was not the bill referred to the Committee on Pensions?

Mr. CALDER. Because it belongs to the Committee on Military Affairs, which is the only committee that can recommend legislation affecting his record. I say positively that is so. If some Senator is present who is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, he will vouch for that statement. The Committee on Pensions have no authority to recommend a pension for anyone whose record is not clear, and the only place he can go under those circumstances is to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], whether the statement made by the Senator from New York would entitle this applicant to the relief demanded under the rules which have been heretofore governing the Pensions Committee?

Mr. McCUMBER. I was engaged on another matter when the Senator from New York was speaking and did not hear his statement.

Mr. KING. My inquiry is in reference to the statement of the Senator from New York. He is presenting an application for a pension, or to clear a soldier's record.

Mr. McCUMBER. All I can say is that the rule of the Committee on Pensions has been not to grant a pension until after the right has been established, by the soldier pensionable, under the law which reestablishes his right, but the Committee on Pensions does not clear the records of soldiers.

Mr. KING. I was aware of that fact. What I inquired of the Senator was, assuming the fact to be as stated by the Senator from New York, with reference to the propriety of the Committee on Military Affairs handling the matter?

Mr. CALDER. The Committee on Pensions would not grant the pension if the man's record disclosed a mark against him as a deserter.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; we expect him then to go to the Committee on Military Affairs to get his record cleared up.

Mr. CALDER. I am sure the bill was in the right committee. I will say to the Senator from Utah that it is a very meritorious case. The man had two years of honorable service and an honorable discharge from his last service. He is now 78 years old and living with his family in New York, and there is no one pensionable to succeed to the pension when he passes on. The case is really a meritorious case.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator give assurance to the Senate that some young widow or woman will not marry him so he can leave a widow?

Mr. CALDER. If she does, under the law she can not obtain the pension, because she is forbidden under the law to obtain a pension under those circumstances.

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

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Richard Parke, late of Company A, First Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a member of that organization on the 22d day of August, 1862: *Provided*, That no bounty, pay, or allowances shall be held as accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Richard Parke."

MILITARY ARTICLES FOR NATIONAL MUSEUM.

The bill (S. 4827) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish to the National Museum certain articles of the arms, matériel, equipment, or clothing heretofore issued or produced for the United States Army, and to dispose of colors, standards, and guidons of demobilized organizations of the United States Army, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, in lines 11, 12, and 13, to strike out "any that were donated to such organizations may be returned to the donor or donors upon request by him or them," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized to furnish to the National Museum, or exhibition, upon request therefor by the administrative head thereof, such articles of

arms, matériel, equipment, or clothing as have been issued from time to time to the United States Army, or which have been or may hereafter be produced for the United States Army, and which are objects of general interest or of foreign or curious research, provided that such articles are surplus or can be spared.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized to dispose of all colors, standards, and guidons of demobilized organizations of the United States Army in the following manner: Any which were used during their service by such organizations and which were brought into the service of the United States from the National Guard of any State may be returned to that State upon request therefor from the governor thereof; and all others may be sent, upon request of the governor thereof, to whatever State the Secretary of War may determine to have furnished the majority of men to any such organization at the time of its formation: *Provided, however*, That where it is impossible to determine what State furnished a majority of the men of an organization at the time of its formation, or where any organization was so cosmopolitan in its original make-up that it is impossible to identify it with any particular State, the colors of such organization will be turned in to the Quartermaster General for such national use as the Secretary of War may direct: *Provided further*, That the title to all such colors, standards, and guidons shall remain in the United States: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of War shall require assurance that proper provision has been or will be made for their care and preservation before returning or sending the same as herein authorized.

SEC. 3. That in all cases in which the Secretary of War has heretofore furnished to the National Museum any property of the kinds described in section 1 hereof, or has disposed of any colors, standards, or guidons of demobilized organizations of the United States Army in the manner provided by section 2 hereof, his acts and doings in the premises are hereby ratified and confirmed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

REIMBURSEMENT TO STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS.

The bill (S. 2252) making an appropriation to pay the State of Massachusetts for expenses incurred and paid at the request of the President in protecting the harbors and fortifying the coast during the Civil War, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to pay to the governor of the State of Massachusetts, or his duly authorized agent, the sum of \$233,885.82 out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, being the costs, charges, and expenses properly incurred by such State for interest and premium paid for coin in payment of such interest on bonds issued for money borrowed and expended at the request of the President of the United States during the Civil War in protecting the harbors and fortifying the coast. The accounting officers of the Treasury having found that said expenditures were so incurred and paid by the State; and which the Court of Claims in its report to Congress under the act approved July 16, 1916, as set forth in Document No. 369, House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress, first session, also found had been so incurred and paid.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] why there has been such a delay in the presentation of the claim?

Mr. LODGE. It is one of a class of claims which I think has been paid to every State except Massachusetts. The State at the request of the National Government advanced large sums of money to the Federal Government for the purpose of coast defense. They issued gold bonds to do it, and the State paid the principal and interest and premiums in gold. The advances of the State for the defense of the country during the Civil War have been paid gradually over a long period, but they have not been paid for the gold premium, which is only proper, and the interest.

This class of claims was supported by a decision of the Supreme Court. Part of the claims of the State of Massachusetts have been paid. This is the last one. It has been twice reported from the Committee on Claims favorably and unanimously, and also has been decided in favor of the State by the Court of Claims, which made no award, because they said legislation was needed, as there was no law for repayment. I think it is a claim that is justly due the State.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator whether, as I understood his statement, Congress heretofore has made appropriations for the payment of some claims?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; and paid them all, so far as I know.

Mr. KING. Why did not the State of Massachusetts present all its claims at one time? Litigation in piecemeal is forbidden in controversies between private individuals, and it seems to me States ought not to follow a policy which the law really forbids by the statute of limitations from being interposed between private individuals.

Mr. LODGE. The claim has been presented, and it has been delayed, as many claims are. I have noticed some honest claims that have been delayed in the Senate at times, and unavoidably so. Sometimes a State has not pressed them, but, as I said, claims of just this character have been paid to other States and, under the decision of the Supreme Court, were paid to the State of New York. I think it is a perfectly just claim, so far as that

goes. I do not think there is a claim of a State that ought to be set aside, certainly not on account of delay.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Why is not this such a claim as should be referred to the Court of Claims?

Mr. LODGE. It has been so referred. I just stated that it had been.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But the Senator states that the Court of Claims made no adjudication.

Mr. LODGE. They made an adjudication, but what happened was this: The claim was sent there for a finding of fact. They found the facts and said:

We have been cited to no law of Congress promising to repay Massachusetts any part of the money so expended by her, from which it follows that, however generous and patriotic this action on the part of the State may have been, she has no legal status in this court for the repayment of the same.

There have been acts of Congress paying all of this class of claims.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is what leads me to say that it seems to me Congress should first decide whether it should obligate itself to the State of Massachusetts for money advanced under these circumstances, and then let the Court of Claims pass upon the question.

Mr. LODGE. It is perfectly certain that the State can not get the money without an act of Congress. I have here the decision of the Supreme Court in the New York case, as set forth in the report of the committee. The committee said in their report:

It seems to your committee that this case is precisely parallel to that of the State of New York which was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States (160 U. S., p. 598). This decision allowed interest incurred and paid by such State in obtaining the money for which reimbursement was allowed under the act of July 27, 1861 (12 Stat., p. 276), and joint resolution of March 8, 1862 (12 Stat., p. 615). That this is the view of the Treasury Department is shown by a letter of the comptroller transmitted to the Secretary of the Treasury under date of February 4, 1911, referring to this claim, from which the following is an extract:

"I see no reason why the interest necessarily incurred and paid by the State on the bonds issued for the coast defense should not be allowed as a part of the costs incurred by the State in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Court in the New York case (160 U. S., 598) which allowed the interest incurred and paid by the said State in obtaining the money for which reimbursement was allowed under the act of July 27, 1861 (12 Stat., 276), and joint resolution of March 8, 1862 (12 Stat., 615).

"As the money expended for coast defense was secured from bonds issued after the act of the Massachusetts Legislature which provided for payment in gold or silver coin of the interest and principal of all bonds hereafter issued, there was a legal contract between the State and the holders of said bonds when issued for the payment of principal and interest in coin. The additional cost of said coin was therefore a part of the costs incurred by the State in the matter of the coast defense."

I shall not read any more. On that is based the decision of the committee.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill, but I shall vote against it. I confess that I can not see the liability of the Government, nor can I understand why there has been this delay. Apparently Congress made appropriations many years ago to satisfy the claims of the Northern States for expenditures made during the Civil War. Evidently Congress then felt that the amount appropriated to Massachusetts was sufficient and was a complete satisfaction of her claim. We are now presented with a claim years afterwards amounting to more than \$200,000, which, as I understand the explanation of the Senator from Massachusetts, is for premiums paid upon bonds and for interest.

Mr. LODGE. And which, as I said, have been paid in other cases. Similar claims for other States have been paid within the last two years. The Federal Government only paid the principal claim of Massachusetts within the last 10 years.

Mr. KING. I am not in a position to make any explanation, because the matter is wholly new to me, but I confess, in view of the fact that similar claims have been presented to Congress by the State of Massachusetts and appropriations have been made for their payment that it is rather a dangerous precedent to establish, if this is the first time it has been done, to make further appropriations; it is appropriating in a piecemeal fashion, and we never know when we shall get through with claims of a similar character.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts what danger the harbor of Massachusetts was supposed to be threatened with that caused this expenditure? What did it amount to at the time?

Mr. LODGE. The expenditure was incurred on account of coast defenses which were called for by the Federal Government and built by the State along the coast at the Government's request. The port of Massachusetts is considered to be rather an important port. There were a number of ports on the coast of Massachusetts which were thought worth defending. At all events, I can not argue that, but the Federal Gov-

ernment, through the President, asked for the work, and the State did it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. When was it asked for?

Mr. LODGE. It was asked for in 1863.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Was it feared that some of the extreme southerners might come up there after Ben Butler?

Mr. LODGE. Senate Report No. 1188, Sixty-second Congress, third session, states in reference to the matter:

Military operations in 1863 made it necessary to strengthen Boston Harbor and also to fortify the coast. President Lincoln and Secretary Seward had both recommended these improvements as a military necessity.

The work being recommended by President Lincoln and the then Secretary of State, Mr. Seward, the State borrowed the money on her own credit, borrowed it in gold—and Massachusetts was one of the very few States that did pay the interest on their debts in gold all through the Civil War—and carried out the patriotic motive of the defense of the coast. I do not mean to say that Nebraska was in danger, but it was thought that the coast of Massachusetts was in danger.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The same idea prevailed there during the Spanish-American War when the poor little Spanish armada started across, I understand.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; there was some alarm all along the coast; it was not confined exclusively to Massachusetts.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But I wondered what there really was during the Civil War that even bore the semblance of a danger, so far as Boston Harbor was concerned.

Mr. LODGE. I can only refer the Senator from Nebraska to the correspondence between President Lincoln and the State of Massachusetts, which I have not here. The Federal Government thought the expenditure desirable.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from Massachusetts has represented the State in the Senate for many years.

Mr. LODGE. I can assure the Senator from Nebraska that Massachusetts was not expending several millions of money to defend the coast as an investment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I realize that.

Mr. LODGE. Or in order to make money.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator stated that the principal sum was returned to them a number of years ago?

Mr. LODGE. It was as to all the States. The coast States all had similar claims, and they have all been paid except this one. All of those whose obligations were in gold have been paid, including the premiums on their bonds.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Massachusetts has been very ably represented in the Senate, and I wondered why this claim had not been presented and acted upon earlier.

Mr. LODGE. Some of the other State claims have been paid within the last few years. If the Senator from Nebraska wants to know the cause of the delay, I will say that it is because the Government of the United States resists in every possible way the payment of a private claim or a State claim against the Government, no matter how just it may be.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is a proper and a wise thing for the Government to do, otherwise we should not have much left in the Treasury with general acquiescence in all claims.

Mr. LODGE. That may be so.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It seems to me that under the circumstances this is a very old claim to come up now.

Mr. LODGE. It is a very old claim, but I will say to the Senator that some of these claims, including the claim of New York, I think, has been paid only within a comparatively few years. There have been many claims paid to the States for expenditures incurred by them for this purpose.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the governor of the State of Massachusetts, or his duly authorized agent, \$233,885.82, being the costs, charges, and expenses properly incurred by such State for interest and premium paid for coin in payment of such interest on bonds issued for money borrowed and expended at the request of the President of the United States during the Civil War in protecting the harbors and fortifying the coast, the accounting officers of the Treasury having found that the expenditures were so incurred and paid by the State; and which the Court of Claims in its report to Congress under the act approved July 16, 1916, as set forth in Document No. 369, House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress, first session, also found had been so incurred and paid.

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

CLARENCE L. REAMES.

The bill (S. 3487) for the relief of Clarence L. Reames, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that bill go over.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I make a statement in reference to that bill?

Mr. KING. I withhold my objection in order to hear the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, Mr. Clarence L. Reames was district attorney at Portland, Oreg., having been appointed during the first part of President Wilson's first term. While he was serving as district attorney in Portland he made such an excellent record as a prosecuting officer that the Attorney General ordered him to San Francisco in April, 1916, to prosecute a large number of men who had been looting the public domain. Mr. Reames attended the court in San Francisco for the purpose of preparing for the trials; he tried the cases against those men, and secured convictions in nearly all of them. Later he was again sent to San Francisco to prosecute other cases against men who were fraudulently acquiring title to public lands. He succeeded in those cases. Later he was sent by the Attorney General to Seattle to prosecute a number of cases which had attracted nation-wide attention and which were discussed very largely in the press throughout the West at that time. He succeeded in bringing about the conviction of those who were guilty. During that period he was absent from his home, which he maintained in Portland; but he conducted the district attorney's office in Portland without costing the Government an additional cent. His only pay, aside from his salary as district attorney, was \$4 per day. If there is a hotel in San Francisco or one in Seattle where a man can live for \$4 a day I have never been able to find it.

The Attorney General of the United States has recommended the payment of this claim, and I think it ought to be paid. As a matter of fact, Mr. Reames is entitled to more, and the claim which he presented was larger, but the Attorney General finally compromised and suggested to him that \$2,000 should be allowed.

Mr. SMOOT. The same thing happens in the case of other district attorneys who are ordered away from home, and if this bill passes we will have a flood of bills of a similar character.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will ask the Senator if he can tell me of a single district attorney who has been sent away from his home for a period of six months to prosecute important cases who has not been paid?

Mr. SMOOT. They have been paid whatever the per diem may be.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Four dollars a day.

Mr. SMOOT. There are many of them who are thus ordered away from home.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I hope the bill will be passed. If there are any other claims of a similar nature which may come in I will stand to have them paid; they ought to be paid where a district attorney renders duty outside of his district. Possibly Mr. Reames might have refused to go, but he was ordered to go because of the efficient service he had rendered. Later, because of his capacity, because of his ability successfully to prosecute, he was appointed assistant attorney general at Seattle to prosecute a great many men.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, just one word: I shall not object to the consideration of the bill, but I feel constrained to and shall vote against it. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that under this precedent we will be called upon hereafter to reimburse a great many district attorneys who have accepted appointments under salaries which have been fixed by law.

I wish at this time to express my disapproval of the policy of the Department of Justice—and it has been the policy for many years—of selecting so many special assistant district attorneys. The regular district attorneys should care for the work within their own districts; but other men are imported from other districts to aid those who have been selected and who are entirely competent to discharge the duties that devolve upon them. I regard this as a very bad precedent, and, in my opinion, we will be flooded by a large number of claims of similar character.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to appropriate \$2,000 to pay Clarence L. Reames for extra and special services performed by him while United States district attorney at Portland, Oreg., in the prosecution of certain cases in the northern district of California and in the western district of

Washington, pursuant to the request of the Attorney General, during the years 1916 and 1917.

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

KRISTINA FURJAK.

The bill (S. 4991) for the relief of Kristina Furjak was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Kristina Furjak \$495, being the amount deposited with the Commissioner of Immigration at Ellis Island for safe-keeping pending determination of her right to enter the United States, said sum having disappeared from the safe and all efforts made to determine the responsibility for the loss having proved unsuccessful.

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

WILLIAM E. LEWIS.

The bill (S. 4992) for the relief of William E. Lewis was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I should like to say a word to the Senator from Utah about the bill, for I am sure the Senator does not understand it. The bill came to us from the Department of Labor. The circumstances are as follows: The claimant had been detained by the immigration authorities and had been required by them to deposit a thousand-dollar bond. He deposited Liberty bonds of that value. A Government employee stole the bonds, and when the claimant was released the bonds which he had deposited could not be returned to him. The Department of Labor came to the committee, recited the facts, and admitted that the bonds were taken by an agent of the Government. In view of the circumstances the committee unanimously reported the bill, feeling that common honesty dictated that the man's loss should be made good.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator what steps the Government takes to protect itself from the dishonesty of its employees? It seems to me it ought to require a bond of those who become custodians of funds which are taken from immigrants.

Mr. SPENCER. I should think so.

Mr. KING. Can the Senator advise us whether the Government takes any steps for its own protection?

Mr. SPENCER. I should think so; but, of course, when the Government requires a man to make a deposit and he makes the deposit, which may represent all that he has in the world, and then when the charge against him is dismissed, and he applies for the return of his money, the Government says, "We are very sorry, but we can not return you the money," it is a case where there is a clear legal liability on the part of the Government. I quite agree with the Senator that the Government might well bond every one of its officials, but in this case that was not done, and the man whose money was lost was a poor man.

Mr. KING. Can the Senator advise us what steps the Government took to locate the criminal and to have him punished or to receive financial redress?

Mr. SPENCER. The man who took the money was arrested and was indicted, but the last I heard of the case he had not been tried. He was, I repeat, under indictment, and undoubtedly will go to the penitentiary for the theft. There were two cases of similar character, and the same man was guilty in both instances.

Mr. KING. Can the Senator advise us whether or not the Department of Labor requires those who are custodians of funds of this character to give a bond?

Mr. SPENCER. They did not do so in this case. The employee who took the money was not under bond.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator that the claim ought to be paid by the Government; and yet this is a very loose way of doing business. If the law does not compel the Department of Labor to bond its employees who are charged with fiduciary duties of this character, a statute should be enacted to require it. I withdraw the objection.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not rise to object to the bill, but I will suggest to the Senator that the bill ought to provide that the man be reimbursed by giving him a Liberty bond of a thousand dollars. We could buy such a bond for about \$900; but if the man is paid cash he will be a hundred dollars better off, because of the fact that the Government of the United States took his bond and lost it, than he would be if a Liberty bond of like denomination were returned to him.

Mr. SPENCER. I see the Senator's point; there would be an advantage to the man whose bond was lost. I have no objection to having the bill amended so as to provide for the return to him of a bond similar to that which was lost.

Mr. SMOOT. Everybody would like to have his bonds stolen if he could get par for them.

Mr. SPENCER. The man is entitled to nothing more than the return of a bond of similar par value.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. What was the date of the incident?

Mr. SMOOT. The incident occurred in January, 1920, at which time the bonds were even a little lower than they are to-day.

Mr. SPENCER. It is very simple to suggest a word that will make the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Secretary proceed with the next bill? Then we can recur to this one when the Senator has prepared his amendment.

Mr. SPENCER subsequently said: Mr. President, I have prepared an amendment to Senate bill 4992 which perhaps will meet the objection which was made. I send it to the desk and ask to have it stated.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4992) for the relief of William E. Lewis, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to William E. Lewis, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,106.25, representing loss of Liberty bonds, fourth issue, having a face value of \$1,000, plus accrued interest of \$106.25, said bonds having been stolen by an employee of the Immigration Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri proposes an amendment, which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. After the word "directed," on line 4, it is proposed to strike out the remainder of the bill and in lieu thereof to insert:

Out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to purchase a Liberty bond of the fourth issue of the face value of \$1,000 and to deliver the same, together with \$106.25 interest thereon, to William E. Lewis, in place of a bond of similar value belonging to said William E. Lewis, and which was stolen by an employee of the Immigration Service.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I was wondering whether there would be any objection on the part of the Senate to my moving at this time to take up the fortifications appropriation bill and pass it to-night?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I hope the Senator will allow the calendar to be completed.

Mr. SMOOT. If there is any objection, I shall not insist on it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I say that not because I have any interest in any of the rest of the bills, but because I think this may be the last chance to consider the calendar, and I think every Senator ought to have a chance to have his bills considered.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I recognize that. I do not think it would take 15 minutes to dispose of the fortifications bill, however.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next bill on the calendar.

SAMUEL H. DOLBEAR.

The bill (S. 4694) for the relief of Samuel H. Dolbear was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to issue a warrant for \$2,845.37 to Samuel H. Dolbear, payable from the appropriation made by 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 (40 Stat. L., p. 1274), and in settlement of the award for the above amount made to said Dolbear by the Secretary of the Interior May 18, 1920.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like some explanation about that bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have looked for the report, but there does not seem to have been any report made; but, according to the very terms of the bill, this is in accordance with an award made to this man under a certain act of Congress.

Mr. KING. I caught just a few words of the bill. My attention was distracted by a conversation with another Senator. May I inquire of the Senator if this is not a bill to pay for alleged damages because of the increase in prices after the contract was let?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I can not say. It simply says:

Payable from the appropriation made by 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, * * * and in settlement of the award for the above amount made to said Dolbear by the Secretary of the Interior May 18, 1920.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, that bill had very careful consideration by the Committee on Mines and Mining, and I am able to give the Senator the information which he seeks with respect to the matter. It aroused the inquiry of every member of the committee; but the facts are substantially these:

This man Mr. Dolbear made a claim under the act referred to for losses sustained in mining operations conducted, as he claimed and established before the commission, upon the request of the Bureau of Mines or other officers of the Government. A certain amount was awarded to him, for which a warrant was issued. He asked for a rehearing of the cause, insisting that he was entitled to an amount greater than that awarded to him by the amount claimed here in the bill reported by the committee. The commission heard his claim with respect to that matter, and he satisfied them that they were wrong in rejecting that portion of his claim upon the original hearing, and they amended their order by making the award in this amount. The Comptroller of the Treasury, however, construed the act to operate so as to prevent him from making more than the one payment on the claim; and this act is intended to give Mr. Dolbear the benefit of the award that was made to him by the commission upon a rehearing of his claim.

Mr. KING. Under what act is the claim made?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It is the act which was under consideration here a while ago in connection with the bill introduced by the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. ROBINSON).

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator if a favorable report was made upon this matter by the department? No report was made when the bill was sent to the Senate, or, at least, it is not in my file.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. My recollection is that a report came from the Secretary of the Interior reciting the facts as I have given them to the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. There ought to be a report with the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

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

PASQUALE DOLCE.

The bill (H. R. 7573) authorizing payment of compensation to Pasquale Dolce for personal injuries, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, to Pasquale Dolce the sum of \$1,716 as full compensation for injuries received on May 19, 1919, at Buffalo, N. Y., when he was struck by a truck operated by the United States Army.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to see what the Secretary of War says about this matter. He says he believes this man is entitled to reasonable damages for this injury, together with reimbursement for all expenses incurred by him. I have no objection to the consideration of the bill.

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

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

The bill (H. R. 15935) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That bill has been temporarily laid aside.

SITE FOR POST-OFFICE BUILDING, SPRING VALLEY, ILL.

The bill (H. R. 2328) relating to the title to land to be acquired as a site for a post-office building at Spring Valley, Ill., was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, in the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of a suitable site for a post office at Spring Valley, Ill., pursuant to authority granted by the public building act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. L., 62d Cong., 3d sess., p. 877), to accept title to land, reserving or excepting all ores or minerals on or in such lands, with the rights of mining the same.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, is that a proper restriction in the case of a piece of land on which a post-office building is to be constructed?

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, it appears from the information the committee received that all conveyances of real estate

in that locality reserve the mining rights in the underlying ores and minerals, and of course the department can not accept the land with such a restriction without specific authority from Congress. This is a bill of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN].

Mr. SMOOT. I have not any objection to the consideration of the bill. I simply thought the restriction was a very unusual one and that if we are going to build a post-office on the ground the Government should not reserve the mineral in the ground to itself, but I have no objection.

Mr. FERNALD. I understand that all the conveyances in that locality have the same restrictions.

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

CENSUS OF PERSONS IN ARMY AND NAVY.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 251) to authorize payment to members of the Army and Navy who were employed as enumerators during the Fourteenth Decennial Census to take the census of persons in the Army and Navy was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Whereas it appears that in making an enumeration of persons in the Army and Navy for the Fourteenth Decennial Census, in the judgment of the Director of the Census it was impracticable to do otherwise than, with the official sanction of the Army and Navy, employ officers and enlisted men of the Army and Navy as enumerators, and that such officers and enlisted men were duly employed to make the enumeration and were promised compensation at the rate of 3 cents for each person enumerated; and

Whereas the vouchers for such compensation have been disallowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury Department on the ground that payment thereof was unwarranted; and

Whereas it further appears that in the judgment of the Director of the Census the census of the military and naval forces was taken more accurately by reason of the assurance of compensation to such enumerators than if it had been taken under orders of the War Department: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the appointment of such enumerators be, and the same is hereby, validated and that the moneys appropriated for the Fourteenth Decennial Census are hereby made available for the payment of their services as such enumerators.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall be glad to hear the explanation of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] of this joint resolution. I suggest to him the question of whether he approves of the precedent of double pay; and if we pay these persons who are with the Government, may we not be called upon to pay various other individuals?

The Senator knows that very frequently in the Army officers, as well as privates, do considerable work. Officers engaged in work upon rivers and harbors will want additional pay for the services which they perform as experts, as technicians, and as engineers, in addition to the salaries which they receive from the Government of the United States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I will say, with regard to this measure, that when the census enumeration was about to begin, the matter of enumerating the persons in the Military and Naval Establishments was taken up, and it was found desirable to employ soldiers and sailors for that purpose. After consideration by those in charge on both sides—those in the Army and those in charge of the enumeration—it was felt that they would get a much better enumeration if they were allowed to employ these people and pay them a reasonable amount per name, just as they do in the case of the regular enumerators.

The legal authorities of the Government were consulted informally and decided that it could be done. However, when the vouchers were presented the Comptroller of the Treasury held that the vouchers could not be paid.

It has been recommended by the Director of the Census, and by others interested, that this amount—which does not require an additional appropriation, and which is comparatively small, involving, I believe, about \$5,000 in all—be paid to these men. They are paid at the rate of 3 cents per name for making this enumeration, and the census of these establishments has been very accurately taken over a large area of ground; and as these men are very poorly paid for that class of work, it was deemed only fair that they should have this small additional compensation. It amounts to very little in any case, and in the aggregate it only amounts to \$5,000.

I hope no objection will be raised, and that the joint resolution may be allowed to pass.

Mr. KING. I shall not object to the consideration of the joint resolution, but I do want to invite the attention of the Senate to what I conceive to be a very bad precedent.

We have discovered repeatedly within the past few months that employees of the Government are not satisfied with the compensation received under stipulated law and seek employment in other branches of the Government and get double salaries. A short time ago we were discussing the nitrate bill, and it appeared there that salaries were to be paid to officers of the Government for work which they did in connection with the

construction and operation of the nitrate plant—a policy which is absolutely vicious—and we are now giving our stamp of approval to a policy which says that employees of the Government may be employed in other branches and receive double compensation. If the compensation which they have in their original employment is inadequate, let us give them an adequate compensation; but to pay double compensation seems to me to be a very bad precedent.

I would object to this bill if it were for only 1 cent just as quickly as I would if it were for \$5,000, because of the principle and because of the bad precedent which the bill would establish.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah object?

Mr. KING. No. If the Senate desires to pass it, I shall vote no, as I have been compelled to vote upon a number of bills.

Mr. SMOOT. May I ask the Senator from West Virginia if there is a favorable report upon the bill from the department? There is no report with my file of bills on the calendar.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The committee did not make a report. I have in my hand, however, a report which was made by the House committee. In order to save printing, I did not have a printed report made.

Mr. SMOOT. This is a Senate joint resolution, not a House joint resolution.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The same joint resolution was introduced in the House. They reported a House joint resolution similar to this.

Mr. SMOOT. Has that joint resolution passed the House?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think not. A report accompanied it.

Mr. SMOOT. What does that report show as to the Census Bureau or the department approving the bill?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Here is a letter from the Director of the Census to the Secretary of Commerce, dated November 18, 1920, in which he said:

When arrangements were being made to take the census of persons in the military and naval service it was absolutely necessary to employ officers and enlisted men of the Army and Navy as enumerators, and compensation at the rate of 3 cents for each person enumerated was promised. This arrangement was made after informally consulting some of the legal officials of the department. Upon receipt of the vouchers, however, it developed that it was necessary for the disbursing clerk to refer the matter to the Comptroller of the Treasury for a decision as to whether payment could be legally made. The comptroller, in a decision under date of July 19, 1920, decided that payment of the vouchers in question was not authorized.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator need not read any further.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This compensation was promised these men before they undertook the work, and presumably with authority, and it is to carry out that promise that this authority is now asked. They found it was not authorized by law. It takes no additional money from the Treasury.

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

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (H. R. 12396) to amend an 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, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 10311) to further amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906, as amended by the act approved March 3, 1913, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

LOUISA FROW.

The bill (S. 3129) for the relief of Louisa Frow was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on line 8, to strike out "\$10,000" and to insert "\$1,200," so as to read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louisa Frow, widow of John Frow, who was killed as the result of an accident caused by a United States Navy seaplane, the sum of \$1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

GRIFFITH L. JOHNSON.

The bill (S. 4637) for the relief of Griffith L. Johnson was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, before the bill is disposed of, I should like to make a little explanation of it.

It covers an item of expense for stenographic work, a report made by Mr. Johnson at the request of the Secretary of War of hearings before the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee. The Secretary of War employed him, expecting to pay him from funds under the control of the Secretary of War, but when he approved the bill the Comptroller of the Treasury refused to pay it upon the ground that it was not a legal claim against that particular appropriation. This left Mr. Johnson high and dry, without compensation for the service which he had rendered at the request of an officer of the Government. His only avenue of relief is through an appropriation made by Congress. The committee felt that it was a very just and meritorious claim, and therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. As I remember this claim, the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate paid Mr. Johnson for all the work done by him authorized in the resolution giving the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds authority to employ a stenographer. This claim is simply for putting in a carbon copy and furnishing it to the Secretary of War. We paid him for a number of carbon copies besides. The committee thought that the amount that was paid to Mr. Johnson was ample, and it is for that reason, Mr. President, that I ask that this go over now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PHILIP S. EVEREST.

The bill (S. 2838) for the relief of Philip S. Everest was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$300, and that the same be paid to Philip S. Everest, superintendent and special disbursing agent Bad River (Wia) Indian Reservation, in full compensation on account of money expended by him for the benefit of an Indian allottee upon said reservation whose allotment had been erroneously located by said agent through misinformation given to him as to the location of a reservation corner.

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

PERRY E. BORCHERS.

The bill (H. R. 646) for the relief of Perry E. Borchers because of losses suffered, due to destruction of property and termination of contract for services because of smallpox, while in the employ of the Navy Department in Cuba, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay Perry E. Borchers, of Tadmor, Ohio, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$346.45, the amount of loss sustained due to the destruction of his personal property while in quarantine and to the loss of his position through termination, by the Navy Department, of his contract for services as superintendent of construction at the United States naval station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Mr. KING. I would like to inquire upon what theory the Government of the United States ought to pay a man because he lost his job.

Mr. SPENCER. He is getting nothing because he lost his job. This man was employed for a year, went down to his station in Cuba, was attacked by smallpox, was kept in the hospital for a number of weeks, and was then discharged. He made a claim for his salary, but it was not allowed. The Government took all his belongings, his personal property, his clothes, and, to avoid the danger of contagion, burned them up. This is for the value of his personal property and clothes which were consumed.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator explain the purpose for which he was sent to Cuba, and by whom?

Mr. SPENCER. He was sent there in connection with a construction matter. He was superintendent of construction of the United States naval station. I doubt if there is any legal liability, but the Government burned up everything this man had for fear of contagion, and the committee thought that, so far as his personal belongings were concerned, it was perfectly fair that he should be reimbursed.

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

MRS. JOSEPH C. AKIN.

The bill (H. R. 1035) for the relief of the widow of Joseph C. Akin was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Joseph C. Akin, of Dolores,

Montezuma County, Colo., widow of Joseph C. Akin, who, while in the discharge of his duty as a deputy United States marshal, was killed by a band of renegade Ute Indians while he was attempting to arrest one Tse-Ne-Gat, a Ute Indian charged with murder, on the 21st day of February, 1915, the sum of \$1,195, on account of the murder of her said husband while in the regular discharge of his duties in the service of the Government of the United States.

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

HERMAN W. SCHALLERT.

The bill (H. R. 6414) for the relief of Herman W. Schallert, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$642.90 to Herman W. Schallert to reimburse him for stamps stolen from the post office at Chaseburg, Wis., on April 23, 1915, while said Schallert was the postmaster of said place.

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

SCHOONER "WILLIAM H. SUMNER."

The bill (H. R. 8647) for the relief of the owners of the American schooner *William H. Sumner* was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to William C. Reid, managing owner, and other owners of the American schooner *William H. Sumner*, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,354.57, to reimburse said owners of the American schooner *William H. Sumner* for damages suffered by their vessel as a result of a collision with the U. S. S. *North Dakota* off of Cape Henry, Va., on November 21, 1914.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from Missouri whether this claim has been before the Court of Claims?

Mr. SPENCER. I think not. We acted on it in view of this sentence from the Secretary of the Navy. The Secretary of the Navy reported to the committee:

That the responsibility for the collision and the resulting damages to the *William H. Sumner* rested with the U. S. S. *North Dakota*, and the claim of the owners of the *Sumner* in the sum of \$2,354.57 is reasonable and just, and should be paid.

Acting on that report of the Secretary of the Navy, we recommended that the claim be paid.

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

CAPT. E. V. DICKSON.

The bill (H. R. 9840) for the relief of Capt. E. V. Dickson was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Capt. E. V. Dickson, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment United States Infantry, the sum of \$474.80, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to reimburse the said Capt. E. V. Dickson for the sum of \$474.80, United States currency, which was stolen from the said Capt. E. V. Dickson, without fault or neglect on his part, while he was captain, One hundred thirty-second United States Infantry, and acting disbursing officer at St. Maurice, France, and which said sum the said E. V. Dickson has since paid into the Treasury of the United States in discharge of his liability as such disbursing officer.

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

RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD OFFICERS.

The bill (S. 4894) to provide longevity pay for reserve officers and National Guard officers serving under orders of the War Department was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

FORT BELKNAP RESERVATION LANDS, MONT.

The bill (H. R. 13225), providing for the allotment of lands within the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert:

That within one year from the date of approval of this act the Secretary of the Interior shall appoint a commission of three persons, two of whom shall be members of the Gros Ventre and Assiniboine Tribes of Indians and one member an employee of the Interior Department, who shall cause to be prepared, in such manner as they may deem advisable, a complete and final roll, to contain the names of all Indians ascertained to have rights on the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont. Immediately upon the approval of the said roll which shall be the conclusive and final evidence of the right of any Indian of the reservation to an allotment of land, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to allot pro rata, under rules and regulations and in such areas and classes of lands as may be prescribed by him, among such enrolled Indians all the unreserved and otherwise undisposed-of lands on the Fort Belknap Reservation, which trust patents shall be issued in the names of the said allottees: *Provided further*, That any names found to be on the said roll fraudulently may be stricken therefrom by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, with the

approval of the Secretary of the Interior, at any time within one year from the approval thereof, after giving all persons interested a full opportunity to be heard; and the fraudulent allotment shall be canceled and the lands thereof be subject to disposal under the provisions of this act: *And provided further*, That the land allotted hereunder shall be subject to any tribal leases existing at the date of approval of the said allotments.

Notwithstanding the death of any person duly enrolled as herein provided, allotment shall be made in his or her name as though living, the land embraced in such allotment to pass by descent to the legal heirs of the decedent and be subject to disposition as in the case of lands of other allottees passing upon their death.

SEC. 2. That upon the issuance of the trust patents provided for herein the Indians thus allotted are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States and entitled to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of such citizens, and the allottees shall have the benefit of and be subject to the laws, both civil and criminal, of the State in which they may reside.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to reserve from allotment lands valuable for the development of water power and such reasonable areas as may be needed for Indian agency, school, religious, cemetery, and administrative purposes, to remain reserved as long as needed, and as long as agency, school, and religious institutions are maintained thereon for the benefit of said Indians. Should any such lands be abandoned said lands so abandoned shall revert to the tribe and become available for allotment or other disposition, and the said Secretary is hereby directed to reserve for park purposes an area not to exceed 640 acres, embracing Mission Canyon in the Little Rockies, and an area not to exceed 160 acres within which is the Snake Butte Spring, and an area not to exceed 40 acres at the head of Big Warm Creek as a site for a sanatorium for the benefit of said tribes of Indians: *Provided*, That a patent in fee simple for not exceeding 10 acres may be issued to the duly authorized missionary board or other proper authority of any religious organization heretofore engaged in mission or school work on said reservation for such lands thereon (not included in any town site provided for herein) as have heretofore been set apart to such organization and are now used for mission or school purposes, or which any such organization has heretofore made application to have set apart for such purposes: *Provided, however*, That patent having been heretofore issued for 320 acres to St. Paul's Catholic Mission, it shall not be entitled to receive more than 2½ acres additional under this act.

SEC. 4. That prior to the allotments being made as authorized herein the Secretary of the Interior shall cause an examination to be made by experts of the Geological Survey of all lands of the reservation for the purpose of determining the mineral character thereof; but the surface of any such lands found to be mineral shall be subject to allotment as herein provided, but such mineral shall remain tribal property: *Provided*, That such coal as may be required for use in connection with the construction and maintenance of the irrigation projects may be reserved for that purpose: *Provided further*, That lands valuable for timber shall remain tribal property, and any member of the tribes having rights in the said reservation may cut and take away from such lands such timber as he may require for fuel, fencing, or for building.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to reserve and set aside for town-site purposes not more than 80 acres at the present settlement of Lodge Pole, and not to exceed 80 acres at such other locations as he may deem necessary, and to lay out, survey, and plat said tracts into blocks, lots, streets, alleys, parks, and school sites: *Provided*, That the area reserved for parks and school sites shall not exceed 10 acres in any one town site; and patents shall be issued for such lands to the municipality legally charged with the care and custody of the lands hereby set aside for such purposes. That such town sites shall be appraised and disposed of as provided in section 2381 of the United State Revised Statutes: *Provided further*, That any person who, at the date when the appraisers commence their work upon the land, shall be an actual resident upon any one such lot and the owner of substantial and permanent improvements thereon, and who shall maintain his or her residence and improvements on such lot to the date of his or her application to enter, shall be entitled to enter, at any time prior to the day fixed for the public sale and at the appraised value thereof, such lot and any two additional lots of which he or she may also be in possession and upon which he or she may have substantial and permanent improvements: *And provided further*, That before making entry of any such lot or lots the applicant shall make proof, to the satisfaction of the register and receiver of the land district in which the land lies, of such residence, possession, and ownership of improvements, under such regulations as to time, notice, manner, and character of proofs as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further*, That in making their appraisal of the lots so surveyed, it shall be the duty of the appraisers to ascertain the names of the residents upon and occupants of any such lots, the character and extent of the improvements thereon, and the name of the reputed owner thereof, and to report their findings in connection with their report of appraisal, which report of findings shall be taken as prima facie evidence of the facts therein set out. All such lots not so entered prior to the day fixed for the public sale shall be offered at public auction, in their regular order, with the other unimproved and unoccupied lots. That no lot shall be sold for less than \$10: *And provided further*, That said lots, when surveyed, shall approximate 50 by 150 feet in size.

SEC. 6. That the construction of projects for the irrigation of the irrigable lands shall be undertaken as the needs of the Indians shall require, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, and there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$50,000 for preliminary investigations and surveys to determine the needs of the Indians and for the commencement of such work as may be advisable at this time: *Provided*, That the cost of all such projects on this reservation, including the Milk River Irrigation project, shall be assessed against the lands irrigable under the respective projects in the proportion that each acre of irrigable lands bears to the whole area of irrigable lands under each project, and such assessments shall be reimbursed to the United States and to the tribal fund in such proportion as contributions shall have been made therefrom in not less than 20 annual payments under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, who may fix such operation and maintenance charges which shall be paid as he may direct: *Provided further*, That the provisions of the act of April 4, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 277), requiring reimbursement of the cost of the Milk River project from Indian funds, and any other acts or parts thereof in conflict with this proviso is hereby repealed. Unless otherwise paid, these latter charges may be paid from or made a charge upon his individual share of the tribal fund when said fund is available for distribution; and if any allottee shall receive

patent in fee to his allotment before the amount so charged against his land has been paid, such unpaid amount shall become and be a lien upon his allotment, of which a record shall be kept in the office of the superintendent of the reservation at the agency; and should any Indian sell any part of his allotment, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the amount of such unpaid charges against the land so sold shall remain a first lien thereon, and may be enforced by the Secretary of the Interior by foreclosure as a mortgage. All expenditures for irrigation work on the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., heretofore or hereafter made are hereby declared to be reimbursable under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe and shall constitute a lien against the land benefited, regardless of ownership, and including all lands which have heretofore been sold or patented. All patents or other instruments of conveyance hereafter issued for lands under any irrigation project on the said Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, whether to individual Indians or to purchasers of Indian land, shall recite a lien for repayment of the irrigation charges, if any, remaining unpaid at the time of issuance of such patent or other instrument of conveyance, and such lien may be enforced or, upon payment of the delinquent charges, may be released by the Secretary of the Interior. In the case of lands under any project purchased in the bona fide belief on the part of the purchaser that by his purchase he acquired a right to have water from the project for the irrigation of the land purchased by him in the same manner as the Indian owner, the Secretary may, after notice to the Indians interested, determine the value of the land at the time of the purchase from the Indian, and give to the purchaser or his assigns credit on the charge for construction against the land to the amount of the difference between the price paid and the value as so determined, and shall withhold for the benefit of the tribe from the Indian or Indians of whom the purchase was made an equal amount from any funds which may be due or distributable to them hereunder. Delivery of water to such land may be refused, within the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, until all dues are paid: *Provided*, That no right to water or to the use of any irrigation ditch or other structure on said reservation shall vest until the owner of the land to be irrigated shall comply with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, and he is hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be deemed reasonable and proper for making effective the foregoing provisions: *Provided, however*, That in no case shall any allottee be required to pay either construction, operation, or maintenance charges for such irrigation privileges, or any of them, until water has been actually delivered to his allotment.

Nothing in this act shall be construed to deprive any of said Indians of the Fort Belknap Reservation of the use of water appropriated and used by them for domestic purposes or for the necessary irrigation of their lands, or lands claimed and occupied or used by them, or any ditches, dams, flumes, or reservoirs constructed and used by them in the appropriation and use of said water. No Indian shall acquire any priority of right to any of the waters of said reservation as against any other Indian by priority of appropriation to an extent greater than the water necessary to the irrigation of 40 acres.

Every person entitled to allotment on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation shall before patent is issued designate as a homestead 40 acres of irrigable land or 320 acres of nonirrigable land, already allotted or to be allotted hereunder, which homestead shall remain inalienable during the lifetime of the allottee or the minority of his or her heirs. Designations for minors shall be made by their natural guardians, and in the event that any Indian shall fail to make such designation the Secretary of the Interior shall select for him a homestead, and all patents for such homestead shall recite that they are such.

Any and all minerals, including oil, gas, and lands valuable for the development of water power, granted or to be allotted hereunder, are set aside as tribal property, and such land may be leased or mining permits granted upon the request of the tribal council under such rules, regulations, and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, but no lease shall be made for a longer period than 10 years, but the lessees shall have the right to renewal thereof for a further period of 10 years upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided, however*, That until the same shall be leased any Indian being the head of a family and having rights on the said reservation may take coal from any of the lands within the same for his own domestic use: *And provided further*, That at the expiration of 50 years from the date of approval of this act the coal, oil, gas, or other mineral deposits upon or beneath the surface of said allotted or granted lands shall become the property of the individual allottee or his heirs, but the right is reserved to Congress to extend the period within which such reserved tribal rights shall expire.

Sec. 7. That sections 16 and 36 of each township, except such lands in lieu of which thereof as the State has heretofore received indemnity under existing laws, are hereby granted to the State of Montana for school purposes: *Provided, however*, That for any lands thereof lost to the State by allotment, withdrawal, or otherwise under the provisions of this act, the State may through its proper officers select as indemnity other unoccupied unreserved nonmineral and nonirrigable lands within such reservation, not exceeding two sections in any one township: *Provided further*, That all such selections by the State must be completed within one year after the approval of this act, and be made with the view to preventing any final conflict between the claims of the State and the allotments and withdrawals provided for herein: *And provided further*, That the United States shall pay to the Indians of the reservation the sum of \$5 an acre for the lands thus granted to the State: *And provided further*, That all the children, being descendants of Indians entitled to rights on said reservation, shall be permitted to attend the public schools of said State on the same condition as the children of white citizens of said State.

Sec. 8. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$170,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay for the lands granted to the State of Montana; and there is hereby appropriated the further sum of \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be required, to be immediately available, to be used in paying the expenses of making the roll, classifications, and allotments hereunder, and such further allotment surveys as are necessary, and in defraying the expenses of the survey, appraisement, and sales of the town sites provided for, the said \$50,000 to be reimbursable from the proceeds of the town-site sales or from other tribal funds available or that may become available for such purpose.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. There is one amendment, Mr. President, on page 20, in the committee amendment, further to safeguard the rights of the Indians, that I wish to offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the amendment to the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 20, line 24, strike out the word "such," after the word "except," and after the word "which," in the same line, strike out the words "thereof as," and insert, in line 24, after the word "township":

Being nonirrigable and not occupied nor heretofore selected for allotment by any Indian.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House on the bill and amendment, and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. CURTIS, Mr. GRONNA, and Mr. WALSH of Montana conferees on the part of the Senate.

CEDAR ROAD, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The bill (S. 5023) to provide for the closing of Cedar Road between Quincy Street and Shepherd Street NW., in the District of Columbia, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the commissioners are hereby authorized to close Cedar Road between Quincy Street and Shepherd Street NW., in the District of Columbia.

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

EXPERIMENT VINEYARDS IN CALIFORNIA.

The bill (H. R. 13402) for the purchase of land occupied by experiment vineyards near Fresno and Oakville, Calif., was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill go over.

Mr. PHELAN. Will the Senator withhold his objection a moment?

Mr. SMOOT. I will.

Mr. PHELAN. I understand the matter came up yesterday during my absence in the form of an amendment to the Agricultural appropriation bill. The matter has been before the Senate during the last two sessions of Congress. It comes from the Agricultural Department and nowhere else. It seems that there are two pieces of land whose purchase is contemplated and not provided for. This is a mere recommendation that they be purchased, so that the Secretary of Agriculture can negotiate. There are no less than 600 varieties of grapes and, according to report I have before me, this is the most valuable vineyard property in the world. In this connection the committee report states as follows:

These experiment vineyards now contain approximately 700 varieties of grape stocks collected from all the vine-growing regions of the world. They constitute the largest and most valuable collection of grape varieties now known to exist. Their value for experimental and scientific purposes can not readily be estimated.

By reason of the adoption and enforcement of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution, the owners of these lands are going out of the business of producing wine grapes and are subdividing their properties and selling them in small tracts. Unless these experiment vineyards are purchased by the United States, the work of 15 years of experimentation by the Department of Agriculture and these valuable collections of grape varieties from all over the world will become a total loss.

The committee is of the opinion that it would be false economy to fail to make the necessary appropriation to acquire these properties, and that, with their acquisition, the work of the department during the past 15 years will be preserved for the benefit of the grape growers of the country and the department will be enabled to carry on experiments for the purpose of developing new uses of wine grapes and discovering new products into which wine grapes can be manufactured, thus probably saving a great industry now threatened with destruction.

Thus it will be seen that if the provision is not made the United States will lose a very valuable experiment station which can not be reproduced, as this represents the work of the Department of Agriculture for 15 years. The bill provides simply that the Secretary of Agriculture shall negotiate for the purchase of the two pieces of land, one in Fresno County and the other in Napa County, 20 acres in each piece, as I remember, for \$15,000 each. The department is emphatic in the belief that the 600 varieties of grapes collected over a period of 15 years are an invaluable possession to the Government, and that the property will be lost unless such provision is made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Would it not be unconstitutional for the Government to go into the vineyard business?

Mr. PHELAN. That is one reason why vineyard property is very valuable now to the producers of the country. Not being allowed to use the vines for the purpose of producing grapes from which to make wine, the department by these experimental stations shows how the vicious wine grape may be turned into the innocent and wholesome raisin grape, the currant grape, or table grape. Without the assistance of these experimental vineyards a great injustice will be done. I submit that the United States owes something to the vineyard interests of the country, having destroyed the wine-making business.

Mr. SMOOT. Would not the grape growers of California like to have it destroyed again in the same way that the Government destroyed it with prohibition? I think that grapes are now bringing about three times what they did before prohibition was in force.

Mr. PHELAN. I should be glad to believe that that condition will continue.

Mr. SMOOT. Does not the Senator think it will continue?

Mr. PHELAN. I do not know what the new administration will do with respect to the enforcement of the law as to the domestic use of grapes in the manufacture of wine on the premises. That is really the reason, as the Senator knows, why high prices prevail, because there are not enough deputies to go into each residence and arrest the housewife for making good potable wine.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, the Senator knows that grapes are taken by everybody who wants to make wine, and that wine is made in perhaps 60 per cent of the homes in California, and not only in California but in most of the Western States. Therefore grapes have advanced in price at least three times what they were before prohibition was in force. I thought that was a very splendid way for the grape grower to be destroyed, when he was enabled to receive higher prices than he ever did before. I thought it brought prosperity to California, a fact which I was delighted to learn.

Mr. PHELAN. I am sorry that the prosperity is predicated upon such a basis. It may not last long.

Mr. SMOOT. Several years ago, when I was listening to the Senator from California plead for the grape growers of California and state that if prohibition was put into force every one of them would be ruined financially, it really touched my heart, and I thought perhaps that would be the result. But when I was in California last August and September I learned from my grape-growing friends there that they were never so prosperous in all their raising of grapes as they have been since prohibition went into effect.

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

Mr. SMOOT. It seems to me that \$750 an acre for land is a pretty high price. Does the department recommend this, may I ask the Senator? I see the report that is made here, but I do not observe any recommendation from the department.

Mr. PHELAN. The department has recommended it in letters. I have one here, dated February 18—as late as that—signed by Mr. Corbett, the horticulturist in charge, who warns against the dangers of phylloxera unless the experimental work is maintained.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood the Senator to say that this is only an authorization. It is not for the purchase, I understand.

Mr. PHELAN. Let me read the bill. It is very brief. It provides—

That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized to purchase and acquire the lands occupied by the department's experiment vineyards near Fresno and Oakville, Calif., now maintained under contracts with the owners of said lands: *Provided*, That the land purchased for the Fresno vineyard shall not exceed 20 acres, at a cost not to exceed \$12,000, and for the Oakville vineyard not to exceed 20 acres, at a cost not to exceed \$15,000.

The bill has been passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that if we authorize the purchase we will have to pay for it. We can not get out of that situation.

Mr. PHELAN. It does not require any appropriation this year.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true, if we do not purchase the land, but we will have to appropriate the money for it if we purchase the land, and we might as well know that now.

Mr. PHELAN. I can assure the Senator that it is a departmental measure, and that they desire exceedingly that the transaction be consummated.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall not object. I think it perfectly useless, though.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized to purchase and acquire the lands occupied by the department's experiment vineyards near Fresno and Oakville, Calif., now maintained under contracts with the owners of said lands: *Provided*, That the land purchased for the Fresno vineyard shall not exceed 20 acres at a cost not to exceed \$12,000 and for the Oakville vineyard not to exceed 20 acres at a cost not to exceed \$15,000.

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

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL PASSED OVER.

The bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PAYMENTS DUE RAILROAD COMPANIES.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have not been here all the afternoon and I should like to know what was done with Calendar No. 693, the bill (S. 4898) to amend the transportation act, 1920. It is a bill similar to the House bill that passed the Senate the other day. It ought to be taken from the calendar and indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action was taken and the bill has been indefinitely postponed.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Very well.

ELIJAH C. PUTMAN.

The bill (S. 663) fixing the term of service of Elijah C. Putman during the Civil War was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

Mr. SMOOT. I think it had better go over.

Mr. MYERS. I ask the Senators to withhold their objection a moment until I can make an explanation. I am satisfied that it is a meritorious bill, although I am not the author of the bill. It was referred to me as a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I obtained a favorable report from the committee and reported it to the Senate.

There is a statute of the United States which provides that any soldier of the Civil War, on the Union side, of course, who served 90 days shall have the privilege of making a homestead entry and making proof without registering and complying with some of the other requirements. It is intended as a reward for veterans of the Civil War.

The beneficiary of the bill, Elijah C. Putman, is still living. The records of the War Department show that he enlisted in the Army during the Civil War and served about 85 days.

Mr. SMOOT. Eighty-one days.

Mr. MYERS. His enlisted service appears to be 9 days short, and he was then discharged because his regiment was disbanded, but the evidence shows that he was mustered in quite a number of days before he was formally enrolled, and that he was really with his regiment, mustered in, and serving considerably more than 90 days. The records of the War Department show that while his formal enlistment simply lacks nine days of the time, he was really with the troops and in service.

This is simply to fix his status and give him the privilege of making a homestead entry upon the same terms as if his enlistment record had actually shown 90 days. He was mustered in and served 90 days, and there is no doubt about that. The War Department records show that and the papers with the committee show it. I think the objection should be withdrawn under the circumstances.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall have to object. There are thousands and tens of thousands of similar cases that occurred right at the close of the war. The men were not in any fighting. They did not pass through any real Army service. I will say to the Senator from Montana that no one can charge me with being niggardly in any way in taking care of the old soldiers.

Mr. MYERS. Oh, no; I think not.

Mr. SMOOT. But I can not go this far. I must object.

Mr. MYERS. But in this particular case the soldier was discharged before the end of the war. His regiment disbanded before the close of hostilities. Does the Senator say there are thousands of cases where soldiers were mustered in and served and were not enlisted as much as 90 days and yet actually served more than 90 days? I think this is a very exceptional case. Does the Senator still insist on his objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. I must insist.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The 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, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to appeal to the Senator not to object to the present consideration of the bill. It is the only bill that I have on the entire calendar, and it contains many of the names that were in bills which passed the Senate last May. It is the only one of the pension bills that we will have this session. The House Members are very eager to get it back. There are many old men and women who helped to save the country from 1861 to 1865 who are praying for the passage of the bill. Many others will come up at the next session upon which the Senator can express his objection by particularizing against pension bills in general. I hope the Senator will be in the Senate many years yet to exercise that function, but I also hope that he will not object to this particular bill, the last one we have, so that we may get it through and settle these cases that have been before the committee so long. I do not wish to wait here another day until we get through with the next appropriation bill and then move to take it up, because there is plenty of time this evening to finish it. I appeal to the Senator to allow us to go ahead and get the bill through and thus let me give my attention to other matters now before the Finance Committee.

Mr. KING. I have been so generous with the Senator to-day in permitting him to pass a very obnoxious pension bill that he ought not to press my generosity too much, but I will ask the Senator what the bill is and how much it carries and how many items are provided for in the bill?

Mr. McCUMBER. There are possibly 9,500 altogether, but the Senator must remember that we have not passed a pension bill this session at all and scarcely none at the last session. The bill relates solely to those of the Civil War. The bill which we passed this forenoon related to the other wars.

The cases are, for the most part, like the one I will state. I will give one, almost the first case that is on the list, but I do not know that it is the first one. Here was a man who served in the Army for about three years. Then he had a furlough. As he failed to get back within three days after his furlough, he was marked on the records as a deserter. He enlisted again and served six months, or more than six months, in his second enlistment. Of course, he did not get an honorable discharge in his first enlistment. Under a law which we afterwards passed, that six months' service after desertion would cure the desertion charge. The Pension Office seemed to hold that under that law he must have an honorable discharge from his previous service, which is not the law as we construe it. We believe that where he has an honorable discharge from the second enlistment, it cured the two or three days that he was away when he did not get back to the Army service.

We have many cases similar to that. Here is another case, the very first one that comes in the bill:

It was ascertained, however, that the soldier had been married some time prior thereto—in 1878, I think it was, he was married—and that he had never obtained a legal divorce. His first wife obtained a divorce shortly afterwards; but the ruling of the Pension Bureau was that inasmuch as he did not live in Indiana, I think, where the common-law marriages were recognized, this time would have to be counted out, and that his marriage did not begin until after 1905, when he moved back. Consequently those 22 years of married life before the husband died were not to be counted at all, and the widow was to be considered as not having married him until after 1905, and hence could not receive a pension. There are very many cases of that kind that we attempt to cure by special legislation. So I hope the Senator will allow the bill to be considered and passed.

Mr. KING. Most of these cases, I apprehend, as I understand the Senator, are to remove the charge of desertion from individuals and to put them on the pension roll so that they may draw pensions?

Mr. McCUMBER. This was not a case of real desertion. There were a great many soldiers who deserted and then reenlisted in order to get a bounty, often under other names. We have persistently and consistently refused to grant them any relief. These, however, are cases where there was no desertion really intended, but the soldiers did not look as carefully into that matter as they should have done. It did not make much difference to them at that time what their record was, provided they got an honorable discharge finally when they reenlisted. There are many such cases where it was not necessary to go back to get the charge of desertion removed. I state this as representing two classes of cases that are covered by these private pension bills.

Mr. KING. And this is the last such bill for the session?

Mr. McCUMBER. This is the last such bill for the session.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota has stated that there is only a deficit of two billions of dollars

for the new administration to start out with, and I see no reason why we should not create a little further deficit.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the 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, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, at the top of page 2, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 3, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 11, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 19, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 23, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 5, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 9, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 17, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 21, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 13, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 17, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 20, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 6, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 9, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 17, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 7, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 8, after the words "per month," to strike out "and pay her the soldier's accrued pension," so as to read:

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.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of Martha J. Holden, widow of Richard Holden, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 16, after the words "per month," to insert "such pension to cease upon proof soldier is living," so as to read:

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, such pension to cease upon proof soldier is living.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 21, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 4, to strike out:

The name of Mary F. 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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 8, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 12, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 18, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$35" and insert "\$30," so as to read:

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 \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 21, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 13, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 11, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 19, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 15, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 4, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 14, before the words "of Samuel Purviance," to strike out "helpless and dependent daughter," and insert "widow," so as to read:

The name of Lydia Ann Purviance, widow 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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 22, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 8, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 19, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 14, before the words "per month" to strike out "\$35" and insert "\$30," so as to read:

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 \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 3, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 6, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$35" and insert "\$30," so as to read:

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 \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 6, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 24, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 4, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 8, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 9, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 2, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 9, after the words "at the rate of," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$35," so as to read:

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 \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 10, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 18, after the words "at the rate of," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$35," so as to read:

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 \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 4, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 16, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 10, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 23, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 22, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 6, after the word "receiving," to strike out "and the soldier's accrued pension," so as to read:

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.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 11, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 4, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 7, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 21, before the words "per month," to strike out "\$35" and insert "\$30" per month, so as to read:

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 \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 17, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 13, after the words "per month," to insert "without any deductions for alleged erroneous payments," so as to read:

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 without any deductions for alleged erroneous payments.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 2, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 8, before the words "per month," to insert "\$35," so as to read:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 12, after the words "at the rate of," to strike out "\$40" and insert "\$35," so as to read:

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 \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 13, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 4, to strike out:

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 amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 5, to insert:

The name of Jennie Y. Brandon, widow of Isaac M. Brandon, late of Company K, Thirtieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Second Battalion, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ada Sloan, widow of Robert Sloan, late of Company H, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jeannette A. Harrington, widow of Charles A. Harrington, late unassigned Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah Cole, widow of Charles Cole, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Flora A. Winchester, helpless daughter of Alpheus L. Winchester, late of the U. S. S. *Sabine*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Josephine Nickerson, as widow of Andrew A. Nickerson, late of Companies A and K, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Fourteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah Scrivens, widow of Roland Scrivens, late of Company D, One hundred and seventy-first Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Gilbert Adams, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Jennie Denning, widow of William Denning, late of Company G, Seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Laura Frazier, widow of James Frazier, late of Company K, Twentieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mory Mulliken, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him the pension to which he is entitled under existing laws, without any deductions or rebate on account of former alleged overpayments or erroneous payments of pension.

The name of Elizabeth Colquitt Marshall, widow of William L. Marshall, late brigadier general, retired, 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 Alice Jones, widow of William Jones, late of Company A, One hundred and seventy-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month, no further recoveries to be made by the Bureau of Pensions for former erroneous payments of pension.

The name of Allen Laudis, late of Company I, One hundred and ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Harriet J. Bailey, widow of Harrison C. Bailey, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Fannie West, widow of William West, late of Company A, Fifteenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Helen L. Barzee, widow of Charles Barzee, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company K, Second Regiment New York Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Abbie E. Avery, widow of James E. Avery, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Isabella W. Williams, widow of John D. Williams, late of Company G, Second Regiment District of Columbia 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 Minta Green, widow of Thomas Green, late of Company E, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month and pay to her the amount of pension accrued to the soldier at the time of his death.

The name of Harriet M. Powers, former widow of William A. Rousey, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Georgianna Curry, widow of Joseph N. Curry, late of Company C, One hundred and twenty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Charles F. George, helpless and dependent son of Isaac O. George, late of Company A, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James S. George, helpless and dependent son of Isaac O. George, late of Company A, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Josephine Olson, helpless and dependent daughter of Samuel Olson, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month through a duly appointed guardian.

The name of Emma Colt, widow of Alexander R. Colt, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Forty-ninth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Finson, widow of Charles H. Finson, late of Company D, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mabel Turton, helpless and dependent daughter of Robert Turton, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Missouri 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 Martha J. Colestock, widow of Jacob H. Colestock, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Harrison Bernard Taylor, helpless and dependent son of James F. Taylor, late of Companies A and G, Ninth 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 Nancy J. Parker, widow of Joseph Parker, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary M. Roush, widow of Parmenas Roush, late of Company B, Fourth Battalion Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lovina Taylor, widow of John B. Taylor, late of Company I, Thirtieth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mattie Rowney, former widow of James Sullivan, late of Company E, One hundred and sixty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Fourteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth M. Shears, widow of Albert H. Shears, late ordinary seaman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary B. Preston, widow of Stephen A. Powers, also known as Ambrose Preston, late of Company L, Second Regiment Mas-

sachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jennie B. Spiker, widow of Joseph F. Spiker, late of Company G, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth A. Wheeler, widow of Calvin R. Wheeler, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Vermont 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 Elizabeth Stowell, widow of Henry C. Stowell, late of Company K, Thirty-fourth Regiment, and Company E, 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 Clarrisa L. Frye, widow of Otis G. W. Frye, late of Company G, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Cleo York, widow of Anderson York, late of Company H, Twenty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Leon Springer, helpless and dependent son of John M. Springer, late of Company C, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania 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 Angeline O. Hemenway, widow of Stacey Hemenway, late surgeon, Forty-first Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Bailie, widow of Gilbert Bailie, late of Company E, Fifty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Catherine T. Keating, helpless and dependent daughter of Edward Keating, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellen Sommer, widow of William Sommer, late of Company C, Thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nannie A. Mann, helpless and dependent daughter of John P. Mann, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment, and first Lieutenant and regimental commissary, Fifth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Bowman, helpless and dependent son of John A. Bowman, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania 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 Hewitt, helpless and dependent daughter of William H. Hewitt, late of Company H, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Linda Bradley, widow of Samuel J. Bradley, late of Company H, Seventy-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth M. Snay, widow of George H. Snay, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Ellen Woodward, widow of Milton Woodward, late of Company I, Thirtieth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and Company E, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Edwin Reader Patterson, helpless and dependent son of Uriah Patterson, late of Company M, Second Regiment, and Company M, Fifth Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Mary J. Smoke, widow of Daniel Smoke, late of Company E, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Malissa Main, widow of Henry B. Main, late of Companies A and F, Ninety-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary I. Bennett, widow of Nicholas Bennett, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret Gibbons, widow of William Gibbons, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Burtie Gibbons, helpless and dependent daughter of said Margaret and William Gibbons, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Margaret Gibbons, the name of Burtie Gibbons 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 Margaret Gibbons.

The name of Lou Watson, widow of Francis M. Watson, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lucy Banks, widow of Henry Banks, late of Company D, Second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Marcus Broderick, late of Company D, Sixty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer State Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Julia Finley, widow of Andrew Finley, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Emma E. Warner, former widow of Marlow D. Wells, late of Company H, One hundred and third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Maria C. Hill, widow of Jacob C. Hill, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret A. Patterson, widow of John O. Patterson, late of Company E, Seventeenth 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 William Stevenson, helpless and dependent son of John Stevenson, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-seventh 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 Rebecca E. Myers, widow of Jacob M. Myers, late of Company A, Fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary C. Titman, widow of Baltus T. Titman, late of Company D, Second Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Joseph L. Titman, helpless and dependent son of said Mary C. and Baltus T. Titman, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary C. Titman, the name of said Joseph L. Titman 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 C. Titman.

The name of Lena A. Fowler, widow of Dias N. Fowler, alias David N. Fowler, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Clara A. Griffin, widow of Lemuel Griffin, late of Company I, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and unassigned, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Katherine Wheeler Hauns, widow of Valerian Hauns, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lizzie Bailey, widow of John W. Bailey, late of Company C, Ninety-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Catherine E. Weatherby, former widow of Frank E. Reed, late of Company D, Ninety-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of George A. Liston, helpless and dependent son of Everhart Liston, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Mary E. Whitbeck, widow of John W. Whitbeck, late of Company A, Ninth 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 Mary Winegardner, widow of Samuel Winegardner, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment, and Company K, Forty-first Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Carrie B. Winegardner, helpless and dependent daughter of said Mary and Samuel Winegardner, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary Winegardner, the name of said Carrie B. Winegardner 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 Winegardner.

The name of Daisy B. Shindollar, helpless and dependent daughter of Samuel M. Shindollar, late of Company H, One hundred and seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month through a duly appointed guardian.

The name of Allie Lyzear, widow of Albert Lyzear, late of Company H, Fortieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month and pay to her the amount of pension accrued to the soldier at the time of his death.

The name of Margaret Fitzpatrick, widow of Edward Fitzpatrick, late of Troop B, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Peter Edwin Fitzpatrick, helpless and dependent son of said Margaret and Edward Fitzpatrick, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Margaret Fitzpatrick the name of said Peter Edwin Fitzpatrick 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 Margaret Fitzpatrick.

The name of John Baker, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Vernon Stevens, helpless and dependent son of Jacob Stevens, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Ralph England, helpless and dependent son of David England, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Nancy Ault, widow of John C. Ault, late of Company C, Forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Fannie E. Tinker, helpless and dependent daughter of John M. Tinker, late of Company E, Fiftieth 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 A. Leighton, widow of James Leighton, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Belle Morrison, helpless and dependent sister of Thomas W. Morrison, late of Company I, Eighty-third 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 Elizabeth Dulhagen, widow of Isaac Dulhagen, late of Company I, Thirty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Matilda Smith, widow of Gilbert A. Smith, late of Company K, One hundred and sixty-sixth Regiment Ohio National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of both Eva L. Smith and Arthur D. Smith, helpless and dependent daughter and son of said Matilda and Gilbert A. Smith, \$20 per month of the pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of either Eva L. Smith or Arthur D. Smith, helpless and dependent daughter or son of said Matilda and Gilbert A. Smith, no portion of the pension herein granted to Matilda Smith shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Matilda Smith the names of said Eva L. Smith and Arthur D. Smith 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 to each from and after the date of death of said Matilda Smith.

The name of Mary E. Emery, widow of William J. Emery, late of Company K, Thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and the One hundred and tenth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucinda Welch, widow of Messor B. Welch, late of Company A, Seventy-eighth 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 William Allen, late a scout and spy, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah M. Beach, widow of Theron A. Beach, late of Company C, Fourth 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 Annie Rouse, widow of William J. Rouse, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sadie L. Holmes, widow of Eugene R. Holmes, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Martha E. Hoover, widow of John Hoover, late of Company G, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ella H. Anthony, widow of John E. Anthony, late of Company D, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jennie Hall, widow of Vincent A. Hall, late of Company L, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Davis, widow of Isham Davis, late of Company C, Forty-ninth 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 Alice Chamblin, widow of Marcus Chamblin, late of Company C, Seventieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Winnie E. Saunders, helpless and dependent daughter of Elijah B. Saunders, late of Company B, Thirty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Elizabeth N. Coombs, widow of John S. Coombs, late ordinary seaman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nancy E. Wimer, widow of Benjamin J. Wimer, late of Company E, Forty-third Regiment Indian Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Occia Wimer, helpless and dependent daughter of said Nancy E. and Benjamin J. Wimer, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Nancy E. Wimer, the name of said Occia Wimer 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 Nancy E. Wimer.

The name of Josephine Chambers, widow of Samuel Chambers, late of Company F, Fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Orr, widow of Jesse F. Orr, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Rebecca J. Short, widow of Ferdinand E. Short, late of Company C, Thirty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of John L. Short, helpless and dependent son of said Rebecca J. and Ferdinand E. Short, \$20 per month herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Rebecca J. Short, the name of said John L. Short 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 J. Short.

The name of Rhoda Workman, widow of Joseph Workman, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Josephine Ella Henshen, widow of Fred Henshen, late of Company G, Sixtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Eleventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sybil M. Mixer, widow of Wesley Mixer, late of Company G, Thirty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Clara M. Mixer, helpless and dependent daughter of said Sybil M. and Wesley Mixer, \$20 per month of the pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sybil M. Mixer the name of said Clara M. Mixer 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 Sybil M. Mixer.

The name of Rebecca E. Hosier, widow of Adrian M. Hosier, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Creswell C. Hosier, helpless and dependent son of said Rebecca E. and Adrian M. Hosier, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Rebecca E. Hosier, the name of said Creswell C. Hosier 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 E. Hosier.

The name of Kate N. Mytinger, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles W. Mytinger, late unassigned, Twenty-second 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 Sarah E. Murray, helpless and dependent daughter of Ivory Murray, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nellie A. Dalton, helpless and dependent daughter of John H. Dalton, late of Company C, First Battalion Nevada Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Barbara Reineck, widow of Daniel Reineck, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Ohio 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 Margaret J. Page, widow of George W. Page, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nannie B. Turner, helpless and dependent daughter of William Turner, late of Company G, Fifth 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.

The name of Mahala Winn, widow of Thomas Winn, late of Company K, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Henrietta Sheumacher, widow of David H. H. Sheumacher, late of Company B, Third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lewis Powers, alias George Powers, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Hannah E. Brainard, widow of John C. Brainard, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment New York 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 Anis Apple, widow of Hiram Apple, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and Company Eight, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Helen I. Tilton, helpless and dependent daughter of Edwin A. Tilton, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and second lieutenant Company One hundred and sixty-eight, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Amelia C. Martin, former widow of Gilbert T. Connor, late of Company B, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Amanda Kenny, widow of Harrison Kenny, known as Harrison Collins, late of Company G, One hundred and nineteenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Juliette Boon, widow of James F. W. Boon, late of Company D, Forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Julia A. Gardner, widow of James R. Gardner, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-fourth 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 Anne E. Black, widow of James R. Black, late surgeon, One hundred and thirtieth 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 Clara Daughters, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry Daughters, late of Company D, One hundred and tenth 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 Charles Duerson, late civilian attached to the Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Susie Labaw, widow of Simon Labaw, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Blunt, widow of James L. Blunt, late of Company B, Twenty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Clara Blunt, helpless and dependent daughter of said Mary E. and James L. Blunt, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary E. Blunt the name of said Clara Blunt 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. Blunt.

The name of Ellen L. Barnes, widow of William L. Barnes, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jane E. Kernan, widow of James Kernan, late of Troop M, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Harriet E. Dennison, widow of James H. Dennison, late of Company C, Seventh Battalion District of Columbia 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 Alberto Murray, helpless and dependent son of Ivory Murray, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles N. Ashford, alias William Kenney, late of Company D, One hundred and fifth Regiment, and Company K, Ninety-seventh Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving: *Provided*, That no part of the pension herein granted shall be withheld by the Bureau of Pensions for recoupment of former alleged erroneous payments of pension.

The name of Lida Haskill, widow of James L. Haskill, late of Company F, Twenty-ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jetera E. Anderson, widow of Thomas Anderson, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alice M. Thompson, former widow of Warren Welton, late of Company G, Eighty-ninth Regiment New York 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 Nelson H. Henry, helpless and dependent son of Samuel M. Henry, late of Company K, Eighty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Annie T. Lamarche, widow of Alfred F. Lamarche, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Amanda M. Bailey, widow of Henry H. Bailey, late of Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment Maine 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 Ida L. Sook, widow of Oliver P. Sook, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Malinda Rundell, widow of Harrison Rundell, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company M, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret S. Pruyn, widow of James W. Pruyn, late of Company F, Twenty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Clark, widow of Charles J. Clark, late of Company C, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Hester A. Phillips, widow of Benjamin B. Phillips, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Delaware 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 Mary E. Peake, widow of James B. Peake, late of Company B, Fourth Battalion District of Columbia 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 Jennie H. Squier, widow of George J. Squier, late of Company F, One hundred and fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth A. Barclay, widow of Alexander M. Barclay, late of Captain Daugherty's Company, One hundred and third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Minnie May Andrews, helpless and dependent daughter of John E. Andrews, late of Company E, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and Company G, Seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ulysses Grant Kirker, helpless and dependent son of William J. Kirker, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Reserve Infantry, and Company I, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mabel Nolin, helpless and dependent daughter of John F. Nolin, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Kentucky 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 Martha Tucker, widow of Green G. Tucker, late of Company L, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Fannie Hart Baber, former widow of Peter Hart, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah C. Rawlins, widow of Daniel S. Rawlins, late of Company B, Sixty-seventh 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 Margaret Sweet, widow of Oliver W. Sweet, alias Oliver W. Frazee, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and Company K, Seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Amanda J. Gilmore, widow of Isaac J. Gilmore, late of Company I, One hundred and ninety-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah McGowan, widow of Taylor McGowan, late of Company G, One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Amanda Baird, widow of William K. Baird, late of Company A, Thirty-fifth 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 Alice Dunbar, widow of Charles S. Dunbar, late of Company K, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month, and pay to her the amount of pension accrued to the soldier at the time of his death.

The name of John A. Thomas, helpless and dependent son of Levi Thomas, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Betsy G. Frost, widow of Hiram C. Frost, late of Company E, One hundred and seventy-fourth 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 Phoebe A. Rawles, widow of Jacob B. Rawles, late first lieutenant, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Mary A. Carroll, widow of John Carroll, late of Company I, One hundred and eighty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Joseph Floyd, helpless and dependent son of Peter Floyd, late of Company D, Forty-eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Susan Baker, widow of Hiram Baker, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Illinois 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 Olive G. Hughes, widow of Nathan B. Hughes, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cynthia Rudler Osgood, former widow of Joseph Rudler, late of Company G, Sixty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah M. Brown, widow of Phillip M. Brown, late of Company D, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Arnold, widow of James Arnold, late of Company C, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Malvina A. Williams, widow of Russell A. Williams, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret J. Cutright, widow of John H. Cutright, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ella V. Altmeyer, widow of Mathias Altmeyer, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Otilie Carrol, widow of Charles Carrol, late of Company A, One hundred and sixty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Matilda Starbuck, widow of William N. Starbuck, late of Company G, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Florence E. Wellington Washburn, widow of Nathan A. Washburn, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

month, and pay to her the amount of pension accrued to the soldier at the time of his death.

The name of Aurelia E. Wilkins, widow of James H. Wilkins, late of Companies G and A, Fourteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Katherine Shurts, widow of John W. Shurts, late of Company G, Eighty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lurinda F. Haines, widow of Eli Haines, late of Company D, Fifty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jane P. Hoyt, widow of Alonzo A. Hoyt, late of Company C, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth H. Waugh, widow of William W. Waugh, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Susan C. Kendrick, widow of Theron W. Kendrick, late of Company D, Forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Catherine Rentfro, widow of Francis M. Rentfro, late of Company K, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mahala Goff, widow of Bethuel J. Goff, late of Company C, Eighty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Henrietta W. Carlisle, widow of Joseph Carlisle, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Harriet A. Wormuth, widow of Alfred D. Wormuth, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Julia E. Wooster, widow of George B. Wooster, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Cynthia A. Miller, widow of William K. Miller, late of Company H, Thirty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ruth Maxwell, widow of James T. Maxwell, alias James H. Davis, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company L, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Fannie Gilbert, widow of Hiram Gilbert, late of Company C, Thirty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nancy C. Henderson, widow of Wilson Henderson, late of Company A, Ninety-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Clara B. Plessner, widow of Otto R. Plessner, late of Company H, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Applegate, widow of Edwin R. Applegate, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Pernecia Boozer, widow of John Boozer, late of Company D, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lydia Smith, widow of Lewis Smith, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month.

The name of Rosetta Chaney, widow of William H. Chaney, late of Company K, Forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Laura Adams, widow of Hiram Adams, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment, and Company E, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month and pay to her the amount of pension accrued to the soldier at his death.

The name of May J. Wode, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles Wode, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy E. Hixson, widow of William Hixson, late of Company C, Thirty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Virginia A. Dixon, widow of Thomas Dixon, late of Companies G and A, Ninth Regiment, and Company K, One hundred and twenty-eight Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ella Merrick, widow of Anstlin W. Merrick, late of Company B, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Marinda Maynard, widow of Aldin Maynard, late unassigned, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ellen M. Deer, widow of Job Deer, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment, and Company E, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Fanny Stewart, widow of George D. Stewart, late of Company A, Twenty-fifth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lena Derl, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles Derl, late of Company B, Forty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa Gladwish, widow of John W. Gladwish, late of Company D, Third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ann Vanfeet, widow of Otis B. Vanfeet, late of Company A, One hundred and second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Adam Perry Kaufman, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Sarah Isabell Lowe, helpless and dependent daughter of John Lowe, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Adelia Doersh, widow of Lorenzo Doersh, late of Company H, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of William Doersh, helpless and dependent son of said Adelia and Lorenzo Doersh, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Adelia

Doersh, the name of said William Doersh 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 Adelia Doersh.

The name of Carrie Hover, widow of Jonathan Hover, late of Company A, One hundred and eighty-third Regiment, and Company A, 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 Ellen J. Johnston, helpless and dependent daughter of Franklin L. Johnston, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Francis M. Chronister, former widow of James E. Buckhanon, late of Companies C and G, Fiftieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Robert Gardner, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Twenty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Alice Jewett, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles Jewett, late of Company K, Fifty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cyrus J. Wilsey, late of Company K, One hundred and ninety-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Sarah M. Standish, widow of Newton L. Standish, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Hall, widow of Theodore Hall, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Martha Nave, widow of Daniel S. Nave, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month, and pay to her the amount of pension accrued to the soldier at his death.

The name of Annie Baird, widow of Hiram Baird, late of Company B, First Regiment East Tennessee Volunteer National Guard Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Hopper, widow of Thomas Hopper, late of Company F, Sixty-fifth Regiment, and Company F, One hundred and twentieth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Garrett Williamson, helpless and dependent son of James K. P. Williamson, late of Company E, Thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Mary B. Morgan, widow of William H. Morgan, late of Twenty-fifth Regiment Indiana 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 Ella B. Flaherty, helpless and dependent daughter of Francis P. Flaherty, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Marion A. McClelland, widow of George W. McClelland, late of Company G, One hundred and fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Anna Lowe, widow of William A. Lowe, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment, Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment, and Company A, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Julia Ann Hopkins, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas B. Hopkins, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Nellie J. Merriman, widow of Truman A. Merriman, late of Company B, Ninety-second Regiment New York 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 Eva Miller (lunatic), helpless and dependent daughter of Nathan E. Miller, late of Company A, Seventy-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 Mary A. Smith, widow of Peter C. Smith, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of William F. Hawley, helpless and dependent son of Francis Hawley, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Eliza J. Gibson, widow of David Gibson, late of Company A, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Lewis, widow of Greenville Lewis, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cynthia Timberlake, widow of Pleasant Timberlake, late of Company F, Twenty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Clara Mahoney, helpless and dependent daughter of William J. Mahoney, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Charles Blaker, helpless and dependent son of Charles W. Blaker, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Hannah B. Kesler, widow of William Kesler, late of Company B, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Catherine F. Edsall, former widow of William H. Edsall, late of Company E, Eleventh 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 Emily W. Johnson, widow of Charles W. Johnson, late of Companies G and B, Second Regiment New York Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nathaniel Bitner, late of Company D, Veteran Battalion, Second Regiment Potomac Home Brigade Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Susanna Spencer, widow of Archibald Spencer, alias William Webster, late of Company H, Second Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Volunteer Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Warner M. Ellis, helpless and dependent son of William Ellis, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-first 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 Louisa E. Harrison, widow of Thomas J. Harrison, late of Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie A. Lewis, former widow of George W. H. Allen, late of Company E, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, and Company L, Eleventh Regiment United States Colored 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 John Seidel, helpless and dependent son of John Seidel, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment New York 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 William H. Knowles, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Sue N. Inness, widow of William Inness, late of the Thirtieth and Fifteenth Regiments United States Colored 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 John H. Walker, helpless and dependent son of Irvin B. Walker, late of Company D, Forty-eighth 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 Sallie J. Pile, widow of George Pile, late of Company H, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and Company A, Thirty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah Athens, widow of Edward G. A. Athens, late of Company D, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah C. Turner, widow of Loren H. Turner, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Addie M. Blair, widow of Willard C. Blair, late of Company G, Two hundred and third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Inez Mabel Chase, widow of Ambrose P. Chase, late of Company A, Twenty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month and pay to her the amount of pension accrued to soldier at the time of his death.

The name of Esther A. Blythman, widow of James Blythman, late of Company I, Twenty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Neal, widow of James Neal, late of Company E, First Regiment Alabama 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 Mary J. Kimball, widow of Lorenzo A. Kimball, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Hale, widow of James Hale, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Eliza E. Clink, widow of Adam Clink, late of Company H, Fifty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company Fifty-eight, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Flick, widow of Joseph Flick, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month and pay to her the amount of pension accrued to the soldier at the time of his death.

The name of Sarah C. Mattox, widow of William Mattox, late of Company F, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of William A. Bengt, helpless and dependent son of Isaac F. Bengt, late of Company H, Seventieth 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 Elizabeth DuHamel, widow of William J. C. DuHamel, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month.

The name of Emma Brock, widow of William P. Brock, late of Company B, One hundred and tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alice M. Jones, widow of William M. Jones, late of Company H, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Cavalry, and Company H, Tenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Manella A. Eastman, widow of William H. Eastman, late of the Second Independent Battery, Massachusetts Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alice M. Knox, widow of Walter Knox, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month and pay to her the amount of pension accrued to the soldier at the time of his death.

The name of Marie Schneider, widow of John D. Schneider, alias Daniel Schneider, late of Company G, First Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Anna A. Hall, widow of Christopher Hall, late of Company H, Ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of S. Eliza Faught, widow of James J. Faught, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Taylor Hall, helpless and dependent son of John Hall, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Tennessee 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 Wilhelmine Roehl, widow of Fritz Roehl, late of Company E, Twenty-first Regiment Iowa 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 Edward E. Berry, helpless and dependent son of James T. Berry, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of William Bieber, helpless and dependent son of Oscar Bieber, late of Company K, Seventeenth Regiment Massachusetts 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 Nina E. Benjamin, widow of James H. Benjamin, late of Companies M and I, Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jennie A. Fisk, known as Adella J. Fiske, former widow of Frederick C. Lawrence, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month.

The name of George F. Phillips, helpless and dependent son of Ruel Phillips, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Lucy Esterbrooks, widow of Ashabill P. Esterbrooks, 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 Emily L. Bennett, widow of Bradford W. Bennett, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Rhode Island 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 Cena M. Maples, widow of William Maples, late of Company M, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month, and pay to her the amount of pension accrued to the soldier at the time of his death.

The name of Clara Larish, helpless and dependent daughter of Andrew S. Larish, late of Company A, Ninetieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Polo, widow of Andrew Polo, late of Company A, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Emma Polo, helpless and dependent daughter of said Mary and Andrew Polo, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary Polo the name of said Emma Polo 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 Polo.

The name of Ella K. Johnson, widow of Henry T. Johnson, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Francis Ann Sherlaw, widow of Miles Sherlaw, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ada L. Kinsey, widow of William B. Kinsey, late of One hundred and sixty-first Regiment New York 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 Mary V. Benton, widow of John Benton, late of Company C, Two hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Elizabeth Benton, helpless and dependent daughter of said Mary V. and John Benton, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary V. Benton, the name of said Elizabeth Benton 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 V. Benton.

The name of Hannah Atchison, widow of William D. Atchison, late of the Forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Florence J. Atchison, helpless and dependent daughter of said Hannah and William D. Atchison, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Hannah Atchison, the name of said Florence J. Atchison 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 Hannah Atchison.

The name of Helen M. Gross, widow of Solomon Gross, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nicholas Brady, helpless and dependent son of Thomas Brady, late of Company B, Twenty-ninth Regiment Massachusetts 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 Agnes Fowler, widow of Lyman H. Fowler, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Companies B and I, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Annie L. Marksby, widow of James W. Marksby, late of Company G, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Luella E. Foote, helpless and dependent daughter of Bronson H. Foote, late of Company C, One hundred and sixty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of W. Walter Branyan, helpless and dependent son of Robert H. Branyan, late of Company B, Thirtieth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve 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 Harriet Barnes, widow of Corydon J. Barnes, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Hist, widow of Henry Hist, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ellen Smith, widow of Thomas Smith, late of Company C, First Regiment, and Company C, One hundred and ninety-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Martha Short, widow of Eldridge Short, late of Company B, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Eliza Macomber, widow of Clark Macomber, late of Company B, Twentieth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary V. Barlow, widow of James C. Barlow, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lola Beebe, widow of Lewis M. Beebe, late of the band, Forty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret Gilbow, widow of John Gilbow, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-second Regiment New York 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 E. Sabin, widow of Luther B. Sabin, late of Company I, One hundred and ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Daisy M. Tibbott, widow of David Tibbott, late of Company F, Ninety-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month, and pay to her the amount of pension accrued to the soldier at the time of his death.

The name of Mary E. Taylor, widow of Theodore W. Taylor, late of Company E, Twenty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company E, First Regiment New York Volunteer Provisional Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month, and pay to her the amount of pension accrued to the soldier at the time of his death.

The name of Naoma Doble, widow of Francis T. Doble, late of Company C, First Battalion, Fifteenth Regiment, United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Miranda Johnson, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas W. Johnson, late of Company D, Fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Elbert M. Defendall, helpless and dependent son of Abram Defendall, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-third 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 Mary L. Nevill, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas Nevill, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky 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 Catharine Conn, helpless and dependent daughter of Francis M. Conn, late of Company B, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, to be paid to duly appointed guardian.

The name of Orpha Conroy, widow of Moses B. Conroy, late of Company H, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Clara E. Fritcher, widow of Henry Daniel Fritcher, late of Company M, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and Company G, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Roxie L. Colbert, widow of John L. Colbert, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Illinois 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 Annie Beck, widow of Felix Beck, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elvira M. Anderson, widow of William B. Anderson, late of Sixtieth Regiment Illinois 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 Catharine Pentz, widow of David A. Pentz, late of Company H, One hundred and second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Charles B. Pentz, helpless and dependent son of said Catharine and David A. Pentz, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Catharine Pentz, the name of said Charles B. Pentz 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 said Catharine Pentz.

The name of Mary A. Chorpennig, widow of Samuel A. Chorpennig, late of Company G, First Battalion, Nineteenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, First Battalion, — Regiment Provisional Pennsylvania Volunteer Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Corby, helpless and dependent daughter of Ell C. Corby, late of Company G, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month, payable to a duly appointed guardian.

The name of John D. Gardner, alias John Darity, late of Company K, Ninety-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Flora McMann, widow of William A. McMann, late of Company M, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and Company I, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Veteran Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Isaac N. Bayless, helpless and dependent son of Daniel B. Bayless, late of Company A, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Margaret Ann Evans, widow of Zedic R. Evans, late of Company A, Sixty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Minnie M. Evans, helpless and dependent daughter of said Margaret Ann and Zedic R. Evans, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Margaret Ann Evans the name of said Minnie M. Evans 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 Margaret Ann Evans.

The name of Adaline C. Bellew, widow of James F. Bellew, late of Company G, Thirty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Rose Dodge, widow of David E. Dodge, late of Company G, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Minnie Alldaffer, widow of Joel Alldaffer, late of Company A, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month, and pay to her the amount of pension accrued to the soldier at the time of his death.

The name of Mary E. Harris, widow of Bateson Harris, late of Company G, Forty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Leah F. Ruess, widow of Anthony J. Ruess, late of Company A, One hundred and sixty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Anna Snyder, widow of John Snyder, late of Company I, One hundred and seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Bridget Hopkins, widow of Patrick Hopkins, late of Company H, Ninetieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Lizzie Hopkins, helpless and dependent daughter of said Bridget and Patrick Hopkins, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine:

Provided further, That in the event of the death of Bridget Hopkins the name of said Lizzie Hopkins 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 Bridget Hopkins.

The name of Caroline Bartlett, widow of Eugene Bartlett, late of Company F, Thirty-first Regiment Wisconsin 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 Sarah E. Fisk, widow of John W. Fisk, late of Battery A, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lelia Crawford, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles N. Crawford, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month, payable to duly appointed guardian.

The name of Ella Parsons, helpless and dependent daughter of George W. Parsons, late of Company E, Seventy-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Amanda J. S. Brockway, widow of Nicholas M. Brockway, late of Company G, Fifty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Emergency Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month, and pay to her the amount of pension accrued to the soldier at the time of his death.

The name of Terrissa N. Hunter, widow of Andrew J. Hunter, late of Company A, One hundred and sixth 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 Spearman, helpless and dependent son of John Spearman, late of Company F, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Abbie M. Packard, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles Packard, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment, and Company K, Thirtieth Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lillie Werntz, helpless and dependent daughter of John S. Werntz, late of Company K, Seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of David Conrad Doup, helpless and dependent son of Frederick Doup, late of Company B, Second Regiment Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Fobes, widow of Daniel A. Fobes, late of Company A, Sixty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Charles Fobes, helpless and dependent son of said Elizabeth and Daniel A. Fobes, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Elizabeth Fobes, the name of said Charles Fobes 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 Fobes.

The name of Phoebe A. Fairhurst, widow of George H. Fairhurst, late of Company C, Forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Maria A. Owens, widow of William J. Owens, late of Company F, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Langley, widow of Alonzo D. Langley, late of Company A, Fiftieth Regiment Missouri 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 Ferdinand Lambert, helpless and dependent son of Andrew Lambert, late of Company A, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month, payable to a duly appointed guardian.

The name of Edmund Hishley, helpless and dependent son of Coonrod Hishley, late of Company A, Second Battalion District of Columbia Volunteer Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Bagley, late of the construction corps, quartermaster teamster department, United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eunice Wright, widow of Watson W. Wright, late of Company A, Ninety-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and the Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Bridget Mitchell, widow of Alexander Mitchell, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Emma K. Barrett, widow of William B. Barrett, late of Company B, Seventy-fourth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah Johnson, widow of Lorenzo D. Gardner, alias Lorenzo D. Johnson, late of Company I, Thirty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Fisk, widow of Winfield S. Fisk, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Frances Tucker Hartley, widow of Stacey E. Hartley, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret Stewart, helpless and dependent daughter of William Stewart, late of Company B, One hundred and nineteenth 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 A. Parker, widow of John L. Parker, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Catharine T. Cuff, helpless and dependent daughter of James H. Cuff, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Daniel W. Orr, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month, and that he be entitled to any further relief within the provisions of the act of May 1, 1920, for 90 days' or more service.

The name of Minnie Chapman, widow of Corydon S. Chapman, late of Company B, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Annie S. Miller, former widow of John Miller, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary J. Finney, widow of John A. Finney, late of Company G, Forty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sallie A. Stauter, widow of Franklin Stauter, late of Company A, Seventy-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Olga Stauter, helpless and dependent daughter of said Sallie A. and Franklin Stauter, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sallie A. Stauter the name of said Olga Stauter 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 Sallie A. Stauter.

The name of Marvin A. Coshun, helpless and dependent son of John Coshun, late of Company F, One hundred and sixty-fifth Regiment, and Company G, One hundred and first Regiment Pennsylvania 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 Elizabeth Borden, widow of Humphrey Borden, late of Company E, Ninety-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Third Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Fred Nilan, helpless and dependent son of James Nilan, alias James Hines, late of Company I, Third Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Mary Nease, helpless and dependent daughter of Rolland Nease, late of Company B, Fifty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Walter Scott Ingalls, helpless and dependent son of Walter Ingalls, late of Company A, Twenty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts 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 McNulty, widow of James McNulty, late of Company C, Thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah A. Thornburg, widow of William Thornburg, late of Company B, Nineteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Catharine Kinder, widow of Jefferson Kinder, late of Company B, Nineteenth Regiment, and Company C, Twentieth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Ovid C. Kinder, helpless and dependent son of said Catharine and Jefferson Kinder, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Catharine Kinder, the name of said Ovid C. Kinder 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 Catharine Kinder.

The name of Mary M. Tullock, widow of William C. Tullock, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Matilda May Tullock, helpless and dependent daughter of said Mary M. and William C. Tullock, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary M. Tullock, the name of said Matilda May Tullock 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 M. Tullock.

The name of Adeline F. Terry, widow of William L. Terry, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Prudence Francisco, widow of Ransom Francisco, late of Company I, Seventy-first Regiment New York 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 Eunice R. Tripp, widow of Chauncey G. Tripp, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Rebecca Zellers, helpless and dependent daughter of Isaac Zellers, late of Company D, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of John E. Austin, late of Company G, One hundred and ninety-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Rebecca Backman, widow of Charles M. Backman, late of Company E, One hundred and seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Susan A. McBride, widow of Thomas McBride, late of Company L, First Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Hurley, widow of James P. Hurley, late of Company G, Twenty-eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sallie A. Moore, widow of Shriver Moore, late of Fourteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Louisa Bailey, widow of Samuel Bailey, late of Company C, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alice F. Parrigin, widow of Joseph Parrigin, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month.

The name of Hosea G. Messersmith, helpless and dependent son of Alfred H. Messersmith, late of Company L, First Regiment Colorado 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 Maria M. Reed, former widow of William C. Reed, late of Company K, Thirty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary M. Rutherford, widow of Lyman Rutherford, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah A. Blatchley, widow of Washburn Blatchley, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Spatch, widow of James Spatch, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Hattie Miller, widow of David Miller, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Amelia Hoelscher, widow of George Henry Hoelscher, late of Company E, One hundred and sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ottello Lendeborn, widow of Henry Lendeborn, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Holmes, widow of Andrew A. Holmes, late of Company D, Nineteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jennie M. Pitman, widow of William H. Pitman, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Leando M. Muck, helpless and dependent son of Joseph Muck, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Iowa 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 Ursula Bayard, helpless and dependent daughter of George A. Bayard, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Vale, widow of Thomas S. Vale, late unassigned, Eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Gilly Leming, widow of Elijah Leming, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment, and Company I, Second Regiment, Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month and pay to her the amount of pension accrued to the soldier at the time of his death.

The name of Sarah A. Fringer, widow of Worthington Fringer, late of Company G, Third Regiment Potomac Home Brigade Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Carlton DeWitt, helpless and dependent son of George C. DeWitt, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of William M. Nourse, late citizen attached to the Eighteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lizzie J. Currier, widow of George W. Currier, late of Company B, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elroy L. Kemp, helpless and dependent son of Austin Kemp, late of Second Independent Battery, Vermont Volunteer Light Artillery, and First Independent Battery, Vermont Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Millie A. McKeown, widow of Robert McKeown, late of Company E, Eighteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Florence Ada Stoddard, helpless and dependent daughter of Freeman Stoddard, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment, and Company K, Ninth Regiment, Michigan 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 Elliott, widow of William M. Elliott, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nellie M. Reilly, widow of John J. Reilly, late of Company G, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Carrie B. McCrady, widow of Alfred E. McCrady, late of Company G, Twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret J. Calhoun, widow of William T. Calhoun, late of Company H, Two hundred and sixth Regiment Pennsylvania 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 Bertha J. Bitler, widow of Samuel H. Bitler, alias Henry DeCarroll, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company C, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ira S. Merrill, helpless and dependent son of William F. Merrill, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Indiana 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 Esther L. Carl, widow of Jarvis E. Carl, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Minnie M. Rayser, helpless and dependent daughter of David H. Rayser, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month, to be paid to a duly appointed guardian.

The name of Angelina Coolman, widow of Robert Coolman, late of Company F, Eighty-sixth 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 Amanda L. Townsend, widow of Jacob Townsend, late of Company D, Twelfth 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 Ida L. Baker, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry Baker, late of Company D, One hundred and eighty-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 Phebe J. Clements, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles W. Clements, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Sarah A. Rhoads, widow of John A. Rhoads, late of Company B, Thirty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mahala Printis, former widow of William H. Binkley, late unassigned, Seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Emma M. Chandler, widow of John Chandler, late of Company F, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Martha J. Jenkins, widow of Christopher C. Jenkins, late of Company H, Forty-ninth 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 Julia Horton, widow of William H. Horton, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Veteran Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Eliza Ann Henry, widow of James K. Henry, late of Company A, Twenty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of George Bellamy, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Rhode Island 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 Pauline G. Fritz, former widow of Clarence B. Geiston, late of Company K, One hundred and third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Frances T. Gaddis, former widow of John C. Wiggins, late first lieutenant, Signal Corps, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia Kless, helpless and dependent daughter of Lewis G. Kless, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Jacob J. Spencer, helpless and dependent son of John F. Spencer, late of Company B, One hundred and fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of William A. Fox, helpless and dependent son of Abner Fox, late of Battery B, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emma Durocher, widow of St. Clair Durocher, late of Company K, One hundred and sixty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah A. Warren, widow of Horatio N. Warren, late of Company C, Sixty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth M. A. Bumgarner, widow of George W. Bumgarner, late landsman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Leah A. Brubaker, widow of Harrison Brubaker, late of Company H, Eighty-fourth 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 Louise H. Thornton, widow of William H. Thornton, late of Company B, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and Company G, Twenty-fourth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary F. McGill, widow of Israel F. McGill, late of Company A, Eighteenth 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 Pauline McEuen, widow of William C. McEuen, late of Company F, One hundred and fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Hallie Turner, helpless and dependent daughter of William H. Turner, late of Company M, Seventh Regiment Missouri State Militia 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 Louisa Helton, widow of Jefferson Helton, late of Company G, Fourteenth 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 Mary R. Butler, widow of Adon Butler, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment New York 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 Emma C. Rogers, widow of Frank S. Rogers, late of Company I, Ninth 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 Katherine Wood, widow of William Wood, late of Company B, Fifteenth 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 Josephine Carey, widow of Robert S. Carey, late of Sixteenth Independent Battery New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of George A. Ettinger, widow of Jacob M. Ettinger, late of Company A, One hundred and ninety-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Edith Ettinger, helpless and dependent daughter of said George A. and Jacob M. Ettinger, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of George A. Ettinger the name of said Edith Ettinger 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 George A. Ettinger.

The name of Malissa Leonard, widow of Newton G. Leonard, late of Company C, Twenty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Theresa B. Strelbig, helpless and dependent daughter of Rony Strelbig, late of Company G, One hundred and nineteenth 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 Rebecca E. Boblett, widow of Jacob Boblett, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Indiana 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 Mary M. Taylor, helpless and dependent daughter of Samuel G. Taylor, late of Companies C and G, Sixty-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 Emily Swank, widow of George W. Swank, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Emily T. Minkler, widow of Frank G. Minkler, late of Lieut. Sheldon's company, Sturges Rifles, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Daniel Michael, late of Company I, Fifty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Margaret Flory, widow of James A. Flory, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and Company G,

Sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Florence Pugh, widow of Edward L. Pugh, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ruth B. Adamson, widow of John V. Adamson, late of Company H, One hundred and seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Louise P. May, widow of Emory W. May, late of Company H, One hundred and sixty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Annie T. Barclay, widow of Charles J. Barclay, late rear admiral, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Paul O. Brownlee, late of the Twenty-ninth Regiment United States Field Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Eva J. Moody, widow of John H. Moody, late of Company F, Second Regiment United States Sharpshooters, and Company I, Fifth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DRAINAGE OF INDIAN ALLOTMENTS—VETO MESSAGES.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the President of the United States having returned to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, the bill (H. R. 517) amending an act to provide for drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes, approved March 27, 1914 (38 Stats., 310, Public, No. 77), with his objections thereto, the House proceeded in pursuance of the Constitution to reconsider the same; and

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the veto message be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. In connection with the veto message, I ask to have printed in the Record the letter of the Secretary of the Interior recommending the passage of the bill, in order to show that the committee acted upon the report of the Secretary of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior reports favorably upon the measure, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, March 5, 1920.

MY DEAR MR. SNYDER: I am in receipt of your request of February 7, 1920, for a report on H. R. 517, introduced in the House of Representatives on May 19, 1919, by Mr. McKown of Oklahoma, entitled "A bill amending an act to provide for drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes, approved March 27, 1914 (38 Stat., 310, Public No. 77)."

A comparison of H. R. 517 with the act of Congress approved March 27, 1914 (38 Stat. L., 310), which it proposes to amend, shows that the only difference between the two bills is to be found in line 25, page 2, of H. R. 517, which provides that in any event such assessment on any Indian allotment shall not exceed "\$25 per acre" instead of "\$15 per acre," as provided in the act of March 27, 1914, the existing law.

I assume that the increase in the assessment of \$10 per acre over the existing law is justified on account of the increased cost of labor and material.

Inasmuch as the laws of Oklahoma provide for the creation of drainage districts for the reclamation of swamp and overflowed lands, which will prove a benefit to lands included within the drainage districts, and inasmuch as the Indian allottee is protected from any such assessment "unless the Indian allottee affected, or his legal guardian, shall consent thereto," the imposition of the assessment is not made arbitrary.

If the Indian allottee affected, or his legal guardian, shall consent thereto, it is proposed to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to pay the Indian allottee's taxes for drainage purposes from the funds or moneys arising from any source under his control, or under the control of the United States to the credit of the Indian.

I offer no objection to the bill if Congress sees fit to increase the assessment from \$15 to \$25 per acre.

Cordially, yours,

ALEXANDER VOGELSANG,
Acting Secretary.

HON. H. P. SNYDER,
Chairman Committee on Indian Affairs,
House of Representatives.

MUNICIPAL COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. KELLOGG. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Order of Business 421, being House bill 10074. It is a bill which has passed the House of Representatives, proposing to amend the municipal court act of the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. OVERMAN. I object to that, Mr. President. I wish to examine the bill.

Mr. KELLOGG. I hope the Senator from North Carolina will not object to the consideration of the bill. The bill has received the unanimous approval of the Judiciary Committee. After hearing all of the judges of both courts, we agreed on amendments which are satisfactory. I should like to have the bill considered and passed.

Mr. OVERMAN. The bill has been amended, as I understand?

Mr. KELLOGG. The bill has been amended, and I will state what the amendments are.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I trust the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand amendments have been made to the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The amendments have all been agreed upon by the interested parties.

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

There being no objection the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 10074) to enlarge the jurisdiction of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and to regulate appeals from the judgments of said court, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was, in section 1, on page 1, line 7, to strike out the words "and cost," the first words in the line, and in line 9, after the word "in," to strike out the word "action" and insert "actions," so as to read:

That the municipal court of the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction in the following cases of all claims and demands in which the value of the personal property claimed or the debt or damages claimed, exclusive of interest, does not exceed \$2,000, namely, in the classes of cases over which the court had jurisdiction immediately prior to the passage of this act, and in actions for the recovery of damages for assault, assault and battery, slander.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk, which has been agreed to by the Subcommittee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 1, it is proposed to strike out lines 4, 5, 6, and 7, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

have exclusive jurisdiction in the following civil cases in which the claimed value of personal property or the debt or damages claimed, exclusive of interest and costs, does not exceed \$1,000, namely, in the classes.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KELLOGG. On behalf of the committee I offer another amendment striking out section 12 and inserting a new section.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On pages 6, 7, and 8, it is proposed to strike out all of section 12, as follows:

SEC. 12. That no appeal shall hereafter lie from the Municipal Court to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. Any party aggrieved by any final judgment in an action to recover possession of real property, or by any final order or judgment of said Municipal Court where the amount or value involved, exclusive of interest and costs, exceeds the sum of \$100, or by any interlocutory order whereby the possession of property is changed or affected, such as orders dissolving writs of attachment and the like, provided the amount or value involved exceeds the sum aforesaid, may appeal therefrom to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. If the amount or value involved does not exceed, exclusive of interests and costs, the sum of \$100 the Court of Appeals may allow a special appeal, whenever it is made to appear to said court, upon petition, that it will be in the interest of justice to allow an appeal. The time for and manner of taking, perfecting, and prosecuting appeals, and substituting parties, shall be the same as now obtaining, or as hereafter modified, for appeals from the Supreme Court of said District to said Court of Appeals. No appeal by the defendant in an action for the recovery of possession of real property shall operate as a stay of execution or supersedeas, unless within six days, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, after the judgment, the appellant shall file in the clerk's office of the municipal court a bond with surety or sureties, to be approved by the said court or a judge thereof, conditioned to abide by and pay the judgment rendered by the municipal court, if it shall be affirmed, together with the costs of the appeal, and to pay all intervening damages to the leased property and compensation for the use and occupation thereof from the date of the judgment appealed from to the date of its affirmance. The penal sum of said bond shall be fixed by the municipal court or a judge thereof.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 12. That hereafter no appeal shall lie from the Municipal Court to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. If in any case in the municipal court an exception is taken by any party to any ruling or instruction of the court on matter of law the exception shall be reduced to writing and stated in a bill of exceptions with so much of the evidence as may be material to the question or questions raised, and such bill of exceptions shall be settled and signed by the judge within such time as may be prescribed by the rules of said court. Any party aggrieved by any final judgment of said court may seek a review thereof by the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia by petition under oath setting forth concisely but clearly and distinctly the nature of the proceeding in said court, the trial and judgment therein and the particular ruling or instruction upon matter of law to which exception

has been taken, said petition to be presented to any justice of the court of appeals within 10 days after the entry of such judgment and with such notice to the opposite party as may be required by rules of said court of appeals. If the justice shall be of opinion that such judgment ought to be reviewed a writ of error shall be issued from the court of appeals to the municipal court which shall send to the court of appeals, within such time as may be prescribed by that court, a transcript of the record in the case sought to be reviewed; and the court of appeals shall review said record and affirm, reverse, or modify the judgment in accordance with law. Execution of such judgment shall be stayed if the party seeking the review shall within 20 days after the entry of the judgment file in the clerk's office of the municipal court an undertaking with surety and penal amount approved by a judge of the court, to abide by and pay the judgment and the costs of the review if such judgment shall not be reversed; and, when the defendant in an action to recover possession of real estate seeks such review, the undertaking shall also provide for the payment of all intervening damages to the property sought to be recovered and compensation for its use and occupation from the date of the judgment to the date of the satisfaction thereof if the judgment is not reversed; and in all such undertakings the principal and surety shall submit to the jurisdiction of the municipal court and consent to the entry of judgment against them in that court in respect of their undertaking.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I desire to ask the Senator from Minnesota whether the amendment just agreed to was printed as it was ultimately agreed upon?

Mr. KELLOGG. It was.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In section 1, page 2, line 9, after the word "act," it is proposed to strike out "and the actions included by this act" and to insert "and also the actions pending in the supreme court over which the municipal court would have jurisdiction if brought under the provisions of this act and which may be," so as to read:

Said municipal court shall also have jurisdiction of civil causes now pending in the supreme court which are of the classes and amounts over which the municipal court had jurisdiction immediately prior to the passage of this act, and also the actions pending in the supreme court over which the municipal court would have jurisdiction if brought under the provisions of this act and which may be transferred to it for trial and disposition by order of said supreme court.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, page 3, line 20, before the words "supreme court," to insert the word "said," and in the same line, before the word "shall," to strike out "of said District," so as to read:

At least 10 days before the term of service of jurors shall begin, the clerk of the said supreme court shall certify to the said municipal court, for service as jurors for the then ensuing term, the names of not to exceed 36 persons, drawn as directed by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 5, before the word "certificate," to strike out "such" and insert "a"; in the same line, after the word "certificate," to insert "to that effect"; and in line 7, after the word "Columbia," to strike out "the justices of," so as to make the clause read:

Whenever the judges of the municipal court shall certify in writing that the business of said court requires the services of additional jurors and shall file a certificate to that effect in the office of the clerk of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, said supreme court shall direct the clerk of the said supreme court to certify to said municipal court for service as jurors for the then ensuing term the names of such number of other persons as may be necessary for such service, which names shall be drawn as directed by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, page 4, line 13, before the word "demand," to insert the word "shall," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 5. That if neither party shall demand a trial by jury, or if the value in controversy shall not exceed \$20, the case may be tried and determined by any judge of the court, and his finding upon the facts, which may be either general or special, shall have the same effect as a verdict of a jury, with the same right of either party to take an exception to any ruling of the court, and have the same embodied in a bill of exceptions, as in case of a jury trial.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9, page 5, line 23, after the word "shall," to strike out "be in force" and to insert "apply to attachment proceedings," so as to make the clause read:

The provisions of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia relating to attachments shall apply to attachment proceedings in said municipal court.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 10, page 6, line 5, after the word "require," to strike out the remainder of the section, as follows:

Said municipal court shall have power to appoint one additional assistant clerk, to be known as jury clerk, at an annual salary of \$1,200, payable in monthly installments; and the said clerk shall note the attendance of each juror, administer oaths when required, and perform such other duties as the trial judge shall direct.

So as to make the section read:

Sec. 10. That the marshal of the United States in and for the District of Columbia shall designate two of his deputies to take charge of the jurors in the municipal court, under the direction of the trial judge, and they shall perform such other services as the judge may require.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 15, page 8, line 13, after the words "Supreme Court," to insert "of the District of Columbia," so as to read:

Sec. 15. That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to deprive the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia or the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia from reviewing and finally determining such cases as may be pending on appeal or certiorari at the time that this act goes into effect.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 1, to strike out the numerals "1917" and insert "1919," so as to read:

Provided further, That nothing in this act shall be construed to supersede or modify any of the provisions of Public resolution No. 31, Sixty-fifth Congress, entitled "Joint resolution to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia," approved May 31, 1918, nor of any provisions of Public Law No. 63, approved October 22, 1919, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel,'" approved August 10, 1917.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

TUNGSTEN ORES.

Mr. HENDERSON. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Order of Business No. 441, being House bill 4437. This bill passed the House of Representatives some time ago; it has been carefully considered by the Committee on Finance of the Senate and has been on the calendar for a long time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, the title of which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 4437) to provide revenue for the Government and to promote the production of tungsten ores and manufactures thereof in the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill, but I shall have something to say upon it before it is finally voted on.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it can not be acted on to-night, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. HENDERSON. How long does the Senator from Colorado desire to speak on the bill? Perhaps in a few minutes we could reach a vote.

Mr. THOMAS. I will try to get through by the 5th of March.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, was objection made to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understood there was objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understood.

Mr. HENDERSON. Who objected?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator from Nevada that I objected to the bill because I knew it could not be passed to-night.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL POWER ACT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Calendar No. 627, being the bill (S. 4554) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Federal power commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920.

This bill, which relates to the national parks, has been heretofore brought up once or twice. It is a bill that was prepared pursuant to an agreement which the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and I had with the Secretary of the Interior in order that the water power bill might be signed. I have a number of amendments which I propose to offer to the bill, which I think will remove most of the objections to it. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has been opposed to it heretofore, but I understand he will not oppose its consideration at this time, although the Senator may desire to say a few words about it.

Mr. BORAH. I do not desire to object to its consideration, but I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Washington if this is the bill against which many protests have been received from various quarters?

Mr. JONES of Washington. This is the bill in connection with which no doubt the Senator from Missouri has been bombarded with letters and telegrams and petitions and that sort of thing.

Mr. SPENCER. I object to the consideration of the bill; I desire to look into it further.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

WENDELL PHILLIPS LODGE.

Mr. CALDER. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9794) for the relief of Wendell Phillips Lodge, No. 365, Knights of Pythias.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$381.65 which was paid by the Wendell Phillips Lodge for the body of an ambulance which under the law the Federal Government could not accept.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there appears to be no report accompanying the bill.

Mr. CALDER. The Senate committee filed no report with the bill, although there was a report filed by the House committee which considered and acted upon the bill. The facts are that the Knights of Pythias Lodge tendered to the War Department an ambulance, which, at first, the department accepted. The ambulance cost something in the neighborhood of \$1,800. Subsequently, the War Department refused to accept the ambulance, and so notified the lodge. They then canceled their order with the manufacturer; but it appears that the manufacturer had already shipped to the War Department the chassis for the ambulance, which cost something like \$381.

Subsequently, this lodge gave another automobile to the Red Cross. I see from the report that the Chief of the Motor Transport Service recommends that the \$381 be repaid to this lodge.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9794) for the relief of Wendell Phillips Lodge, No. 365, Knights of Pythias. It authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$381.65 which was paid by the Wendell Phillips Lodge for the body of an ambulance which under the law the Federal Government could not accept.

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

STANDARD WEIGHTS AND MEASURES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BALL. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of House bill 8067, to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the superintendent of weights, measures, and markets of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask the Senator if this is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. BALL. It is.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. From what committee does it come?

Mr. BALL. The Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Was there a quorum there when the bill was reported?

Mr. BALL. It has been reported so long that I really could not say at present.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is a pretty long bill to take up at this time of night.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I will state that this bill was referred to a subcommittee, and was given very careful consideration.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator says it was given very careful consideration?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It was.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, has the bill been read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not.

Mr. SMOOT. It is a bill 24 pages long.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It seems to me that a bill of that length, and a matter of such importance, should hardly be taken up at this time of night.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I can state the main features of the bill. It is a bill to fix definitely the manner of the sale of produce, coal, and ice in the District of Columbia. It fixes the size of a loaf of bread. At present no definite size is prescribed for a loaf of bread. This bill makes it either a pound or a half-pound. It compels those articles that can be sold by weight to be sold by weight. It provides for the sale of small amounts of coal. It makes provision for no new appointees, and no increase of salary. The present laws were passed at different times, and it is very difficult to have any definite knowledge of the laws governing the sale of these materials in the District of Columbia. This is really a compilation of the laws, and fixes definitely the size of the containers, and prescribes how the articles referred to shall be sold.

That is really about the extent of the bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, does the bill change in any important respect the practice in the sale of goods?

Mr. BALL. No; it does not, except that it fixes definitely the size of the loaf of bread.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Was there anything controversial about it? Were there hearings?

Mr. BALL. No; I think not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Was there any opposition or advocacy on the part of any classes?

Mr. BALL. I think not. The Senator from Washington is familiar with the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. My recollection is that the bill was referred to a subcommittee, and I know I asked that action upon it be delayed until I got information from the people out in my State with reference to the measurements of boxes, and so forth, and looked into it very carefully, and we had no objection to it, and thought it was very necessary.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Was the introduction of this bill the result of any demand on the part of the people of the District? Was that the origin of it? Why was this change proposed? What was the genesis of it?

Mr. JONES of Washington. My recollection is that the bill was framed largely as the result of the investigation of the special committee into food conditions, and so forth, here in the District. I think the Senator from Delaware can answer the question more certainly than I can.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the real cause of the starting of the investigation was the increase in the price of the loaf of bread and the reduction in its size. Senators will remember that it was brought out in that investigation that there was no fixed size.

That probably was the origin of the bill. Then we found that bread was not the only thing sold practically by guesswork, without any fixed weight or any fixed manner of selling.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Does this bill provide any extra machinery for the enforcement of the law?

Mr. BALL. None whatever. It changes the title, probably, of the sealer of weights and measures. I do not know whether that was his title before or not.

Mr. THOMAS. This bill is confined to the District of Columbia, is it not?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Is the bill confined entirely to the District of Columbia?

Mr. BALL. Entirely to the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

The Senate, as in Committee on the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8067) to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the superintendent of weights, measures, and markets of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 3, line 7, after the word "approve," to strike out the comma and insert the word "and," and, in the same line, after the word "seal," to strike out the word "and," so as to read:

SEC. 3. That the superintendent and, under his direction, his assistants and inspectors shall have exclusive power to perform all the duties provided in this act. They shall at least every six months, and oftener when the superintendent thinks proper, inspect, test, try, and ascertain whether or not they are correct, all weights, scales, beams, measures of every kind, instruments or mechanical devices for weighing or measuring, and all tools, appliances, or accessories connected with any or all such instruments or mechanical devices for weighing or measuring used or employed in the District of Columbia by any owner, agent, lessee, or employee in determining the weight, size, quantity, extent, area, or measurement of quantities, things, produce, or articles of any kind offered for transportation, sale, barter, exchange, hire, or award, or the weight of persons for a charge or compensation, and shall approve and seal, stamp, or mark in the manner prescribed by the commissioners such devices or appliances as conform to the stand-

ards kept in the office of the superintendent, and shall seize and destroy or mark, stamp, or tag with the word "condemned" such as do not conform to the standards, and shall also mark the date of such condemnation upon the same, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 22, before the word "delivery," to insert the word "a," so as to read:

No person shall deliver or attempt to deliver any coal, charcoal, or coke without accompanying same by a delivery ticket and a duplicate thereof, the original of which shall be in ink or other indelible substance, on each of which shall be expressed distinctly in pounds, avoirdupois, the gross weight of the load, the tare of the delivery vehicle or receptacle, and the net weight of coal, charcoal, or coke contained in the vehicle or receptacle used in making delivery, with the name and address of the purchaser and the name and address of the person, firm, or corporation from whom or which purchased.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, before the word "vegetables," to strike out the word "and," so as to read:

(a) That standard barrel for fruits, vegetables, and other dry commodities, other than cranberries, shall be of the following dimensions when measured without distention of its parts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, to strike out lines 5 to 11, both inclusive, in the following words:

That a barrel of flour shall contain 200 pounds avoirdupois, net weight, and fraction parts thereof shall contain proportionate net weight.

A standard sack or bag of potatoes shall contain 90 pounds of potatoes at the time of sale, and potatoes shall not be sold by the sack or bag in other than standard sacks or bags.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 18, page 18, line 17, after the word "four," to strike out "thousand three hundred and seventy-five tens of," and insert "hundred and thirty-seven"; on line 19, after the word "and," to strike out "twenty-one thousand eight hundred and seventy-five tens of" and insert "two hundred and eighteen"; on line 22, after the word "ounce," to strike out "one and eight thousand and forty-seven thousandths" and insert "one and eight-tenths"; and on line 24, after the word "foregoing," to strike out "capacity" and insert "capacities," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 18. That the standard liquid gallon shall contain 231 cubic inches; the half gallon, 115.5 cubic inches; the quart, 57.75 cubic inches; the pint, 28.875 cubic inches; the half pint, 14.437 cubic inches; the gill, 7.218 cubic inches; the fluid ounce, 1.8 cubic inches; and to liquid measure of other than the foregoing capacities, except multiples of the gallon, shall be deemed legal liquid measure in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 27, page 22, line 4, after the word "by," to strike out the word "the" and insert "this," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 27. That the powers and duties granted to and imposed on the superintendent by this act are also hereby granted to and imposed on his assistants and inspectors when acting under his instructions.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 15, to strike out:

SEC. 33. That the act entitled "An act for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1895, as amended, is hereby repealed.

And to insert:

SEC. 33. That this act shall become operative 90 days after its passage. The act entitled "An act for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1895, as amended, and the act entitled "An act defining the standard shape and size of dry measures in use in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 30, 1896, are hereby repealed, such repeal to be effective when this act becomes operative.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

LABORATORY GLASSWARE, OPTICAL GLASS, ETC.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of H. R. 7785, to provide revenue for the Government, to establish and maintain in the United States the manufacture of laboratory glassware, laboratory porcelain ware, optical glass, and scientific and surgical instruments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

OSCAR SMITH.

Mr. STERLING. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of H. R. 644, for the relief of Oscar Smith. This is a very meritorious case.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill be read.

The reading clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Oscar Smith the sum of \$108.04 for service performed by him in carrying the mail between the post office and railroad station at Pactola, S. Dak., messenger route No. 259020, from March 16, 1915, to September 29, 1915: *Provided,* That no claim for said sum or any other sum be made to the Post Office Department by said Oscar Smith.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Was this man paid?

Mr. STERLING. He was not paid at all. This claim is presented for the reason that he was not paid. He was a mail messenger on a regularly designated messenger route from the station to the post office, a distance of half a mile, and served for a period of over six months, and this pay is at the rate of \$200 a year, and amounts to one hundred and eight dollars and some cents.

Mr. SMOOT. The Postmaster General says the claim should not be allowed.

Mr. STERLING. The Committee on Claims has made a very full report in regard to this case. It is a case where the postmaster was unable to find anyone to act as messenger except his own father. He served as a messenger. It seems that it is a rule or it may be a provision of the statutes—I do not know—that no member of the immediate family of the postmaster can act in that capacity; but in this case no one else could be found. Bids were advertised for, and no bids were received for the work, and this man had to carry the mail, and it is for that reason that the claim is here.

Mr. SMOOT. If that is the case, I do not see why the Postmaster General should report that it should not be paid.

Mr. STERLING. Well, he has said that it should not be paid.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, the post office is half a mile from the station. The postmaster tried by advertisement and every means in his power to get some one to carry the mail from the station to the post office. He could get nobody, and so finally he persuaded his father to do the work. The old man did the work. The compensation can not be more than \$200 a year, but there is a rule of the Post Office Department that the postmaster can not employ a member of his own family to do this work; and therefore, although the work was done, the Post Office Department has refused payment.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION ACT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to make another attempt to make good my promise to the Secretary of the Interior. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] a moment ago told me that this was not the bill he had in mind. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 4554, intending to offer two amendments if that consent is given. It is the bill that takes from the jurisdiction of the Water Power Commission the granting of permits in national parks and leaves it with Congress.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4554) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter no permit, license, lease, or authorization for dams, conduits, reservoirs, power houses, transmission lines, or other works for storage or carriage of water, or for the development, transmission, or utilization of power, within the limits of any national park or national monument shall be granted or made without specific authority of Congress, and so much of the act of Congress approved June 10, 1920, entitled "An Act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water

power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920, as authorizes licensing such uses of national parks and national monuments by the Federal Power Commission is hereby repealed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. After the word "limits," on page 1, line 7, I move to amend by inserting the words "as now constituted."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Then, on page 2, line 6, after the word "uses of," I move to insert the word "existing."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I did not feel that I was in a position to object to the consideration of this bill, as the Senator from Washington has been for a long time trying to get it before the Senate for consideration, and he was under an obligation, by reason of a promise which he made to the President and the Secretary of the Interior, to bring it up for consideration if possible. I did not desire to interfere with his bringing it before the Senate, neither have I time at this hour to discuss the bill; but I desire to record my objection to it, and I want an opportunity to vote against it. That is all I shall ever get out of it anyhow, I presume, so we might just as well consider it this afternoon.

I have understood that the bill is very generally favored by the Senate, but it seems to me to be an unwise measure, even from the standpoint of those who are advocating it, taking into consideration the reasons for it which they assign. But I can not undertake at this late hour, Mr. President, to discuss it. However, I ask for an opportunity to vote upon it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I only want to say that I happen to know something about the situation. The water power bill, which many Members of Congress were interested in securing the passage of, was in very grave danger of a presidential veto in the closing hours of the last Congress, and finally the Secretary of the Interior expressed as his main objection the fact that the power in that bill extended over the national parks, and he did not want any bill to develop power in the national parks and destroy their beauty. Finally, the Secretary agreed that he would recommend to the President to sign the bill and let it go through, if the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], who was acting chairman of the committee in charge of the bill, would bring before the Congress a bill to amend the water power act so as to leave out the national parks. I think in good faith we ought to pass the bill.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not think that good faith requires us to pass it. I think that good faith does require that an opportunity shall be given for the Senate to vote upon it. Therefore I have not opposed a vote.

As I understand the bill, it all resolves itself into a simple proposition whether the parks would be better protected by the Congress of the United States or by the commission which was created by the power act.

I had some experience here in trying to protect the parks through the Congress of the United States, when we had up the famous Hetch-Hetchy proposition, and I observed that the Congress did all it could do, in that instance, to destroy that park. I think those who are advocating this bill will find in a very short time that they are not securing the protection which they think they are securing. I am just as much in favor of protecting the parks, I think, as those who are advocating this bill, but I wholly disagree with them as to how they can be best protected. Therefore I am opposed to the bill.

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

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

ARTHUR J. BURDICK.

Mr. PHELAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may take up House bill 1856.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1856) for the relief of Arthur J. Burdick.

Mr. SMOOT. Is there any report on this bill?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes; I have a report of the House committee. The House has passed the bill. In the report, if the Senator will permit me, it is stated that—

On November 8, 1909, Arthur J. Burdick was permitted by the local land officers at Los Angeles, Calif., to make desert-land entry (being No. 67331) for the west half of section 31, township 1 north, range 6 east, San Bernardino meridian, containing 320 acres; the entryman made an expenditure of \$1,981.68, which was necessary for reclamation. On August 8, 1910, it was discovered by the local land officers that a mistake had been made by them in allowing entry to this tract of land. A hearing as to Mr. Burdick's rights was had in the department of the General Land Office and Mr. Burdick was required to relinquish his

rights to the land; there is no dispute as to his expenditures, as shown by the letter of the Secretary of the Interior, which is hereto attached, together with departmental reports, and made a part of this report.

The man was led on this land and expended his money, and is asking to be reimbursed for what he spent. I do not know him personally, but he is a poor man.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know why the Committee on Claims should have reported this bill. I have had a claim before that committee for a poor woman who made an entry upon a piece of land near Salt Lake City, who built a house on it, and began to farm on it. She paid her fees to the land office, and her filing was accepted. Fort Douglas was near to the land, and the officials decided that they wanted it. It was discovered later that the receiver of the land office at Salt Lake City had made a mistake in accepting the entry. The Fort Douglas people put her bodily off, with her husband and children, and tore down everything they had built. I can not get any report from the Committee on Claims on that bill. This case does not compare with that one, but they have reported this bill. It may be that the Senator from California is a member of the Claims Committee.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator from California is not a member of that committee.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the committee should treat all cases alike.

Mr. SPENCER. I do not know about the claim of which the Senator from Utah speaks. I am sorry I do not.

Mr. SMOOT. I have called it to the Senator's attention.

Mr. SPENCER. I shall look it up at once. Perhaps the committee can meet and act upon it. As the Senator puts it, it is a very strong case. But the claim we are now considering is the case of a man who made an entry on public land and who put some improvements on it. He was perfectly free from any negligence or lack of care on his own part. It was found that the Government itself had given him the wrong location, and that he had put his improvements upon land which the Government could not give to him, and therefore when they found that out they required him to move, of course, and the amount he had expended on his improvements and his moving, which is admitted by the department, is the amount for which this bill is drawn. There is a clear liability.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not saying that this is not a liability, but in the case of the woman I referred to there was no mistake by the Government as to the land. The land office at Salt Lake City had received her money and her filing, and she went on it and remained there for years and years, and then when the officials at Fort Douglas wanted to expand that fort to take in that piece of land, they simply ordered her off, and when they would not go off the United States marshals took her and put her and her children and her husband in a wagon and dumped them in a street down in Salt Lake City. I tried to get some report from the committee on that bill, but not a report has come from the committee.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the Senator tell us when that happened in Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. It happened 30 years ago, and I have been trying for 18 years to get it settled.

Mr. SPENCER. May I say to the Senator from Utah that this is the first I ever heard of that claim or that bill? Certainly the Senator does not intend to say that he himself has ever called the attention of the Committee on Claims to that bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Time and time again.

Mr. SPENCER. I mean in the last two years.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; in the last two years, Mr. President.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am a member of that committee, and I have never heard of that claim before. When did the Senator file the claim?

Mr. SMOOT. Ten years ago, and in every Congress since.

Mr. HENDERSON. It has never been called to my attention, nor has it been called up at any meeting of the committee I have attended.

Mr. SMOOT. How long has the Senator been a member of that committee?

Mr. HENDERSON. For two years.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, within two years it was referred to a subcommittee, of which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] was chairman, for consideration, and he reported back favorably to the full committee, with a recommendation as to the amount, but it was not reported out of the committee. So the clerk tells me, and so the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] told me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What about this bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to its passage.

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

COAL-TAR DYES.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I submit a communication, dated February 23, 1921, from Hon. Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of State, submitting copy of a report of the War Trade Board Section, entitled "Coal-tar dyes for which import licenses were granted during the fiscal year 1920," which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Printing, with the view of its being printed as a public document.

I will say in reference to this report that there is only one copy of it in existence. This compilation was made by some statisticians of the War Trade Board and sent to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State prepared a copy and sent it to me. It contains very valuable information regarding the licenses issued for the importation of German dyes this year, and will be very much sought after by the manufacturing trade.

I move that it be printed as a public document, and ask that the motion be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

RECESS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow, at which time I shall ask to have the river and harbor appropriation bill taken up.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, February 25, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 24, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. Morgan Compher, pastor First Methodist Protestant Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we reverently bow before Thee to render our grateful thanks for Thy love and kindness and gracious care shown to us all our lives. We thank Thee for the glory of another day, for the opportunity of service which it brings. And now Thy servants come before Thee and pray for Thy blessing and Thy holy presence, without which all our efforts are in vain. And as they face the grave problems which confront our Nation, oh, God, do Thou grant to each man vigor of mind and body, and bestow abundantly of Thy wisdom, that the conclusions they may reach may redound to Thy glory and the good of our land. And, oh, God, do Thou keep us all true to the faith of our fathers, to those high ideals and lofty aspirations which are ever pleasing in Thy sight.

Continue, we pray Thee, to bless us in basket and in store, that we may be able to minister to the needs of all who call upon us.

Forgive our sins, and if in the busy hours of this day we should forget Thy will, hold us in loving remembrance and bring to pass, even, oh, Lord, that which is written: "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord, and the people whom He hath chosen for his own inheritance."

And Thine shall be the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

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

HOURLY MEETING FOR THE WEEK.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for the balance of the week the meeting hour shall be 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that for the balance of the week the hour of meeting shall be 11 o'clock a. m. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EVENING RECESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess this evening from 6 until 8 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the House shall stand in recess this evening from 6 until 8 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving an objection, what is the purpose of the recess?

Mr. MONDELL. To give the gentlemen an opportunity to get their dinners.

Mr. GARD. Two hours will afford a very generous opportunity to enable one to get his dinner. I appreciate that. The intention of my question was as to what legislation the gentleman thought would be up.

Mr. MONDELL. We have several conference reports, and I imagine they will run into the evening.

Mr. GARD. In the opinion of the gentleman, it is desirable to have an evening session?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Can the gentleman give us an idea whether we will have evening sessions the rest of the time? I am not objecting at all.

Mr. MONDELL. I think it will be necessary to hold evening sessions from now on.

Mr. WINGO. I think that the gentleman's policy of taking a recess to allow dinner is a good one, and really will save time.

Mr. MONDELL. I am making it at the request of several gentlemen on both sides, who thought it better to have a recess than to hold sessions continuously.

Mr. WINGO. And for special reasons that would be the gentleman's policy for the rest of the week, would it not?

Mr. MONDELL. It would.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Is it your policy to have a recess every evening when you have a night session?

Mr. MONDELL. It seems to me that would be a better policy, unless gentlemen may express a different opinion.

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

DRAINAGE OF INDIAN LANDS—VETO MESSAGE.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a privileged report from the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York presents a privileged report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (H. R. 517) entitled "An act amending an act to provide for drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes," approved March 27, 1914. (38 Stats., 310, Public, No. 77.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk read the title of the bill. How is there any privilege to that?

Mr. SNYDER. There is a report attached there which the Clerk did not read.

Mr. WALSH. I think we ought to know.

Mr. SNYDER. There is a report there that should be read.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the report is a subject for debate. It is a vetoed bill.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman from New York did not say anything about a vetoed bill.

Mr. SNYDER. I supposed the report would be read.

Mr. WALSH. The Clerk read only the title.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to have the report read?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Then I ask that the report be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Your Committee on Indian Affairs of the House, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 517) entitled "An act amending an act to provide for drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes," approved March 27, 1914 (38 Stats., 310; Public, No. 77), together with the objections of the President thereto, having reconsidered said bill and the objections of the President thereto, report the same back to the House with the recommendation that said bill do pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I would not at this busy period in the session have imposed this matter upon the House or asked the Committee on Indian Affairs to report it but for the fact that this measure is of vast importance to the people of my State, and the further fact that the measure does not do what the President thought it did in the statement he makes in his veto. In the veto message he stated that it seemed to him that this bill took away from the Indians some safeguards which did not appear necessary to be taken.

Now, this bill changes existing law in only two particulars. It strikes out the words "or the United States," on page 2, line 10, and on page 2, line 25, it strikes out this language:

Provided further, That in any event such assessments on any Indian allotment shall not exceed \$15 per acre, and no such assessment shall be made unless the Indian allottee affected or his legal guardian shall consent thereto and.

Here is the situation: The streams of Oklahoma as a rule flow from the west to the east. Oklahoma is made up of two Territories, the old Territory of Oklahoma and the Indian Ter-

ritory. This bill affects only the Five Civilized Tribes. Here is what happens: You can organize a drainage district on the old Territory of Oklahoma, and bring the drainage ditch down to the line of the Indian Territory, and there, because some individual Indian objects, you can not organize the district, and the result is that the water is dumped upon the land of the Indians and the white men who live across the line in the old Territory.

For that reason, and to cure that, this amendment was offered. The only change it makes is that it will not permit one individual Indian by objecting to defeat the creation of an entire drainage district.

I want to call attention to the fact that under the existing law there is no assessment against the Indian lands. The only provision is that in the event a drainage district is created and the Indian has any money here in Washington in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary, if he approves the assessment—and he must examine and must approve or disapprove it, if he sees fit—

Mr. CARTER. And it is no lien on the land—

Mr. McKEOWN. And it is no lien upon the land at all; if he has no money—and a great number of them are in that condition—if they have no money here in the Treasury in the care of the Secretary of the Interior, it does not hurt them at all. But if the restricted Indians object, it does tie up all the drainage in the eastern part of the State of Oklahoma.

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

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Did the Secretary of the Interior approve the bill?

Mr. McKEOWN. The Secretary of the Interior in his report to the Senate approved the bill as it passed the House and as it went to the Senate, and no objection was called to my attention to the form it passed finally.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the House pass the bill, the views of the President to the contrary notwithstanding? Those in favor of so passing the bill will, when their names are called, answer "yea," those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 323, nays 18, answered "present" 1, not voting 86, as follows:

YEAS—323.

Ackerman	Denison	Hernandez	McAndrews
Almon	Dent	Hersey	McArthur
Anderson	Dewalt	Hickey	McClintic
Andrews, Md.	Dickinson, Iowa	Illicks	McDuffie
Andrews, Nebr.	Dickinson, Mo.	Hill	McFadden
Ashbrook	Domnick	Hoch	McKenzie
Ayres	Dooling	Hoey	McKeown
Babka	Dowell	Holland	McLaughlin, Mich.
Barbour	Drane	Houghton	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Earkley	Dunbar	Howard	McLeod
Bell	Dupré	Hudspeth	McPherson
Benson	Dyer	Hullings	MacGregor
Black	Eagan	Hull, Iowa	Magee
Bland, Ind.	Echols	Humphreys	Major
Bland, Va.	Elliott	Husted	Mann, Ill.
Boles	Elston	Hutchinson	Mansfield
Bowers	Emerson	Igoe	Mapes
Bowling	Esch	Ireland	Martin
Box	Evans, Nebr.	Jacoway	Mason
Brand	Evans, Nev.	James, Va.	Mays
Briggs	Fairfield	Jefferis	Merritt
Brinson	Ferris	Johnson, Ky.	Michener
Brooks, Ill.	Fields	Johnson, Miss.	Miller
Brooks, Pa.	Fisher	Johnson, Wash.	Minahan, N. J.
Browne	Flood	Jones, Pa.	Monahan, Wis.
Buchanan	Focht	Juul	Mondell
Burroughs	Fordney	Kahn	Montague
Butler	Foster	Kearns	Moore, Ohio
Byrnes, S. C.	Frear	Keller	Moore, Va.
Byrnes, Tenn.	Freeman	Kelley, Mich.	Morin
Caldwell	French	Kelly, Pa.	Mott
Campbell, Kans.	Fuller	Kendall	Murphy
Campbell, Pa.	Gallivan	Kennedy, R. I.	Neely
Caraway	Ganly	Kettner	Neison, Mo.
Carew	Glynn	Kincheloe	Neison, Wis.
Carter	Godwin, N. C.	King	Newton, Minn.
Chndblom	Good	Kinkaid	Newton, Mo.
Christopherson	Goodall	Knutson	Nicholls
Coady	Goodykoontz	Kraus	Nolan
Cole	Gould	Kreider	O'Connell
Collier	Graham, Ill.	Lampert	O'Connor
Cooper	Green, Iowa	Langley	Ogden
Copley	Greene, Mass.	Lanham	Oldfield
Crago	Greene, Vt.	Lankford	Oliver
Cramton	Griest	Larsen	Oiney
Crisp	Griffin	Layton	Osborne
Cullen	Hadley	Lazaro	Overstreet
Currie, Mich.	Hardy, Colo.	Lea, Calif.	Padgett
Dale	Hardy, Tex.	Leshler	Palke
Dallinger	Harrell	Linthicum	Park
Darrow	Harrison	Little	Parker
Davis, Minn.	Hastings	Longworth	Parrish
Davis, Tenn.	Haugen	Luce	Patterson
Dempsey	Hawley	Lufkin	Peters
	Hayden	Luhring	Phelan

Porter	Rucker	Stephens, Miss.	Vinson
Pou	Sanders, Ind.	Stephens, Ohio	Voigt
Purnell	Sanders, La.	Stevenson	Volk
Quin	Sanders, N. Y.	Stinnes	Volstead
Radcliffe	Sanford	Strong, Kans.	Ward
Raker	Schall	Strong, Pa.	Wason
Ramsey	Scott	Summers, Wash.	Watkins
Ramseyer	Sells	Sweet	Watson
Randall, Calif.	Sherwood	Swindall	Weaver
Randall, Wis.	Shreve	Swope	Welling
Ransley	Siegel	Tague	Walty
Rayburn	Sinclair	Taylor, Ark.	Whaley
Reavis	Sinnott	Taylor, Colo.	White, Kans.
Reber	Sisson	Taylor, Tenn.	White, Me.
Reed, N. Y.	Siemp	Temple	Williams
Reed, W. Va.	Smith, Idaho	Tillman	Wilson, La.
Rhodes	Smith, Ill.	Tilson	Wilson, Pa.
Ricketts	Smith, Mich.	Timberlake	Wingo
Riddick	Smith, N. Y.	Tincher	Winslow
Robinson, N. C.	Smithwick	Tinkham	Wood, Ind.
Rodenberg	Snell	Towner	Woods, Va.
Rogers	Snyder	Treadway	Wright
Ronjue	Steagall	Uphaw	Yates
Rose	Stedman	Vaile	Young, N. Dak.
Rouse	Steele	Venable	Young, Tex.
Rowe	Steenerson	Vestal	

NAYS—18.

Aswell	Drewry	Lee, Ga.	Stoll
Begg	Evans, Mont.	Madden	Sullivan
Blanton	Gallagher	Pell	Waish
Carss	Gard	Sims	
Clary	Jones, Tex.	Small	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Huddleston

NOT VOTING—80.

Anthony	Donovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Rainey, Henry T.
Bacharach	Doremus	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey, John W.
Baer	Doughton	Kiess	Riordan
Bankhead	Dunn	Kitchin	Robson, Ky.
Bee	Eagle	Klecicka	Rowan
Benham	Edmonds	Lehbach	Ruby
Eland, Mo.	Ellsworth	Loneragan	Sabath
Britten	Fess	McCulloch	Scully
Brumbaugh	Fish	McGlennon	Sears
Burke	Gandy	McKinley	Summers, Tex.
Candler	Garner	McKinley	Thomas
Cannon	Garrett	McLane	Thompson
Cantrill	Goldfogle	Maher	Vare
Casey	Goodwin, Ark.	Mann, S. C.	Walters
Clark, Fla.	Graham, Pa.	Mead	Webster
Clark, Mo.	Hamill	Milligan	Wheeler
Classon	Hamilton	Moon	Wilson, Ill.
Connally	Hays	Mooney	Wise
Costello	Hersman	Moore, Ind.	Woodyard
Crowther	Hull, Tenn.	Mudd	Zihlman
Curry, Calif.	James, Mich.	Perhman	
Davey	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rainey, Ala.	

So, two-thirds voting in the affirmative, the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. DUNN with Mr. CLARK of Missouri.
 Mr. FESS with Mr. GARRETT.
 Mr. CANNON with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
 Mr. BRITTON with Mr. CANDLER.
 Mr. ZIHLMAN with Mr. HERSMAN.
 Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. CONNALLY.
 Mr. THOMPSON with Mr. SUMMERS of Texas.
 Mr. MUDD with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.
 Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. BEE.
 Mr. CROWTHER with Mr. BANKHEAD.
 Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. RUBEY.
 Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. CANTRILL.
 Mr. EDMONDS with Mr. CASEY.
 Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.
 Mr. WHEELER with Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY.
 Mr. MOORES of Indiana with Mr. KITCHIN.
 Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.
 Mr. FISH with Mr. GANDY.
 Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. DOREMUS.
 Mr. BAER with Mr. DAVEY.
 Mr. WEBSTER with Mr. RIORDAN.
 Mr. WALTERS with Mr. THOMAS.
 Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.
 Mr. PERLMAN with Mr. MILLIGAN.
 Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky with Mr. MCGLENNON.
 Mr. KLECZKA with Mr. SEARS.
 Mr. CURRY of California with Mr. MOON.
 Mr. VARE with Mr. RAINEY of Alabama.
 Mr. JOHNSON of Washington with Mr. WISE.
 Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. MEAD.
 Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. MAHER.
 Mr. BURKE with Mr. DOUGHTON.
 Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. SABATH.
 Mr. KIESS with Mr. GARNER.
 Mr. CLASSON with Mr. DONOVAN.

Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
 Mr. JAMES of Michigan with Mr. MOONEY.
 Mr. BENHAM with Mr. MCKINIRY.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 5030. An act authorizing the city of New Orleans, La., to extend Dauphin Street, in said city, across the United States military reservation known as the Jackson Barracks.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 15812) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives, and had appointed Mr. GRONNA, Mr. KENYON, Mr. McNARY, Mr. GORE, and Mr. SMITH of South Carolina as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to exempt the New York State Barge Canal from the provisions of section 201 of H. R. 10453.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15682) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922; had agreed to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14, 17, 20, 25, 26, 27, 32, 40, 42, 43, 60, 61, 62, 64, 82, 94, 95, 101, 102, 109, 129, and 130; had receded from its amendments numbered 53, 65, 83, 104, and 106.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments by the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, had agreed to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 40, 52, 53, and 62, and had receded from its amendment numbered 33.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment House joint resolution 465, for the appointment of one member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

The message also announced that the Senate had further insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 9521) to prevent hoarding and deterioration of and deception with respect to cold-storage foods, to regulate shipments of cold-storage foods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had asked a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GRONNA, Mr. McNARY, and Mr. SMITH of South Carolina as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the reports of committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the following titles:

H. R. 10515. An act 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;

H. R. 9281. An act 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;

H. R. 11554. An act 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

H. R. 7775. An act 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.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Post Office appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois calls up the conference report on the Post Office appropriation bill. When the House adjourned last night the vote was being taken on amendment No. 12, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 12: Page 7, line 21, after the figures "\$6,000,000," insert: "Provided, That the Postmaster General may, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, authorize the delivery of special-delivery matter without obtaining a receipt therefor: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as excusing the delivery of special-delivery matter by messenger in the first instance."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Will not this amendment have the effect of destroying the privilege that a person now has of demanding a receipt for a registered letter?

Mr. MADDEN. It will have no effect at all on registered letters.

Mr. McCLINTIC. It will not affect the receipts which may be demanded for registered letters?

Mr. MADDEN. No; not at all.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 13: Page 8, line 20, insert: "*Provided further*, That the Postmaster General may contract with any individual, firm, or corporation for an airplane mail service between such points as he may deem advisable and designate, in case such service is furnished at an actual cost not greater than the cost of the same service by rail, and shall pay therefor out of the appropriation for inland transportation by railroad routes."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MADDEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 13 and agree to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by the said amendment insert the following: "*Provided further*, That the Postmaster General may contract with any individual, firm, or corporation for the transportation of mail by airplane between such points as he may deem advisable and designate in case such transportation service is furnished at a cost not greater than the actual cost of the same service by rail, and shall pay therefor out of the appropriation for inland transportation by railroad routes."

Mr. MADDEN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER].

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I intend to support this amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, which authorizes the Postmaster General to contract for the carrying of mail by airplane, with proper restrictions. I want to address my remarks to the next amendment, which is a graft on the Public Treasury in the way of an appropriation of \$1,500,000 for carrying mail, when they know it is pure waste. I have examined the hearings before the Appropriations Committee in the attempt they have made to get this appropriation, and there is not one word of testimony in those hearings that would warrant this appropriation. I am not sure that I have the figures in mind, and I want the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MADDEN] to answer a question or two. How much of this money that was appropriated last year was used by the Post Office Department to buy German airplanes?

Mr. MADDEN. Two hundred thousand dollars, according to the report.

Mr. TINCHER. And how many planes did they buy?

Mr. MADDEN. Eight.

Mr. TINCHER. What has become of those planes?

Mr. MADDEN. Three of them were burned up.

Mr. TINCHER. And what became of the pilots of those planes?

Mr. MADDEN. Those men were burned up.

Mr. TINCHER. And that is the way this appropriation, which is unconscionable, is being used. Now, they have offered to alight in my district, so this matter is not personal with me. Yesterday they pulled off the ordinary demonstration, that is as old as the hills, for the purpose of preventing any opposition to this appropriation. I can remember as a boy, when the Navy was asking for appropriations to build battleships and the bill was pending in Congress, we always had a war just before they had the naval appropriation bill up for consideration. A day or two ago, knowing that this matter was coming up, they made a showing of how quickly they could fly from San Francisco to New York. They burned up only one man in one plane and got across with about a shirt tail full of mail.

They wanted to justify this raid on the Treasury for \$1,500,000. I am in sympathy with the man who is going to administer the affairs of the Post Office Department after the 4th of March, if I am correctly advised as to who he is, and I am speaking in his favor now, because the men who have airplane stations in their district are expected to be in favor of this appropriation. Take Omaha, for instance. I see they carried a couple of sacks of mail to Omaha from Chicago and beat a train two or three hours. Of course, the Omaha Representative must be for that. The airplane station is a nice place to go and show folks where they alight with the airplanes. Perhaps for the amusement of the folks in Omaha they burned a few of these German airplanes there. I do not know.

I say to you that the testimony offered before the Appropriations Committee asking for a million and a half dollars would not get for a widow \$2.50 by an honest jury as between man and man, and still I think it will be sufficient on a roll call, if we have an opportunity to have one, to extract from the Public Treasury for the benefit of a few cities where they will have the alighting places for airplanes, a million and a half dollars. It may be that you think I am not sincere in fighting this, but I want to stop this graft from the Public Treasury. [Applause.]

Mr. ROUSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. ROUSE. Will the gentleman explain the difference between his amendment and the Senate amendment?

Mr. MADDEN. The difference is that the Senate amendment provides that the Postmaster General may contract for airplane mail service. My amendment proposes that the Postmaster General may contract for the transportation of mail by airplane. Now, there is quite a distinction between transporting mail by airplane and contracting for airplane mail service. We do not know what airplane mail service means. We do not know what transportation of mail by airplane means. We know that under the language that is sought to be amended, during the last year the Postmaster General did establish a number of routes that were not authorized by this language, and for which he expended \$488,000, and for which he came to the Appropriations Committee and asked a deficiency. We thought that if we were going to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for carrying the mail by airplane that we ought to say so. We say that in respect to transportation of mail by rail and by ships, and we thought we ought to say the same in respect to the transportation of mail by air.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This provision is in the existing law. How much mail is now being carried in this way under this provision of law?

Mr. MADDEN. Under this provision of law there is a route between New York and Washington, but I do not know how much mail they carry. There is another one from Chicago to St. Louis, and to Minneapolis and St. Paul, and I think one in the extreme Northwest. These routes were established by the Postmaster General without any authority of law and have been used presumably as the result of this language.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Postmaster General must claim that the mail is carried by airplane at no greater expense than would occur if carried by train.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say to my colleague that the Postmaster General under this provision during the last year did let a contract, amounting to \$685,000 in the aggregate, for the transportation of mail by air between New York and Atlanta and between other points, and the contract price would be about ninety times what the actual rail rates would be.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEENERSON. I think the gentleman is slightly inaccurate about carrying the mail under this provision. As I understand, there has been no mail carried by virtue of the contract provision; that is, the mail is authorized to be carried by contract if the contract price does not exceed the cost by rail transportation. What they have done is to carry the mail on routes the gentleman has mentioned under section 3 of the appropriation act of June 30, 1921, third section. Where it authorizes the Secretary of War to turn over airplanes to the Post Office Department, and the Postmaster General is authorized to use the same for the transportation of mail. The section reads as follows:

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of War is authorized hereafter, in his discretion, to deliver and turn over to the Postmaster General, without charge therefor, from time to time, such motor vehicles, airplanes, and parts thereof, and machinery and tools to repair and maintain the same, as may be suitable for use in the Postal Service; and the Postmaster General is authorized to use the same in the transportation of the mails and to pay the necessary expenses thereof, including the re-

placement, maintenance, exchange, and repair of such equipment, out of any appropriation available for the service in which such vehicles or airplanes are used.

We had a hearing before my committee recently, and we asked Mr. Corrydon, of the air mail service, by what authority he was establishing these routes, and he said by virtue of section 3.

Mr. MADDEN. There has been no appropriation made for that purpose.

Mr. STEENERSON. No; the money must be taken from the appropriation for the transportation of mail by railroad, because there is no other fund. But the fact is this is the only claim for authority, because the contract provision that has been quoted has never been performed. Contracts have been made, but no service has been yet performed under them. The contract has been waiting on the action of Congress.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. DYER. I wanted to call to the attention of the gentleman from Illinois that that provision is still the law, and this does not affect that provision. In my opinion, the department has no authority to establish new lines under said section 3. The only authorized route is the transcontinental route, and this service to Washington, Chicago, and Minneapolis, and so forth, is illegal. There is no appropriation out of which that service can lawfully be paid.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman from Minnesota has very accurately stated that the Post Office Department is operating this service, which the gentleman mentions, under section 3 of the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1921. In answer to the criticism directed against the Post Office Department as having exceeded its authority, I think it is fair to state that the matter was submitted to the Auditor of the Post Office Department, and if the gentleman from Illinois will permit me, I will read the auditor's opinion.

Mr. MADDEN. I would be the last man to do anyone an injustice.

Mr. BLACK. I am sure the gentleman feels that way, but there has been a good deal of criticism of the Postmaster General about this particular matter, and that is why I have asked to read what the auditor says. It is:

As you know, this office is not authorized to render a decision in advance of the settlement of accounts; but in view of the very short time between the approval of the act and the date it goes into effect, and your statement that the Post Office Department must act at once on options for material, personnel, and fields for service, I advise you informally that this office concurs in the interpretation the Post Office Department places upon this legislation, viz, that the aviation and truck material turned over to the Post Office Department by the Secretary of War may be operated in the Postal Service on and after July 1, 1920, and paid for out of the appropriation for railway transportation, power-boat transportation service, or out of the appropriation for any other service in which such planes or trucks are used.

That was the opinion of the Auditor for the Post Office Department, and it was upon that opinion that the Postmaster General has operated this service. I admit that such construction of the language referred to seems to me to be contrary to the intent of Congress, but nevertheless it was made, as I have stated.

Mr. MADDEN. I am very glad, indeed, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] has read that opinion into the RECORD.

Mr. STEENERSON. Why not get the opinion of the Comptroller of the Treasury? The auditor has no authority to grant an opinion of that kind.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS.]

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the ruling of the Auditor for the Post Office Department is not conclusive authority. The auditor is right in saying that he has no authority to render an advance opinion. The law specifically provides that the Comptroller of the Treasury may render an advance opinion, and that opinion will be final and conclusive upon all the officers of the Government in the adjustment of the accounts. The opinion of an auditor in advance, as given in this case, is wholly out of the order and is not worth the paper it is written on.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GRIEST. In connection with the inquiry, I think of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], in respect to the relative cost of transporting mail in the air and by rail, it may be interesting to the House to know that it was stated yesterday before the Postal Commission that the cost per pouch of taking mail from New York to Cleveland by air is \$56 and the cost of taking it by car is 41 cents,

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. What is the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. MADDEN. To provide for giving authority to the Postmaster General to contract for airplane mail transportation at a cost not higher than mail transportation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to recede and concur with an amendment. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 14: Page 9, line 4, insert "For the operation and maintenance of the airplane mail service between New York, N. Y., and San Francisco, Calif., via Chicago, Ill., and Omaha, Neb., including necessary incidental expenses and employment of necessary personnel, \$1,500,000."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$1,250,000."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this is an item upon which I think it is fair the House should be thoroughly advised. It will be recalled that last year in the Post Office appropriation bill authority was granted for the establishment of an airplane mail route between New York and San Francisco. The object principally was to experiment not only in the more expeditious movement of the mail, but also to experiment in flying under varying climatic and altitudinal conditions. The thing that led the House to act in favor of the establishment of this route at that time was that while we were experimenting in the development of airplane flying, we might also properly get some revenue, and that could only be had through carrying the mail. I think it is the consensus of opinion among the advanced thinkers of America that the United States ought to keep abreast of the other nations of the world in the development of aircraft, and while I have said more than once that if we undertook to carry the mail in any large quantities by air it would be unjustifiable because of the excessive cost, yet I believe that we would not be justified in eliminating this particular experiment. The cost of carrying mail by train is about 7 cents per ton-mile. The cost of carrying mail by air is about \$5.50 per ton-mile. The cheapest rate at which an airplane can run without carrying anything at all is \$1 a mile, and I doubt if that cost will be reduced much, because it is said that the life of a plane is 150 hours of actual flying. The cost of these planes is high. However, the people all over the route from New York to San Francisco have been delighted with the thought that we were giving an opportunity for them to see the new scientific development in the air, and they have at their own expense prepared landing fields and airdromes, and have welcomed the introduction of this activity with an enthusiasm which may not be justified by the expense, but which nevertheless does exist.

It is said that we advance the mail by reason of this method of transportation, and we do to some extent, but not to the extent that the air mail enthusiasts argue. However, whether we advance it or not, whether the cost is higher as compared with the cost of land transportation or not, it seems to me that we can not afford to say to America that we are not as farseeing in our desire for the development of aeronautics as any other nation in the world; and, further, I think we can well afford to spend \$1,000,000 a year or a little over to try out the development and encourage people to enter aeronautics from a commercial standpoint. Whether they will ever be able to do that successfully, I do not know; but, for one, although opposed to the tremendous cost, I feel that I would be derelict in the proper discharge of my duty if I did not present the facts as I now present them and urge the adoption of the Senate amendment with the amendment which I have proposed.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I just voted for the gentleman's amendment that it should be carried at a cost not exceeding the cost of other mail service. The gentleman now offers an amendment to make a special appropriation of \$1,250,000 instead of the Senate amount of \$1,500,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I listened with interest to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHEP]. What the gentleman now proposes is a mere show. The people can get that at the circuses and they can get it by viewing the voluntary flying here and there. I do not believe, under existing conditions, that we are authorized to spend \$1,250,000 a year merely for show.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. We authorized this for the current fiscal year. We began the operation in October. They have not had a fair chance to make a fair test, and it seems to me that we ought to give them at least one year more to make this test.

Mr. CANNON. It has resulted, however, in the buying of certain flying machines from Germany and other countries.

Mr. MADDEN. Only from Germany—eight of them.

Mr. CANNON. To my mind we have enough burdens as it is without running in opposition to the circuses of the country.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. The naval appropriation bill carries quite an appropriation for developing aeronautics.

Mr. MADDEN. About \$30,000,000, I think.

Mr. TINCHER. And the military appropriation bill carries a large appropriation for developing aeronautics in the United States.

Mr. MADDEN. I suppose it will when it goes through.

Mr. TINCHER. It did as it passed this House.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. Does the gentleman believe in "duplicity" in these departments [laughter]—perhaps I ought to say in duplicating these activities in these departments—or does the gentleman think the Post Office Department is more efficient to develop aeronautics than the War and Navy Departments?

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to say this in reply to my friend, that the Post Office Department is the only department through which any revenue can be returned in any experiment which may be had in connection with the development of the Air Service.

Mr. TINCHER. Then will my friend yield? Does he think it would be a good idea to put all these experiments under the Post Office Department and do away with them in the other departments?

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, I think my friend knows that I do not believe we can carry all the mail by air, and I do not believe we ought to do it if we could.

Mr. TINCHER. The parties who appeared before the gentleman's committee and asked for this line between New York and San Francisco asked \$3,500,000. The gentleman brought in the original bill for \$1,250,000 and his present amendment reduced this—

Mr. MADDEN. No; this brings it to the original.

Mr. TINCHER. Now, that figure was arrived at absolutely arbitrarily?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. There is no basis for any such figure in any hearing before the committee?

Mr. MADDEN. There was no scientific calculation.

Mr. TINCHER. The only scientific calculation was by the gentleman himself in which he disclosed the inefficiency of carrying mail from New York to Chicago, taking about 12 hours more by airplane than by train and the extreme cost of carrying by airplane over carrying it by train.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, we can not overlook the fact that it does cost a great deal more.

Mr. TINCHER. Do I understand the gentleman is advocating the carrying of this item because there is some peculiar training for a man to carry the mail? Does he think that by the airplane simply flying through the air it is going to be of equal benefit to us as these experiments of the War and Navy Departments?

Mr. MADDEN. I will say the House is only a part in the Congress, and in the consideration of this problem we have to take the views of the other side into consideration.

Mr. TINCHER. Let me say to the gentleman this matter was never mentioned on the floor on the other side, if the gentleman is worried about that.

Mr. MADDEN. It was not mentioned because there was no opposition to it.

Mr. TINCHER. I think there was.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman's committee when it brought in the Post Office bill brought in this item for a transcontinental air mail service, as I understand it?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Therefore, as a matter of fact, when the gentleman moves to recede and concur he simply recommends the action that he and his committee originally recommended?

Mr. MADDEN. It would be consistent, of course.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, if the gentleman will yield me just a moment further, say, two minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield the gentleman from Wyoming three minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think we all, like the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER], wish to avoid duplication in these appropriations, likewise duplication of activities. Generally, this item, fortunately or unfortunately, as one may look at it, is one of the items with regard to the development of the science of aeronautics that has no uncertainty in it. We have various items in bills which have passed the House under which uncertain and indefinite sums can be used for the airplane service. There is such a provision in the Agricultural bill with respect to the Forest Service, under which the Forest Service can use quite a considerable appropriation for that purpose if they see fit to do so. We have placed a provision in this bill under which the Post Office Department may be tempted to make contracts not clearly within the purview of the amendment; they are proposals likely to lead to large and indefinite expenditure. Now, this is a proposal for a definite service and at a limited cost.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. The country expects us, in my opinion at least, to make this contribution toward the development of aeronautics. This is a contribution made in a limited way for a service now established and well under way, and I think if we are to do anything for aeronautics anywhere this item ought to be accepted.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield the gentleman from Connecticut one minute.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, there is no duplication here. The appropriations for aviation carried in the naval appropriation bill are for the national defense in warfare carried on by the Navy. The Army appropriations are necessary in order to keep abreast of the times by having aeronautics developed in the Army branch of our national defense. We spend a substantial sum for these two services. Here is the only place where we are doing anything at all toward developing aeronautics for commercial or peaceful purposes. It seems to me that we can well afford to maintain at least one through line from the Atlantic to the Pacific and thus spend a comparatively small amount for development along commercial and peaceful lines. I do not think we can afford to neglect it. Other countries are going ahead and we should not permit this country to be left behind. We ought not to allow ourselves to be left behind in such an important matter by smaller and less progressive countries. I think the \$1,250,000 is none too much.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, before the House votes upon this proposition I think we ought to know something about the facts that have been recently disclosed before various hearings of the Post Office Committee and before the Joint Commission. Now, if the House desires to maintain this present continental line, as the gentleman from Connecticut suggests, as a contribution to commercial aeronautics, that is one thing.

On the other hand, if you want to contribute to it out of the postal funds for the purpose of maintaining a show, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] suggests that it is, that is another thing. But it is established, by evidence which I do not think can be successfully contradicted, that as a mail facility this service is a complete failure.

The expert testimony before the Post Office Committee showed that the mail was very little, if any, expedited by the Air Service to San Francisco. Besides, the small amount as compared with the total volume of first-class mail is so insignificant that there is not one man in ten thousand who gets a letter by air, while he has got to pay this extra expense for this extraordinary speed they claim they have attained.

Well, practically there is no advantage in the speed, either. In the Joint Commission recently, as was referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRIEST], it appeared that not only the cost was out of proportion, but here is the transcontinental route, that starts from New York and goes to Cleveland and Chicago, and the Post Office Department reported they had 98 per cent performance, but the expert that examined it shows that the department has instructed the aviators to call a trip that started a "performance," although they never get more than a mile, perhaps, or never get to the destination. He showed that the percentage of failures to make connections with train 35 at Cleveland is 93 per cent. So that only 7 per cent of the performance on that schedule was performed, because, if they failed to make train 35, the mail came into Chicago on the same train on which it left New York, which is train 44.

Ninety-three per cent of the time the mail went to Chicago on that train; 93 per cent of the time the mail came to Chicago on the same train on which it started from New York.

Now, that is the general performance. At Omaha there is 55 per cent of failure to reach the plane by which they intend to expedite the mail, according to this testimony, and the result is that there is practically no advantage so far as expedition of the mail is concerned.

Of course, when you consider the small quantity of mail they intend to expedite, it is insignificant. So that the conclusion is irresistible that if you want to vote this as simply a contribution to commercial aeronautics you must do it on that ground, but do not do it because it helps the mail service, for it does not. I do not argue the question of whether you should contribute one million and a quarter dollars to commercial aeronautics or not. I leave that to yourselves.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. JEFFERIS].

Mr. JEFFERIS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the future of the air mail or the Air Service is one that I think should require the careful and thoughtful study of our people. It is a new service, it is true, but this Congress has deemed it wise, from the standpoint of war facilities, to make appropriations for the Army and for the Navy to develop it.

Now, if this Nation is really to exist as a great Nation, it must have, as it should have, a national viewpoint concerning these new developments. It would seem to me that nothing could do more toward solidifying the whole thought of the country than by having not only the experiments in the Air Service in the Army and in the Navy, but likewise across the center of this Republic, from one ocean to the other. [Applause.]

You may speak of it as a show, but let me remind you that when Robert Fulton first invented his steamboat the people made fun of it. The same might be said of the first engine, which has since been developed, for the hauling of the commerce of this country, and so regarding many other new inventions in their day. But, nevertheless, if we want the young people of America to have a forward-looking mind, and to undertake to develop and keep America in the forefront of the world, there is nothing that can do more in that line than the development of the Air Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFERIS. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman spoke of the route being across the center of the country. Of course, that means through the city of Omaha?

Mr. JEFFERIS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Rather than by St. Paul and the Santa Fe route?

Mr. JEFFERIS. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to say it does go through Omaha. Why? Because Omaha happens to be the center of the United States, being located halfway between the Pacific and the Atlantic Oceans, and it should have no rocks thrown toward it simply because of its natural location. I want to cite here an instance. Out there in the city of Omaha a small boy by the name of Fetters has during this past summer invented an airplane. His father is an engineer and has taken up the boy's ideas, and I believe that their combined efforts will result in an airplane in the near future that will surpass any that have been developed up to this time. The young idea, young America, is directing its thought toward the manufacture, toward the invention, of some of these things which will be of great advantage to this country, not only from a commercial standpoint but from the standpoint of war, from the standpoint of defense. For Congress here, after it has tried this experiment only one year, and after it has made the expenditure of this year, and after the cities along this route have established their hangars, and so forth, to throw it aside and discard it seems to me is not giving the air mail service a fair trial. For one, I am in favor of the motion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is wonderful how we progress. And this progression commenced on an amendment reported on an appropriation by the Committee on Appropriations that I had the honor to have charge of.

Prof. Langley, the head of the Smithsonian Institution, now dead and gone, invented the airplane, the first one that was ever built on earth. The ridicule that he received was the cause of his death. He was cartooned and ridiculed all over the country. He did make a machine with the modest appropriation, as I recall it, of \$10,000. It was taken on a scow down on the

Potomac, and at first it did not make an extended flight. That machine is still in existence. It did this much good: The Wright brothers, those bright men—we call them "Yankees"; if not, they are first cousins of the Yankees—put their hands to the plow, and they found that what that machine needed was an engine, and an engine was constructed, in the course of time, without any appropriation from the Government. That engine was installed in this machine, and it flew all over Washington, and spread all over the world. It played an important part in the late war.

But it seems to me that there are other things under existing conditions that need appropriations more than this \$1,250,000 is needed, from the standpoint of Omaha, or to show that they are still building these machines, and I have no doubt improving them. The \$1,250,000 is partially to go to the people who are engaged in getting a sale for their product. I do not believe that it is necessary, or that it will forward the development of aviation one particle. That is all I desire to say.

God knows that, in unscrambling these eggs on the appropriations that we are compelled to make, this proposed appropriation of \$1,250,000 should not be made. [Applause.] "Many mickles make a muckle," is an old Scotch proverb. I would be glad if we could have some regard for the taxpayers of this country, some of whom, the farmers and others, want loans, multiplying into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

You may say, "Are you selfish, CANNON, in this?" No. I am anxious where we can that we shall keep down the appropriations; and I want to say to my friends on this side of the House that something will be done unless we can keep down the appropriations and lessen taxation inside of two years and four years from now. [Applause.]

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

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois what is to be demonstrated by the use of this appropriation that can not be demonstrated or is not already known as the result of experiments on the part of the Army and Navy?

Mr. MADDEN. The Army and Navy experiment in particular places under given circumstances. The advantage to be gained by the experiments to be pursued through this appropriation will be that flying will be done under all climatic and latitudinal conditions, making a complete record of the ability to develop the air possibilities in the mountain regions, in the frozen north, among the clouds, in the valleys, in the summer, in the winter; and there is no other route that could be selected in which all the conditions that are provided in this route could be obtained.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me a little time, say three minutes?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have the information from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], because I assume that the Army is not making these experiments in flying above the clouds in the various altitudinous positions and maneuvers on the theory that if we get into a war and if the conditions are unfavorable, the Army airplanes will remain on the ground and the war will stop until the altitudinous conditions are more favorable. [Laughter.]

I think that, so far as concerns the securing of any information above the clouds of the various classes of weather in which planes can be flown, it is not necessary to appropriate money for the Post Office Department to get that information. But, Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect of this matter that I think the people should take into consideration, and especially the reinforcements upon this floor to that band of raiders upon the Federal Treasury that exists elsewhere. I sometimes regret that the rigid rules of the House require one to be rather restricted in expressing his opinion as to the matters that come before us in the way of amendments from other regions. We do not want to forget that there are several other conference reports to be acted upon before we adjourn; that is, we hope to. They may have some claims upon them, put on elsewhere. We go on appropriating money, \$1,250,000 in one lump. There may not be enough money to take care of those claims. Because we took down the bars and removed the hinges from the doors of the Treasury Department yesterday, here is another effort to go in and take \$1,250,000 out to get some information about carrying a few mail bags through the fog or up over the mountains or down through the valleys in the incidental view of the great city of Omaha, which enjoys the great distinction of being located in the geographical center of this great Republic.

I desire to reenforce the sentiment expressed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], that it is time this raid upon the Treasury of the United States should cease. We are having a perfect saturnalia of appropriations, and this Congress will

hand to the new administration a deficit increased many hundreds of thousands of dollars to make very difficult the problems that will confront the Chief Executive after the 4th of March. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] three minutes.

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

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be unfortunate if the House should get the opinion that this air mail service from New York to San Francisco is operated purely as an experimental service. In my judgment mail service by airplane is now a permanent establishment in the United States.

What is the objective in handling first-class mail, anyhow? The object is to handle it as rapidly as possible, to make the delivery as soon as possible. Why do we use the telegraph in preference to the mail service? Because we want to get a rapid transmittal of our communications. That is the primary purpose of the air mail service. There is where its greatest possibilities lie.

I think the House would be interested in knowing what the Post Office Department is actually accomplishing in this airplane mail service from New York to San Francisco. In the report of the Postmaster General he gives an account of its present administration.

I know the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Minnesota have criticized this report, and yet the hearings before the committee have not impeached in any way the accuracy of these statements. Of course, they do not show that this service is a perfect success. These hearings do not show that all the difficulties have been obviated and that all the obstacles have been overcome, but they do show that the service is being operated with a measurable degree of success.

Now, what is the method of operation? The Postmaster General states it accurately in his report:

In the operation of the New York-San Francisco service the Post Office Department had to choose between advancing 15,000 letters 42 hours, each direction, or by combining the air mail with the railway service, using trains at night to advance 64,000 letters 24 hours, each direction. It decided upon the latter policy, which is accomplished by the following operation:

The plane leaves New York at daybreak with 16,000 letters that would not depart from New York for San Francisco until 8.40 o'clock that night and delivers them in Chicago that afternoon in ample time to dispatch them to the through west mail connection which left New York at 8.40 o'clock the previous night. These 16,000 letters are thus advanced 24 hours.

Now, I will not take time to read the description of the same operation as to the other three legs of the journey, for the operation is substantially the same. What is accomplished annually by this airplane mail service? The Postmaster General says that—

The cost of operating the air mail service, including interest on investment, the writing off of losses for planes and equipment damaged beyond repair, and including every conceivable expenditure in connection with the flying of the planes, was \$553,156.10.

For this expenditure the air mail advanced the delivery of 23,463,120 letters 16 to 24 hours.

The report also shows that \$646,143.70 was used in remodeling aircraft turned over by the War Department, in buying new necessary equipment, and things of that kind.

Now, gentlemen of the House, I am not advocating that this air-mail service be gone into on an extravagant scale, but I do believe that the country expects that we continue this utility along practical lines and expand its use as conditions justify, and I can think of no more practical route than the one between New York and San Francisco.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman think we would be justified in stopping the only experiment in which we are now engaged, in using aviation for peaceful purposes?

Mr. BLACK. I do not; and as I have stated, I look upon it as more than an experiment. I believe it is now a permanent branch of the service.

Mr. TILSON. But it is the only experiment that we are now conducting along that line.

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, the House unhesitatingly gave appropriations for the Navy Department and for the War Department for this same service. We have had a statement of the utility that has been derived from this service through the Post Office Department. Anyone who looked into this subject after the armistice will realize that we had no airplanes that could cross the mountains. The people east of the Sierra Nevada Mountains desired an airplane service from

San Francisco. They had the airplanes, and the people in those localities were ready and willing to lay down a check to pay all the expenses of the Government for sending the planes from the fields in San Francisco across the Sierra Nevada Mountains, crossing from Nevada into the northern part of California. When it came to a show-down—there is no secret about the matter, for we have the letters—the War Department had to admit that they had no planes that could cross the Sierra Nevadas, by reason of the altitude; that they had had no experience which would enable them to rise to the altitude that would be necessary and then come down into the valleys after crossing the mountains. Now, from the western coast until you strike the Atlantic you find every degree of change of climate and wind that there is. There is a practical demonstration every day, or every other day, so that these experienced men will be in a position to know what the machines will require, what the different altitudes will mean, what are the conditions of the air currents in these various valleys, and it will bring a success, just like that which has been achieved in the carrying of the mails by automobile. The same objection was made, that you could not carry the mail by automobile over the mountains, and that was only 10 years ago. The same objection is made here, where we can use a little money and get the most of it back, and we can demonstrate to the Navy Department and to the War Department, and they can get the benefit of the use that will be made by the Post Office Department, and eventually there will be a commercial service, which will be of advantage to this country not only in time of peace but if by any chance we should have a necessity for airplanes in any conflict we will have the information upon which to work and upon which to act. I hope the amendment will be agreed to by the House.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to recede and concur with an amendment.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for a division.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for the yeas and nays, and, pending that, I make the point of no quorum present.

Mr. KING. There has been no division.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman demand the yeas and nays?

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of no quorum first.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the point of no quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. It is an automatic call, Mr. Speaker. The House is dividing.

The SPEAKER. There has been no division yet.

Mr. BLANTON. The Speaker stated that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KING. There has been nothing but a viva voce vote.

The SPEAKER. A quorum has not failed to vote.

Mr. BLANTON. I will withdraw the point for the present and will ask for a division.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were 94 yeas and 57 noes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in Senate amendment No. 14.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 219, nays 121, answered "present" 1, not voting 87, as follows:

YEAS—219.

Ackerman	Caraway	Drane	Ganly
Almon	Carew	Drewry	Gard
Aswell	Carrs	Dunbar	Glynn
Ayres	Carter	Dupré	Godwin, N. C.
Babka	Chindblom	Dyer	Greene, VI.
Barbour	Christopherson	Eagan	Griffin
Barkley	Clark, Fla.	Elliott	Hadley
Bell	Cole	Elston	Hardy, Colo.
Benson	Collier	Esch	Hardy, Tex.
Black	Connally	Evans, Mont.	Harrell
Bland, Ind.	Copley	Evans, Nev.	Hastings
Box	Crago	Fess	Hawley
Brinson	Crisp	Fields	Hayden
Britten	Cullen	Fish	Hays
Buchanan	Darrow	Fisher	Hernandez
Burdick	Davis, Minn.	Fordney	Hill
Byrnes, S. C.	Davis, Tenn.	Frear	Hoey
Byrnes, Tenn.	Dempsey	Freeman	Holland
Caldwell	Denison	Fuller	Houghton
Campbell, Pa.	Dooling	Gallivan	Howard
Candler	Doremus	Gandy	Hudsoeth

Hull, Iowa	McLaughlin, Mich.	Pearlman	Smith, Ill.
Hull, Tenn.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Peters	Smith, N. Y.
Humphreys	McLeod	Phelan	Smithwick
Igor	McPherson	Porter	Stegall
Ireland	Madden	Pou	Stedman
Jefferis	Magee	Purnell	Stephens, Miss.
Juul	Major	Radcliffe	Stephens, Ohio
Kahn	Mansfield	Raker	Stevenson
Keller	Mapes	Ramsey	Stoll
Kelley, Mich.	Martin	Ramseyer	Strong, Pa.
Kelly, Pa.	Mays	Randall, Calif.	Sullivan
Kettner	Mead	Randall, Wis.	Taylor, Colo.
Kinkaid	Merritt	Ransley	Taylor, Tenn.
Knutson	Michener	Rayburn	Temple
Lampert	Miller	Reber	Tilson
Lanham	Minahan, N. J.	Reed, N. Y.	Upshaw
Lankford	Mondell	Reed, W. Va.	Vaile
Larsen	Moore, Ohio	Rhodes	Venable
Lea, Calif.	Murphy	Rogers	Vestal
Lee, Ga.	Newton, Minn.	Rouse	Voigt
Leibach	Nicholls	Sabath	Volk
Lesher	Nolan	Sanders, Ind.	Ward
Linthicum	O'Connell	Sanders, N. Y.	Watson
Little	Ogden	Sanford	Weaver
Luce	Oliver	Schall	Welling
Lufkin	Osborne	Sells	Whaley
Lubring	Overstreet	Shreve	Wilson, La.
McAndrews	Padgett	Siegel	Wilson, Pa.
McArthur	Paigo	Sims	Woods, Va.
McDuffie	Park	Sinclair	Wright
McGlennon	Parker	Sinnott	Young, N. Dak.
McKeown	Parrish	Sisson	Young, Tex.
McKinley	Patterson	Slemp	Zihman
McLane	Pell	Smith, Idaho	

NAYS—121.

Anderson	Echols	Kendall	Rowe
Andrews, Md.	Edmonds	Kennedy, R. I.	Rucker
Andrews, Nebr.	Emerson	Kincheloe	Scott
Anthony	Evans, Nebr.	King	Sherwood
Ashbrook	Fairfield	Kraus	Snell
Beggs	Focht	Kreider	Snyder
Bland, Va.	Foster	Langley	Strong, Kans.
Blanton	French	Layton	Summers, Wash.
Boies	Goodall	McClintic	Sweet
Bowers	Goodykoontz	McFadden	Swindall
Bowling	Gould	MacGregor	Swope
Brand	Graham, Ill.	Mason	Tague
Briggs	Green, Iowa	Monahan, Wis.	Thompson
Brooks, Ill.	Griest	Montague	Tillman
Brooks, Pa.	Harrison	Moore, Va.	Timberlake
Browne	Haugen	Moore, Ind.	Tincher
Burroughs	Hersey	Mott	Tinkham
Butler	Hickey	Mudd	Towner
Campbell, Kans.	Hoch	Neely	Treadway
Cannon	Huddleston	Nelson, Mo.	Volstead
Cleary	Hullings	Nelson, Wis.	Wason
Coady	Husted	Oldfield	Welty
Cooper	Jacoway	Olney	White, Kans.
Cramton	James, Va.	Quin	White, Me.
Currie, Mich.	Johnson, Ky.	Reavis	Williams
Dale	Johnson, Miss.	Ricketts	Wingo
Dallinger	Johnson, S. Dak.	Riddick	Winslow
Dewalt	Johnson, Wash.	Robinson, N. C.	Wood, Ind.
Dickinson, Iowa	Jones, Pa.	Robson, Ky.	
Dominick	Jones, Tex.	Romjue	
Dowell	Kearns	Rose	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Greene, Mass.

NOT VOTING—87.

Bacharach	Ellsworth	Loneragan	Scully
Baer	Ferris	Longworth	Sears
Bankhead	Flood	McCulloch	Small
Bee	Gallagher	McKenzie	Smith, Mich.
Benham	Garner	McKinry	Steele
Bland, Mo.	Garrett	Maher	Steenerson
Brumbaugh	Goldfogle	Mann, Ill.	Stiness
Burke	Good	Mann, S. C.	Summers, Tex.
Cantrill	Goodwin, Ark.	Milligan	Taylor, Ark.
Casby	Graham, Pa.	Moon	Thomas
Clark, Mo.	Hamill	Mooney	Vare
Classon	Hamilton	Morin	Vinson
Costello	Hersman	Newton, Mo.	Walsh
Crowther	Hicks	O'Connor	Walters
Curry, Calif.	Hutchinson	Rainey, Ala.	Watkins
Davey	James, Mich.	Rainey, Henry T.	Webster
Dent	Johnston, N. Y.	Rainey, John W.	Wheeler
Dickinson, Mo.	Kennedy, Iowa	Riordan	Wilson, Ill.
Donovan	Kiess	Rodenberg	Wise
Doughton	Kitchin	Rowan	Woodyard
Dunn	Kleca	Rubey	Yates
Eagle	Lazaro	Sanders, La.	

So the motion was agreed to.
 The following additional pairs were announced:
 Until further notice:
 Mr. MANN of Illinois (for) with Mr. WALSH (against).
 Mr. GOOD with Mr. FLOOD.
 Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. LAZARO.
 Mr. NEWTON of Missouri with Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri.
 Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. BANKHEAD.
 Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.
 Mr. YATES with Mr. SUMMERS of Texas.
 Mr. MORIN with Mr. FERRIS.
 Mr. CROWTHER with Mr. WISE.
 Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. O'CONNOR.
 Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.

Mr. McCULLOCH with Mr. DENT.
 Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. SMALL.
 Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. KITCHIN.
 Mr. STINESS with Mr. VINSON.
 Mr. HICKS with Mr. GARRETT.
 Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. WATKINS.
 Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no."
 I am paired with the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. BANKHEAD, and I wish to withdraw that vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.
 The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 18: Page 16, line 8, strike out lines 8, 9, and 10, which read as follows: "For village delivery service in towns and villages having post offices of the second or third class, and in communities adjacent to cities having city delivery, \$1,500,000."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.
 The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.
 The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 19: Page 16, after line 13, insert:
 "Sec. 2. That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, at his discretion, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to loan to any State of the Union, when so requested by the highway department of the State, such tractors as are retained and not distributed under the act approved March 15, 1920, for use in highway construction by the highway department of such State: *Provided*, That all expenses for repairs and upkeep of tractors so loaned and the expenses of loading and freight shall be paid by the State, both in transfer to the State and the return to the Army."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.
 The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 20: Page 17, insert at the top of the page the following:

"Sec. 3. That the joint commission authorized under section 6 of the act approved April 24, 1920, entitled 'An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes,' is hereby continued until June 30, 1922, to complete the investigation and to prepare a detailed report containing a summary of its findings thereof, and such recommendations as to legislation as it may deem proper."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur, but before the vote is taken I wish to say that this commission was appointed during the last session of the Congress, and the life of the commission was to expire on the 4th of March next. The time allotted between the appointment of the commission and the 4th of March next is not nearly sufficient to enable the commission to function properly. The commission was organized for the purpose of investigating how we could expedite the handling, the dispatching, and the transportation of mail. It is conceded by people everywhere who have given consideration to the question that the time has come when there must be greater terminal facilities for handling the parcel post, and it seems that if those facilities are not supplied the first-class mail is bound to be more or less slowed up. The commission is now considering the question of not only how we can supply the facilities to handle the parcel post separately from the first-class mail but it is also considering many other things in connection with the expeditious dispatch of the mail. It is one of the most important functions that has ever been imposed upon a commission, and it is believed by all who have thought about it that good results will follow the investigation. I sincerely trust that the House will agree to extend the life of the commission so that it may really do the work for which it was authorized and selected.

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
 Mr. MADDEN. Yes.
 Mr. ROUSE. Can the gentleman inform the House what the cost of this commission has been up to the present time?
 Mr. MADDEN. \$48,487.69.
 Mr. ROUSE. How has that money been expended?
 Mr. MADDEN. The statement of expenses is as follows:

<i>Statement of expenses, Joint Commission on Postal Service.</i>	
Expense, May 17 to July 1	\$967.15
Expense, first quarter, including July, August, September	3,075.26
Expense, second quarter, including October, November, December	2,970.34
	7,012.75
Expenses for January, 1921 (salaries, incidentals)	609.77
Total expenses to Jan. 31, 1921	\$7,622.52
Engineers' services, Oct. 11 to Nov. 1	4,869.10
Engineers' services, Nov. 1 to Dec. 10	5,130.90
Engineers' services, Dec. 10 to Jan. 1	7,478.34
Total engineers' services (to Jan. 1, 1921)	17,478.34

Transportation charges for October-----	\$254.52
Transportation charges, Nov. 1 to Dec. 10-----	784.86
Transportation charges, Dec. 11 to Jan. 1-----	454.61
Total transportation charges, engineers (to Jan. 1, 1921)-----	\$1,493.99
Total-----	26,654.85
Engineers' services, Jan. 1 to Jan. 31-----	20,588.78
Transportation charges for January-----	1,244.06
Total engineers' service for January-----	21,832.84
Grand total-----	48,487.69

Mr. ROUSE. What engineers have been employed?

Mr. MADDEN. W. B. Richards & Co., of New York, I understand.

Mr. ROUSE. How many engineers have been employed?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know how many they have. I am not a member of the commission, but I understand they have whatever number it is thought will be necessary to expedite the work. It fluctuates from month to month.

Mr. ROUSE. Does the gentleman know how much money is being paid monthly?

Mr. MADDEN. I understand the highest paid engineers get \$1,000 a month and their railroad expenses, but no other expense, and the next lowest down to \$750 a month. That includes all of their expenses except railroad fare.

Mr. ROUSE. Does the gentleman believe these engineers can give more information regarding transportation than could be given by the post-office inspectors and other postal employees?

Mr. MADDEN. I really do not know just exactly what sort of information the engineers are giving. I am not qualified to answer the question. If I were a member of the commission I would be better qualified to answer it.

Mr. ROUSE. Will the gentleman yield to the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON]? Possibly he can give the House that information.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. STEENERSON. What is the question?

Mr. ROUSE. The question is, How many engineers are employed and what are the salaries paid to these engineers?

Mr. STEENERSON. I understand that Richards & Co., who are efficiency engineers in New York, have a large staff employed. I can not tell how many men they have in this work. It started only last October, and the work is in progress. Sometimes they have a great many men on the work and sometimes not so many. They have gone into a very elaborate investigation of the whole transportation system. They have investigated the congested conditions, especially in New York, with a view to determining whether or not the tunnel that was proposed by the department, to cost \$1,800,000, between the New York Central and the Pennsylvania Stations, was advisable. They have made a report saying that the tunnel would not relieve the situation, that the congestion is at the terminals and that building a tunnel would not help out any. They say that the terminals can not be extended because the New York Central terminal is sunk about 70 feet into the solid rock and the land on each side is so expensive that it can not be had at a reasonable price. It would be economically impossible to extend the terminals sufficiently to have space in which to move cars which would be required. They have suggested, as the gentleman from Illinois has said, a separation of the parcel-post mail from the first-class mail, and taking that another way. The recommendations of the engineers, I believe, could not be arrived at by anybody except engineers of that kind. The postal experts could not do it.

Mr. ROUSE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. ROUSE. Does the gentleman believe these engineers will get any information other than from postal employees?

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, yes; a great deal, and the postal employees are not at liberty to get at the facts.

Mr. ROUSE. If the gentleman will pardon me, the commission has the right to ask any question it wishes?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; and that is what the commission is doing?

Mr. ROUSE. Then why not save this money by—

Mr. STEENERSON. Because the post office employees could not do it; it would be absolutely impossible. They are no more fit for that than for physicians or surgeons.

Mr. ROUSE. Where do the engineers get the information, if not from postal employees?

Mr. STEENERSON. They get it from all sources; they go to the records. For instance, in their air-mail investigation they sent men to take the actual records of flying—

Mr. ROUSE. And they got that information from—

Mr. STEENERSON. At the local stations. Now, the Postmaster General reports 98 per cent in performance. The engineers sent men there to find out the instructions to the flyers, and so forth, and they find that the flyers have orders to make a start whenever they can, and many times they will start and come back in 15 or 20 minutes. The department calls that a performance if they only start, whereas a performance should only be counted when the trip is completed. In this way they report 98 per cent performance, when in fact there was only 55 per cent performance on the New York to Chicago test. I want to make a few general remarks, if the gentleman will excuse me. This provision was considered by the Post Office Committee, discussed, and it was canvassed in every way, and a unanimous report was made recommending its passage. It is now on the calendar, so the Post Office Committee has recommended the enactment of this identical provision, and I do not think there is any division of opinion. There is no doubt in my mind that if this commission is given further time it will save many millions in the economic administration of the Postal Service. This is no reflection on the Postal Service at all. The best business houses in the United States are employing men like these that are being employed to suggest improvements in methods and economies—the Steel Corporation, the Westinghouse Co., and many others.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will yield.

Mr. DUNBAR. How long will it take the commission before it finishes this work?

Mr. STEENERSON. I think the engineers may complete it in two or three months, and then the commission, of course, will have to meet and decide upon what recommendations to make.

Mr. DUNBAR. What will be the additional cost?

Mr. STEENERSON. The additional cost of what?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. DUNBAR. What will be the additional cost for the labor of the commission?

Mr. STEENERSON. I am unable to state the additional cost.

Mr. DUNBAR. Does the gentleman know how many are employed by this commission?

Mr. STEENERSON. No; nobody knows, because the number varies from day to day as they are undertaking investigations.

Mr. DUNBAR. Well, approximately how many?

Mr. STEENERSON. Perhaps 20 or 25.

Mr. DUNBAR. Well, under whose direction are they, the Postmaster General?

Mr. STEENERSON. They operate under the commission. Senator TOWNSEND is chairman of the commission, and I have the honor to be the vice chairman. The active chairman is Senator TOWNSEND, of Michigan, and he is looking after it very minutely.

Mr. DUNBAR. And they work under your directions?

Mr. STEENERSON. They work under the direction of this commission. All these are employees of the commission. We also have advisory counsel, consisting of men who are prominent in business in the large cities.

Mr. ROUSE. In the gentleman's remarks will he place the names of this advisory counsel so it will appear in the RECORD?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will place them in the RECORD. It has been changed. Former Secretary of Commerce Redfield was on the advisory counsel for a long time, but he recently resigned; but I can supply the names. They are as follows:

Advisory counsel of the Postal Service Commission: John Gribbel, Philadelphia, Pa., chairman; Charles G. Bancroft, Boston, Mass.; Union N. Bethell, New York, N. Y.; A. Holmboe, Crookston, Minn.; T. W. Dwight, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; I. C. Wade, Cornelia, Ga.; M. E. Cooley, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman refer to me or to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. BLACK. Perhaps the gentleman from Illinois can give the information. When this commission was created, the law provided that the pay of these engineers and other employees should come out of any unexpended balance of the Post Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1920?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Now, I presume if we give the commission life for another year that that provision will still continue and these employees under the commission will be paid out of any unexpended balance for the fiscal year 1920?

Mr. MADDEN. This provision does not change the law at all.

Mr. BLACK. Can the gentleman give any information as to what is that unexpended balance of the department for the year?

Mr. MADDEN. I have not the slightest idea.

Mr. BLACK. Did the committee inquire what the probable cost would be for the continuance of this commission for another year?

Mr. MADDEN. Nobody could tell exactly, because no one can tell how extensive an investigation along a given line will be; but I wish to say in answer to the question of the gentleman that if they can do the work I think ought to be done by the commission and the results are obtained that I think would be obtained, it would not make any difference how much money they spent, it would be money well spent, but I assume they would not spend over \$150,000.

Mr. BLACK. Does not the gentleman think that in a matter of this kind, in the creation of a commission, there ought to be some recommendation of the amount of money that they can spend?

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, if you put a limitation on you may embarrass the work. I apprehend the purpose we have in mind is to facilitate the work; to get the information; to adjust the conditions; to provide for more expeditious movement of the mail; to see that it is handled, dispatched, and transported more rapidly; to see that the first-class mail gets priority, and, in fact, to do everything that can be done to make the Post Office Department function better than it has functioned in the past.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment. After the word "proper," at the end of the Senate amendment, add the following:

Provided, That said commission shall not expend a greater sum than \$150,000 during the fiscal year 1922.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] made a preferential motion that the House recede and concur.

Mr. BLACK. Is it not in order to amend the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The motion to recede and concur has preference.

Mr. BLACK. Then I ask that the motion be divided.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has a right to do that. He demands a division. The question is on receding.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLACK. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLACK to the Senate amendment: After the word "proper," at the end of the amendment, insert: "*Provided*, That said commission shall not expend a greater sum than \$150,000 during the fiscal year 1922."

Mr. MADDEN. I accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Then the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment as amended.

The Senate amendment as amended was agreed to.

CONSULAR AND DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 15872, the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts calls up a conference report, which the Clerk will read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15872) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 20, and 35.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 15, 21, and 24, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$379,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of

the sum proposed insert "\$403,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "\$5,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$18,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the matter inserted by said amendment commencing with the word "*Provided*," in line 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That the deed of transfer of said property to the United States shall be unconditional and free from encumbrance and shall convey such estate as may be held by the said J. Pierpont Morgan: *And provided further*, That the property is held on freehold tenure and not on customary London ground lease"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,874,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,909,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendments: Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, 27, 30, 32, 33, 34, and 36.

JOHN JACOB ROGERS,
J. A. ELSTON,
JNO. H. SMALL,
Managers on the part of the House.

H. C. LODGE,
W. E. BORA (by H. C. L.),
CLAUDE A. SWANSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15872) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying report as to each of the said amendments, namely:

On Nos. 6 and 7: Appropriates \$403,600, instead of \$378,000, as proposed by the House, and \$428,600, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries in the Diplomatic Service.

On No. 8: Strikes out the increase of \$180,000, inserted by the Senate, in the appropriation for clerks at embassies and legations.

On No. 15: Reduces from \$10,000 to \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico.

On Nos. 16 and 17, relating to the International Institute for Agriculture: Appropriates \$5,000 for the salary of one member of the permanent committee, instead of \$3,000, as proposed by the House, and \$7,500, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the appropriations, inserted by the Senate, of \$2,500 for a secretary and \$2,500 for traveling expenses.

On Nos. 20 and 21: Strikes out the increase of \$12,000, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for expenses of the International Joint Commission, United States and Great Britain, and inserts the proviso, proposed by the Senate, authorizing expenditures for rent in the District of Columbia if space can not be furnished in other governmental buildings under the control of the Public Buildings Commission.

On Nos. 24 and 25: Inserts a substitute for the language proposed by the Senate and the language proposed by the House, for the acceptance of the gift of the London residence of J.

Pierpont Morgan for use as the residence of the diplomatic representatives of the United States.

On Nos. 28 and 29: Appropriates \$1,900,500, instead of \$1,809,500, as proposed by the House, and \$2,009,500, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries of the Consular Service.

On No. 31: Appropriates \$1,400,000, instead of \$1,200,000, as proposed by the House, and \$1,800,000, as proposed by the Senate, for allowance for clerk hire at United States consulates.

On No. 35: Strikes out the appropriation of \$66,000, inserted by the Senate, for relief of the contributors to the Ellen M. Stone ransom fund.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendments of the Senate:

On Nos. 1 to 5, inclusive: Providing for an ambassador to Turkey at \$17,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of at \$10,000 as proposed by the House.

On No. 9: Appropriating \$39,500 for salaries of interpreters to embassies and legations.

On No. 10: Appropriating \$1,800 for quarters for student interpreters at embassies.

On No. 11: Appropriating \$4,500 to pay one year's salary to the widow of Jay White, late consul to Naples, Italy.

On No. 12: Appropriating \$4,000 to pay one year's salary to the widow of Edward Higgins, late consul to Bahia, Brazil.

On Nos. 13 and 14: Providing for authority to pay for transporting to their homes the remains of clerks in the Diplomatic and Consular Service who die abroad or in transit.

On No. 18: Appropriating \$2,000 for the Bureau of Interparliamentary Union for Promotion of International Arbitration.

On No. 19: Appropriating \$25,000 for the United States Section of the Inter-American High Commission.

On No. 22: Appropriating \$2,658 for expenses of the International Research Council.

On Nos. 23, 26, and 27: Appropriating \$300,000 for the acquisition of embassy, legation, and consular buildings and grounds and creating a commission to supervise the expenditure of that sum.

On No. 30: Appropriating \$500,000 for post allowances to diplomatic and consular officers.

On Nos. 32 and 33: Extending indefinitely the provisions of the passport control act of May 22, 1918, in so far as they relate to passports and visés of aliens coming to the United States and making the appropriation for the execution of the act "immediately available."

On No. 34: Appropriating \$41,300 for expenses of embassies, legations, or consular offices, not otherwise provided for in the bill.

On No. 36: Appropriating \$7,425 for expenses of the Sixteenth International Congress against Alcoholism.

JOHN JACOB ROGERS,
J. A. ELSTON,
JNO. H. SMALL,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no disposition to curtail discussion of the conference report, but I think there is not anything within the report itself which is likely to excite very much discussion. And while I shall be glad to yield to any questions, I propose to move the previous question at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I will.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not read the report. Does the gentleman agree to the Senate amendment which was under discussion when the bill was before the House a few days ago?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, what is the idea of rushing it through without any discussion at all?

Mr. ROGERS. There is no idea, as I just explained. If the gentleman has any questions to ask I shall be pleased to answer them. I assumed that the comments of the Members would more naturally arise in connection with matters on which a separate vote is required under the rules of the House. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to hear the gentleman from where I sat. What is the conference report? Will my colleague tell me? Is it on the passport bill?

Mr. ROGERS. The conference report deals only with the items as to which the conferees have power to agree. The passport item, to which the gentleman refers, will be presented for a separate vote a little later.

Mr. MASON. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first five amendments may be reported and considered together. They relate entirely to one specific question, and they more naturally should be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the first five Senate amendments be read and considered together. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1: Page 2, line 4, strike out the word "and" before the word "Spain."

Amendment No. 2: Insert, after the word "Spain," line 4, page 2, the words "and Turkey."

Amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 5, strike out "\$210,000" and insert "\$227,500."

Amendment No. 4: Page 2, line 7, strike out the language: "For ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Turkey, \$10,000."

Amendment No. 5: Page 2, line 25, strike out "\$566,000" and insert "\$583,500."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede from the House disagreement to the five Senate amendments, and agree to the same. I will say in explanation that when this bill passed the House it provided a salary of \$10,000 for our ambassador to Turkey. All our other ambassadors receive a salary of \$17,500, and ever since an embassy was created in Turkey that ambassador has received a salary of \$17,500. As in the view of the Senate, the salaries of all ambassadors should be made uniform, the Senate adopted the amendments which have just been reported and which reestablish the salary at \$17,500.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is the total in the bill as it passed the House wrong, or is the total in the bill as it passed the Senate wrong? They do not jibe. The gentleman adds \$7,500 by way of appropriation. The total adds \$17,500. Of course, it is not important, but we might as well be accurate.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. They did not have Turkey in there at all in the first item.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I am not speaking of the first item. I am speaking of the total at the bottom of the page—amendment No. 5.

Mr. ROGERS. I think the gentleman's point is entirely sound, and I suspect that the correct figure is \$573,500 instead of \$583,500.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman can move to concur in all the Senate amendments with an amendment to amendment No. 5.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the first four amendments and to concur with an amendment to Senate amendment No. 5, so that the figures will be "\$573,500" instead of "\$583,500."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to concur in the first four amendments and to concur with an amendment to Senate amendment No. 5, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 5: Strike out "\$583,500" and insert "\$573,500."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the five amendments.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 9: Page 4, after line 9, insert:

"SALARIES, INTERPRETERS TO EMBASSIES AND LEGATIONS.

"Interpreter to legation and consulate general to Persia, \$2,000;
"Interpreter to legation and consulate general to Bangkok, Siam, \$2,000;

"For 10 student interpreters at the legation to China, who shall be citizens of the United States, and whose duty it shall be to study the Chinese language with a view to supplying interpreters to the legation and consulates in China, at \$1,500 each, \$15,000: *Provided*, That the method of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as an interpreter at the legation or consulates in China so long as his services may be required within a period of five years;

"For the payment of the cost of tuition of student interpreters in China, at the rate of \$350 per annum each, \$3,500;

"For six student interpreters at the embassy to Japan, who shall be citizens of the United States, and whose duty it shall be to study the Japanese language with a view to supplying interpreters to the embassy and consulates in Japan, at \$1,500 each, \$9,000: *Provided*, That the method of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as an interpreter at the embassy or consulates in Japan so long as his services may be required within a period of five years;

"For the payment of the cost of tuition of student interpreters at the embassy to Japan, at the rate of \$200 per annum each, \$1,200;

"For four student interpreters at the embassy to Turkey, who shall be citizens of the United States, and whose duty it shall be to study the language of Turkey and any other language that may be necessary to qualify them for service as interpreters to the embassy and consulates in Turkey, at \$1,500 each, \$6,000: *Provided*, That the method of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as an interpreter to the embassy and consulates in Turkey so long as his services may be required within a period of five years;

"For the payment of the cost of tuition of student interpreters at the embassy to Turkey, at the rate of \$200 per annum each, \$800;

"No person drawing the salary of interpreter or student interpreter as above provided shall be allowed any part of the salary appropriated for any secretary of legation or other officer;

"Total, \$39,500."

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. ROGERS. Certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. This is simply the restoration of items that went out in the House on points of order?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the proportion of the amendments brought back under the rule seems rather large; but the fact is that 13 of the 22 amendments brought back under the rule result from the fact that on technical points of order items which were essential to the foreign service and which had been carried for many years in the bill went out in the House. We are attempting in this indirect way to restore the havoc that was wrought. I move the previous question on the amendments.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, that the House recede and concur.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 23, noes 1.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees. As many as favor the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the House recede and concur will answer "yea" when their names are called; those opposed will answer "nay." The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 317, nays 4, answered "present" 1, not voting 106, as follows:

YEAS—317.

Ackerman	Collier	Glynn	Kettner
Almon	Connally	Godwin, N. C.	Kinchee
Anderson	Cooper	Good	King
Andrews, Nebr.	Copley	Goodykoontz	Kinkaid
Anthony	Crago	Gould	Knudson
Ashbrook	Cramton	Graham, Ill.	Kraus
Aswell	Crisp	Green, Iowa	Kreider
Babka	Cullen	Greene, Vt.	Lampert
Barbour	Currie, Mich.	Griest	Langley
Barkley	Dale	Griffin	Lanham
Bee	Dallinger	Hadley	Lankford
Begg	Darrow	Hardy, Colo.	Larsen
Bell	Davis, Minn.	Hardy, Tex.	Layton
Benham	Davis, Tenn.	Harrell	Lea, Calif.
Benson	Dempsey	Harrison	Lee, Ga.
Black	Denison	Hastings	Lehbach
Bland, Ind.	Dickinson, Iowa	Haugen	Linthicum
Bland, Va.	Dickinson, Mo.	Hawley	Little
Boise	Dominick	Hayden	Longworth
Bowers	Doelling	Hernandez	Luce
Bowling	Dowell	Hersey	Lubring
Box	Drane	Hickey	McAndrews
Brand	Drewry	Hicks	McArthur
Briggs	Dunbar	Hoch	McClintic
Brinson	Dupré	Hoyer	McCulloch
Brooks, Ill.	Dyer	Houghton	McDuffie
Brooks, Pa.	Eagan	Howard	McKenzie
Buchanan	Echols	Hudspeth	McKeown
Burdick	Edmonds	Hull, Iowa	McKinley
Burke	Elliott	Humphreys	McLane
Burroughs	Elston	Husted	McLaughlin, Mich.
Byrnes, S. C.	Emerson	Hutchinson	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Byrns, Tenn.	Esch	Igou	McLeod
Campbell, Kans.	Evans, Mont.	Ireland	McPherson
Campbell, Pa.	Evans, Nebr.	Jacoway	MacGregor
Candler	Fairfield	James, Va.	Magee
Cannon	Fess	Jeffers	Major
Cantrill	Fields	Johnson, Ky.	Mann, Ill.
Caraway	Flood	Johnson, Miss.	Mansfield
Carew	Focht	Johnson, S. Dak.	Mapes
Carrs	Fordney	Johnson, Wash.	Mason
Carter	Foster	Jones, Pa.	Mays
Chindblom	Freeman	Juul	Mead
Christopherson	French	Kearns	Merritt
Clark, Fla.	Fuller	Keller	Mitchener
Cleary	Gallivan	Kelly, Pa.	Miller
Coady	Ganly	Kendall	Minahan, N. J.
Cole	Garrett	Kennedy, R. I.	Monahan, Wis.

Mondell	Radeliffe	Sisson	Upshaw
Montague	Raker	Slomp	Vaile
Moore, Ohio	Ramseyer	Small	Venable
Moore, Va.	Randall, Calif.	Smith, Idaho	Vestal
Moore, Ind.	Randall, Wis.	Smith, Ill.	Vinson
Mudd	Ransley	Smith, N. Y.	Voigt
Murphy	Rayburn	Smithwick	Volk
Neely	Reavis	Snell	Volstead
Nelson, Mo.	Reber	Stegall	Walsh
Nelson, Wis.	Reed, N. Y.	Stedman	Ward
Newton, Minn.	Rhodes	Steenerson	Wason
Newton, Mo.	Ricketts	Stephens, Miss.	Watkins
O'Connell	Robinson, N. C.	Stephens, Ohio	Watson
O'Connor	Robison, Ky.	Stoll	Welling
Ogden	Rodenberg	Strong, Kans.	Whaley
Oliver	Rogers	Strong, Pa.	White, Kans.
Olney	Ronjue	Sullivan	White, Me.
Osborn	Rose	Summers, Wash.	Wilson, Ill.
Oversstreet	Rouse	Summers, Tex.	Wilson, La.
Overgett	Rowe	Sweet	Wilson, Pa.
Paige	Rucker	Swindall	Wingo
Park	Sabath	Swope	Winslow
Parker	Sanders, Ind.	Tague	Wood, Ind.
Parrish	Sanford	Temple	Woods, Va.
Patterson	Schall	Thompson	Woodyard
Pell	Scott	Tillman	Wright
Perlman	Sells	Tilson	Young, N. Dak.
Peters	Shreve	Timberlake	Young, Tex.
Porter	Siegel	Tincher	Zihlman
Pou	Sims	Tinkham	
Purnell	Sinclair	Towner	
Quinn	Sinnott	Treadway	

NAYS—4.

Blanton Huddleston Jones, Tex. Sherwood

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Greene, Mass.

NOT VOTING—106.

Andrews, Md.	Ferris	Kleezka	Riordan
Ayres	Fish	Lazaro	Rowan
Bacharach	Fisher	Leshner	Rubey
Baer	Frear	Loneragan	Sanders, La.
Bankhead	Gallagher	Lufkin	Sanders, N. Y.
Bland, Mo.	Gandy	McFadden	Scully
Britten	Gard	McGlennon	Scars
Browne	Garner	McKiniry	Smith, Mich.
Brumbaugh	Goldfogle	Madden	Snyder
Butler	Goodall	Maher	Steele
Caldwell	Goodwin, Ark.	Mann, S. C.	Stevenson
Casey	Graham, Pa.	Martin	Stines
Clark, Mo.	Hamill	Milligan	Taylor, Ark.
Claason	Hamilton	Moon	Taylor, Colo.
Costello	Hays	Mooney	Taylor, Tenn.
Crowther	Hersman	Morin	Thomas
Curry, Calif.	Hill	Mott	Vare
Davey	Holland	Nicholls	Walters
Dent	Hullings	Nolan	Weaver
Dewalt	Hull, Tenn.	Oldfield	Webster
Donovan	James, Mich.	Phelan	Welty
Doremus	Johnston, N. Y.	Rainey, Ala.	Wheeler
Doughton	Kahn	Rainey, Henry T.	Williams
Dunn	Kelley, Mich.	Rainey, John W.	Wise
Eagle	Kennedy, Iowa	Ramsey	Yates
Ellsworth	Kiss	Reed, W. Va.	
Evans, Nev.	Kitchin	Riddick	

So the motion to recede and concur was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

- Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. HAMILL.
- Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.
- Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. BANKHEAD.
- Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.
- Mr. YATES with Mr. RUBEY.
- Mr. WILLIAMS with Mr. KITCHIN.
- Mr. BUTLER with Mr. STEELE.
- Mr. GOODALL with Mr. MANN of South Carolina.
- Mr. RIDDICK with Mr. AYRES.
- Mr. SNYDER with Mr. LAZARO.
- Mr. NOLAN with Mr. HERSMAN.
- Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. GARD.
- Mr. MADDEN with Mr. FISHER.
- Mr. FISH with Mr. CASEY.
- Mr. HAYS with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.
- Mr. SANDERS of New York with Mr. OLDFIELD.
- Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland with Mr. WELTY.
- Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.
- Mr. BRITTON with Mr. MARTIN.
- Mr. STINES with Mr. PHELAN.
- Mr. MCFADDEN with Mr. NICHOLLS.
- Mr. FREAR with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.
- Mr. BROWNE with Mr. DOUGHTON.
- Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. WEAVER.
- Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.
- Mr. HILL with Mr. STEVENSON.
- Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. HOLLAND.
- Mr. MOTT with Mr. LESHER.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I am paired with the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. BANKHEAD, so I wish to withdraw my vote and to answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 10: Page 6, in line 12, insert:

"QUARTERS FOR STUDENT INTERPRETERS AT EMBASSIES.

"For rent of quarters for the student interpreters attached to the embassy to Japan, \$1,200.

"For rent of quarters for the student interpreters attached to the embassy to Turkey, \$600.

"Total, \$1,800."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede from the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendment and concur in the same.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I call the attention of the gentleman to the typographical error in line 13 in the misspelling of the word "attached." I think the gentleman would like to have that corrected.

Mr. ROGERS. I ask unanimous consent that the typographical error in line 13 be corrected.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that it is correct in the engrossed copy.

Mr. ROGERS. I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of getting a record of it, I demand a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 153, noes 1.

Accordingly the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 11: Page 9, line 19, insert:

"PAYMENT TO MRS. ANNA GALE WHITE.

"To Mrs. Anna Gale White, widow of Jay White, late consul to Naples, Italy, \$4,500, one year's salary of her deceased husband, who died while at his post of duty from illness incurred in the Consular Service."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is it the policy now to pay the widow of a diplomatic or consular officer who dies in the service a year's salary?

Mr. ROGERS. It is not the settled policy. The gratuity, if you care to call it that, has been reserved for cases of real want, established in the given case. I am advised by the Department of State and through personal friends of the widow in this particular case that really straitened circumstances exist. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the House recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 12: Page 10, line 1, insert:

"PAYMENT TO MRS. MARY A. HIGGINS.

"To Mrs. Mary A. Higgins, widow of Edward Higgins, late consul to Bahia, Brazil, \$4,000, one year's salary of her deceased husband, who died while at his post of duty from illness incurred in the Consular Service."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 13: Page 10, line 7, after the word "assistants," insert "and clerks."

Mr. ROGERS. I move to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 14: Page 10, line 11, after the word "assistants," insert "and clerks."

Mr. ROGERS. I move to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 18: Page 16, line 1, insert:

"BUREAU OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION FOR PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

"For the contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of International Arbitration at Brussels, Belgium, \$2,000."

Mr. ROGERS. I move to recede and concur.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is this the Mexican-boundary amendment?

Mr. ROGERS. No; this is the Interparliamentary Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 19: Page 18, line 1, insert:

"UNITED STATES SECTION OF THE INTER-AMERICAN HIGH COMMISSION.

"To defray the actual and necessary expenses on the part of the United States section of the Inter-American High Commission, \$25,000; to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State."

Mr. ROGERS. I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 22: Page 19, line 22, insert:

"INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL.

"To pay the annual share of the United States, as an adhering member of the International Research Council and of the Associated Unions, organized at Brussels, July 18-28, 1919, as follows: International Research Council, \$129; International Astronomical Union, \$772; International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry, \$290; International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, \$1,338; International Union of Mathematics, \$129; in all, \$2,668, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State."

Mr. ROGERS. I move to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments 23, 26, and 27 be reported and considered together, they being a unit in their effect.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that amendments 23, 26, and 27 be considered together. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Reserving the right to object, what are these amendments?

Mr. ROGERS. They are three amendments that relate to the acquisition of buildings for legations, embassies, and consulates.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Does one of these amendments relate to the Morgan home in London?

Mr. ROGERS. The Morgan home is disposed of by the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I object.

Mr. ROGERS. I ask that the Clerk report amendment No. 23.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 23: Page 21, line 9, strike out the words "legation building and grounds at San Salvador."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the acquisition of embassy, legation, or consular buildings and grounds at any or all of the following places: Rome, Brussels, Berlin, Christiania, Athens, Belgrade, Bucharest, Prague, Monrovia, Vienna, Budapest, Canton, Hankow, and Amoy, \$300,000: *Provided*, That the limit of cost shall not exceed the sum of \$150,000 at any one place; *And provided further*, That such acquisition shall be subject to approval of the commission hereinafter constituted.

There is hereby constituted a commission composed of the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Treasury, of which the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate shall be the chairman, whose duty it shall be to consider and formulate plans or proposals for the purchase of embassy, legation, and consular buildings and grounds under the authority contained in this act.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. I make the point of order that my motion is preferential.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's motion may be divided.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks a division of the question. The question is on the motion to recede.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Now I move to amend the Senate amendment by striking out "\$300,000" and inserting "\$450,000."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LINTHICUM moves to amend the Senate amendment, in line 5 of the matter proposed by the Senate, by striking out the figures "\$300,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$450,000."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the amendment by striking out "\$450,000" and inserting "\$200,000."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MANN of Illinois offers an amendment to the amendment by striking out "\$450,000" and inserting "\$200,000."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I shall need the whole five minutes, but I do want to impress on the House that if there ever was a time in the history of this country and of the world when we had an opportunity to buy at a reasonable rate homes for embassies and consulates, now is that time. It was testified at the hearings that the mission in Berlin—and, in fact, I received a letter from the chairman of that mission that the embassy which formerly cost the Austrian Government \$1,500,000, \$750,000 for the purchase of the property and \$750,000 for repairs, reconstruction, and changes—could now be bought for \$75,000. I visited Berlin last year, I visited Prague, and I visited Vienna, and went into these matters fully with those in authority. If there ever was a time when we could procure property at a reasonable rate, now is the time to do it. I was greatly impressed and would love to sufficiently impress you with its importance. If we wait two or three years we will pay three or four times as much as we will have to pay now. With \$450,000 in Europe at the present rate of exchange we can almost get embassy buildings in Paris, Vienna, Prague, and all other capitals in Europe, having already provided for Paris and London. It is the best investment the Government could possibly make. I feel satisfied from my visit there that if you purchase even from a speculative standpoint it will be a wonderful investment. I do not want to say anything more except that now is the time to purchase embassies there. I have personally inspected it. I have visited those embassies, and have seen the great opportunity that is offered to this Government.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. What will it require to maintain the million and a half dollar building that the gentleman speaks of in normal times if normal times are reestablished?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I should think not as much as it costs to maintain the building that you are occupying at the present time in Wilhelm Platz in Berlin.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. That does not answer my question, for I do not know how much we are paying for that.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It will not cost anywhere near what it costs at present for the building we are renting which I mentioned. Certainly not more.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. If the building cost a million and a half dollars it must be a very elaborate building, better than we would care to construct. If we could get it for \$75,000 that would not mean that it would not be a great expense in normal times.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I saw the property we are now occupying in Wilhelm Platz and the cost of maintaining this building would not be as much as it costs to rent and maintain the building we are now occupying. I think it is a wonderful chance to purchase property.

Mr. PELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. PELL. Would not the adoption of the gentleman's amendment increase the number of places to which a comparatively poor man could be sent as a representative of the United States?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; that has been the trouble in the past, it was impossible to send a man as ambassador to these capitals who was not rich because the salary and allowances are too small to maintain him with the dignity and standing of our country under present conditions. Wealth must necessarily prevail no matter how brainy a man with inadequate means might be.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I did not make a point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland. I do not know whether it was subject to the point of order or not, but I am inclined to think it was. We have a law which provides in reference to making appropriations for the purchase of diplomatic and consular buildings abroad. That law says that not more than \$500,000 can be expended in any one year. Now, this bill already carries \$150,000 for an embassy building in Paris. The gentleman's amendment proposes to add \$450,000 to that, making a total of at least \$600,000, when under the law it can not be expended.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Congress made the law, did it not?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Congress made the law which governs the expenditure of money for the purchase of embassy buildings, and it says that the Government shall not expend more than \$500,000 in any one year. We may appropriate more money, but the law is not repealed, the law is not changed, and the Department of State can not expend it. What is the use of appropriating it?

Mr. LINTHICUM. This is a subsequent law to the other.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This is a mere appropriation. We can appropriate a billion dollars, perhaps, but the law says that the Secretary of State or the State Department or the Government shall not expend more than \$500,000 in any one year for this purpose. To appropriate more money is idle, although that is not the only reason I am opposed to it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I did not think so.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; I have not yet gone plumb crazy on the subject.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I think I can state with some confidence that the Senate amendment was limited to \$300,000 for the precise reason suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. There is a separate provision of \$150,000 for Paris carried in this bill. The Paris item and this, combined, appropriate \$450,000. In the face of the Lowden Act it seemed inadvisable to attempt to exceed the \$500,000, whether it would have been valid or not to do so.

I quite agree with what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] has said as to the extraordinary opportunity that is now presented to the country to acquire embassies, legations, and consulates abroad. We pay in rent for the offices of our ministers something like \$150,000 a year, much of which can be saved by the adoption of this amendment, all of which can perhaps be saved by continuing the program which is inaugurated in this amendment. The question of exchange has never been so favorable to any country as it is to the United States to-day. A dollar of American money will go as far as \$50 or even \$100 in purchasing property of this kind in some of the principal capitals of the world.

In addition to that, many countries owe us large sums of money. We expect them to pay and we believe that they will pay; but I assume there is no doubt that there will be a considerable lapse of time before some of them will be physically able to pay in full. We believe those countries will be delighted to turn over to the United States a suitable embassy building or legation building or consulate building in exchange for a credit upon their debt of the fair purchase price of that property, not to exceed \$150,000. We thought there ought to be some money available for certain countries that do not owe us. It will be noticed that in the list of authorized cities appears Christiania, where we should have a suitable building. Norway is not in the debt of the United States, but we should acquire a legation in her capital city.

I hope that the House will disagree to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] the effect of which would be to reduce the available amount from \$300,000 to \$200,000. Three hundred thousand dollars spent at this time and in this way will bring us an enormous return upon the investment. I think that the utility of the measure will be considerably impaired if there is a reduction such as proposed by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield three minutes more to me?

Mr. ROGERS. Has the gentleman something further to submit?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have.

Mr. ROGERS. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I want to say, as to the Lowden Act, that this is an entirely new proposition, and it seems to me that whatever law we pass to-day not in accord with the Lowden Act will supersede that act in so far as the purchase of embassies is concerned. If gentlemen will notice, the bill establishes a commission and provides that such acquisition shall be subject to the approval of the commission herein created. In other words, we constitute a commission which shall purchase those embassies, and no embassy can be purchased without the sanction of the commission. It is an entirely new proposition. Congress enacted the Lowden Act and Congress can supersede the Lowden Act by the new legislation.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LINTHICUM) there were—ayes 12, noes 131.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 27: Page 23, line 8, insert the following:

"With the approval of said commission and within a limit of cost at any one place of \$150,000, the Secretary of State shall have power to purchase from any foreign Government suitable embassy, legation, and consular buildings and grounds in any city specified in the foregoing paragraph and to effect payment therefor by causing the purchase price thereof to be credited upon the obligations or debts of such Government then held by or owing to the United States, or by causing a part of such purchase price so to be credited, paying the remainder in money from applicable sums hereinbefore appropriated for the acquisition of embassy, legation, and consular buildings and grounds; and when the Secretary of State shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury that a purchase has been made, the Government from which made, and that a part or all of the purchase price is to be paid by crediting the same upon obligations or debts of said Government then held by or owing to the United States, the date as of which said payment is to be made and the amount in United States dollars so to be credited, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to credit the amount so certified upon unpaid principal or interest of obligations or debts of said foreign Government held by the United States: *And provided further*, That the President is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to accept on behalf of the United States unconditional gifts of land, buildings, furniture, and furnishings, or any of them, for the use of diplomatic and consular offices and residences."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede from the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendment and concur in the same with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROGERS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 27, and agree to the same with the following amendment: Strike out line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment and all of line 5 of said matter up to and including the word "paragraph," and in lieu thereof insert the following: "Suitable buildings or buildings and grounds for embassy, legation, and consular purposes, separate or combined, in any city specified in connection with the foregoing appropriation of \$300,000."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the reference in the amendment as sent to the Clerk's desk is to the printed copy of the Senate amendments; but in the bill which is in the hands of Members it applies to lines 11 and 12 of page 23. The principal effect of the amendment is to take care of an erroneous reference to the words "the foregoing paragraph," which appears in the text.

The reference to "the foregoing paragraph" was correct as the bill was originally prepared; but a new paragraph was created, so that the reference should now be to the paragraph prior to the preceding paragraph.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that a proposition like that involved in these two amendments ought to go through the House without any explanation of them at all. This bill creates a new executive commission, composed of Members of the legislative bodies. I have never been enthusiastic about creating any commission of Congress to do executive or administrative work. I think the executive and legislative authorities ought to be in separate hands. One of the amendments has already been agreed to, the one creating a new commission, consisting of the chairman and the ranking minority members of the two Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees of the House and Senate, to make plans with reference to public buildings, to buy public buildings abroad, make any sort of trade they want to without even so far, as I now recall, as making a report to anybody on earth.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I will.

Mr. RAYBURN. I want to know what the gentleman from Illinois thinks about the policy of the United States Government, beginning at this early date, being paid by the Governments that owe it by these chips and whetstones that they bring in here? Does not the gentleman think that it would be much better policy for the United States Government to allow the Governments that owe us to pay the money and then pay the money out for anything we want to buy in those countries?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, I think it is a very great lack of dignity on the part of a great Government like ours, which has immense sums of money due us from other Governments, to try to dicker with them as to whether they will get \$150,000 or \$50,000 to be paid out of the millions and hundreds of millions due us. I think it is beneath our dignity. [Applause.] If any-

body is going to do it at all, I do not think the dickerer ought to be done by a portion of the legislative branch of the Government composed into an executive commission. I do not think it ought to pass without some statement made in its behalf on the floor of the House, as it is such an unusual thing to come before us.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad, in compliance with the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], to offer an explanation of the viewpoint of the conferees in presenting the motion in reference to this Senate amendment that the House recede and concur with only a technical amendment. The Senate amendment originated with a Member of this body. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has introduced a bill which is almost identical with this amendment. Members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs have deemed this a suitable piece of legislation, although I am not aware that they have taken any formal action as a committee. Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] suggests, forcibly, as his suggestions always are forcible, that it is not desirable for a committee of Congress to be involved in an undertaking of this nature.

This was the viewpoint of gentlemen of the House who are interested in this proposal: The House of Representatives has always been reluctant to bestow upon the Secretary of State or any other individual any considerable degree of authority to buy embassies or legations. The House of Representatives has repeatedly expressed the opinion, both in debate and by vote, that the Congress should retain control of these expenditures; that we should not appropriate a blanket sum, \$200,000, \$300,000, or \$500,000, and turn it over to the Department of State to do what it likes with it in the acquisition of these properties. It is not material at this moment whether or not that viewpoint is correct; but I think it has been the declared viewpoint of the House of Representatives. In drawing up this amendment it seemed to us that it would be a proper thing and a safeguarding thing if we should provide that any action taken by the Secretary of State on these matters should be subject to the control and subject to a veto of a commission of which more than half the membership was made up of Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

You will notice the language of the proposal that is now pending, "With the approval of said commission and within a limit of cost at any one place of \$150,000, the Secretary of State shall have power to purchase from any foreign Government," and so forth, these suitable buildings. That commission is to be made up of six members. The chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is the chairman of the commission. The ranking minority member is the second member. The chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs is the third member, and the ranking minority member of the same committee is the fourth member. The Secretary of State is added to it, and because the transaction involves the assets of the United States the Secretary of the Treasury is also made a member of the commission. Four out of the six are members of one or the other Houses of Congress. We thought that this proposal would be approved by the House and that it was free from substantial objection. The Secretary of State will have the duty of negotiating. He will bring back a report to this commission who will say "yes" or "no." The actual negotiations will inevitably and properly be in the hands of the Secretary of State, but Members of Congress will control and will determine whether the decision of the Secretary of State shall prevail.

Mr. GARRETT and Mr. CONNALLY rose.

Mr. ROGERS. I yield first to the gentleman from Texas, who was on his feet.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts this. On page 24 the Senate amendment contains this language:

Provided further, That the President is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to accept in behalf of the United States unconditional gifts of land, buildings, furniture, and furnishings, or any of them, for the use of diplomatic and consular offices and residences.

Is not the Government able to buy furnishings and furniture? And why does the committee have to agree to an amendment of that kind?

Mr. ROGERS. The Government, of course, is able to buy furniture, but the gentleman from Texas knows perfectly well that this very Capitol Building is filled with objects of art and decoration which were donated by patriotic citizens. Now, is it sensible, before a beautiful vase, such as stands in the Speaker's lobby here, can be accepted as a part of the furnishings of some public building, that the Congress must pass upon and authorize that individual gift?

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman is putting a rather large area in his question. I would say that the amendment certainly covers a large ground in accepting gifts and—

Mr. ROGERS. I am frank to say that I regard that last proviso as not an essential part of this amendment. But I do not see any danger involved in putting the authority in the hands of the President of the United States.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT. On page 23 it reads:

With the approval of said commission and within a limit of cost at any one place of \$150,000 the Secretary of State shall have power to purchase from any foreign Government suitable embassy, legation, and consular buildings and grounds in any city specified in the foregoing paragraph and to effect payment therefor by causing the purchase price thereof to be credited upon the obligations or debts of such Government then held by or owing to the United States.

And so on. Is it intended that the right to purchase shall be limited to a purchase from the foreign Government?

Mr. ROGERS. Is it intended that this sort of transaction should be possible? Suppose in the city of Berlin the Austro-Hungarian Government owned in years past an embassy. Germany, we will assume, does not owe us money. Austro-Hungary, we will assume, does owe us money. This language is intended to permit the acquisition from Austria of that building in Berlin.

Mr. GARRETT. Well, the power to purchase would be confined under this to purchase from a Government?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes; under this language. The \$300,000 dealt with in amendment 26, of course, would have no such limitation.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I want to say to the gentleman that I see on page 11 where the conference committee struck out the \$10,000 from the bill and substituted \$5,000 for the protection of the Mexican boundary. I want to know if the gentleman's committee is willing to assume the responsibility of destroying that commission?

Mr. ROGERS. It does not destroy the commission.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It absolutely does. You can not finance the same for \$5,000.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CONNALLY. I would like if the gentleman would yield to my colleague from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. I would like three minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have been of the opinion for some time that the countries that owe us money would start in some way to pay that money to us and relieve themselves of that obligation in a way that would not benefit us, but I had no idea that a monstrous proposition like this would find any support here or elsewhere. I want to warn the Members of this House at this time and to let them understand the sea upon which they are embarking by adopting such amendments as this. To think of the great Government of the United States accepting in payment of the obligations due it from other Governments a dicker for a piece of real estate in the capitals of some of these countries. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that if I ever saw a proposition in my life that was beneath the dignity of a great Government like this, this amendment 27 entirely covers it. They will want to be selling us some barren island somewhere for an immense sum to cover the obligations that they now owe us. This is the entering wedge, and I want this House to understand that when it votes upon this question.

Listen to the amendment that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] called attention to:

And provided further, That the President is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to accept on behalf of the United States unconditional gifts—

Not of paintings, not of vases, not of little matters like that, but of lands and buildings. I never in all my life saw such an opportunity for the humiliation of a great Government as is contained in this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas is getting very much excited over a creation of his own imagination. It has been habitual on the part of the United States Congress to authorize the acceptance of gifts. I have some of the precedents in my hand. We occupy a legation at Bangkok that was presented to us by the Emperor of Siam. We occupy a building in Morocco that was presented to us by the Emperor of Morocco. We occupy a consulate in Tahiti that was pre-

ented to us by the reigning queen of the islands. If it is true that in the past we deemed it proper to accept gifts from potentates, why is it ignominious now for us to accept gifts from American citizens who, in the opinion of the President of the United States, seek to present to us objects which it is desirable for the United States to possess? Time and time again within my brief service in the House we have authorized the acceptance of gifts of various kinds and of great value. We have authorized the acceptance of gifts as sites for the manufacture of armor; we have authorized the acceptance of aviation sites, of mobilization sites, of nitrate-plant sites, of various gifts to the United States Navy, including just the sort of thing that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] alluded to. We have authorized the acceptance of gifts of horses for breeding purposes, the acceptance of land for hatchery purposes, the acceptance of buildings in the District of Columbia for housing purposes, the acceptance of gifts for rifle ranges, and gifts from various memorial associations. I will put in the Record a list of these recent statutes, where we have authorized in blanket terms acceptance of gifts of these various kinds.

The legation property in Bangkok was presented to us in 1884 by the King of Siam, and its exchange for other property owned by the Siamese Government was only recently authorized by Congress. The consular property in Tahiti was a gift from the reigning queen.

The new legation in Salvador is erected upon land presented by that Government and accepted by the President under the authority of the act of Congress approved April 15, 1918.

Instances where Congress has authorized the acceptance of gifts from individual citizens are very numerous. Some of them are here enumerated:

Sites for manufacture of armor. (Act Aug. 29, 1916, 39 Stat., 563.)
Aviation sites. (Act Aug. 29, 1916, 39 Stat., 622; June 15, 1917, 40 Stat., 182; July 27, 1917, 40 Stat., 247.)
Mobilization sites. (Act Aug. 29, 1916, 39 Stat., 623.)
Nitrate-plant sites. (Act June 3, 1916, 39 Stat., 215.)
Gifts to Navy. (Act May 20, 1908, 35 Stat., 171.)
Horses for breeding purposes. (41 Stat., 962.)
Expenses of land for hatchery to be given by individual named in the act. (39 Stat., 431.)
Buildings in the District of Columbia for housing purposes. (40 Stat., 550.)
Gifts for rifle ranges. (36 Stat., 1457.)
Land to be given by Memorial Association of Georgia. (39 Stat., 901.)
One hundred and twenty-five acres, premises at Gullford Court House. (39 Stat., 997.)
Authorization to receive gifts of land. (36 Stat., 264.)
Gift from Lincoln Farm Association of birthplace of Lincoln and \$60,000 for its maintenance. (39 Stat., 385.)
Land for cemeterial purposes. (36 Stat., 1077.)
Constitution Island. (35 Stat., 1166.)
Land near Fort Missoula. (33 Stat., 142.)

It is the rule to do under authority of Congress exactly what this amendment proposes to do. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] froths at the mouth over this practice. Why, it is not a new thing. It is just as old as Congress itself. And the committee of conference in recommending this language is simply recognizing the practice that has prevailed ever since the United States was a government.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield.

Mr. BEE. Has the gentleman from Massachusetts any precedents for accepting in lieu of a debt a piece of land from a foreign Government?

Mr. ROGERS. That is a very different question, and that is not the question to which I was addressing myself.

Mr. BEE. That is involved in this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Oh, no.

Mr. BEE. Is this to be the forerunner of the way they can cancel the debts they owe the United States hereafter?

Mr. ROGERS. Oh, no; my personal viewpoint is that the foreign Governments concerned will be very glad to show their good faith in the matter of these debts by turning over to us a suitable building where we can be permanently housed. It will be a business transaction involving not exceeding \$150,000 in any one place. It will have no bearing whatever upon the general collection of the debts. I may say to the gentleman that I am just as much in favor of the United States collecting those debts promptly as he can be. But this is a method by which we can get something of value without imperiling or in any way affecting the opportunity to collect the debts or impairing the general international relationships of the United States.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. BEE. Is not the United States of America amply able to buy this land without dickering with the foreign countries to get a credit on a debt?

Mr. ROGERS. Of course it is; but when that Government owes us something why not collect the debt as best we can? When a man owes the gentleman from Texas something, if the man is not prepared to pay at once he may make an arrange-

ment with the gentleman from Texas to pay in kind something that the gentleman from Texas desires.

Mr. BEE. I will promise the gentleman from Massachusetts that if they pay me in kind, I will get a profit in the kind if they do not pay me the cash. [Applause.]

Mr. ROGERS. This is a liberal proposition, so far as the United States is concerned.

Mr. BEE. Are we trying to make a profit?

Mr. ROGERS. The American dollar in certain countries is now worth anywhere from ten to fifty times as much as it was worth in normal times.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. In addition to the three instances which the gentleman enumerated where the foreign Governments have made donations, is the gentleman able to find anywhere instances where we have made gifts?

Mr. ROGERS. I was citing those instances where donations of sites of embassies, legations, or consulates have been made to us by foreign rulers. I might also cite similar cases in Japan and China.

Mr. RAKER. Does not the gentleman make a distinction between sites for rivers and harbors and other public works and gifts by foreign countries to our ambassadors and consuls abroad if they are accepted by the President? Does he not make a distinction there?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Does it not look bad to permit these officers to ask the President to allow them to accept furniture and furnishings for these buildings abroad? Does not the gentleman think it is a dangerous precedent to allow even the President, on behalf of these various foreign offices, to accept these gifts of furniture and furnishings?

Mr. ROGERS. I do not think so. Of course, foreign Governments are not going to give away very much to the United States. There will be cases where American citizens may desire to make these gifts.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Certainly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I wish to say, if the gentleman will permit, that while I can not give my approval to the form of this amendment, and while I think the method of purchasing embassies by offsets of debts is rather undignified, certainly indelicate, yet this matter of providing buildings for our service abroad is a duty which our Government has too long postponed. I congratulate the House that we have now some opportunity for the acquisition of quarters for our foreign representatives. Heretofore, with few exceptions, only wealthy men could represent the Nation abroad. This practice is a negation of our democracy. We should not function as a democracy at home and a plutocracy abroad. [Applause.] Therefore, I shall vote for almost any measure that looks to the accomplishment of the object that the committee seems to have in view. [Applause.]

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALSH). The gentleman from Massachusetts moves the previous question.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield me two or three minutes before he moves the previous question?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman three minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws his motion for the previous question, and yields to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] three minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, of course, this amendment No. 27 ought not to pass. No part of it should pass. The part of it before the proviso will place the country in the indelicate and unfortunate involvement which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has so forcefully pointed out. The proviso gives a blanket authority to the President of the United States in his discretion to accept unconditional gifts of land and buildings and furniture and furnishings.

That is not a desirable thing to do. Accept gifts from whom? I do not believe they ought to be accepted from anybody. [Applause.] I think it is extremely unfortunate that this House ever agreed to the acceptance of this Morgan house at London. [Applause.] It is a humiliation to this country. [Applause.]

I concur in the thoughts expressed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] that, within reason, this country ought to own homes for its diplomatic representatives abroad. That is true, I think, within reason, and moving along proper lines and dealing with each condition as it arises. But have we come to the point where this Nation is willing to say, "We will not buy, but we will accept as a gift from a nation, or from Tom, Dick, or Harry, land and houses in which to shelter those who represent our sovereignty abroad"?

Oh, gentlemen, we ought not to agree to this. We ought to disagree to this amendment, and then we ought to reconsider the section immediately before it, and let this go back to conference and let these gentlemen work out something that will be in accord with the dignity and the fine traditions of this Republic. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SMALL rose.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur with the criticisms made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] of this amendment, but it seems impossible to do so. The proposed amendment is very simple. It authorizes us to purchase quarters for embassies and legations and consulates from Governments, and have the same credited upon an indebtedness to us.

Gentlemen say it is undignified. We loaned our credit to those Governments who owe these amounts to us, and they expended it for foodstuffs and grain and clothing and munitions. And yet it is now said to be undignified that we shall accept in part payment a building and grounds for the use of our Diplomatic Service and have that part payment credited upon the obligation. Why have we become suddenly so supersensitive upon this question? For 20 years I have heard gentlemen in this House advocate the plain duty of Congress to provide suitable quarters for our legations and embassies. I recall notably the efforts of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] on that subject. But Congress has failed to discharge its duty, with the result, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] points out, that the appointments to most of our important diplomatic posts are restricted to men of wealth, because the salaries which we pay them will not permit poor men to represent this great Government. It seems to me it is stretching the point of dignity too far to complain at this moment that we can not accept from another Government in part payment of a valid obligation the purchase price of a suitable embassy or legation.

As to the proviso authorizing the President to accept gifts, gentlemen say that it is a dangerous proviso. In what respect is it dangerous? In the first place no citizen is going to offer us any property, and no Government is going to offer us any property except it be done in a punctillious way that complies with all the laws and obligations of international courtesy. If perchance there should be any impropriety connected with its acceptance, have we ever had a President or a Secretary of State who would not observe the proprieties and protect the dignity of the United States? And if such a gift is offered us under the laws of propriety and courtesy, are we going to act to the contrary in declining to accept a gift of that kind? No similar gift which has heretofore been offered to the United States by any individual or Government has been refused by Congress. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] three minutes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, in ordinary times, when we did not have to question the expenditure of money, because of a great debt and high taxes, we did not appropriate sufficient sums to buy embassies abroad. If we did not do it then, we are surely not going to do it now, with the Treasury in its present depleted condition. However, in this time of stress we may be able to credit upon the indebtedness owing to us by foreign nations amounts which will enable us to buy suitable embassies. Gentlemen say that is undignified, if not indelicate. Why undignified? We are doing favors to nations embarrassed, to nations not in a position to pay in money, to nations which want to maintain their credit and good faith, to nations which want to discharge their debts and are willing to give that which is of greater value to us than money itself at the present moment. Why then should it not be done?

Only a couple of years ago we paid \$20,000,000 for some islands down in the Caribbean, to protect the Panama Canal. Suppose that Denmark had owed us that amount and suppose we had credited it upon that indebtedness, at a time when Denmark was not ready to pay. Where is the gentleman who will say that that would not have been a wise, a good, and a proper transaction?

Then we hear it suggested, let me say in answer to the gentleman from Texas, that we may have some barren islands thrust upon us to apply upon these debts. Only a few days ago we heard it suggested that the British West Indies, such as Jamaica, might be transferred in part payment of the debt of Great Britain to us. Well, will the gentleman say that that complete protection to the Panama Canal, that insuring its

being guarded for all time, that safeguarding our interests in this way would not be a wise and a statesmanlike thing to do?

So I think there can be no question about the advisability of such transactions.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. Does not the gentleman distinguish between the purchase of sovereignty over territory and the matter of having given to us by some foreign nation the home in which our diplomatic representatives are housed?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do, indeed, and I say to the gentleman in answer to that suggestion what has been said by the chairman of this subcommittee, that that is a minor and small part of this section, and when the gentleman stops to think of it I do not believe he will consider that of serious consequence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I should like one or two minutes more.

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman from Tennessee well knows that that is meant not so much to meet such small gifts as may come to us from foreigners, but that wealthy Americans who are travelling abroad will often see the opportunity to present something of interest or historic value to their country and desire to avail themselves of it. Why, only a day or two ago I wandered into a room in the Army and Navy Club, and there I found all of the belongings of Capt. Culver, a captain in the Navy who recently died. His belongings were assembled in that room in memory of him, and such things and only such things, not of great moment, not of sufficient importance to dignify them by becoming apprehensive of evil results, are the things that are contemplated, and they are the only things that will result or come out of this provision.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. If it is merely a matter of personal belongings why does it say lands and buildings?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It means that to any man who exercises just ordinary common sense.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield to me three minutes?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois three minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to add to what has been said by the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Texas a note of warning in regard to this trading and dickering upon the amount of money that is owing to the United States. First of all, I am opposed, and I think it is a great mistake, to be accepting presents. I think that when we bought the strip of land in Panama and made it American territory we did the wisest thing, although the strip of land had been promised to us as a gift.

So I am opposed to accepting presents, and particularly opposed to crediting it on the amount of money due to this Government by other Governments. That money is due. We are not asking them for the money; let them give us their notes; let us be able to liquidate and make liquid assets out of those notes. If you start in the entering wedge, you know the propaganda that is started in this country, and if you do not, you ought to—eventually we will dicker and deal back and forth until distinguished peace Christian statesmen have their way, who are willing to be generous with other people's money and allow us to forget and forgive.

If this proposition which is the entering wedge means anything, it means that some great nation that owes us two or three billion dollars can begin negotiations; they will tender us \$50,000 worth of some islands to withhold the final settlement. In other words, you remember what I say when I am through, you young men who are here, they will be offering you from day to day, from time to time, two bananas as partial payment for a billion dollars due, and while you are considering the question of whether you are going to take that partial payment the debt will go on, and your constituents and mine will continue to pay the interest on the debt that that Government owes us. I am opposed to the amendment for the reason suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. Let them give us their notes and let us buy and pay for what we get. [Applause.]

Mr. ROGERS. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as a general rule I have the highest opinion of my friends, the gentleman from Tennessee, and the gentleman from Texas, but in this case I think they are making a mountain out of a molehill. This is nothing new; it is the usual thing. We have acquired em-

bassies by gift for many years. In some countries you can not buy embassies. You can not buy property in Japan, and we have an embassy there by gift from the Japanese Government.

There is one thing foreign governments who owe us money can not do now, and that is to pay us in cash. They not only can not pay the principal, but they can not pay a cent of interest. We are not putting ourselves under obligations to those nations by permitting them to pay the equivalent in real estate. We are putting them under obligations to us, and I can not see any possible reason, nor does it derogate from our dignity as a Nation, to permit the settlement of some of those debts by accepting the thing we need, to wit, land and buildings in the capitals of other countries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on receding and concurring with an amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division of the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas demands a division of the motion, and the question is on the motion to recede.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on concurring in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAYBURN) there were 123 ayes and 58 noes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and six Members present; not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 204, nays 120, answered "present" 2, not voting 102, as follows:

YEAS—204.

Ackerman	Fess	Luce	Robinson, N. C.
Andrews, Nebr.	Fish	Lufkin	Robison, Ky.
Anthony	Fisher	Luhring	Rogers
Benham	Fordney	McArthur	Rose
Benson	Frear	McLaughlin, Mich.	Rowe
Black	French	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sabath
Boles	Fuller	McLeod	Sanders, Ind.
Bowers	Gandy	McPherson	Sanders, N. Y.
Briggs	Ganly	Magee	Sanford
Brinson	Glynn	Mapes	Scott
Britten	Godwin, N. C.	Martin	Sells
Brooks, Ill.	Good	Mays	Shreve
Brooks, Pa.	Gould	Merritt	Siegel
Browne	Green, Iowa	Michener	Sinnott
Burdick	Greene, Vt.	Monahan, Wis.	Small
Burroughs	Griest	Mondell	Smith, Idaho
Butler	Griffin	Montague	Smith, Mich.
Campbell, Kans.	Hadley	Moore, Ohio	Snell
Campbell, Pa.	Hardy, Colo.	Moore, Va.	Snyder
Cannon	Hardy, Tex.	Moore, Ind.	Stedman
Chidholm	Hawley	Morin	Steele
Christopherson	Hays	Mott	Stephens, Ohio
Cleary	Hernandez	Mudd	Strong, Kans.
Coady	Hersey	Murphy	Strong, Pa.
Cole	Hickey	Nelson, Wis.	Summers, Wash.
Cooper	Hicks	Newton, Minn.	Swindall
Crago	Hoch	Newton, Mo.	Swope
Cramton	Holland	O'Connor	Taylor, Tenn.
Crisp	Houghton	Ogden	Temple
Currie, Mich.	Hull, Iowa	Olney	Tilson
Dale	Husted	Osborne	Timberlake
Dallinger	Hutchinson	Overstreet	Tinkham
Darrow	Ireland	Padgett	Treadway
Davis, Minn.	James, Va.	Paige	Upshaw
Davis, Tenn.	Jefferis	Park	Vaile
Dempsey	Johnson, Wash.	Parker	Vestal
Denison	Jones, Pa.	Patterson	Voigt
Dewalt	Kearns	Pell	Volk
Dickinson, Iowa	Kendall	Perلمان	Walsh
Drewry	Kettner	Peters	Ward
Dunbar	Kinkaid	Porter	Watson
Dupré	Knutson	Purnell	Watson
Echols	Kraus	Radcliffe	Welling
Edmonds	Kreider	Randall, Wis.	Whaley
Elliott	Langley	Ransley	White, Kans.
Elston	Lankford	Reber	White, Me.
Emerson	Layton	Reed, N. Y.	Winslow
Esch	Lea, Calif.	Reed, W. Va.	Wood, Ind.
Evans, Mont.	Leibach	Rhodes	Woods, Va.
Evans, Nebr.	Linthicum	Ricketts	Young, N. Dak.
Fairfield	Longworth	Riddick	Zihlman

NAYS—120.

Almon	Blanton	Clark, Fla.	Focht
Anderson	Bowling	Collier	Foster
Andrews, Md.	Box	Connally	Gallagher
Ashbrook	Brand	Cullen	Gallivan
Aswell	Buchanan	Dent	Gard
Barka	Burke	Dominick	Garrett
Barbour	Byrnes, S. C.	Doelling	Graham, Ill.
Barkley	Byrns, Tenn.	Dowell	Harrison
Bee	Caraway	Drane	Hastings
Begg	Carew	Egan	Hayden
Bell	Carss	Fields	Hersman
Bland, Va.	Carter	Flood	Howard

Huddleston	Leshar	Oldfield	Steagall
Hudspeth	Little	Oliver	Stephens, Miss.
Hull, Tenn.	McClintic	Parrish	Stevenson
Humphreys	McKenzie	Phelan	Stoll
Igoe	McLane	Quin	Summers, Tex.
Jacoway	MacGregor	Raker	Sweet
Johnson, Ky.	Major	Ramseyer	Tague
Johnson, Miss.	Mann, Ill.	Randall, Calif.	Taylor, Ark.
Johnson, S. Dak.	Mansfield	Rayburn	Taylor, Colo.
Jones, Tex.	Mason	Romjue	Thompson
Keller	Miller	Rouse	Tillman
Kelly, Pa.	Milligan	Rucker	Vinson
Kincheloe	Minahan, N. J.	Sanders, La.	Volstead
King	Neely	Sherwood	Wilson, La.
Lampert	Nelson, Mo.	Sinclair	Wilson, Pa.
Lanham	Nicholls	Sisson	Wingo
Larsen	O'Connell	Smith, Ill.	Wright
Lee, Ga.		Smithwick	Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.
Greene, Mass. Schall

NOT VOTING—102.

Ayres	Evans, Nev.	Lazaro	Scully
Bacharach	Ferris	Loneragan	Seares
Baer	Freeman	McAndrews	Sims
Bankhead	Garner	McCulloch	Siemp
Bland, Ind.	Goldfogle	McDuffie	Smith, N. Y.
Bland, Mo.	Goodall	McFadden	Steenerson
Brumbaugh	Goodwin, Ark.	McGlennon	Stinnes
Caldwell	Goodykoontz	McKeown	Sullivan
Candler	Graham, Pa.	McKinley	Thomas
Cantril	Hamill	McKinley	Tincher
Casey	Hamilton	Madden	Towner
Clark, Mo.	Harril	Maher	Vare
Classon	Haugen	Mann, S. C.	Venable
Copley	Hill	Mead	Walters
Costello	Hoey	Moon	Watkins
Crowther	Hullings	Mooney	Weaver
Curry, Calif.	James, Mich.	Pou	Webster
Davey	Johnston, N. Y.	Rainey, Ala.	Welty
Dickinson, Mo.	Juul	Rainey, Henry T.	Wheeler
Donovan	Kahn	Rainey, John W.	Williams
Doremus	Kelley, Mich.	Ramsey	Wilson, Ill.
Doughton	Kennedy, Iowa	Reavis	Wise
Dunn	Kennedy, R. I.	Riordan	Woodyard
Dyer	Kiess	Rodenberg	Yates
Eagle	Kitchin	Rowan	
Ellsworth	Kieczka	Rubey	

So the motion to recede and concur in the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:
Until further notice.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. POU.

Mr. HARRELD with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. REAVIS with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. TINCHER with Mr. HOEY.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. MEAD.

Mr. DYER with Mr. McKEOWN.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. VENABLE.

Mr. TOWNER with Mr. LAZARO.

Mr. JUUL with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. COPLEY with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. McANDREWS.

Mr. FREEMAN with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ with Mr. EAGLE.

Mr. HULLINGS with Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. LONERAGAN.

Mr. McCULLOCH with Mr. McDUFFIE.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I desire to withdraw my vote because I am paired with the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. BANKHEAD.

The name of Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 30: Page 25, after line 9, insert:

"POST ALLOWANCES TO DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICERS.

"To enable the President, in his discretion, and in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make special allowances by way of additional compensation to diplomatic and consular officers and consular assistants and officers of the United States Court for China in order to adjust their official income to the ascertained cost of living at the posts to which they may be assigned, \$500,000."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede from the House disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROGERS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 30, and agree to the same with the following amendment: "In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert '\$250,000.'"

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, this exact item was included in the bill as it was reported to the House by the Committee on Appropriations carrying an appropriation of \$250,000. A point of order was made against the paragraph in the House and the

point of order was sustained. The Senate restored the item and recommended \$500,000 instead of the \$250,000. The committee of conference recommends concurring in the Senate amendment, but with the amount of \$250,000, as originally proposed to the House.

I move the previous question on the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 30: Page 28, line 11, after the word "and," strike out "Public act No. 79 of the Sixty-sixth Congress, when the latter act shall have become effective," and insert "of this act, to be immediately available, \$600,000."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, amendments 32 and 33 should stand or fall together. I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 33 be reported and be considered with amendment No. 32.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, this amendment continues in effect the passport-control system which has been in force for some time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this amendment No. 33 does not do that.

Mr. ROGERS. The two amendments together do that. The first amendment taken by itself simply appropriates for the enforcement of the act of May 22, 1918.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I submit there is no need for debate upon that question.

Mr. ROGERS. That is precisely why I hoped that the gentleman from New York would permit the consideration of the two amendments together.

Mr. SIEGEL. I think amendment No. 32 would not arouse any discussion.

Mr. ROGERS. Then, I move to recede and concur, and on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur with amendment No. 32.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33: Page 28, after the amendment just adopted, insert: "Provided, That the provisions of the act approved May 22, 1918, shall, in so far as they relate to requiring passports and visas from aliens seeking to come to the United States, continue in force and effect until otherwise provided by law."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. On page 28, line 117, what is the use of the words "until otherwise provided by law"? Does not the gentleman think that useless verbiage?

Mr. ROGERS. I do not think it is of any value, and on the other hand I do not think it is particularly detrimental or bad legislative language.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I have never observed it before in legislative language.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Certainly.

Mr. MASON. I would like to have some agreement so that we may be heard on this amendment. I am opposed to it.

Mr. ROGERS. How much time does the gentleman require?

Mr. MASON. I want five minutes.

Mr. SIEGEL. I want five minutes.

Mr. SABATH. I want five minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL].

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, the visé law, as it is called, was originally enacted as a war measure. Later we passed a resolution of the House continuing it in force until March 4, 1921. No logical reason can be urged why in this bill we should proceed to make the visé requirement a permanent law. At this very minute the State Department and the Department of Labor are not enforcing it in all cases, because they have found that in some cases they are unable to enforce it without perpetrating gross inhumanities. The last time when this subject came up I said if this law were enforced no political refugee could come into America. We have seen since that political refugees are being denied the right of asylum here because of their inability to have passports viséd.

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

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. While the Committee on Naturalization and Immigration has been investigating these matters, would the gentleman inform the House what particular cases there are where they have allowed these men to enter without passports?

Mr. SIEGEL. Well, now, let us take one case, for example. I refer to the O'Callaghan case. He will not be deported, because the American people will never permit the deportation of a political refugee. By the laws of nations, he should remain here. Why enact a law of a kind which we know well enough that we do not intend to enforce, because it is opposed to all of our traditions? I said weeks ago that some of the agents engaged in this visé work were corrupt, and there was some doubt expressed here about it. A jury in the United States district court in New York convicted one last week, and he was sentenced to one year yesterday.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. SIEGEL. I will.

Mr. RAKER. Outside of the O'Callaghan case, what other man who entered without a passport has not been ordered deported?

Mr. SIEGEL. I will say for the benefit of the gentleman that I do not propose to name the political refugees who have arrived here. He has the same sources of information available that I have and if he desires to drive political refugees out of this country, let him do so. I do not believe in any such policy. Neither does the average American citizen.

Mr. RAKER. I want to know if the immigration officers are enforcing the law.

Mr. SIEGEL. The immigration officers and the State Department are doing their full duty. What is the sense of having a visé law continued indefinitely? Every man here knows that there are pitiable cases which are brought to his attention. I had one case here to-day; four children over in Antwerp coming from Ukraine, never obtained a passport because there is no recognized government. They have arrived at Antwerp, the father here a declarant, the mother killed, and there is no way to get a visé for those children to come over to this country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. There is a way to get a visé, and there is a method of making an appeal.

Mr. SIEGEL. There is no way by which they can get a visé, as the way our visé law reads you must have a passport from that particular country whose existence as a government must have been recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Are not refugees getting visés from the French Government, not citizens of France, but other countries?

Mr. SIEGEL. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think they are.

Mr. SIEGEL. I want to say for the benefit of the gentleman it is not so, because I made inquiry to-day at the State Department in reference to the particular case I have just cited. The man came here seven years ago, tried to bring his wife and children over after being here a few months, he being a declarant, his wife was killed, and those children have been over there trying to get across. They are in Antwerp, and they can not get over unless an exception, based upon the ground of humanity, is made.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. How are refugees, who are stacked up in France now, being transported to the United States to get passports if they do not get them from the French Government?

Mr. SIEGEL. These refugees to which I refer are people coming from Lithuania, Georgia; it is only from nations which are in existence. This law, clear as it may appear upon the surface of it, can not function as far as women and children are concerned where there are no regular governments organized. I am opposed to any further extension of war measures, and this is one of them.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, if there is anything that our party promised—and I speak to my friends on this side of the Chamber—in this last campaign, it was that we would repeal all of these war laws. Until the war there was no necessity for a man having a passport from his master, the king, before he could come to America. It was a necessary law during the war. Now, as it has appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, they have recommended, according to my recollection, that a law be passed which would permit them to admit a man

without a visé provided he makes a showing that he is a refugee, that he is persecuted either in a political or religious way, and presents to the Government the fact that he is eligible under the immigration law to come into this country.

Now, I have no disposition to find fault with the immigration laws, but this is doing exactly the thing which we promised not to do. We are continuing a war measure. This law that we had during the war would have kept the Pilgrim Fathers out, and it would have kept out many men, and most of your ancestors, if it had been a law when they started for this country. Take, for instance, as an illustration, the incident just now given by my friend from New York [Mr. SIEGEL]. I have many cases now where some of my constituents who have been here for many years and have made a success in life want to bring here an aged father or a mother. They make a showing to the department that they are abundantly able to take care of them, but they can not get a passport for some reason or other. Suppose they were coming from the soviet government in Russia, what chance is there of their getting a passport? We recognize no government there. Here are two gentlemen starting out from Great Britain or some of her colonies, the Indias or Ireland. One of them is coming here to spread propaganda of Indian or Irish principles.

The other is coming for the purpose of continuing Great Britain's rule in Ireland or India. The King says to one man, "You may go," and to the other man, "You must stay." We submitted to it during the war, for we had our alliances and our fighting friends, and we said that we would not let anyone come in here for any purpose unless the Governments gave them a passport; and they did the same for us. But with this law in times of peace you allow somebody besides the people of the United States to say who may come to this country. It is a delegation of American power to a foreign body or to a foreign court. And I say that the law ought to be repealed. It has been repealed by action of peace. We claimed it when we passed the declaration of peace.

I say, if you please, that this legislation ought to be taken up by itself. I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and this particular item of extending the law for one year I have not heard discussed. I have been necessarily absent for some time. But it is the extension of the war measure, which allows the kings and the rulers of other countries to say who shall come into this country, and is an absolute invasion of American rights.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. If you make it quick.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Does not the gentleman know that he was present and participated in the debates of the committee upon the visé control act?

Mr. MASON. Yes; it was the gentleman's bill.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes; and it was reported favorably to the House, and it is waiting on the calendar.

Mr. MASON. I made a minority report, and I am speaking for that report now; that is, not this bill. I am opposed to any country in the world saying to any man in the world if he strikes the American shore and is shipwrecked, if he has not anything in the world except an ambition to become an American citizen, and he will satisfy the people of the country that he is in love with our principles, that he is a refugee, that he has been persecuted for religious and political duties, and he lands here and complies with the immigration law, that he shall not stay here. If we do otherwise we have violated the fundamental principles of the American Constitution.

The fathers of this Republic when they wrote the Declaration of Independence complained of Great Britain that they viséed all Government passports and permitted the addition only of British subjects. What is the fact to-day? They have it in their power. They are coming from that Kingdom, they are coming from that Empire, whenever the people of that nation say. I say let us reserve to the people of the United States the power to say who shall and who shall not become citizens of our Republic. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this proposition is a simple one. It provides for the further extension of the war-passport act, in so far as it applies to incoming aliens, and continues that act until otherwise provided by law.

Congress did make one extension of that act, which extension expires on March 4 next without ever having been operative,

for the reason that the United States has failed to reach a legal state of peace with enemy countries. Hence the old war-passport act runs, but it will run only until the day we reach a declaration of peace. It is certain that one of the first acts of the next Congress will be a declaration of peace. It is not possible to get action upon a new passport bill. In my opinion, it is a dangerous proposition, with the state of unrest that now exists in the world, to let the United States drop the passport requirements as now applied to incoming aliens.

Aliens who are entitled to be admitted to the United States under some circumstances without passports and visés are now admitted. For the fiscal year ending June 30 of this past year 1,001 Germans were admitted without passports under special conditions. Other aliens have been admitted without passports on a proper showing. Refugees from certain countries in Europe now reach other countries in Europe without passports, and in the course of getting them out of those countries where they have arrived they are given passports to the United States. This seems to be for the good of the second country, but I contend that it is not so good for the United States. Therefore we need and will continue to need the visé. It seems to be nearly always to the United States they desire to come, and most of these other countries seem quite willing—even anxious—to assist them out of their countries into ours.

Some objection appears to the words "until otherwise provided by law," and a date certain is suggested. I presume the words imply the intent—I do not think the words amount to a great deal, but I am sure it is the intent of members of certain committees, both of the House and of the Senate, to work in harmony in an effort to draw a further passport law. If gentlemen will remember—

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In one moment. Gentlemen will remember I opposed in the previous session of this Congress an extension of the passport act with an amendment which gave the State Department officials the power to override and act above the immigration laws. I opposed that, and you remember we overturned the conference report. But this amendment does not upset or supersede the immigration laws. Our State Department officials in other countries have only the power now to refuse to visé upon knowledge and information that the person applying for that visé is dangerous politically, harmful to the integrity and institutions of the United States. Our consular agents can not refuse applications for visés to persons for even apparent defects that would be certain to cause them to fail to get into the United States after arriving at our gates. I have opposed enlargement of State Department authority because I do not want to see a State Department passport regulation superimposed upon the immigration laws. This amendment, as I say, does not do that, but it extends the law already adopted.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman spoke of that language as being perhaps of no effect. Is it not true that the effect of that language is to make permanent law of that which was originally adopted as a war-time measure?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; I think not, for we will reach permanent legislation, I hope.

Mr. CRAMTON. And in the event that Congress does not agree upon new legislation this would continue perpetually and be permanent law?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The assumption is that inasmuch as this is a live subject and the new Congress will be a live Congress, we will make haste toward a complete passport bill intended as permanent law.

Mr. CRAMTON. This may continue for all time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We should act within one year, but I thought that before, for I introduced and pressed the first extension—the one with a time limit now about to expire.

Mr. CRAMTON. If Congress acted it would continue in effect, perhaps, for one year, but if Congress did not act it would fello that, although it is a war-time agency, it is to be perpetually continued.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to know whether, if this becomes a law, a political prisoner in Great Britain, imprisoned because of the trouble in Ireland, if he escapes from prison and becomes a stowaway, coming on a vessel from Great Britain to the United States, will be deprived of admission into or return from the United States because he has not a passport visé?

Mr. ROGERS. I will answer the question of the gentleman from Illinois by saying that he will not be deprived of admission to the United States.

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. ROGERS. The Secretary of State has power to exclude, and the Secretary of State has power to admit.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Under the passport law?

Mr. ROGERS. Under the passport law of May 22, 1918, under the proclamation of the President and under the regulations issued in accordance therewith.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It has been stated recently in the press that a certain Irishman who has come to the United States—however, I think he did not escape from prison—has been ordered deported because he did not have his passport viséed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But he claimed to be a sailor.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Did the law apply to that case?

Mr. ROGERS. If the matter had been properly presented to the Secretary of State he would have had the right to admit the particular person to whom the gentleman refers.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Or the right to exclude him?

Mr. ROGERS. Or the right to exclude him.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. So that under this law if a man does escape, when he has been imprisoned for a political offense—and there are many such cases now—if he manages to escape and get into the United States, he may be sent back by our Government to the prison from which he escaped?

Mr. ROGERS. May I answer the gentleman further?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes. I want information.

Mr. ROGERS. I have in my hand the regulations issued by the Department of State in connection with the execution of this law and dated August 28, 1920. I will not take the time to read them at length.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman one minute more. I will not read the regulations at length; but the provision is that in order for an alien to be excludable he must be of a class which is dangerous to the public safety of the United States. Of course, the Secretary of State, like an immigration officer, may err or may even be corrupt on the question of facts; but in order to exclude such a man as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has referred to the Secretary of State must decide that in fact the man is dangerous to the public safety of this country.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. What does the passport law mean if it requires a passport viséed, if, when a man comes here, the Secretary of State has to declare that he is of a class which ought to be excluded?

Mr. ROGERS. Because the law itself provides that the President may make regulations in order to exclude aliens who would be dangerous to the public safety.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I confess I thought I would get this thing cleared in my own mind, but it is as muddly as ever.

Mr. ROGERS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I should like more time than that.

Mr. ROGERS. Let the gentleman take his five minutes, and then he can ask for more.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the measure under consideration makes a permanent law of the act of May 22, 1918, by which it is provided that it shall—

Be unlawful for any alien to depart from or enter or attempt to depart from or enter the United States except under such reasonable rules, regulations, and orders, and subject to such limitations and exceptions as the President shall prescribe.

The penalty for violating said act is \$10,000 fine and 20 years imprisonment.

That law was passed as a war measure and by its terms its operation was limited to the war. By this measure that law is reenacted so far as aliens are concerned, and it is made of permanent operation.

Any regulations which the President may adopt under this law obviously must require the alien desiring to come to the United States to have some form of permit from some agent of our Government stationed in the foreign country. As at present applied the regulations require the alien to obtain a passport from his own Government and to have same viséed by an American consul in his home country. That is the present practice. The offices of our consuls in various European cities are besieged by multitudes of emigrants seeking visés so that they may come to the United States. Long lines of these unfortunates stand in wait day by day. Sometimes weeks are consumed before the emigrant can learn from the consul what is required of

him. Necessarily our consular offices are not equipped for this business. They have not sufficient clerical force. There is much useless red tape, heartbreaking delays, and much unnecessary suffering; but with this aspect of the matter it is not my purpose to deal.

THE O'CALLAGHAN CASE.

Under the law which it is now proposed to make a permanent part of the American system, no alien can secretly come to the United States, for obviously under any regulation which may be adopted he must obtain the consular permit before leaving home. If he is proscribed by his home authorities, he can not openly apply to the consul for the permit. If he should slip away and take ship as a stowaway or otherwise, he will find that upon setting his foot upon American soil he has committed a crime, and will find himself not in a land of freedom and opportunity, but will be confronted by officers of the law who will conduct him to a penitentiary for 20 years' imprisonment.

The recent case of O'Callaghan, the Irish refugee, has been referred to in this debate. The moment O'Callaghan put his foot upon the soil of Norfolk he violated the law; he became liable to 20 years' imprisonment. What course will finally be taken in his case, I do not know. Suffice it to say that he is now out of jail merely by grace of the Department of Justice. The law makes no exception in behalf of political refugees, nor of those persecuted upon racial or religious grounds. It makes no allowance for those fleeing from oppression, tyranny, or brutality. It requires that any alien who wishes to come to the United States must openly present himself at our consular office in his own country and by open application for a permit subject himself to the pogrom of a "black hundred," to the proscription of a red terror, or to execution by a firing squad.

ROBERT EMMET COULD NOT HAVE COME TO AMERICA.

The law proposed makes no exception—no alien can come secretly to the United States. He may be a man of high character; he may be a patriot; but he can not come to the United States without the permit. No Irish republican marked for death by a "black and tan" reprisal can find asylum in America; no Polish nor Ukrainian Jew, persecuted for his religious beliefs, can come to America; no Wrangel or Kolchak, proscribed by the soviet authorities, can come; no Korean patriot, in rebellion against Japanese tyranny, can come to America; no Egyptian, no Hindu, no Boer, no Alsatian, revolting against the constituted authorities in defense of his native land, can find refuge in America. Kosuth could not have come to America; Kosciusko could not have come; Robert Emmet could not have escaped the hangman's noose by breaking jail and shipping as a stowaway for the United States. None of the world's patriots whom brave and free men all delight to honor could have come to the United States.

The measure comes into the House as a rider upon an appropriation bill. It has never been considered by any legislative committee. The parliamentary situation in which it is presented does not permit that it be given the consideration that a measure of such importance should receive. Nothing can justify legislation of such importance being passed through the House in such fashion except a great emergency. No such emergency exists. The existing law by its terms remains in effect until peace is proclaimed. Congress will have ample time at its next session to take such action as may be proper.

CONGRESSIONAL ABDICATION.

But for another reason no emergency exists. The Johnson immigration restriction bill has been amended by the Senate so as to permit only 3 per cent of the nationals of the immigrants who have been naturalized as citizens to come to the United States annually. The existing immigration laws forbid the coming of all anarchists and others opposed to organized government or advocating the overthrow of government by force. The Johnson bill still further restricts immigration to 3 per cent of immigrants already naturalized. That bill has been agreed on in conference, is on the Speaker's table, and will be acted on within a few hours. No excuse that the measure under consideration is needed to bar out anarchists or other undesirables can be made honestly. The measure is not a measure for immigration restriction. In reality it merely serves to mark the abdication by Congress of its legislative function and turns over the entire subject of the admission of aliens to the executive branch of the Government. It authorizes the Executive to say who may and who may not come to the United States. It leaves the Executive free to follow any whim or pursue any arbitrary fancy.

This measure has never been considered by any committee of the House. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, has reported the Newton bill. That bill, bad though it is, is much better than the measure under consideration. The

Newton bill is comparatively mild. It merely extends the passport-control act to June, 1922. It excepts all those who may seek to come to this country to escape political, racial, or religious persecution. Its penalty is only 1 year in prison, instead of 20 years as provided by this amendment. The Newton bill is bad, but this measure is infinitely worse. And the Newton bill was approved by the committee by a vote of only 5 to 4, there being less than a quorum present.

REPUBLICAN PROMISES TO REPEAL WAR LAWS.

Now for a little heart-to-heart talk with our Republican brethren on the other side of the Chamber. This law was originally passed as a war measure to meet an emergency. You have recently won a great political victory. You won it upon your promise to the people of America that you would repeal the war laws. For more than a year I have been trying to get the war laws repealed. I have cooperated with you in your measures to that end. I thought that you were sincere; I still believe that many of you were sincere.

You promised the people that you would repeal the war laws. This law is the most drastic of them all. If we adopt the measure under consideration, you will violate the promise you made to the people that you would have done with war measures. You promised that you would carry this country back to normal. You got the votes of the people of the United States upon the strength of that promise. This is one of the worst of the war laws. When you made your promise to the people to repeal those laws you did not except this one; you did not except it when you spoke to alien-born citizens of the great industrial communities and asked for their support; you did not make an exception of this measure when you spoke to them; you made no exception whatsoever; you included all of the war laws; and on the strength of the promise that you would repeal them they gave you their support.*

PEOPLE DEMAND RETURN TO OLD-FASHIONED AMERICANISM.

The responsibility now is yours. You have the majority. Will you violate the promise that you made to the people of the United States? I call upon you to redeem your pledge of faith. I demand that you make good your promises. Upon behalf of the great masses of plain Americans, I challenge you to perform your pre-election pledges. I say to you in their behalf that they are watching Congress as never before; they are demanding performance and not promises. They demand a return to old-fashioned Americanism and to American ideals. They will punish you if you refuse.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box].

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, the Johnson immigration bill has not yet been enacted into law. I hope this House will be able to deal with and to pass the measure. It will then have to go to the Chief Executive for his approval or disapproval. If it becomes a law, it will not go into effect until April 1. The passport law will expire March 4. The reasons for the enactment of that measure are understood and appreciated by the House and continue to exist. Every reason which existed then urges the continuance of the law now. Such information as I have in connection with this subject prompts me to say and to urge that the continuance of this law is imperatively necessary. I think the committee has done the wise thing and hope their action will be ratified by the House.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS. In the event that there should be a record vote upon this proposition and that it should be in progress when the recess arrives at 6 o'clock, would the ye-and-nay vote be allowed to continue until completed?

The SPEAKER. It would.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Temple].

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman does that, will he permit me to offer an amendment for the information of the House?

Mr. ROGERS. Certainly.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the Senate amendment in accordance with the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CRAMTON moves to amend the Senate amendment by striking out of the last two lines of the matter inserted by the Senate the words "otherwise provided by law" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1922."

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a statement that has been made very frequently in the course of the debate, to the effect that the existing law will lapse on the

4th of March. That is not correct. The existing law is the act of May 22, 1918, which will cease to be in effect at the conclusion of peace between the United States and those countries with which we are now technically at war.

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

Mr. TEMPLE. In just a moment. In expectation that the war would cease prior to the 4th of March, 1921, Congress passed an act which is No. 79 of the Sixty-sixth Congress, which was to go into effect at the conclusion of peace when the act of May 22, 1918, ceased to be in effect and to remain in force until the 4th of March, 1921. It has not gone into effect as yet. If it had gone into effect, it is the law which would lapse on the 4th of March, but it has not yet superseded the act of May 22, 1918, which is to last throughout the war.

It is the act of May 22, 1918, which the Senate amendment would continue in effect until there should be further legislation. I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I presume the gentleman has the act of May 22, 1918, in his hand?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Public act 154?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I would ask the gentleman what construction he would put upon the language, the last phrase of the first paragraph, "which shall until otherwise authorized by the President or Congress be unlawful"?

Mr. TEMPLE. The whole act gives the President the right to make certain regulations and to withdraw those regulations when he wishes to do so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield one more minute to the gentleman in order that he may elaborate that point?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TEMPLE. The whole act of May 22, 1918, puts the question up to the President and authorizes the President to make such regulations as he may think fit.

Mr. GRIFFIN. But as a matter of fact, under the phrase which I have indicated to the gentleman, does not the act of May 22, 1918, remain in force until otherwise ordered by the President or by Congress?

Mr. TEMPLE. No.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The language so states.

Mr. TEMPLE. The gentleman is mistaken. He reads a part of the sentence only—

That when the United States is at war, if the President shall find that the public safety requires that restrictions and prohibitions in addition to those provided otherwise than by this be imposed upon the departure of persons from and their entry into the United States, and shall make public proclamation thereof, which shall until otherwise ordered by the President or by Congress be unlawful—

And so forth.

This law does not go into effect until the President makes proclamation putting it into effect.

Mr. GRIFFIN. He has already done that.

Mr. TEMPLE. He did that, and when he makes another proclamation withdrawing the first one this act has no further effect.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal said in the course of the discussion which I think tends to obscure the issue presented by this amendment. In the first place, passport control of aliens who desire to come to the United States has never been, is not now, and will not be if this amendment is adopted, an attempt to enforce the immigration law. In my judgment, it would be wise if such extension were inaugurated, but that is not permitted under the present law and it has never been attempted.

Under the law of May 22, 1918, the sole function of consuls to whom application must be made for visés is to determine whether an applicant is an anarchist or a person who believes in, advocates, or teaches opposition to all organized governments. In other words, the purpose of the law of May 22, 1918, that we suggest shall be continued for the present, is merely to keep out aliens who desire to come to the United States and here to preach the doctrine of anarchy and bolshevism, of destruction and of opposition to all organized government and society.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I can not yield just at this moment. I should think that gentlemen would hesitate to vote against the continuation of a law of that kind in view of the fact that its

execution and administration have always been limited strictly to what is authorized by the law.

We have had hearings repeatedly on this general question before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, before the Committee on Immigration, and before the Committee on Appropriations. The testimony is universally to the effect that there has been no transgression of the restrictions laid down in the act of Congress itself.

What has been the effect of the law? We have kept out thousands of persons dangerous to the public welfare of the United States. The testimony is that 2 per cent of all persons who apply for a visé are rejected by our consular officers abroad. That is not a very large percentage. I think that it should be larger. But with immigration at this moment at the rate of something like a million persons a year that means that we are keeping out 20,000 anarchists and bolshevists through the medium of this law. I think with the world on fire to-day we are better off as a Nation to have these 20,000 people in Russia, Poland, or southeastern Europe than to have them in the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I can not yield just now. It is quite possible that the law ought to be changed and modified when the new Congress comes in next month; but Mr. Harding has announced that he hopes that his first work will be to sign an agreement of peace and issue a proclamation of peace. At that moment this law stops, and there will be a hiatus in passport control. We, who are familiar with the legislative methods of Congress, know that it may be a long time before we can get through a continuation or a modification of this law. So we are urging to-day that the present salutary system shall continue for the present and until a carefully devised law shall replace it.

There is one more element I want to bring to the attention of the House before I move the previous question, and that is the matter of revenue. A million men and women come yearly into the United States under this law and \$10 is charged per person. That means a revenue of \$10,000,000, which is more than enough to maintain the entire foreign service of the United States, both at home and abroad. The revenue feature can not be overlooked.

A great deal has been said here to-day relative to the hardships in the case of the political refugee. The law of May 22, 1918, does not exclude the stowaway or the political refugee who comes to this country directly or by way of Mexico or some other country and who has no passport or visé.

It does not, it is true, say definitely that he may come in, and it ought not to say that he may come in. It says if the Secretary of State finds that that man is of a character who would be dangerous to our institutions that he shall be excluded, but in the event that he is not of a character dangerous to our institutions that he may be admitted. All this discussion about the danger to the political refugee, and about the danger that America may no longer be an asylum as she has been in the past, is pure poppycock. You can not find a line of it in the law or in the President's proclamation or in the regulations issued thereunder. The only question involved in agreeing to this amendment is whether you believe that we ought to keep out in the next year 20,000 anarchists who seek to wreck the United States. [Applause.] I move the previous question.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment pending which is preferential.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I demand a division of the question.

Mr. ROGERS. I make the point of order that the gentleman's amendment is not preferential at this time.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, the situation is, we have already receded. Now, the question is merely on concurring in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was not aware we had receded.

Mr. CRAMTON. It was my recollection that on the demand of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] the question was divided, and we voted then on the motion to recede.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman's recollection, if the Speaker will permit, is not correct. The request I made was to have two different amendments considered at once, and to that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] objected. There has been no motion to recede.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not remember one.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask a division of the question, to which I am entitled.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is entitled to it.
Mr. CRAMTON. I think my recollection of the facts is right, but it is immaterial.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed at the desk that there was no such motion to recede. The question is on the motion to recede.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CRAMTON moves to amend Senate amendment No. 33, after the word "until" in the fourth line of the matter inserted by the Senate, by striking out the words "otherwise provided by law," and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1922."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. SABATH. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 37, noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer as an amendment the Newton bill, which has been reported by the committee.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS. The previous question having been put and carried, is further amendment in order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would say, at first blush, that it was not. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Alabama if he has any argument.

Mr. ROGERS. I yielded to the gentleman from Michigan so that he could offer an amendment before the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The previous question was ordered before the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan was read for action.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Permit me to call your attention to the fact—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will certainly hear the gentleman.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The previous question was ordered, but subsequent to that the previous question was not ordered on the amendment and all amendments to final action. We have taken already two votes under the order for the previous question. We took the vote upon receding, and the previous question was not demanded upon the motion to adopt the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The previous question was demanded on the motion to recede and concur.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. When the motion was defeated, the previous question was not demanded on the motion to adopt the amendment.

The SPEAKER. It was not necessary.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, if the Speaker should rule that the right to make a motion to amend the Senate amendment that is now pending has been cut off by ordering the previous question, then that puts it in the power of the conferees having charge of a committee report to prevent the House considering any amendment.

The SPEAKER. Oh, no. It is within the power of the House—not of the conferees.

Mr. CRAMTON. Just a moment. The report is presented. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] in this case calls up a certain Senate amendment on which he has preferential recognition for debate. He can debate it for 5 or 10 minutes and then move the previous question, and if he can get a majority vote for ordering the previous question no Member of the House has an opportunity to get before the House a motion to amend the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. If the House is satisfied with a proposition and does not wish to have it amended or debated further, it has a right, by voting the previous question, to come to an immediate vote. That is what the previous question is for. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] to concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. IGOE. I make a point of order that no quorum is present, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, pending the announcement, may I make a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. It has already been agreed to that the House will recess at 6 o'clock. Now an automatic roll call will come. If 6 o'clock should come before the roll call is completed, would the roll call be interrupted?

The SPEAKER. The roll call would not be interrupted.
Mr. GARRETT. Then the House would not adjourn at 6 o'clock?

The SPEAKER. The House would not adjourn until after the roll call. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and fifteen Members are present. A quorum is present.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.
The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts demands the yeas and nays. As many as favor taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Twenty-nine gentleman have risen—not a sufficient number.

So the yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The yeas have it, and the motion to concur is agreed to. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 34: Page 28, line 19, strike out: "For such expenses, not otherwise provided for herein, as may be necessary to enable the President to conduct and maintain any embassy, legation, or consular office authorized by law, \$41,300."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, before passing to the next amendment I want to make a point of order, that the Speaker did not put the question on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts to concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Yes; the Chair did.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The demand was made for the yeas and nays. The Speaker asked those in favor of taking the vote by yeas and nays to rise and stand until they were counted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had already put the oral vote before that.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman's position is untenable.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I think the RECORD will show it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 36: Page 29, line 12, insert:

"SIXTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS AGAINST ALCOHOLISM.

"For expenses of delegates, not exceeding 10 in number, to be designated by the President, to the Sixteenth International Congress against Alcoholism at Lausanne, Switzerland, August, 1921, not to exceed \$7,425, to be paid out of the unexpended balance of the appropriations heretofore made for the Fifteenth International Congress against Alcoholism, said amount including secretarial and stenographic work and transcription of reports."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. And on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The hour of 6 o'clock having arrived—

Mr. ROGERS. I ask unanimous consent to change a total in line 25, page 2, from "\$573,000" to "\$583,500."

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he has announced that the hour of 6 o'clock had arrived.

Mr. ROGERS. I ask unanimous consent to make a correction in the total from "\$573,000" to "\$583,500" on page 2, line 25.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. What the gentleman means is that he asks unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the House concurred in Senate amendment No. 5 with an amendment, in order that it might correct the total.

Mr. ROGERS. That is true. I ask unanimous consent to do that.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment to the Senate amendment No. 5 was agreed to will be reconsidered, the amendment disagreed to, and the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur therein.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. It is simply to change the total in the amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is an error in the House print.

RECESS.

The SPEAKER. It being 1 minute to 6 by one clock and 1 minute after 6 by another clock [laughter], the House stands adjourned until 8 o'clock.

Thereupon, at 6 p. m., the House stood in recess until 8 o'clock.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House, at 8 o'clock p. m., resumed its session.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 15812, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, and to disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Agricultural appropriation bill, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman whether he thinks there is a possibility of a separate vote or separate consideration in the House on what is known as the seed-grain amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know what the attitude of the Senate conferees will be on that matter, but I think it very likely that it will come back for a vote.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MAGEE, and Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution and bills of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 215. Joint resolution authorizing the legal heirs of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard who lost their lives when the Coast Guard cutter *Tampa* was destroyed in Bristol Channel September 26, 1918, to receive pay and allowances that would have accrued to said officers;

H. R. 11841. An act to amend "An act granting additional quarantine powers and imposing additional duties upon the Marine Hospital Service," approved February 15, 1893;

H. R. 15769. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Rio Grande between the cities of Del Rio, Tex., and Las Vacas, Mexico;

H. R. 15662. An act to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for letters patent, for taking actions in the United States Patent Office with respect thereto, for the reviving and reinstatement of applications for letters patent, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13402. An act for the purchase of land occupied by experiment vineyards near Fresno and Oakville, Calif.;

H. R. 9840. An act for the relief of Capt. E. V. Dickson;

H. R. 8647. An act for the relief of the owners of the American schooner *William H. Sumner*;

H. R. 7573. An act authorizing payment of compensation to Pasquale Dolce for personal injuries;

H. R. 6414. An act for the relief of Herman W. Schallert;

H. R. 2328. An act relating to the title to land to be acquired as a site for a post-office building at Spring Valley, Ill.;

H. R. 1035. An act for the relief of the widow of Joseph C. Akin;

H. R. 646. An act for the relief of Perry E. Borchers because of losses suffered due to destruction of property and termination of contract for services because of smallpox while in the employ of the Navy Department in Cuba;

H. R. 397. An act to authorize a lieu selection by the State of South Dakota for 160 acres on Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1430. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Weiser National Forest, Idaho;

H. R. 2946. An act to amend acts to permit the use of the right of way through the public lands for tramroads, canals, and reservoirs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8535. An act to provide for the redistribution of general taxes and special assessments due and payable on real estate in the District of Columbia in cases of subdivision or sales of land therein;

H. R. 5081. An act for the relief of James E. Adams;

H. R. 9028. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Nez Perce National Forest, Idaho;

H. R. 9702. An act granting certain lands to the city of Sandpoint, Idaho, to protect the watershed of the water-supply system of said city;

H. R. 10434. An act to add certain lands to the Targhee National Forest;

H. R. 10598. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Sharon, Pa.;

H. R. 11004. An act to grant certain lands to the board of trustees of the village of Downey, State of Idaho, for the protection of its water supply;

H. R. 11307. An act to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in relation to the qualifications of directors of the National Banking Association;

H. R. 13051. An act to add certain lands to the Lemhi National Forest, Idaho;

H. R. 13592. An act to authorize certain homestead settlers or entrymen who entered the military or naval service of the United States during the war with Germany to make final proof of their entries;

H. R. 5416. An act to authorize corporations organized in the District of Columbia to change their names;

H. R. 1300. An act for the relief of Alfred E. Lewis;

H. R. 567. An act for the relief of John Chick;

H. R. 13319. An act for the relief of Wilson Certain;

H. R. 644. An act for the relief of Oscar Smith; and

H. R. 9794. An act for the relief of Wendell Phillips Lodge, No. 365, Knights of Pythias.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

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

S. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to exempt the New York State Barge Canal from the provisions of section 201 of the transportation act, 1920, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 8038. An act to amend section 4 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act, extending its provisions to Porto Rico;

H. R. 11945. An act for the relief of W. C. Stewart; and

H. R. 12005. An act for the relief of Henry P. Corbin.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 15422).

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up a conference report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15422) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 10, 17, 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 45, 46, 47, 48, 52, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 73, 79, 83, 84, 86, 96, 99, 100, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 113, 116, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 130, 131, 135, 140, 153, 154, 155, 156, 159, and 161.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 12, 19, 23, 40, 41, 51, 53, 57, 61, 63, 70, 71, 74, 75, 77, 85, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 112, 115, 117, 118, 119, 128, 129, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 157, 158, and 160, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "eleven"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$11,917.50"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$9,811,857.50"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 139: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 139, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 16, 21, 22, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 49, 50, 60, 72, 76, 78, 80, 81, 82, 87, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 111, 114, 120, 121, 127, 132,

133, 134, 136, 137, 138, 141, 142, 143, 149, 150, 151, 152, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, and 168.

JAMES W. GOOD,
WALTER W. MAGEE,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
Managers on the part of the House.
E. E. WARREN,
REED SMOOT,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15422) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying report as to each of the said amendments, namely:

On Nos. 3 and 4, relating to the remodeling of public buildings: Increases from \$25,000 to \$30,000, as proposed by the Senate, the limitation on expenditures at any one building, and appropriates \$380,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$340,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 10: Strikes out the legislation proposed by the Senate with respect to enlarging the site of the customhouse, appraisers' stores, etc., building at Wilmington, N. C.

On Nos. 12 to 15, inclusive, relating to the Coast Guard: Increases from \$6,000,000 to \$6,800,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for pay and allowances of the personnel; provides for 11 clerks to district superintendents, instead of 12 as proposed by the House and 10 as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates \$11,917.50, instead of \$13,000 as proposed by the House and \$10,835 as proposed by the Senate, for the pay of clerks to district superintendents.

On Nos. 17 to 20, inclusive, relating to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance: Strikes out the provision, proposed by the Senate, for services in connection with the supply of library books, magazines, and papers to beneficiaries; prohibits, as proposed by the Senate, the payment of certain allowances to other than commissioned medical officers entitled thereto by statute; and strikes out the provision, proposed by the Senate, for the employment of chaplains for hospitals.

On No. 23: Reduces from \$6,000 to \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for the recoinage of minor coins.

On No. 24: Appropriates \$125,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate, for scales for customs service.

On Nos. 25 to 27, inclusive, relating to the Public Health Service: Strikes out the authority, proposed by the Senate, to employ chaplains for hospitals, and restores the appropriations for field investigations and rural sanitation, stricken out by the Senate.

On No. 29: Appropriates \$375,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$200,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the expenses of the Alien Property Custodian.

On No. 30: Provides that appropriation for Columbia Hospital and Lying-in Asylum shall be paid 60 per cent out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent out of the Treasury, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 40 and 41, relating to the Employees' Compensation Commission: Reduces from \$30,000 to \$20,000 the appropriation for contingent expenses, as proposed by the Senate, and reduces from \$2,000,000 to \$1,800,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for the employees' compensation fund.

On Nos. 45 to 48, inclusive, relating to the Federal Power Commission: Appropriates \$100,000 in one sum, as proposed by the House, instead of two sums aggregating \$116,300, as proposed by the Senate, and adopts the appropriation language proposed by the House.

On No. 51: Reduces from \$305,000 to \$275,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriations for general expenses of the Railroad Labor Board.

On No. 52: Provides that appropriation for the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission shall be paid 60 per cent out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent out of the Treasury, as proposed by the House.

On No. 53: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the limitation of \$25,000,000, proposed by the House, on the use of receipts from the operation of ships to defray in part the expenses of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation during the fiscal year 1922.

On No. 54: Appropriates \$46,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$44,000, as proposed by the Senate, for continuing ethnological researches.

On Nos. 55 to 57, inclusive, relating to the National Zoological Park: Appropriates \$125,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$133,000, as proposed by the Senate, for general expenses; provides that the appropriation shall be paid 60 per cent out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent out of the Treasury, as proposed by the House; and appropriates \$2,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,000, as proposed by the House, toward the acquisition of additional land.

On Nos. 58 and 59, relating to armories and arsenals: Appropriates \$50,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$35,000, as proposed by the Senate, for testing machines, Watertown Arsenal; and appropriates \$1,850,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,550,000, as proposed by the Senate, for repairs of arsenals.

On No. 61: Reduces from \$275,000 to \$250,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for national cemeteries.

On No. 62: Provides that 60 per cent of the appropriation for burying in Arlington National Cemetery indigent persons who die in the District of Columbia, and who are entitled to be buried therein, shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House.

On No. 63: Reduces from \$49,000 to \$45,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park.

On Nos. 64 to 71, inclusive, relating to buildings and grounds in and around Washington: Appropriates \$18,550, as proposed by the House, instead of \$17,000, as proposed by the Senate, for construction and repair of post-and-chain fences, etc.; appropriates \$35,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$30,000, as proposed by the Senate, for improvement, care, and maintenance of various reservations; appropriates \$45,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$40,000, as proposed by the Senate, for care and improvement of East Potomac Park; strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation on account of the memorial fountain in Dupont Circle; provides that 60 per cent of certain appropriations shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent out of the Treasury, as proposed by the House; appropriates \$250,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$150,000, as proposed by the House, for continuing the construction of a reflecting pool in West Potomac Park, and provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the appropriation shall be immediately available; and extends until July 1, 1922, the appropriation for expenses of dedicating the Lincoln Memorial, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 73: Provides that appropriation for Georgetown bridge shall be paid 60 per cent out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent out of the Treasury, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 74 and 75: Provides for improvement of Hudson River under contract authorization, as proposed by the Senate, instead of for continuing improvement in completion of contract authorization, as proposed by the House.

On No. 77: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision making the appropriations for flood control available until expended.

On No. 79: Appropriates \$50,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$60,000, as proposed by the Senate, on account of artificial limbs.

On No. 83: Strikes out the authority, proposed by the Senate, to use \$24,000 of the appropriation for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance for the fiscal year 1921 for the erection of surgeons' quarters at the Danville and Hampton Branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

On Nos. 84 to 86, inclusive, relating to public buildings under the Department of the Interior: Appropriates \$65,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$40,000, as proposed by the Senate, on account of the Capitol Buildings; authorizes the use of \$7,000 of any appropriation for the Federal Board for Vocational Education for making repairs to Maltby Building; and provides that 40 per cent of the appropriation for repairs and improvements to the courthouse, District of Columbia, shall be paid out of the Treasury and 60 per cent out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 88 to 90, inclusive, relating to the Public Lands Service: Increases from \$375,000 to \$400,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for contingent expenses of land offices; increases from \$500,000 to \$550,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for depredations on public timber; and increases from \$25,000 to \$35,000, as proposed by the Senate, the limitation on expenditures from the appropriation for depredations on public timber for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles.

On Nos. 91 to 98, inclusive, relating to the Geological Survey: Strikes out one assistant photographer, at \$720; two clerks of

class 2, two clerks at \$900 each, and two messenger boys, at \$480 each, as proposed by the Senate; makes it permissive to use \$25,000 of the appropriation for gauging streams for determining underground water supplies, as proposed by the House; and increases from \$125,000 to \$140,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for engraving and printing geologic maps.

On Nos. 99 and 100, relating to the Bureau of Mines: Appropriates \$76,900, as proposed by the House, instead of \$65,000, as proposed by the Senate, for general expenses, and appropriates \$200,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$225,000, as proposed by the Senate, on account of mining experiment stations.

On Nos. 106 and 107, relating to Alaska: Strikes out the provision, proposed by the Senate, for the repair, etc., of vessel transferred from the Navy Department, and restores the appropriation for the protection of game in Alaska, stricken out by the Senate.

On Nos. 108 to 110, inclusive, relating to national parks: Restores, as proposed by the House, a law clerk at \$2,000 and three clerks of class 3, as proposed by the House, instead of two clerks of class 3, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 112 and 113, relating to national parks: Provides that \$25,000 of the appropriation for the Glacier National Park shall be immediately available, as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the appropriation of \$275,000, inserted by the Senate, for the Hot Springs Reservation, Ark.

On Nos. 115 to 117, inclusive, relating to national parks: Provides that \$25,000 of the appropriation for Mount Rainier National Park shall be immediately available, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$86,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Sequoia National Park; and provides that \$25,000 of the appropriation for the Yellowstone National Park shall be immediately available, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 118: Increases from \$90,000 to \$95,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for the support of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

On No. 119: Increases from \$1,500 to \$2,200, as proposed by the Senate, the amount to be expended from the appropriation for maintenance of Howard University for normal instruction.

On Nos. 122 to 124, inclusive, relating to miscellaneous objects, Department of Justice: Strikes out the authority, inserted by the Senate, to use \$200,000 of the appropriation for the detection and prosecution of crimes for caring for liquors and property seized and held for use in the trial of cases for the violation of the national prohibition act; appropriates \$2,000,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,990,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the detection and prosecution of crimes; and restores the appropriation for protecting the interests of the United States in suits affecting Pacific railroads, stricken out by the Senate.

On Nos. 125 and 126, relating to United States courts: Appropriates \$600,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$400,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the compensation of assistants to the Attorney General and to United States district attorneys employed to aid in special cases; and restores, as proposed by the House, the prohibition against the payment of extra compensation to clerks of United States district courts.

On Nos. 128 and 129, relating to the Coast and Geodetic Survey: Provides for three clerks at \$900 each, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 130 and 131, relating to the Cape Vincent, N. Y., fish station: Restores a fireman at \$720, stricken out by the Senate, and strikes out a foreman at \$1,200, proposed by the Senate.

On No. 135: Strikes out the appropriation of \$13,000, inserted by the Senate, for the fish hatchery at Duluth, Minn.

On No. 139: Appropriates \$550,000 for the Naturalization Service, instead of \$525,000, as proposed by the House, and \$575,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 140: Appropriates \$70,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries, United States Housing Corporation.

On Nos. 144 to 148, inclusive, relating to the Senate: Appropriates \$35,000 for contingent expenses of the Senate, \$5,000 for decorating the corridor walls in the Senate wing of the Capitol, \$4,000 for shelving and file boxes for the Senate document room, \$50,000 for maintenance of the Senate Office Building, and \$5,000 for furniture for the Senate Office Building, all as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 153 to 161, inclusive, relating to public printing and binding: Appropriates \$2,290,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for printing and binding for Congress; appropriates \$750,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$700,000, as proposed by the Senate, for printing and binding for the Treasury Department; appropriates \$450,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$400,000, as

proposed by the Senate, for printing and binding for the War Department; appropriates \$250,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$225,000, as proposed by the Senate, for printing and binding for the Navy Department; reduces from \$285,000 to \$265,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for printing and binding for the Interior Department; reduces from \$150,000 to \$140,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for printing and binding for the Geological Survey; appropriates \$75,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$65,000, as proposed by the Senate, for printing and binding for the Civil Service Commission; makes immediately available, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation of \$20,000 for printing and binding the annual reports of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and appropriates \$40,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$35,000, as proposed by the Senate, for printing and binding for the Department of Justice.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendments of the Senate:

On No. 1: Appropriating \$60,000 for the purchase of property in Salt Lake City, Utah.

On No. 2: Authorizing a site for an archives building and appropriating \$10,000 for preparing working drawings for said building.

On No. 5: Authorizing the expenditure of \$5,000 from the appropriation for repairs and preservation of public buildings for the repair and preservation of structures at Marcus Hook Quarantine Station.

On Nos. 6 and 7, relating to general expenses of public buildings: Reducing from \$195,000 to \$170,000 the limitation on expenditures for the pay of technical employees in the field, and reducing the appropriation from \$424,600 to \$399,000.

On No. 8: Reducing the appropriation for operating force, public buildings, from \$3,800,000 to \$3,700,000.

On No. 9: Reducing the appropriation for furniture and repairs of furniture, public buildings, from \$700,000 to \$625,000.

On No. 11: Directing the heads of executive departments and independent establishments of the Government to issue and enforce regulations with respect to smoking in buildings under their control.

On No. 16: Appropriating \$281,345 for improvements and purchasing land at the Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn.

On Nos. 21 and 22, relating to additional hospital facilities: Appropriating \$18,600,000 for additional hospital facilities for patients of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and the Federal Board for Vocational Education, Division of Rehabilitation, and for veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the Boxer rebellion suffering from neuropsychiatric and tubercular ailments and diseases.

On No. 28: Appropriating \$300,000 to enable the Public Health Service to assist the States in protecting the military and naval forces against venereal diseases.

On Nos. 31 to 39, inclusive, relating to the Employees' Compensation Commission: Reducing the pay of and abolishing certain positions and reducing the appropriation for salaries from \$124,940 to \$102,590.

On Nos. 42 to 44, inclusive, relating to the Federal Board for Vocational Education: Providing for medical service and treatment of trainees when not provided by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and authorizing the expenditure of \$60,000 for such service and treatment not heretofore furnished; authorizing a revolving fund of \$500,000 for making advancements to persons commencing or undergoing training under the vocational rehabilitation act; and limiting to 12 months the time in which persons may avail themselves of the training privilege after notification to begin training.

On No. 49: Appropriating \$363,000 for additional work in connection with the Lincoln Memorial and increasing the limit of cost from \$2,594,000 to \$2,957,000.

On No. 50: Appropriating \$200,000 for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

On No. 60: Appropriating \$10,000,000 on account of nitrate plant.

On No. 72: Appropriating \$3,000 for removing and reconstructing a part of the fence around the Botanic Garden.

On No. 76: Appropriating \$150,000 for continuing improvement of the Willapa River and Harbor, Wash.

On No. 78: Increasing the appropriation on account of flood control, Mississippi River, from \$6,670,000 to \$8,000,000.

On Nos. 80 to 82, inclusive, relating to transportation facilities on inland and coastwise waterways: Making a lump-sum appropriation on account of transportation facilities; increasing from \$17,680 to \$30,000 the limitation on expenditures for the compensation of civilian assistants in the War Department; and amending section 201 (c), transportation act, 1920.

On No. 87: Authorizing the consolidation of the offices of registers and receivers at district land offices at Alliance, Nebr., and at Vancouver, Wash.

On Nos. 101 and 102, relating to the Bureau of Mines: Appropriating \$132,000 for the enforcement of the oil land leasing act of February 25, 1920.

On No. 103: Authorizing the reconveyance of title to land acquired under the reclamation law upon repayment to the United States of the amount paid therefor, less amount for damage, if any, as the result of the use thereof.

On Nos. 104 and 105, relating to the insane of Alaska: Appropriating \$127,000 for the care and custody of insane of Alaska, and increasing the amount to be paid the Sanitarium Co. of Portland, Oreg., for the care and maintenance of Alaskan insane to \$570 per capita per annum.

On No. 111: Appropriating \$25,000 for fighting forest fires in national parks.

On No. 114: Designating the Hot Springs Reservation as the Hot Springs National Park.

On Nos. 120 and 121, relating to the Howard University: Appropriating \$116,000 for additions to the home economics building.

On No. 127: Excluding an employee of the Lighthouse Service from the operation of the compulsory retirement law affecting employees of the Lighthouse Service.

On Nos. 132 to 134, inclusive, relating to the Bureau of Fisheries: Striking out the appropriations for the compensation of the personnel of the steamers *Osprey*, *Gannet*, and *Phalarope*.

On No. 136: Appropriating \$11,250 for the Saratoga (Wyo.) fish hatchery.

On Nos. 137 and 138, relating to the Immigration Service: Appropriating \$170.50 and \$240 to be refunded to Falik Schimmer and N. Galanos & Co., agents National Steam Navigation Co. of Greece, respectively.

On Nos. 141 and 142, relating to the Housing Corporation: Striking out appropriation of \$20,000 to pay certain municipal, State, and county charges assessed against property in which the Housing Corporation has an interest, and for defraying expenses incident to foreclosing mortgages, etc.

On No. 143: Appropriating \$225,000 for Employment Service under the Department of Labor.

On Nos. 149 to 152, inclusive, relating to the office of the Public Printer: Increasing from \$2,500 to \$3,000 the pay of the clerk in charge of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the Capitol.

On Nos. 162 to 166, inclusive, relating to the office of the superintendent of documents: Striking out two clerks at \$1,600 each, two clerks at \$1,400 each, and two clerks at \$1,200 each; appropriating \$9,100 for salaries and expenses incident to indexing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and striking out the provision charging the superintendent of documents, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, with the duty of preparing, etc., indexes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On No. 167: Appropriating \$35,000 for investigating petroleum resources and the production of petroleum in other countries.

On No. 168: Authorizing the printing until December 1, 1921, of publications now being issued by a department or establishment of the Government.

JAMES W. GOOD,
WALTER W. MAGEE,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the conferees found that there were many items in this bill as to which we would have very little difficulty in coming to an agreement. There were some items that were contested and some that we have not considered at all, because it was desired to get rid of those amendments as far as possible as to which we could come to an agreement within a short period of time. There are about 60 amendments as to which we have not come to an agreement, most of which we have discussed, and we will have to agree to some and to some the Senate will have to recede; and I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 16, 21, 22, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 60, 76, 78, 80, 81, 82, 87, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 132, 133, 134, 141, 142, 162, 163, 164, 165, and 166.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Did I understand the gentleman to mention amendment 50 or 60?

Mr. GOOD. Sixty.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Sixty is the nitrate amendment.

Mr. GOOD. No. 60 should be eliminated and should not be in the list; and I modify my request so that 60 will not be included.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. You are in disagreement on that?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and expect to take it up to-night.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee why he includes No. 2, the archives building? It seems to me something ought to be done about that.

Mr. GOOD. I have included that along with the others. Something will need to be done with many of those. The action proposed simply places them back where they were before, when we went into conference, and leaves them for the conferees to handle.

Mr. DALLINGER. But it is not final?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no. We will go into conference on the matters which we did not have time to discuss in the conference, or on which we could not agree.

Mr. PARRISH. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask if the gentleman intends to include in this list 101?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; 101. It simply takes it back into conference, and will save perhaps an hour's time in the consideration of each individual case. My request simply puts it back into conference.

Mr. PARRISH. It will come back before the House if it is not agreed on?

Mr. GOOD. Absolutely; the same as any matter in conference. The conferees will have power to treat it just as before they made the report.

Mr. OLIVER. The same applies to the inland transportation item?

Mr. GOOD. The same applies to inland transportation. We have not discussed inland transportation in conference, and it simply places that matter back in conference, so we can consider it the same as in the original conference.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. This only continues the conference?

Mr. GOOD. As to these amendments.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. The House insisting no further than when it went into conference originally?

Mr. GOOD. That is true.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Aside from this request is it the purpose to consider the conference report afterwards in the order in which the items occur?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman include 113 and 114?

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. WINGO. Those are not covered.

Mr. GOOD. No. 114 is coming up to-night; the Senate has receded on No. 113.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Did the gentleman request that a number of them be voted on at the same time?

Mr. GOOD. I am just asking unanimous consent that these amendments go back to conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the items to which he refers be disagreed to.

Mr. GOOD. That we insist on our disagreement to those amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Senate added 168 amendments to the bill, involving an increase of \$30,828,460.50. As to these amendments the Senate conferees have receded on 58, and the House conferees receded on 46. So far as the money consideration is concerned the House has receded on amendments aggregating approximately \$1,114,000.

The House conferees were conscious after going over the matter of the Coast Guard that we could not reduce the estimates by as large a sum as the House had reduced it, unless men who had been enlisted for a number of years were summarily dismissed from the service. The action of the House in passing the joint resolution of May 18 increasing the pay of the Coast Guard was more far-reaching than we had at first supposed. That item itself makes it necessary next year to pay in increased pay in the Coast Guard, \$2,100,000. It was found on a thorough examination that the House appropriation was too small.

The House bill carried \$6,000,000, and the Senate amendment carried \$6,800,000. The total estimates for this service by the department were over \$9,000,000. In cutting that estimate to \$6,000,000, going over the matter very carefully, and going over it so that we might appropriate a sum that would be sufficient and that would not make it necessary for the Coast Guard to come back for a deficiency, we found it would be necessary to yield. In agreeing to this amount the Coast Guard Service ought to take notice that it must cut its goods next year accord-

ing to the cloth. It must bring its force within this appropriation or at the end of next year tie up its boats.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Is not this increase of pay because of the fact that they were put on the same basis as the Navy during the war and that when the termination of the war has been judicially passed upon or legislatively passed upon, they will revert back to peace-time pay.

Mr. GOOD. My recollection is that they do not return to peace-time pay until six months after the proclamation of peace. But the pay I was referring to was under the act of May 18, the increased officers' pay, and that calls for \$2,000,000.

Mr. WALSH. That is war-time pay also, is it not?

Mr. GOOD. The law provides that the pay of the officers of the Coast Guard shall be the same as the Navy pay, and then by the act of May 18 we increased the pay of the Navy, Marine Corps, and the Army, and the Coast Guard, and Public Health Service, and that act is in effect for the next fiscal year, irrespective of the proclamation of peace. That whole increase of pay under the act of May, 1918, next year will involve an expenditure of \$75,000,000.

The next amendment was No. 70, the reflecting pool, in West Potomac Park. The estimate for this reflecting pool was \$300,000. The House bill carried \$150,000. The Senate amendment carries \$250,000, an increase of \$100,000. It was the plan of the House that the granite coping on this reflecting pool should not be placed there at the present time, when the prices are so excessive, and we only provided in the House bill for putting a concrete bottom in the pool. The Senate absolutely insists that the work shall be completed, and the conferees on the part of the House have agreed to the Senate amendment increasing that amount by \$100,000.

The amendment as to the deprecations on public timber—Senate amendment 89—carries an increase of \$50,000. The estimate was for \$650,000. The bill as it passed the House carried \$500,000, and there was a very strong showing made that there would be a necessity for this money for next year. My recollection is that there is a deficiency in that appropriation for this year.

Then, in the contingent expenses of the Land Office the Senate added \$25,000. The estimates of the department were for \$425,000, but the House bill carried \$375,000. The Senate amendment was for \$400,000, which is \$25,000 less than the estimate. The conferees have agreed to that amendment. The Senate items, items that are always placed on the bill in the Senate and agreed to by the House, amounted to \$99,000, and have been agreed to. The principal reduction involved in the Senate amendments on which the Senate receded were the contingent expenses of Employees' Compensation Commission, \$10,000, and the employees' compensation fund, \$200,000. After the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations the Compensation Commission found that because of the reduction in the number of people that would be employed as clerical help in the departments and workmen in navy yards and arsenals, there might be an anticipated reduction in compensation for injury, and that there might be a reduction of \$200,000 over what was carried in the House bill. The Senate amendment reduced the appropriation by \$200,000, and to that the House conferees have agreed.

The general expenses of the Railroad Labor Board carries a reduction of \$30,000, made in the Senate bill, and we have agreed to that.

There is a reduction, all told, in expenses for the maintenance of national cemeteries of \$25,000, and we have agreed to that reduction.

In the printing and binding of the Interior Department there was a reduction of \$20,000, made in the Senate bill, and we have agreed to that.

These are the principal items that have been agreed to in regard to the Senate amendments, and unless there are some questions with regard to these special items, I ask for a vote on the adoption of the conference report.

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

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 11: Page 15, line 1, insert the following:

"The heads of executive departments and independent establishments of the Government are hereby directed to issue and enforce such regulations as will prevent smoking in those portions of buildings owned or leased by the Government and used by any executive department or independent establishment in which such smoking endangers Government property or constitutes a hindrance to the efficient conduct of Government business."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, as far as this amendment is concerned, I care nothing about it. I realize that every department now can prevent smoking if it wants to. If it does not want to, the enactment of this provision would be a farce. We have agreed to bring it back because it is a matter of legislation, in order that the temper of the House might be tested on a vote. Therefore, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 11.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 11.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 42: Page 37, line 21, after the word "board," insert: "necessary medical service and treatment to trainees hereafter required in cases where such service or treatment is not provided by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and not more than \$60,000 may be used for such service and treatment heretofore furnished."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, this item was estimated for and hearings were had upon it when the Committee on Appropriations was considering the bill. The situation is this: An ex-service man who has been discharged from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and goes into training under the Board for Vocational Education is no longer, then, a beneficiary of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and if he is taken sick he can not be placed in a hospital by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. They have found in some cases that trainees who have taken up this training become sick and need hospital treatment and are not able to take the treatment. It has been very earnestly urged both on behalf of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and the vocational board that this item be carried in the bill. When inquiry was made as to how much it would cost, we were advised that it was anticipated that the cost would be large. I rather anticipate myself that it will be very much larger than either the vocational board or the Bureau of War Risk Insurance anticipate it will be. Yet the House and the Congress have been generous, so far as appropriations go, to that class of men who are taking this training. It is not a permanent thing, and is not intended to be; and a little later on, at the request of one of the departments, we carry a limitation in regard to the training. It has seemed to the committee, therefore, that this amendment of the Senate is a piece of legislation along humane lines for these soldiers who are taking training which ought to be adopted. The committee that heard the testimony would have reported out the provision originally in the bill if it were not for the fact that it would have been subject to a point of order, and we did not at that time desire to report out anything in the bill that could be avoided which would make it subject to such an attack.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 42 and agree to the same.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 43, page 38, line 3, after the figures "\$35,000,000," insert "of which sum not exceeding \$500,000 may be used by the Federal Board for Vocational Education as a revolving fund for the purpose of making advancements to persons commencing or undergoing training under the vocational rehabilitation act, such advancements to bear no interest and to be reimbursed in such instalments as may be determined by the Federal board by proper deductions from the monthly maintenance and support allowance, allowed by said act as amended."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Order of Elks for some time has supplied this fund. Several hundred thousand dollars have been turned over by the Benevolent Order of Elks to the vocational board to make advances to the men who are taking vocational training. This order has notified the Congress and the department that it will be compelled to withdraw those funds at the end of this fiscal year. The Order of Elks looked into the matter very carefully when we were at war, and thought that this was one of the places where it could do some real benevolent work for men who had been injured in the service. I am advised by the board that there have been no losses, or comparatively few, that losses are negligible, that the loans or advances are rarely more than for one month's compensation, and as the amendment is worded it is intended that if perchance an ex-service man who is taking training should have sickness in his family or if something extraordinary should occur in his own private affairs which would require an unusual expenditure, he might anticipate a part of his compensation, and this fund would be used as a revolving fund for that purpose. If it is administered wisely, if it is administered as conservatively as it has been administered so

far as the Elk's fund is concerned, it seems to me it would be a very great advantage to the ex-service men and it would not result in loss to the Government.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 43 and concur in the same.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 44, page 38, line 21, after the word "made," insert: "Provided further, That no person who has been declared eligible for training under the provisions of the vocational rehabilitation act, for whom training has been prescribed, and who has been notified by the board to begin training shall be eligible to the benefits of said act in the event of his failure to commence training within a reasonable time after notice has been sent such person by the board: *Provided further*, That except when such failure is due, in the opinion of the board, to physical incapacity, such time shall not be longer than 12 months after the passage of this act for persons already declared eligible and notified to begin training, and 12 months after notice is given for persons hereafter declared eligible and notified to begin training."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, this item is asked for by Dr. Lamkin, the director of the board. It simply does this: It gives the board the power to fix a limit within which a trainee must commence training after he has once made his application and that application has been granted. In no case, except where he is physically incapacitated, shall that time be extended beyond 12 months. It seems to me that the request of the board in this respect is along the line that Congress intended when it provided for the training, and that is, that this training should not continue indefinitely, that these men should take the training while they are young, and that Congress should not be called upon to appropriate money year after year for training these ex-service men, that they ought to take the training now.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. This amendment seems not to give the board the power to make that limitation, but makes the limitation itself.

Mr. GOOD. No; it does give the board power. The first proviso reads:

That no person who has been declared eligible for training under the provisions of the vocational rehabilitation act, for whom training has been prescribed and who has been notified by the board to begin training, shall be eligible to the benefits of said act in the event of his failure to commence training within a reasonable time after notice has been sent such person by the board.

It fixes a reasonable time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then it goes on and says what the reasonable time shall be, and says except for "physical disability." Has the attention of the gentleman been called to cases where men who would be entitled to this training had dependents upon them that might make it impossible for them to take the training for more than a year; in other words, may have to postpone for more than a year the taking of the training on account of some family circumstances that are not due to any physical incapacity? Does the gentleman know whether this limitation will work any hardship upon such cases?

Mr. GOOD. This is what the board asked for. This is not a provision prepared by a Member of Congress, this is a provision asked for by the director of the vocational board. I move to recede from our disagreement.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I do.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I want to get a little information as to how it will be construed in reference to the provision if he does not commence training "within a reasonable time after notice has been sent such person by the board."

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not know whether this is to be a general regulation or a reasonable time in individual cases, but suppose a notice has been sent but not received? That frequently happens, and it would be what would frequently happen in the case of young men who were moving at times from one place to another. However, I do not want to ask a question that is too hard.

Mr. GOOD. I do not know just how the board would construe that; but I do know this, as the gentleman knows, that in all these cases the language is not construed against the trainee or ex-service man.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But if the law says so-and-so, that is the law.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I know. I do not know how the notice will be sent. I assume that if sent by mail a strict construction of this would mean that when the notice is deposited in the mail that that is the sending of the notice.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Undoubtedly.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman feels that the matter is liable to deprive some one of his just rights, I take it that the Senate would agree to an amendment to strike out the word "sent" and insert the words "received by the trainee."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Those who know more about it than I would be better judges, but that occurred to me.

Mr. GOOD. But the whole amendment was drawn by the board, it is their amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I understand, and I suppose they must have had language of that sort in their minds, but apparently this would depend upon the sending of the notice.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. SWEET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. SWEET. The proviso provides further:

That except when such failure is due, in the opinion of the board, to physical incapacity.

The only condition in there is to physical incapacity. Would it not be better to have some other condition put in there such as might be more reasonable by the board?

Mr. GOOD. Well, the gentleman will recollect that when this matter was before the Congress it was intended to clean up the whole thing except those who took college courses within three years. Now they have been at it for two years. This gives the board what it asked for and I take it if there is any injustice in it that it will be corrected by subsequent legislation, but it is only to bring to the attention of these men that they can take training now, but if we make it so loose, "it will hit if it is a deer and miss if it is a cow," we might as well not have any.

Mr. SWEET. But the point I make is their incapacity is passed upon by the board, and it is not your purpose or the purpose of the Congress to cut off any of these men in an unreasonable manner?

Mr. GOOD. No; it is a matter of limitation, that they must take their training—

Mr. SWEET. But the gentleman confines it simply to physical incapacity.

Mr. GOOD. I say it is one of the board's amendments, that they think is necessary in the economical administration of this law, and I do not see any serious objection to it. And I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 49. Page 43, line 6, insert:

"LINCOLN MEMORIAL COMMISSION.

"For additional work on the masonry approaches and terrace around the Lincoln Memorial, including foundations to rock and all necessary expenses of every kind incident thereto, \$363,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, and the limit of cost of the said Lincoln Memorial is hereby increased from \$2,594,000 to \$2,957,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, this increases the limit of cost of the Lincoln Memorial from \$2,594,000 to \$2,957,000, and carries \$363,000. The amendment, as I understand it, is to make some provision for the settling of the walls that carry the outer walls of the terrace. The walls of the memorial itself were built on a rock foundation. To have built these terrace walls, that are some distance from the memorial on each side, as well as steps leading to the memorial, on solid rock would have necessitated an excavation of about 18 to 20 feet of earth, so conferees were advised. Instead of doing that, large slabs of concrete were laid upon ground that had not settled. Why it was done one familiar with its situation can not well understand. To have laid this outer wall and these foundations upon that newly made ground without going to bedrock was a mistake.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Can the gentleman state whether or not the Government was protected by any bond given by the original contractors?

Mr. GOOD. The contractor performed his work just as it was specified. The trouble was in the specification. Instead of specifying that these outer walls should rest upon solid rock, the specification provided that they should simply rest on slabs of concrete.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Who was responsible for the specifications?

Mr. GOOD. The commission employed an architect to make the plans and specifications, and one of the things in this estimate I do not like is that it carries an estimate of \$17,000 for

architect's fees for the improvement. Why we should call in an architect at this time, when the work is the work of an engineer and not of an architect at all, I do not understand. I assume the \$33,000 estimate for superintendence should cover any such charges. This work is underground, requiring the excavating of the dirt and the putting in concrete foundation down to rock. Now, personally, I believe that work must be done.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I wanted to ask the gentleman if the same architect is to be employed to do that work that is yet to be done that performed the first work?

Mr. GOOD. The work is already completed. The monument is finished. The architect has had his fees. This matter, when it is appropriated for, will be turned over to the commission to let a new contract.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I did not hear all of the gentleman's statement. Of course this is not connected in any way with the foundations of the memorial building itself.

Mr. GOOD. That is true.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman said he could not understand why this was done. As a matter of fact, does not the gentleman know that eminent engineers went over this matter carefully, and in the effort to save a very large expenditure of money adopted the plan that was adopted?

Mr. GOOD. I suppose that is so. But the gentleman knows this monument stands on filled ground.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I understand.

Mr. GOOD. Now, then, it was newly made ground, and the Committee on Appropriations a year and a half ago absolutely refused an appropriation that was asked for by the engineers, to place a pavement upon that ground. We thought then it would be only a short time before the pavement would go to pieces. And we have refused up to this time to provide the funds to lay a permanent pavement upon that newly made ground. With the walls upon which the outer terrace rests standing on large blocks of concrete, on this newly made ground, it has settled. Now, those uneven walls in some cases have settled as much as 4 inches. And the only thing that is urged now, as I recall, why the work should be done at once is that they are fearful that where the girders are attached to the memorial itself there might be, if there should be much more settling, some breaking or chipping of the stone of the memorial.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I understand; but after all I doubt whether they are subject to criticism.

At least I do not feel disposed myself to criticize the engineers, who, after careful examination, endeavored to save money. But they sometimes make a mistake, an engineering mistake, as was made in this case. Of course, they could have provided stone or concrete foundations down to the solid rock to begin with, but that would have entailed a very great expense, which they thought, which good engineers thought, which I think most engineers of the country would have thought, was unnecessary.

Mr. GOOD. Does not the gentleman think that harm will be done if we postpone this for another year?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think that harm would be done, really.

Mr. GOOD. Why?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Because I think, with this ground settling in this connection, it may interfere with the foundations of the memorial structure itself. That would be a very great disaster and involve a very great expense.

Now, the gentleman is complaining that they did not go to the full expense in the first place, and endeavored to save money, and made a mistake. I hope we will not repeat the mistake in an effort to save a little money and involve ourselves where we have got to build new foundations for the entire structure at enormous expense.

Mr. GOOD. They do not claim that.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They do claim now that it may settle and interfere with the upper structure.

Mr. GOOD. No. All they claim is that where the girders which support the floor of the terrace are attached to the foundation, if it settles much more—and they extend into the monument proper a short distance—they claim that that will tip some of the stones of the monument. That is all that they claim.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That will destroy practically the lower part of the monument.

Mr. GOOD. No. Those girders are about 20 feet apart and way below the surface, and there will not be very much tipping there.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Of course, I do not know whether the eminent engineers of the House and Senate who were on this commission are subject to criticism or not.

Mr. GOOD. I do not think they would attempt to qualify as engineers or that they should be criticized.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not think so myself.

Mr. GOOD. I will not criticize in the least the Members of the House and Senate who are on this commission. I think the gentleman from Illinois or any Member of the House would have done just as they did. They did employ engineers. But why an engineer should have done that, when he could go down and look at the ground and realize that it would cost only a little more to go down to the solid rock and put in these footings, when he knew the immense weight that was to be placed upon those piers of concrete, I do not understand.

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

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. Has the gentleman from Iowa examined this structure and this outer wall personally?

Mr. GOOD. I have not.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman said that this mistake could not have been avoided except by very deep excavations.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; about 18 feet.

Mr. MONDELL. But it could have been avoided by waiting a little longer, allowing this new material to settle. This is simply an outer wall, the function of which is to help sustain some of the terrace surrounding the monument. It has nothing whatever to do with the monument except as it is a retaining wall for the terrace, for the earth terrace. There was no necessity of putting in that wall at the time it was put in. They might very well have waited and have allowed the earth to settle, and in that event the settling that has now occurred would not have occurred at all.

Does the gentleman believe that there would be any possible damage to the monument by delaying this additional expense until we shall know how much settlement shall occur? The only point upon which there is any attachment to the monument proper is at a depth of some 20 feet below the surface, and then merely, I imagine, by some settling of the rods that do not go a great distance into the foundation.

Mr. GOOD. I realize that there is a great desire to complete this monument. I think that is the thought foremost in people's minds.

Mr. MONDELL. Is not that the only argument for the expense, that there is a desire to complete the monument? Otherwise the whole affair could be managed by allowing that outer wall to settle, which probably has settled now all that it will.

Mr. GOOD. I think that is correct.

Mr. MONDELL. Allowing a little more time, and then correcting the top, instead of the bottom, at a very slight cost?

Mr. GOOD. This settling commenced a long time ago.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will permit, the argument that was made to me on behalf of this appropriation was not that the appropriation was needed, not that any damage would occur, but that we must get this monument completed; and in order to complete it immediately it would be necessary to dig to the foundation of these outer walls and possibly, not certainly, possibly remedy the defect by extensive underpinning of the wall. We are not certain that this additional expense would accomplish what is intended to be accomplished, but we do know that in a short time the settlement will cease. Then we can tell what ought to be done there. Of course, it leaves the outer terraces of the monument in an incomplete condition, and one of the gentlemen urging it said, "Can we not afford to spend \$365,000 more rather than leave this monument incomplete for another year?"

Mr. BRAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BRAND. What has been expended on this memorial enterprise up to date?

Mr. GOOD. \$2,594,000.

Mr. BRAND. Upon whose judgment is the recommendation made to spend \$365,000 more?

Mr. GOOD. The commission that has been created to build the monument.

Mr. BRAND. Is that the same commission that spent the \$2,594,000?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BRAND. Who are they?

Mr. GOOD. I think John Temple Graves, from the gentleman's own State, is one of the members of the commission.

Mr. BRAND. He is not much of a business man, even if he is from my State. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOOD. I do not have all the names, but—

Mr. BRAND. What are the names of others from other States?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. CLARK of Missouri is one, and ex-Speaker CANNON is a member, and William Howard Taft is a member.

Mr. BRAND. Mrs. Taft or ex-President Taft? Was it Mrs. Taft or President Taft? [Laughter.]

Mr. GOOD. William Howard Taft.

Mr. BRAND. Neither of these distinguished men had any practical control over this expenditure—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that John Temple Graves, of Georgia, is the resident commissioner.

Mr. BRAND. That does not change the situation. The money has been spent by somebody, whether by Taft or Graves.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I move that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. MONTAGUE. With the permission of the gentleman from Illinois, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will it be necessary to remove the terraces around the monument building in order to secure this foundation?

Mr. GOOD. Really, I do not know how the work is to be done, but I should assume that it would be necessary. It will be necessary to go down under those cement footings. As I recall, there are big cement blocks that were put in, blocks several feet wide and a couple of feet thick. It will be necessary to go down under them and put in underpinning and make an excavation of from 18 to 20 feet to the solid rock. I do not see how the work can be done without excavating.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I made the inquiry because I thought perhaps the increased architects' fees might indicate additional work upon the terraces around the memorial, as incident to securing a foundation for them. I venture the criticism with reluctance, but with some confidence for a tyro—

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman were going to make an excavation under his own house to put in a wall, he would not hire an architect, he would hire an engineer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will not enter upon that. If these terraces are to be taken away as an incident to securing the foundations, perhaps the faces or sides of the terrace might be improved in some way without very great cost. If I now recall correctly, the faces or sides of these terraces are either cement or granite running to a white marble foundation. Now, the monument itself is a credit to any architect and a credit to any people, but it is a great pity that the terraces should be so finished as to contradict the entire structure.

Mr. GOOD. They are not completed. The completion of the terraces will involve the planting of shrubs and dwarf evergreens that will reach to the top of the terraces.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You wish to hide this monstrosity with some sort of evergreens?

Mr. GOOD. I have nothing to do with hiding it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not criticizing the gentleman. I think a great monument of that sort ought to have a suitable and symmetrical environment, and therefore harmonious terraces.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion I made, and move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the sum in line 4 of the matter inserted by the Senate and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$345,720."

Mr. GOOD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the motion which I have offered provides for concurring in the Senate amendment with an amendment which reduces the amount of the appropriation by the amount of the architect's fee. Whether they can get along without that I do not know.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. TILSON. What assurance has the gentleman that this reduction will be taken from the architect's fee?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I have no assurance at all.

Mr. TILSON. It might be taken from the rest of the work and the architect be paid his \$17,000 just the same.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. We will be just that much ahead anyway. I do not know whether they ought to have an architect or architect's fee for this work or not. The commission on this memorial is composed of men of very high standing.

CHAMP CLARK, who is very careful about all matters of expenditure, is a member of the commission. Uncle JOE CANNON,

who has always been an economist, is a member of this commission. Of course they act upon the recommendations of men who are employed by the commission, but very careful consideration was given to this subject. Evidently a mistake was made. I think it would be a greater mistake for us to stop now. I confess I want to see this memorial to Lincoln completed, so that the people of the country can see the most beautiful structure of its kind in the world as a memorial to a public man, and I hope the House will permit the appropriation to be made, so that the memorial can be completed without danger of chipping or injuring any part of it as now constructed. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the gentleman from Illinois able to suggest any way by which the beauty of this monument may be restored by in some manner hiding the back end of those buildings that have been built in front of it and back almost up to it?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If I had my way about it, I would remove every public building from the public parks.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the gentleman entirely.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does not the gentleman think it is a real mistake, if you want to do what you say you want to do, which is to complete this magnificent monument, to cut out the architect's fee? You must have an architect. You can not build it without an architect.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It may be that the gentleman is right. I want to have this appropriation made. I thought it would be more likely to be made and the House would be more likely to concur with this amendment in. I think we will get it done.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The same architect—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not think the architect is responsible; I doubt whether the architect had anything to do with that.

Mr. CANNON. What is the amendment?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is to reduce the appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. That ought not to prevail; the architect is not to blame.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not think the architect is to blame, and if my motion does not prevail I shall offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I realize that it is not a popular thing to suggest that we ought to give a little care in the matter of an expenditure of nearly \$350,000, even for the completion of a monument to the memory of one of the best men that ever lived. I am quite certain that what I shall say will not affect the vote, for gentlemen do not want to vote against an appropriation for the Lincoln Monument.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this expenditure is wholly unnecessary. In the first place, the outer wall has nothing whatever to do with the monument except as it supports and holds in place a certain portion of the earth or terrace. The outer wall should not have been built until the ground filling around the monument had fully settled, but in the hurry to complete the monument and all approaches—and I am not criticizing anyone for that hurry—in the hurry to do it the outer walls were built. Of course, they do not go to the rock foundation. My understanding is that it will require an excavation of 18 feet or more to reach the foundation from the bottom of the terrace wall, which they used in the estimates, for the appropriation we are asked to make.

The probability is that there will be no further settling of this outer wall. If there is a slight settling, no damage could come to the monument by that further settling. The only thought that those in charge of the monument had in connection with this matter was to hurry up the completion of the monument and not wait for the complete settling of the outer wall, to dig down outside of the outer wall and put in a further rock foundation, in order that the matter might be hurriedly done.

Mr. MILLER. Can the gentleman state what portion of the outer wall has settled?

Mr. MONDELL. I understood the chairman to say that it had settled 4 inches in places. Only a portion of the wall is settled, and a comparatively small portion. I think probably the motion made by the gentleman from Illinois will carry, but I simply wanted to make this suggestion in regard to the matter: My opinion is that if we do what it is proposed to do with this appropriation, it will cost us not \$365,000 but twice that sum before we get through. So in voting for this appropriation, which I believe is wholly unnecessary, I think we should have in mind the fact that eventually we will be called upon to vote as much more for the same kind of work, because I can not

understand how it will be possible to make this extended excavation, going 18 feet below the present wall, even for any considerable distance, for the sum we are proposing to appropriate.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the commission for the construction of this memorial. You can not always have your own way. I stood out for the location of that memorial, instead of in the park where it is now situated—I stood out for the location at the Soldiers' Home, which is 70 feet above the foundation of this Capitol. Uncle Sam owns it. The commission and public sentiment desired it to be constructed where it now is. Ex-Speaker CLARK agreed with me as to the proper location of the memorial.

Since it has been constructed, in the years that have come and gone, I am not so sure that I was right. I am very well acquainted with the architect who made the plans for this memorial. Nearly everybody in Washington, and business men and others out of Washington, wanted the location to be where it is.

Since I have been in Congress and within my recollection the tide ebbed and flowed over a part of that reservation, and I believe that it ebbed and flowed where the memorial actually stands. They had to go down from 60 to 70 feet, according to my recollection, to get a solid rock foundation, and so the memorial rests on the solid rock.

Since its construction they have undertaken the construction of a canal down there between the Memorial and the Washington Monument, at the boundary of Potomac Park, which is being done at great expense. Much expenditure has been made in improving that great park.

I was present a short time ago when this matter was presented to the Memorial Commission. We heard quite a number of people, and I am convinced that what was done was done in the best of faith on the advice of the experts, the best that that commission could get, who felt that the approaches to the Memorial should not be constructed at that time, and they were not constructed from the standpoint of economy. I am satisfied that the experts used their judgment and were perfectly honest. They supposed that the earth would settle gradually and that the concrete would be quite sufficient for the purpose of the support of the approaches. But they found that it settled and settled and settled, against their opinion. We had to go on as best we could. We believed in saving the amount that the opinion of the experts said could be saved.

Of course, this made land mostly was taken from the Potomac by hydraulic force, and it was also a dumping place for the city, from the cellars and excavations that were made throughout the city.

I call attention to the fact that on the 4th of July a few years ago after I began to come here the Washington Monument was only half completed. It stood there an eyesore. The patriotic ladies had raised the money and it was a great monument. John Sherman upon the 4th day of July rose in his place in the Senate and took over the matter and the Monument was completed, and instead of its being an eyesore I am told by experts it is the most magnificent shaft on the face of the earth. The Monument had begun to settle. It settled and settled and settled, and an Army engineer—I think his name was Casey—at a large expense made a foundation which took him the better part of two years to complete.

That Lincoln Memorial is there and it should be finished, whatever it costs. I do not believe it will cost anything near what has been mentioned here since I came into the Chamber. I think the country wants it finished and wants it finished now, and it ought to be finished, and the experts think it can be finished and dedicated by the time the frost is gone, along with the landscape gardening which has been planned. Lincoln is as dear to you as he is to me, and he is as dear to you on the other side of the aisle as he is to us on this side of the aisle. [Applause.] I do not believe that it will cost as much as has been suggested, but whatever it costs, having put our hand to the plow, we can not now look back. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that the depth to solid rock is 40 to 50 feet, I desire to correct the statement that I made. My statement was not taken from the report, for the report is silent on that subject, but was a statement made to the House conferees by the conferees on the part of the Senate, that it was only 18 feet. We had no knowledge except what was given us by the Senate conferees. As the gentleman is a member of the commission and is better informed, I think his statement is no doubt correct.

Mr. BRAND. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman takes his seat, will he yield to me?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BRAND. I simply want to make the statement, in justice to myself, that I did not mean by making the inquiry which I did a short time ago to intimate that I am opposed to this proposition or to the completion of this memorial, because I think it is a just tribute to one of the greatest men who ever lived and held public office in this Republic.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 50: Page 43, after the amendment just adopted, insert the following:

"NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS.

"For scientific research, technical investigations, and special reports in the field of aeronautics, including the necessary laboratory and technical assistants; traveling expenses of members and employees; office supplies, printing, and other miscellaneous expenses, including technical periodicals and books of reference; equipment, maintenance, and operation of Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory, and construction of additional buildings necessary in connection therewith; maintenance and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle; and purchase, maintenance, and operation of one passenger-carrying motor cycle; personal services in the field and in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for clerical, drafting, and messenger service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, shall not exceed \$30,000; in all, \$200,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 50 and concur in the same.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, should not the word "purchased," in line 24, with respect to motor cycles, be stricken out?

Mr. GOOD. The same language I think was carried in the House bill, and it went out on a point of order in the House because it changed the name of the field to the Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory, and also with regard to the item authorizing the buildings in connection therewith.

Mr. MACGREGOR. What I referred to was with reference to this word "purchased" in respect to "motor cycles."

Mr. GOOD. We have them in the War Department, but we have to appropriate the money.

Mr. MACGREGOR. We struck the word out in the other bills that we passed.

Mr. GOOD. I think they decided perhaps they did not need them and that was the reason it was stricken out in such bills.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. How much did the sundry civil bill carry for this item last year?

Mr. GOOD. The same amount carried here.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from the disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 50 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the next item, numbered 60, with respect to the nitrate plant, be postponed until we conclude the other amendments in the bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman anticipate that will take it over until to-morrow?

Mr. GOOD. I can not say as to that. It depends on how long it will take to get through with the other items. I do not want to extend an invitation to anyone to leave the Chamber.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand the gentleman's request is that this amendment go over until all of the other amendments have been disposed of?

Mr. GOOD. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that amendment No. 60 be postponed until the other amendments are considered. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 54, at the top of the page, insert:

"Nitrate plant: For continuing construction of locks, dams, power houses, and appurtenances authorized by the national defense act approved June 3, 1916, \$10,000,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to amendment No. 60.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion. I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 60 and concur in the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers a preferential motion that the House recede and concur. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, when the matter was before the House before it was stated that they would be compelled to hold additional hearings to ascertain certain facts necessary to a correct understanding of this situation. We have held those hearings. It has taken about four days to conduct those hearings. My opinion is that men ought not to vote or be called on to vote on an amendment that takes \$10,000,000 out of the Treasury without understanding just what is involved. There has been considerable demand on this side of the House for time to debate a \$10,000,000 proposition, and I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate be limited to two hours and that I control the time, and, if consent is granted, I will yield one-half of that time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But the gentleman will not have control of it.

Mr. GOOD. Why not?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Because the gentleman will only have control of an hour.

Mr. GOOD. But I have asked unanimous consent that I have control of two hours.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; the gentleman has not asked that.

Mr. GOOD. I incorporate that in my request.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman does not want unanimous consent that he shall control two hours of time.

Mr. GOOD. No; I am going to yield one hour to the gentleman from Tennessee, but not yield the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment shall be two hours, the time to be controlled by himself, and he will yield one-half to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the time is to be eventually divided and is to be for two hours, somebody else is entitled to recognition for one hour's time. The gentleman ought not to make a request that he have two hours of time.

Mr. GOOD. But I have control of the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I suggest the gentleman from Illinois, having made the preferential motion, would be entitled to recognition.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not care for the time. I have no desire to be recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Do I understand the gentleman's request to be that debate close in two hours and that he yields one-half of that to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Who is opposed to the motion, and then he desires to have the other hour for himself?

Mr. GOOD. I made the unanimous-consent request for that time so I would not lose the floor. It simply meant that my time be extended one hour, and I would yield that hour to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. What does the gentleman mean by not yielding the floor?

Mr. GOOD. I desire to retain the floor on this whole matter and close debate upon the amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman will have the right to close debate.

Mr. GOOD. I do not know whether I would or not. That has been contested here a great many times on the other side of the House.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Of course, he would have the right to close debate unless the other side could not use the time, and then he would have the right to close debate. Of course, the request did not state that the previous question should be ordered at the end of that time.

Mr. GOOD. I intended to do so.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman would have the right to move the previous question.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on this amendment be limited to two hours; one hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] and one hour by myself, and at the end of that time the previous question be considered as ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Tennessee have the right to yield time?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that general debate on this amendment be limited to two hours, one hour to be controlled by himself and one hour by the gentleman from Tennessee, and at the end of that time the previous question be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if this request is granted would the vote come at midnight tonight?

The SPEAKER. It depends upon whether the House adjourned over until to-morrow or not. The House can adjourn at any time it desires. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

EMERGENCY TARIFF BILL.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a conference report for printing under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers a conference report (H. Rept. 1359) for printing under the rule. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 15275. An act imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed under the rule.

CONFERENCE REPORT, SUNDRY CIVIL BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE]. [Applause.]

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, I am against the proposed appropriation of an additional \$10,000,000 for this Muscle Shoals project. I am against it for several reasons. One is that I am against governmental paternalism. Another reason is that I am in favor of rigid economy in public expenditures. [Applause.] I think the country elected a Republican House with the expectation that a Republican House would sustain Republican policies and not permit further raids upon the Treasury of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.] While I do not criticize the attitude of any of my colleagues or question their motives, conceding them the right to act individually just as they may see fit and in accordance with their convictions, I as a Member of the House claim the same right, and I propose to speak just exactly as I feel about this proposition, calling a spade a spade.

This proposal to appropriate ten millions of dollars additional for this project is in my opinion nothing more nor less than a well-organized raid, backed by an extensive propaganda, upon the Treasury of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Our opponents say—although the Government has already wasted there more than \$100,000,000, having expended, I think, about \$114,000,000—that they want to expend \$50,000,000 more in order that they may give the farmers cheap fertilizer. I want to say that the question of the manufacture and sale of fertilizer is not involved in this proposition. That plant at Muscle Shoals never has produced a pound of fertilizer and, in my judgment, never will. The fertilizer question is only brought into this proposition in order to appeal to the credulity of the American farmer. That is all it is here for, but they can not fool anybody. It is conceded that if the Wilson Dam is completed, costing \$50,000,000, there will be from 88,000 to 100,000 primary horsepower.

You know what primary horsepower is—the horsepower that is available the year around. The flow of the Tennessee River is very intermittent. At times the water is high, at other times very low. It is estimated that there will be from 100,000 to 400,000 additional horsepower, which is designated as secondary horsepower.

It is conceded that the primary horsepower is so valuable that it should not and will not be used for the manufacture of fertilizer. Those favoring the appropriation claim that they want to use the secondary horsepower for such purposes. But if they are going to use only the secondary horsepower for the manufacture of fertilizer, you can see that there will be certain seasons of the year when the plant will have to be shut down, or they will have to supplement the use of the secondary power with a steam plant.

They say that they do not want to use a steam plant, because it is conceded that if they did they would have to keep a steam-plant organization the year around, even though they did not use it, as estimated, only two to four months in the year. So the proposition is, as stated by the representative of the National Farmers' Union to our committee, when they do not have the secondary horsepower to shut down the plant.

It is conceded that the Government will employ from 2,000 to 2,500 men at the plant, and when we asked Mr. Bower, a very bright man, if he would have the Government pay these men while the plant was shut down he said that he would. That is the proposition—if the plant should be idle for three or four months in the year, with 2,500 employees, the Government should pay the men while the plant is shut down. You can see, gentlemen—anybody can see—that when they come before a

committee and say that they intend to use secondary horsepower solely to run the plant for purposes of manufacturing fertilizer, they admit themselves out of court. There is not anything to that kind of a proposition. The Government has a plant there to-day—a steam plant—which is in perfect running order. They say that plant can not be used for the manufacture of fertilizer because it would cost too much; it would make the price of the product prohibitive. What they propose to do is to get money out of the Treasury of the United States to complete this project solely for power purposes.

They want to supply power within an area of 600,000 square miles—within a radius of 250 miles from Muscle Shoals. That is the proposition—not to distribute power, but to generate and sell electric light and power. I say to that proposition, before we go into that, before the Government goes into the business of generating and selling electric light and power, the policy of the Government should be determined by competent authority. And I want to say that no authority now exists for an appropriation of one dollar for the purpose of the generation and sale of electric light and power there. That is conceded. If you will note the wording of this appropriation, you will see that it is headed "Nitrate plant." And it is proposed to make this appropriation under the provisions of the national defense act, approved June 3, 1916, under the provisions of which not a dollar can be appropriated except for the purposes and necessities of war.

I have called attention to these facts in order that the country may see, clearly see, and in order that all except the blind may see, clearly see, what a howling, rip-roaring farce is the basis of this attempted raid upon the Treasury of the United States. [Applause.] I hope that my friends in the House will not vote to instruct me to vote for this project. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL]. [Applause.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, in 1914, when I first became a member of the Military Committee, I had an opportunity to vote in favor of the construction of a nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals. I voted for it then, and I have never regretted it. I shall vote for it to-night. At that time we saw the European war approaching. It was a question of national defense then. It was defeated, and in consequence of that during the war we had to go 5,000 miles to Chile to get nitrates with which to fight. That is not national defense.

Now, you have heard in the past a great many figures given to you in regard to what you have at Muscle Shoals. Briefly, I want to call your attention to some of the figures. Many that are given to you are grossly exaggerated and confusing. You have to-day plant No. 2 completed, \$80,000,000 spent. It is a nitrate plant, the cyanamid process—a success, workable and complete, with steam. You have another plant, No. 1, under the Haber process, and \$13,000,000 has been spent there, and it is not a working success. However, the experts expect to make it a perfect success. It is one of the German processes. What you have before you and in view is simply the proposition of whether you are going to spend \$26,000,000 to \$33,000,000 on the Wilson Dam to make of the Muscle Shoals project a going concern. You have spent on the Wilson Dam to-day practically \$17,000,000, and to make it a going concern you must spend \$26,000,000 more at least or \$33,000,000 at the most, and this \$7,000,000 discrepancy depends on the amount of horsepower you develop, 100,000 or 600,000, and the latter is possible.

It is not \$50,000,000; it is not \$100,000,000; it is from \$26,000,000 to \$33,000,000; and when you spend it what have you got? You have got a going concern, and it will be workable, and it will connect up, if you want it, with an \$80,000,000 project that you have there—the nitrate plant No. 2; also with the nitrate plant No. 1.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I do not want to, but I will in this case.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Are they producing nitrates at plant No. 2 now?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. No, sir. They have produced nitrates at No. 2, and they can do it. But this is the proposition: If you have only steam, it is not a workable proposition, because your power costs too much money to make nitrates for anything except war purposes in war time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. So that they are not producing nitrates now at this completed plant?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. They are not, and they never will, in my opinion, unless you complete the Wilson Dam, at a cost of from \$26,000,000 to \$33,000,000.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. How far are the nitrate plants from the dam?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. As I understand it, about 5 miles.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Will the gentleman from Tennessee give me five minutes more?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I want to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] since when has it become Republican policy to sacrifice \$110,000,000 because you will not spend \$26,000,000 to make it a going concern? That is the proposition that gentlemen on this side have to face, and if you do not spend it you are going to have a monument of Republican inefficiency down at Muscle Shoals.

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

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman kindly inform us how that \$80,000,000 plant down there could be a monument of Republican inefficiency?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Simply because if the Republican Party will appropriate from \$26,000,000 to \$33,000,000 it can be made a going concern, and if you refuse to do so it can not be leased, sold, or operated; it must stand there idle and unproductive because we, the Republican Party, lacked vision enough to spend \$30,000,000 to save \$140,000,000, including the last \$30,000,000.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman may think so, but well-informed people do not. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The best informed men think so. I call the attention of the gentleman from Wyoming to the statement of the best informed gentleman there is in this country on that very proposition, Col. Cooper, and I will read you his testimony on that very point. This is a statement by Col. Cooper made before the Committee on Appropriations:

Col. COOPER. On the question of the 10 per cent on capital cost of \$50,000,000, I personally am very much opposed to the United States Government going into any business of any kind whatsoever in peace times.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

I hope you will applaud it clear through, gentlemen. Then he continues:

—And I should fight it just as hard as I could forever and amen. Here we have a condition where some \$15,000,000 has been spent and the question comes up whether you will finish it, put up \$35,000,000 more, and the way you could accomplish that. My plan would be this, that the Government should go ahead and finish this work up to the extent of \$43,000,000, not \$50,000,000, up to the extent of finishing everything and putting in the 100,000 primary power, and then at that time let the Federal Power Commission lease this structure for a term of 50 years on a basis that will net the United States Treasury 5 per cent interest on all money that it has in there, and let the lessee operate the plant, keep it up, and maintain it. That, to my mind, is the most practical thing to do.

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

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will read one word where Col. Cooper said he would build this dam to make nitrates, I will vote for the bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I am going to read some more of what Col. Cooper said. I am talking about completing the Wilson Dam. You do not have to complete the dam to make the nitrates. Col. Cooper admitted he was not an authority on that subject. He is a civil engineer, and says it was inconceivable, unthinkable, and would be a national calamity to abandon this project now.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will read one word from Col. Cooper where he said he would complete this dam to make nitrates, I will vote for it.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. He would do it to save the \$110,000,000 you have invested.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to call attention to the fact that Col. Cooper said it would be a national calamity if Congress failed to complete this dam.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will read you from the record a letter under date of November 27, 1920, in which Col. Cooper says:

On the second question, as to the cost of closing down the work at this time, this is difficult to answer. It is not conceivable that the Government would withdraw from this project entirely in view of the more than \$12,000,000 already invested.

That is from Col. Cooper. It is inconceivable and unthinkable to him that you are going to sacrifice a \$110,000,000 proposition there when by the expenditure of \$26,000,000 you can make it a going concern, and then it will be up to the Republican Party to determine what they want to do with the proposition.

Then you can decide to lease, operate, or sell it. When the Fertilizer Trust find out you have a well-equipped plant, able to compete with them, you need not worry; you can sell, and you can name the price.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman from Iowa has referred repeatedly to "a going concern." Will the gentleman be kind enough to tell us what "a going concern" is?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Will the gentleman give me just one minute more?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I want to answer the gentleman. "A going concern" is one that will pay interest on the investment, and Col. Cooper says this will pay 5 per cent if you complete it. That is "a going concern."

Mr. TREADWAY. That would also make the Government a business concern.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. No, sir; not according to Col. Cooper's plan.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will it not, according to your judgment?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. No, sir.

Mr. TREADWAY. It will, according to mine.

Mr. HULL. The gentleman never worries about the Government spending some money in Massachusetts. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, in every great project which entails the expenditure of a very large amount of money there naturally is, and there ought to be, diversity of opinion and free and intelligent discussion. But for the life of me I can not see why this discussion should take a partisan sense or view. In my humble judgment it is a national question. In no way ought it to be considered as a party question.

I see very little sense and less good judgment in those who endeavor to appeal to partisan spirit or party fealty either in regard to the advocacy of this measure or the opposition to it. The gentleman from New York appeals to his party side of the aisle and says the Republicans must live up to their record for economy. I appeal to the Democratic side of the aisle, and say that they, too, in their wisdom and in their duty to their country must also consider the question of economy. But I deem it unwise to save at the spigot and waste at the bung hole. I deem it very unwise to have an expenditure of \$110,000,000 in this project and let that go to absolute waste and destruction because you perhaps in your wisdom may say that you should save possibly \$28,000,000 by refusing to comply with this proposed amendment of the Senate.

And what in regard to this question of paternalism referred to by the gentleman from New York? I as a Democrat am opposed to paternalism in government. That is one of the principles that I learned when I first read the history of my country, and it has been imbued and instilled in me ever since I voted the Democratic ticket, and I hope that I will be able to cleave to that idea. But this is not paternalism. In my judgment it is the conservation and the preservation of the great water power of the Tennessee River, and I believe that the Nation ought to conserve, use, and employ all the water power of this country that it can avail itself of at any time. [Applause.] If that be paternalism, then I am in favor of paternalism.

What is the value of this matter before us? Col. Cooper testifies that in order to complete this entire work, taking into account the amount of money already expended, it will cost \$50,000,000 at present prices, and he estimates now at the highest prices. Taking into consideration that the labor market is falling in price, that materials are also decreasing in price, is it not fair to say that Col. Cooper has fixed the maximum amount which this project will cost in its entirety? In the very same breath he tells you that the power that will be created by this plant, by the construction of this dam, will be 550,000 horsepower, or greater than the horsepower that there is on the American side of Niagara Falls. He tells you that that power can be created at a cost of \$15 per horsepower, and he tells you that the distribution will cost \$12 per horsepower, making a total cost of \$27 to the consumer. He constructed the Keokuk Dam. By the way, he has the reputation of being the greatest

hydraulic engineer there is in this country. At the Keokuk Dam they are to-day receiving \$33 per horsepower.

Is there a demand for this horsepower? You have Birmingham to the south. Those who know of that region know that it is teeming with the iron industry of the South. You have Nashville 100 miles away, Chattanooga 125 miles away, and Memphis, I think, 135 miles away. That entire section of the country is demanding and waiting for the opportunity to have this horsepower.

Mr. SWEET. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. DEWALT. I will, sir, with pleasure.

Mr. SWEET. I have great respect for the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. DEWALT. That may be complimentary to the gentleman and not to the opinion.

Mr. SWEET. And he has stated that he is not in favor of paternalism. He has also suggested that by the expenditure of this \$10,000,000 we can save \$80,000,000 or \$100,000,000.

Mr. DEWALT. I did not quite say that. Possibly the gentleman misconstrued it. I will let the gentleman put his own construction upon it.

Mr. SWEET. Now, is it the purpose of the gentleman to have the Government go into the business of manufacturing power to sell to the various cities of this country, or is it his purpose to put this plant in shape and then sell it to private interests?

Mr. DEWALT. My answer to that question is this: In the consideration of the water power bill before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I was convinced, as I said before, that there is absolute need for the Congress to conserve and use as speedily as possible all the water power that is available. I go one step further. If it be for the benefit of the public at large and for the people who are living in the section, belonging to any portion of the Union, to have that water power sold to them, I say sell it to them, in God's name, and let them prosper. [Applause.] That is my answer to that question.

Col. Cooper not only says that the potential horsepower is 550,000 but he tells you another remarkable thing. He says that the amount necessary to complete this plant will be \$50,000,000, and in the same breath he says to you that within 30 years from this time the demand for this power sold at the rates that he has specified will bring an income sufficient to pay 5 per cent upon the investment of \$50,000,000 and leave a surplus fund of \$10,000,000 besides. [Applause.] In other words, the consequence is that if Col. Cooper is correct in his statement the Government can not lose anything upon this proposition and the Government will be repaid for the investment by the surplus then created every year to the tune of \$10,000,000.

If, then, the Government can not lose, and if the people prosper, whether they be in the North or in the South, whether they are on the fertile plains of the West or upon the coasts of the Atlantic—there is no sectionalism in my heart or mind—wherever they are, if the Government loses nothing, then give them the benefit of this \$10,000,000 appropriation. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEWALT. I would like to have more time, but I know the gentleman has no more time to give me, and therefore I conclude.

Mr. GOOD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. JEFFERIS].

Mr. JEFFERIS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am really gratified to-night by the remarks of the gentleman who has just taken his seat [Mr. DEWALT]. His remarks reveal this proposition stripped of some of the camouflage that has been put forth here in regard to it. In other words, if I understood him, he was advocating this expenditure on the basis that it was a power proposition—for the sale of power to the different cities and communities near Muscle Shoals. That being true, it becomes a local matter for one section of our country.

I wish to discuss it for a moment from the standpoint of what has been contended before, namely, that this is a fertilizer proposition. I want to call your attention to some of the testimony given by Dr. Parsons, who was appointed by this Government to go to Europe in 1916 and study the nitrogen proposition from all angles. This learned gentleman has been giving it his study from that time to this. He was asked by Mr. Goon, of Iowa, a few days ago what he had to say in regard to the production of nitrogen by the cyanamid process, the one provided for at Muscle Shoals. His testimony is this:

No plants are being erected anywhere, so far as I am aware. In fact, the present plants are stopping their production. I was informed last Friday that in all probability the production of the cyanamid plants in Germany this next year would not be over one-sixth the production of last year, and there is no question—I think it is quite

generally admitted—that the cyanamid process is in a condition of obsolescence, and I do not expect to see it operated in any part of the world to any extent a few years hence.

He also says:

I was told last summer by Mr. A. G. Barton, in his office in London, that in his opinion the cyanamid process was absolutely a process of the past. To quote almost his exact words—I have them written down at my office—he said: "Dr. Parsons, as sure as you and I are sitting here, the cyanamid process is a process of the past, being sure to be replaced by the synthetic ammonia process."

The doctor goes on in this testimony as to what the farmers think they are getting, and testifies:

What is your opinion with regard to the operation of the Muscle Shoals plant under the plan proposed by the War Department; would it pay?

His answer was:

I do not think it would; no, sir.

Would it pay expenses?

I do not think it would; no. I am sure it would not.

Again, Dr. Parsons says in regard to the farmers:

I am in open-hearted sympathy with the desire of the farmers and the War Department to follow the needs of the American people; I believe, however, that the farmers' organizations are very seriously deceiving themselves as to the outcome of this proposition. To my mind, I believe from the standpoint of the war reserve and from the standpoint of producing cheap fertilizer for the farmer nothing worse can be done than to operate the plant at Muscle Shoals.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, it had not been my desire to participate in this argument this evening. I imagine that what I had said on a former occasion, not long ago, would perhaps cover the ground about as thoroughly as I cared to, but it may be that I can add something of benefit this evening.

This appropriation is one of \$10,000,000 for the purpose of carrying on the work at the Muscle Shoals Dam. Now, we are justified in voting for this proposition on one of two grounds only, if at all. The first one is the proposition that thereby we improve the navigability of the Tennessee River. I called your attention before to the proposition that this dam in itself will not add to the navigability of the Tennessee River in any particular. As a matter of fact, gentlemen of the House, it interferes with the navigability of the present Muscle Shoals Canal, which formerly gave 5 feet of water around the rapids. Dam No. 2 is built exactly in the middle of the rapids, and in order to make the Tennessee River navigable at this place it would be necessary, according to the estimates of the engineers made in peace times, to build two additional dams, one of which will cost two and one-half million dollars and the other twelve and one-half million dollars at peace-time prices. So it was that Col. Cooper and others testified that so far as that being of assistance to navigation it was of no importance at all.

Now, if it does not add to the navigation we must consider it as a power dam. We are only justified in voting for it as a power dam on one of two propositions: First, that the law authorizes us to erect the dam to make power that we can sell to the communities surrounding it; second, that we can make a dam that will furnish the power for Muscle Shoals plant No. 2. I want to call to your attention again, as I did before, that there was not a cent of money that came from the national defense fund—not a penny—that went into the Muscle Shoals plant No. 2. Not a cent came from the national defense fund, and I challenge anybody, in view of that fact, to cite to me a statute under which we can vote to appropriate for building the dam. There is no such law.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. When this proposition was offered, when the bill was pending before the House, did not the gentleman state to the Chair at that time that he did not desire to make the point of order because after investigation he had determined that it could not be sustained?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I did; and I say so now. The trouble is that the point of order will not lie on this kind of proposition, because the Chair can not stop to investigate the facts. The only way that you can find out whether this money was expended from the national defense fund is to examine the facts; and the parliamentary law is that the Speaker can not go into the facts to determine a question of order. Therefore I made that statement, and was right about it, and I adhere to it now. There is no law upon which you can base this vote, if we vote for the appropriation desired.

Further than that, let us go into the question of power. It has been stated here time and time again, and it is the abso-

lute truth, that this thing has developed until it is simply a proposition of building a dam and selling the power to the country down there in which this dam is to be located. Let me call your attention to what this vote to-night means. I have done it before, and I want to call your attention to it again. If you vote for this appropriation of \$10,000,000, you must go on through the piece and grant the rest of the appropriations, and it will be necessary for you to expend the balance needed to make \$50,000,000, the proposed cost of the dam. You will have to appropriate, in order to complete this, \$12,500,000 for one dam, \$2,500,000 for another dam, and \$12,500,000 more to convert the nitrate plant into an ammonium sulphate plant, and that means \$65,000,000 more which we must put into this business. Is there any man in this House who will say to me, "I am justified in voting for an appropriation of \$65,000,000 in order to save \$12,000,000 that we have put in the abutments of this dam down there before we have established any policy whatever, before we have said what we will do about the nitrate plant"? You gentlemen over here who are advancing this project advocate getting this through before the 4th of March and appropriating this additional \$10,000,000, as then it will be too late to stop. We on this side of the House, particularly, told the people in the last campaign that we would save the public purse and the Public Treasury. We condemned things like this. We condemned practices by which the money of the country was being voted out of the Treasury. Are we going now at this time to vote this money out, when we know that in 10 days a new administration will come into power in this country that may investigate this and may have an entirely different idea about what ought to be the future of this enterprise? I do not believe anyone ought to do it.

Let me call your attention to one or two things. In the examination of Col. Cooper, he stated time and time again that he was opposed to this for any other purpose except as a power proposition. He said that was all that it was. I want to call your attention to two examples where he said that. The chairman [Mr. Good] asked him—

Do you mean by furnishing cheap fertilizer or furnishing cheap power to the industries?

To that he replied:

I mean by furnishing cheap power to the industries.

You are not urging that this amendment be adopted and that this work go on for the purpose of furnishing fertilizer?

Not at all.

Your proposition is simply a water-power proposition?

Yes; that is it.

Again, in answer to a question put to him by Mr. MAGEE—

But you are not in favor of the Government running it?

No, sir; I am not.

You are in favor of the Government keeping out of this business?

Yes; I think they should keep out of it.

You think it is a business that should be conducted by private enterprise?

Absolutely.

Do not you gentlemen agree with him about that? Do you think that we ought to go into the business of making fertilizer? Why should we go into the business of making fertilizer any more than we should go into the business of making harness? One is as essential to carrying on agriculture as is the other. The only reason anyone gives that we put some more money in is for the purpose of getting back what we have already put in. Do you think it is good policy, if we have put \$12,000,000 into the foundation of a dam, to put \$33,000,000 more to get that \$12,000,000 out, and in the end have nothing but a power, and find ourselves in the business of selling power to the surrounding country?

I want to call your attention to a map that I have here, and I want you Alabama men to note this. We paid \$5,000,000 to help the Alabama Power Co. on its feet, to get control of that country down there, and even the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], when we were discussing this thing on the floor of the House here, I believe, made some statement to the effect that he had nothing to say favorable about the operations of the Alabama Power Co.

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

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. If the gentleman will ask a question, yes.

Mr. GARRETT. I think the Alabama Power Co.—I said so in the report and on the floor of the House—took advantage of the Government's necessities and imposed expenses that the Government ought not to have gone to, and if the Government does not do this, the Alabama Power Co. will still retain the monopoly.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I am glad the gentleman interrupted me. Look at this map. This map is an official map published by the Alabama Power Co. Up here in the corner is the nitrate plant. All these surrounding lines we helped

them build during the war, and furnished the money to do it, and now they have a complete circle around Birmingham, Ala., and all that industrial territory, and they have gotten clear up to a little place called Athens, and there is only a little gap of 15 or 20 miles which they have to close there, and then they will have that territory in a circle.

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

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. No; I do not care to yield now. The only possible purchaser of this power will be the Alabama Power Co., absolutely. It is the only possible purchaser in that field. In fact, I want to call your attention to what Maj. Burgess said about this thing. An agent of the War Department went down there and looked the thing over.

Now notice what this Government report says. This is by an Engineer officer of the War Department sent down there to make a survey of this situation, and this is what he says. He is referring to Government cooperation.

And also makes the Alabama Power Co. the logical and in fact the only company capable of building up the market necessary to use all the power which may be developed at Muscle Shoals.

So says Maj. Burgess. And it is a fact, gentlemen, it is the only possible purchaser for this power. I see my time is going and there are some things I desire to say which I will not have the time to say.

It has been stated that we have invested \$17,000,000 and we must expend this money or otherwise we will lose the \$17,000,000 we have. I want to call your attention to some things that have been done that have got us in the position so that we have that \$12,000,000 in this hole. In the first place during the war the building was stopped on this dam by the Priorities Committee, because they refused to give the War Department priorities on the materials for this dam, claiming that the dam could not be completed in time to be of service in the war. The armistice was signed on the 11th day of November, 1918, and on the 9th of November, 1918, word was sent down there, through the Engineer Department, for them to start work on that dam, and they started on the 9th and they have continued at full force ever since. Since the armistice was signed they have opened up this Waco quarry and spent a million and a quarter dollars when they knew the Congress of the United States had not decided upon anything. They finished the Alabama Power Co. plant and built a little village or town for them and put a 30,000-kilowatt turbo-generator in place. They did all these things so as to get in a position to say to the Congress of the United States, when this thing came up that they had gone so far that they could not turn back. Now at this time, within a few days before the close of Congress, they come to us and say to us that we ought to go ahead with this thing and embark upon an enterprise that will cost \$65,000,000 if we keep it up.

It has been said the farmers of this country are for this thing. I do not believe they are, if they knew the facts. I believe the farmers of the country will suffer instead of benefiting by it. I believe there ought to be built up in this country a nitrate industry, and I say to you now solemnly and with due consideration of what I am about to say that if the Government goes into the nitrate business down here nobody else is going into it in opposition and in competition with the Government. And another thing: The Secretary of War came before the committee of which I am chairman and we asked him and others who came there who they were going to sell this product to, and they told us the fertilizer makers. Do you know, gentlemen, that what they make down there, ammonium sulphate, is not fertilizer in itself? You have to mix that ammonium sulphate with phosphates and with other elements to make commercial fertilizer. It has to be mixed with other ingredients in order to make fertilizer out of it, so what do the farmers get out of it? Gentlemen, it is a delusion, in my judgment, and no real argument can be made that will show that there is any real profit in it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SELLS]. [Applause.]

Mr. SELLS. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to discuss the technical features of this proposition, notwithstanding I have given it a rather close and impartial investigation. I believe it to be sound as an economic policy, and assailed from every possible angle as it has been its enemies have not been able to discredit it. From the standpoint of its potential worth and of its influence on the industrial and commercial development of the South there is nothing in this country that can compare with it. I believe that my record in this House, covering a period of 10 years' service, will bear me out in the statement that I have been an unwavering supporter of Republican policies and an unquestioning follower of Republican leadership. In deference

to that leadership I voted against the bill which authorized the first appropriation for this purpose. Probably partisan prejudice was largely the cause of my action, and without attempting to offer any unjust or any unwarranted criticism, possibly other gentlemen on this side of the Chamber voted against that bill just as they are now opposing this for the same reason, and my purpose in addressing you briefly this evening is to beg of you gentlemen on the Republican side of the Chamber to forget, if you can, the location of this stupendous plant and to give to it the same unbiased consideration that you give to projects of a similar nature in other sections of this country. I recognize the fact that the material progress of the South has been retarded by a blind devotion to a political ideal and in its adherence to doctrines long since discarded elsewhere.

For this evidence of her mistaken loyalty I bespeak your patient sympathy. We have suffered as a result; not you. But the light of a new life is dawning full on her face, and in the results of the last November election may be seen the breaking up of traditions and the establishment of a new creed of political thought and action. The "solid South" has been broken. Tennessee, a secession State, has proclaimed to the Nation her abandonment of dead issues and buried doctrines [applause]; and for the first time in our history the flag of a militant Republican Party has unfurled in victory above the cotton fields of Dixie.

Will the Republicans in this House by their refusal to grant this appropriation strike down what will otherwise become Tennessee's greatest asset, affecting every section of our Commonwealth? Shall we carry back to our people at home the tidings that a Republican Congress has unjustly and ungenerously denied this measure of helpfulness, and that our Republican brethren in the North have refused the proffered hand of political fellowship which we have for the first time in our history extended in trust and confidence across Mason and Dixon's line? [Applause.]

The South is no beggar. She asks as alms for none of the crumbs that fall from the rich man's table. But she does ask that sectionalism shall be forgotten and that her claims for recognition shall be judged by the same standards that you apply to those of the remaining States of this Union. [Applause.]

Members of this House, in an excess of patriotic zeal, are wont to proclaim that there is no North, no South, no East, no West. Gentlemen, the vote here on this side of the Chamber to-night will constitute the acid test which will determine the truth and sincerity of that statement. And I make this statement, not as a threat, please understand, but merely as the expression of my honest judgment, that if this Congress, both branches of which are Republican, shall defeat this measure, Tennessee will not give another electoral vote to a Republican candidate during your lifetime or mine.

The South is ready to cut adrift from her political moorings. Her progressive men realize the disadvantage and utter folly of servitude to one political party. They merely wait to see what recognition shall be given to her just claims, and to just what extent the prejudice of sectionalism shall militate against her. A golden opportunity is presented here to-night, and I have faith to believe that gentlemen on this, the Republican, side of the Chamber will take advantage of it to do full and substantial justice. [Applause.]

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Friday, February 25, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

424. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting deficiency estimate of appropriation, in the sum of \$5,594.21, required by the Department of Labor for "Salaries and expenses of the International Conference of Labor, 1920" (H. Doc. No. 1014); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

425. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with report of Maj. W. A. Johnson, Corps of Engineers, on preliminary examination of the Narrows between Choctawhatchee Bar and Santa Rosa Sound, Fla., including the swash channel from Camp Walton to Mary Esther; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

426. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a tentative draft of a bill regarding suits at law or in equity now pending or hereafter brought in any State court on account of any contract, etc., made by the Navy Department during the war with Germany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. VESTAL, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to which was referred the bill (S. 4893) to authorize the coinage of a 50-cent piece in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Missouri into the Union, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1356), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MONTAGUE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10963) granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Savannah River at or near Halleys Ferry, and between the counties of Anderson, S. C., and Hart, Ga., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1358), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 16150) to amend the vocational rehabilitation act to exempt from taxation amounts heretofore or hereafter received thereunder as training pay and allowances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY of California: A bill (H. R. 16151) to create a department of aeronautics, defining the powers and duties of the secretary thereof, providing for the organization, disposition, and administration of a United States air force, and providing for the development of civil and commercial aviation, the regulation of air navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolution (H. Res. 694) asking the Secretary of the Navy to give information to Congress concerning the cost of metal furniture as produced by the Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relating to the exchange of privately owned lands for lands belonging to the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, regarding the reclamation of arid and swamp lands in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also (by request), memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the passage of the French-Capper bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, in connection with Government censorship of moving pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, in connection with the transportation act of 1920, so as to eliminate therefrom the rule of rate making; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, in connection with the designation of Fort Meade as a military hospital; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, in connection with the Rogers bill, H. R. 14961; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, favoring the immediate enactment of an emergency tariff law for the relief of the farmers and live-stock producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, asking Congress to pass legislation directing the United States Bureau of Public Health and the United States Commissioner of Pensions to appoint physicians and dentists who are now in the military service, or who have been honorably discharged from the same, as public health officers and on boards of examining surgeons, in preference to those who are not in the military or naval service, or who have not so served and been honorably discharged; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

6041. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of certain citizens of Megargel, Tex., protesting against market gambling in farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6042. Also, petition of the Boston Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, favoring a thorough and rigid investigation of matters in Haiti and San Domingo; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

6043. Also, petition of Denver Typographical Union No. 49, favoring the recognition of the Irish republic by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6044. By Mr. CLEARY: Petition of Matthew J. Smith and 768 others, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6045. By Mr. CRAGO: Petition of the State Federation of Pennsylvania Women, favoring the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6046. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the St. Joseph Society of Peru, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6047. Also, petition of W. R. Everett, Mrs. Bessie M. Johnson, Mrs. Florence R. Lewis, Mrs. Jessie Goodspeed, St. Monica Court No. 501 (Daughters of Isabella), Mrs. Carrie Stenger, Mrs. Eva Gorman, Mrs. Josephine H. Landgraf, Mrs. Florence B. Crittenden, Mrs. Elsie B. Corveth, Mrs. Agnes E. Morgan, B. G. Morgan, F. Kate Kelley, Louis H. Gillardon, John F. Parker, O. M. Williams, Mrs. O. M. Williams, Mrs. Clara Gillardon, Mrs. Ida E. Orput, Lorenz Weber, Mrs. Lorenz Weber, Mrs. William Eskridge, Miss Ruth C. Ogren, Andrew J. Ogren, Mrs. Ell Myer, Mary C. Ogren, R. A. Orput, Mrs. Nellie Hewitt, George A. Hewitt, Mrs. Mary Proctor, Miss Josie Samuelson, Miss Ruth E. Hewitt, Mrs. B. A. Solem, Mrs. John F. Parker, Nellie M. Keeling, F. S. Madden, A. C. Woods, Mrs. Lottie N. Woods, Miss Ethel Eudeley, Arthur Janes, Mrs. Ellen E. Janes, Andrew P. Lorenzen, Emma S. Carver, Katherine McClintock, Mrs. Clara G. Strokers, Maud V. Patterson, Jennie E. Woodruff, Edward J. Hollister, H. H. Biggert, Martha E. Kennedy, Mrs. Fannie P. Walker, and Mr. and Mrs. Perry Jackson, of Rockford, Ill.; Mr. and Mrs. Nelson Engdal, Mrs. Minnie L. Dempsey, Mrs. Carrie L. Gilroy, Mr. and Mrs. Albert Puls, and Mr. and Mrs. J. E. Carter, of Belvidere, Ill.; Miss Minnie L. Richardson, of Roscoe, Ill.; and Rodney K. Cummins, of Champaign, Ill., protesting against the passage of the so-called Capper-Fess bills, S. 3950 and H. R. 12652; to the Committee on Education.

6048. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Division 72, Ancient Order of Hibernians, Boston, Mass., J. A. Cantwell, secretary, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6049. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of St. Joseph's Casino, of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6050. Also, petition of the City Council of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the burial of an unidentified soldier, killed in France, in Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6051. By Mr. KIESS: Petition of the Renovo Branch of the Ladies' Catholic Benevolent Association, of Renovo, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6052. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition of voters of Oshkosh, Wis., requesting an amendment to the Volstead enforcement act permitting the manufacture and sale of beer and light wines; also protesting against the so-called blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6053. By Mr. McFADDEN: Petition of Troy Grange, No. 180, of Troy, Pa., protesting against the reenactment of the so-called daylight saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6054. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of Local No. 5, Licensed Tugman's Protective Association, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring a duty on fish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6055. By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of the Council of St. Jean Baptiste, No. 10, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6056. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of the Harry Hardy Post, No. 47, of the American Legion, of Burnstad, N. Dak., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for better hospital facilities for disabled war veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.