Also, memorial of Merchant Tailors' National Protective Association, indorsing H. R. 534, relating to industrial education—to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Michael Cook Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Faribault, Minn., for the Lafean bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of National German-American Alliance, for forest reservations in White Mountains and southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of 223 citizens of Clinton for a system of pensions for aged persons—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of National German-American Alliance, against immigration legislation—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturaliztion.

By Mr. DUNWELL: Petition of Frank E. Pearsall, against amendment of copyright bill inimical to photographers—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of National German-American Alliance, against immigration legislation—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of T. B. Walker, for currency legislation—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DUREY: Petition of J. C. Worley, of Ballston, N. Y., against amendment of copyright law as regards photographers—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of National Funeral Directors' Association, for legislation to prevent burial at sea—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Downtown Taxpayers' Association, for construction of a battle ship at Brooklyn Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FLOYD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George Rawlings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Samuel Lyda, Catharine Lyda, and Frances L. Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of George W. Irvin—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of David M. Wiswander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of New York Post-Office Laborers' Protective Association, for increase of pay—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Paint Manufacturers' Association of the United States, against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRAFF: Petition of Edward H. D. Couch, for travel pay as an officer of the United States Volunteers for war service in the Philippines—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of Companies I and L, First Infantry, and Company E, Second Infantry, Connecticut National Guard, favoring H. R. 14783, for promotion of efficiency of the militia—to the Committee on Militia.

Also, petition of Germania Lodge, Sons of Hermann, of Norwich, Conn., against prohibition or interstate-commerce liquor measures now before Congress—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Business Men's Association of Willimantic, Conn., against any changes in the present parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles K. Payne, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Harry Kimmell, to be placed on the retired list of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: Petition of Army and Navy Union, of Erie, Pa., for increase of pay of officers and enlisted men in Army and Navy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELIHER: Petition of women of Boston, for legislation providing for a 1-cent 2-ounce general letter post and for a cheap rural post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of W. B. Clark Company, of Boston, against increase of census clerical force save in compliance with civil-service rules—to the Committee on the Census.

Also, petition of National German-American Alliance, against change in immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of East Asiatic Society of Boston, for joint resolution No. 90, relative to consular establishments in China, Japan, and Korea—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KNAPP: Petition of W. G. Mendeville, of Lowville, N. Y., against amendment of copyright law as regards photographers—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LEE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of heir of James Freeman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of Samuel H. Harrington and others, for pension legislation granting $30 per month to all Union soldiers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ellen Waters—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ambrose M. Phelps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mathew Ready, jr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Mount Pleasant Baptist Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REEDER: Petitions of Homer Calvin et al. and Milo Robinson et al., for the Sherwood bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REYNOLDS: Papers to accompany bills for relief of James Powell, Daniel Snively, and John McNevin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPIGHT: Papers to accompany bills for relief of estate of Jerusha Harrison and estate of T. H. P. Morton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STERLING: Papers to accompany H. R. 16851—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STURGISS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William D. Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of John Todd, Isaac D. Caldwell, Nelson Hendrick, Charles H. Keefer, R. A. A. Collins, John C. Dearing, and John M. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of George Murphy, against amendment in copyright bill inimical to photographers—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. WALLACE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Horace E. Bemis—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WOOD: Petition of Mrs. C. B. Dickinson, for restoration of motto "In God we trust" to the coins—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of G. G. Green, against amendment to pure-food and drugs act of June 30, 1906—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of G. G. Green, against H. R. 11762, prohibiting distribution of advertising matter in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *February 15, 1908.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our Father in heaven, for the deep and abiding patriotism which characterizes the American people and which insures the perpetuity of our Republic; that we are not unmindful of those who sacrificed themselves on a thousand fields in the service of their country. We are reminded of the brave men who, ten years ago to-day, went down to death on the ill-fated *Maine*.

Grant, O God, that their sacrifice may be an inspiration to the living; that our country is not only worth living for, but, if need be, it is worth dying for; that vigilance is not only the price of liberty, but it is the price of everything worth while.

Help us, therefore, to be patriots in times of peace and in times of war; and we most fervently pray, O God, that war shall never come to us again, but that we may live in harmony with each other and in peace with all the world; and Thine will be the praise, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

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

SECOND-CLASS POSTAGE.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print as a document a communication addressed to me by the Third Assistant Postmaster-General relative to the attitude of the Department toward second-class mail.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire if the document is concerning Erastus Moore?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Not at all. I have had many inquiries, as other Members have, relative to the new rules of the service

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

affecting the second-class matter, and this document will enable Members to fully advise in regard to it.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. If I understand, this has reference to the rule which prescribes that in case of a daily paper, if the subscription is not paid within a certain specified time, the subscriber's name shall not be counted in the general make-up of the numbers of bona fide subscribers.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I may say that it covers the entire subject of second-class matter of postage; it gives a full review of the cases—those that have appeared in recent months—and the new rules which have been promulgated.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. But the gentleman does not answer my question.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I say that it covers that, and others as well.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman this question. Some of us are very anxious to know, and a number of the constituents of many of us are anxious to know, the authority of the Postmaster-General to make these rules. Is that also conveyed in this communication?

Mr. OVERSTREET. The entire subject, I repeat, is treated in this communication, and it is prepared with a view of furnishing full and exhaustive information on that subject.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Now, in the event the House or Congress should be of the opinion that the rules, one of which I have referred to, are not proper rules in that regard, what relief is there for the people from such a rule?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Any relief which requires legislation would have to be considered by Congress.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I understand that, but the gentleman is the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and if these rules and regulations are binding then the real relief must come through the committee, so far as this House is concerned.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in my judgment this communication, which I ask shall be printed as a document, carries sufficient information to enable the gentleman from Georgia, as well as others, to satisfy themselves concerning what is the rule and what is the policy of the Department, and then they can take such steps as may seem best to them for any relief which they may think may be wise.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I am glad to have the information, and I am satisfied the press of the country and the people generally will be glad to know by what authority these rules have been adopted.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I would like to couple with my request for unanimous consent for printing as a document that 5,000 copies be printed. I may say that 5,000 copies can be printed, or about five times as many as the limited number that would be printed if no requests were made, for about $133. I think that will cover the entire expense of the 5,000 copies of the document.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. May I ask the gentleman where these extra copies will go—to the Members or to the document room?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I have no objection, just so this is printed and they can be available. I have no objection to coupling with that the request that the documents be distributed through the folding room.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, does that assign to each Member a particular number?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think that is a very wasteful way of distribution.

Mr. McCALL. In the other way a few Members would get them all.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not like that method of distribution, because I regard it as exceedingly wasteful. If every Member took his quota out of the folding room, it would be a different proposition, but there are train loads of documents piled up in the Capitol building that have never been called for.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that under the recent joint resolution the Committee on Printing controls the total amount printed, and the full number is not printed unless the demand justifies it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 139) to fill a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents in the Smithsonian Institution of the class "other than Members of Congress" shall be filled by the appointment of Charles F. Choate, jr., a citizen of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

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

On motion of Mr. McCALL a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 16882), the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Mr. LAWRENCE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee is in the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill (H. R. 16882) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, and for other purposes. When the committee adjourned last evening the committee was considering the bill under the five-minute rule and had reached line 4, on page 104. The Clerk will now resume the reading of the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to return to page 102 for the purpose of offering an amendment, which I will ask to have read from the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to return to page 102 for the purpose of offering an amendment, which will be read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 102, in lieu of that stricken out on point of order, insert the following:

"For a monthly pilot chart of the North Pacific Ocean, showing graphically the matters of value and interest to the maritime community of the Pacific coast, including the expenses of communicating and circulating information, lithographing and engraving, the purchase of material for and printing and mailing the chart, $2,000."

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will resume the reading of the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to reserve his point of order until I make a brief statement with reference to the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania reserve his point of order?

Mr. BINGHAM. I am willing for the gentleman to make a statement if he desires to do so, but I object to returning to any part of the bill save that to which the committee has already conceded.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman can make a statement when the next paragraph is reached under the five-minute rule.

Mr. JONES of Washington. When I make my statement here I do not believe that there will be any objection to my amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is a waste of talk; we are not going back to it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, when this matter came up on yesterday it was a proposition that had been in the bill for a great many years, and no question had been raised on the floor of the House with reference to it, and I will frankly state I did not know anything about the importance of this matter, and therefore I did not propose my amendment on yesterday. This morning I called at the Hydrographic Office to inquire with reference to the matter, and I find that this chart has been prepared every year since about 1882 or 1885 and that it is considered by the Office of the very greatest value, especially to the maritime interests on the Pacific coast. The pilot charts are compilations of observations made by something like 2,000 voluntary observers of the Department, and they show the results of those observations for twenty or thirty years.

There are great demands for this chart, especially by the maritime interests, by the navigators, and also by the schools, colleges, and public institutions of the country, and it seems to me that it is a matter that this House ought not to cut out, especially as it has been used for twenty-five or thirty years. As I say, they have something like 2,000 voluntary observers who send in their reports to the Department, and these charts are simply a compilation of these reports, and that is all there is to it. They will show the experience of navigators with the currents of water and the prevailing wind and all that sort of thing for twenty-five or thirty years. From these observations they are able to determine pretty fully and accurately what they may expect in the future. The Department considers this of the very greatest importance. Eighteen hundred copies of this North Pacific chart are issued monthly, and practically all are sent out. The provision I have sent has been carried in the bill here for twenty-five or thirty years and there ought not to be any objection to it. I have eliminated the objectionable features upon which this matter went out on the point of order yesterday and have simply carried the general proposition and appropriated what they already have had, and I hope there will be no objection to going back for the purpose of adopting the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

Nautical Almanac Office: For the following assistants in preparing for publication the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac, namely: Three, at $1,600 each; two, at $1,400 each; three, at $1,200 each; two, at $1,000 each; one copyist and typewriter, $900; one assistant messenger and one messenger boy, $420; in all, $15,240.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak for a few minutes on a matter that is not, perhaps, germane to the bill before the House, but I will not occupy much time. I will read only a part, and insert in the RECORD the rest, of an article which appears in this morning's Washington Post. Briefly stated, it gives an account of an assault and robbery of a white lady at 6 o'clock or thereabouts yesterday afternoon near the British embassy, or gardens of the British embassy, on Connecticut avenue, one of the most fashionable, best lighted, and best protected avenues in the city of Washington.

This is one of twenty-one of these robberies from the person that have taken place since the 25th of September. There is to-day virtually a reign of terror among all those white women who are compelled to go upon the streets of Washington at night unattended and unprotected. Matters are getting worse instead of better. I am informed, from what I regard as a reliable source, that there are more policemen in the District of Columbia than in any city of like population in the United States. In addition, there are the watchmen in the public parks and public grounds who have police powers. In addition, there is a regimental post of United States cavalrymen——

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is the gentleman's criticism to the effect that there is not a sufficient number of policemen, or is it because of inefficient administration?

Mr. SIMS. I think the gentleman will gather from my remarks what is intended when I get through. Within telephone call is a regiment of soldiers at Fort Myer. At the navy-yard a marine company is on guard. There seems to be enough armed protectors and preservers of the peace within telephone call to prevent anything that can be prevented by police protection, if efficient.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that, having read these instances of robbery, I do not believe it is possible to entirely prevent their occurrence with less than a policeman upon every block. They are not committed by professional pickpockets. Those professionals rob you without letting you know it, and leave you, at least physically, without injury. These robberies are in every instance, so far, by negroes, who begin the robbery by vicious assault upon the unprotected and unaccompanied white woman. Her purse is snatched. Murder has been committed since the 25th of September in one instance, but the victim was a man.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what are we to do about it? An increase of 100 policemen might prevent some of these occurrences. I do not believe it possible that a hundred policemen can prevent all of them. A negro or a white man watching for an unprotected woman whose purse he may snatch is also watching to see that no policeman is within sight. The robbery is committed in an instant, and the culprit gets away, and there is no means of identifying him. The report of the major of police shows that there was reported an increase of 3,000 arrests in the District of Columbia for the last year. The report says that these were due to increase of population and vigilance of the police.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to account for the increase of crime at that rate by increase of population. The population of the District of Columbia is not increasing at the rate of 10 per cent per annum, but crime is, and crime of this character is on the increase, and I will tell you the cause, and I will tell you the remedy.

The cause is that there is coming to Washington City more and more of the very class of idle criminals who commit these crimes, and they are going to remain here as long as present conditions are here, and will increase. Why is it? These criminals are of a low order and not professionals. They are the hangers-around and frequenters of saloons, filled with vile stuff that they can buy for 15, 20, or 25 cents a pint. As temperance legislation has closed the saloons in so many places throughout the States near Washington, this criminal element has flocked to Washington. A segregation of the saloons of the city of Washington accelerates instead of prevents these crimes. We can not prevent it by an increase of police. The police, by increase of vigilance, may prevent part of it, but if you want to stop the blood of helpless women from flowing in the District of Columbia, if you want to prevent the capital city of the United States being held up to the nation as being utterly unable to defend white women as early as 6 o'clock in the evening, close your $800-license saloons, and not one of these cases will occur.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for five minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMS. An analysis of the arrests shows a vast number due to disorderly conduct, and it shows that while the negro population of the District of Columbia is not over one-third of the whole, the arrests for disorderly conduct among the colored people were double that among the whites during the last year reported.

These arrests for disorderly conduct are almost in every instance due to some stage of intoxication. Get rid of these "criminal-creating establishments," and there will not be half the number of arrests, and we will not need more than half the policemen you have now, and it will be a rare thing that one of this kind of crimes will be committed in the District.

We may have professional pickpockets afterwards; we will have some disorderly conduct; we will have some assaults; but we will reduce them to an extent that they will appear as nothing compared with the present. Now, we will be driven to this course by the fact that the States have closed the saloons in so large a part of the contiguous country, and by that means have caused a great many of the criminal element to come to Washington from those places. Say what you please, if Washington is to be a model to the country in morals and in the execution of the laws, it will have to be a model in morality and in moral institutions, and we will have to have here, however much you may dislike it, not simply regulation of saloons in the District of Columbia, but eradication. [Applause.]

Mr. WEBB. Can the gentleman state what kind of vagrancy law there is in the city?

Mr. SIMS. I can not tell you specifically, and therefore will not undertake to answer the inquiry.

Mr. WEBB. If the city had a strict vagrancy law, carefully enforced, in my opinion in less than ten days 10,000 worthless negroes and trifling whites would leave the city.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman's statement may be true, but the best law that we can enact is one to get rid of the business that makes vagrants and fosters vagrancy. [Applause.]

Mr. WEBB. I agree with you in that.

Mr. SIMS. I here insert the article, as follows:

[From Washington Post, February 15, 1907.]

THUG ATTACKS GIRL—NEGRO KNOCKS DOWN AND ROBS MISS MAY MULLAN—NEAR BRITISH EMBASSY—CONNECTICUT AVENUE RESIDENT IS THE LATEST VICTIM—TWENTY-FIRST CASE OF THE KIND SINCE LAST SEPTEMBER—FAMILY APPREHENSIVE THAT SHE MAY NOT RECOVER—NAVY PAY INSPECTOR M'GOWAN AND OTHER CITIZENS TELL OF ASSAULT—UNIDENTIFIED MAN GETS AWAY WITH CASH AND CHECKS.

Knocked down and brutally beaten by an unidentified negro, who had been hiding in the gardens of the British embassy, at Connecticut avenue and N street NW., Miss May Mullan, of 1310 Connecticut avenue NW., proprietress of a laundry at 1134 Connecticut avenue NW., was robbed last night of her pocketbook containing about $75.

Miss Mullan, in falling, struck her head against the fence which encircles the grounds of the embassy and sustained a deep gash over the right eye and contusions of the face and head.

The attack upon Miss Mullan was perhaps the most daring of its kind that has occurred in the city. She is the twenty-first victim of negro desperadoes since last September.

Miss Mullan is suffering from shock, and is confined to her bed. Her condition was such last night that members of her family are deeply apprehensive concerning her condition.

BRILLIANTLY LIGHTED THOROUGHFARE.

Connecticut avenue is one of the most fashionable thoroughfares in the United States, and it is brilliantly lighted near the British embassy. It is doubtful if any street in the city is better illuminated. Many of the embassies and residences of men eminent in political and social life are located in this street. Members of the British embassy had entered the house a few minutes before the attack was made. A number of persons living in the embassy rushed out and assisted in caring for Miss Mullan. They insisted that she be taken into the house, but, after temporarily recovering, Miss Mullan asked that she be taken to her home, a short distance away.

Immediately after the attack was made a crowd gathered. Several persons were on the opposite side of the street, but, owing to the fog which enveloped the city last night, they did not realize what had happened until they saw the negro disappear through N street. A car was passing at the time. The lights from it illuminated the surroundings and gave those aboard and persons on the street an inkling of what had happened. There is a large arc light on the corner of Connecticut avenue and N street, but the rays from this were dimmed by the fog.

LOOKED OVER CHECKS.

Miss Mullan left her place of business shortly after 6 o'clock. It is her custom to leave at 6 o'clock, but, having some important matters to attend to last night, she was a little late. She had received some checks, in payment for work that had been done, during the day, and there she placed in her pocketbook. She was going to take them home and place them in the bank in the morning.

HIT HER ON THE HEAD.

The negro did not get the pocketbook when he first grabbed for it, and, becoming angered, lifted his right fist and hit Miss Mullan on the head as she was attempting to rise. Miss Mullan again fell to the ground unconscious. The negro grabbed the pocketbook.

TWENTY-ONE VICTIMS OF ROBBERS.

The following women have been attacked and in most instances robbed by footpads in the streets of Washington since September 25:

September 25, 1907.—Miss Mamie Esher, 609 Florida avenue NW., knocked down and robbed of a pocketbook containing $2.80.

October 8, 1907.—Mrs. Julia Priest, 1706 S street NW., robbed of pocketbook containing $2

October 19, 1907.—Miss Edna Sheckels, 1300 Tenth street NW., robbed of pocketbook containing $5.80.

October 26, 1907.—Miss Louisa Lewis, robbed in front of 1325 Q street NW., of pocketbook containing $13.

October 29, 1907.—Miss Clara Helf, 2118 Eighteenth street NW., pocketbook containing $5.85 snatched.

October 29, 1907.—Mrs. S. N. Vail reported attempt made to snatch her pocketbook by two negro boys.

November 1, 1907.—Mrs. Mary Hickman, 918 Second street NE., robbed of hand bag.

November 9, 1907.—Mrs. Catherine Baer, 1115 Fifth street NW., pocketbook snatched by two colored boys.

November 18, 1907.—Bessie Smith, colored, knocked down and robbed of hand bag by colored man.

November 21, 1907.—Mrs. Robert Hickman knocked down and robbed of money, watch, and pin.

December 12, 1907.—Mrs. Jennie Williams, of Maryland, hand bag snatched by negro.

December 14, 1907.—Mrs. Alwine Perkins, 1935 Thirteenth street NW., hand bag containing gold watch snatched.

December 28, 1907.—Miss Tyler, 1337 L street NW., knocked down and robbed of purse and car tickets.

January 3, 1908.—Miss Fawkes, 1836 Fifteenth street NW., knocked down and robbed of a hand bag and $1.

January 9, 1908.—Ellen Upshur, 305 N street NW., negro attempted to snatch her hand bag in N street NW.

January 14, 1908.—Miss Kelly knocked down and robbed in front of Portland apartment of bag containing $19.

January 26, 1908.—Mrs. Margaret Welch, 626 B street SW., knocked down and robbed of pocketbook containing $8.

February 7, 1908.—Mrs. Xanten, Twelfth street SE., robbed of pocketbook containing $11.

February 17, 1908.—Miss Sadie Dick, 605 L street NW., robbed of $10 by negro while at Eleventh and F streets NW.

February 12, 1908.—Miss Anna Schaeffer, 1216 Eighteenth street NW., knocked down and robbed by negro at Twenty-third street and Pennsylvania avenue NW.

February 14, 1908.—Miss May Mullan, 1310 Connecticut avenue NW., knocked down and robbed of pocketbook containing money and checks.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Office of the Secretary: For compensation of the Secretary of the Interior, $12,000; First Assistant Secretary, $6,000; Assistant Secretary, $5,000; chief clerk, $3,000; assistant chief clerk, $2,500; and to the chief clerk and assistant chief clerk there shall be distributed by the Secretary the duties prescribed by law for the chief clerk and such other duties as the Secretary may direct; additional to one member of Board of Pension Appeals, acting as chief of the board, $500; twelve members of a Board of Pension Appeals, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, at $2,000 each; eight special inspectors, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, to be subject to his direction, and whose employment shall be limited to the inspection of offices and the work in the several offices under the control of the Department of the Interior, at $2,500 each (in lieu of one special land inspector and five special inspectors, at $2,500 each, and six Indian inspectors, at $2,500 each, heretofore provided for in the Indian appropriation act); chief disbursing clerk, $2,250; clerk in charge of supplies, $2,250; clerk in charge of mails, files, and archives, $2,250; four clerks, at $2,000 each; private secretary to the Secretary of the Interior, $2,500; thirteen clerks of class 4 (two clerks of class 4 transferred to Indian Office and one transferred to General Land Office); sixteen clerks of class 3; twenty-one clerks of class 2 (three clerks of class 2 transferred to Indian Office and two transferred to General Land Office); twenty-four clerks of class 1 (six clerks of class 1 transferred to Indian Office, three transferred to General Land Office, and two omitted); returns office clerk, $1,200; female clerk, to be designated by the President, to sign land patents, $1,200; three clerks, at $1,000 each (three clerks, at $1,000 each, transferred to General Land Office); five copyists (seven transferred to Indian Office); switchboard telephone operator; nine messengers; seven assistant messengers; eighteen laborers; two skilled mechanics, one at $900 and one at $720; two carpenters, at $900 each; plumber, $900; electrician, $1,000; one laborer, $600; six laborers, at $480 each; one packer, $660; two conductors of elevator, at $720 each; four charwomen; captain of the watch, $1,200; forty watchmen; additional to two watchmen acting as lieutenants of watchmen, at $120; engineer, $1,200; assistant engineer, $1,000; seven firemen; one clerk, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, to sign, under the direction of the Secretary, in his name and for him, his approval of all tribal deeds to allottees and deeds for town lots made and executed according to law for any of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in the Indian Territory, $1,200; in all, $283,090.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the language "six thousand dollars" in line 4, page 109, and "five thousand dollars" on line 5 of the same page.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. The Chair can dispose of one thing at a time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman in charge of the bill desire to be heard on the point of order made by the gentleman from Arkansas? If not, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN. I have several points of order I wish to make. I reserve the point of order upon the whole paragraph. To line 6, page 109, I make the point of order on that or I will reserve it; on the language "for assistant chief clerk, $2,500; and to the chief clerk and assistant chief clerk there shall be distributed by the Secretary the duties prescribed by law for the chief clerk and such other duties as the Secretary may direct."

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I think there is an explanation of that which certainly appealed to the committee, and I hope will appeal to the gentleman from Illinois. The Secretary of the Interior asked of us a great many changes to reorganize his force. Now, I think the Committee on Appropriations is quite as much opposed to any changes or reorganization as any Member of the House, because it interferes seriously every year with our comparison of the appropriations with the preceding year and makes it very difficult for us in each year to keep track of the bills; and therefore we are naturally conservative and opposed to changes. The Secretary of the Interior impressed me, and I believe every Member upon the subcommittee, with the fact that the reorganization that he had in view would very much increase the efficiency of the Department and was very much to the advantage of the public service. He asked at this particular place to which the gentleman makes the point of order, instead of the appointment of chief clerk and assistant chief clerk, the appointment of two undersecretaries, his purpose being that the duties now performed by the chief clerk and another clerk should be taken up by these two undersecretaries, who should have control over, as I remember it, the buildings and supplies, and accounts of the Department, the clerical force, the two acting together and having together control over the whole administrative functions of the Department, subject, of course, to the Secretary. He made it clear to the committee that that was a very advantageous and desirable proposition, and convinced us that it would result in great saving to the Government and efficiency to the Department. But we did not like to introduce into the bill this new phrase, "undersecretary." We thought the same could be accomplished by the phraseology which we have used, and that we could accomplish this desirable object by having a chief clerk and assistant chief clerk and allowing the Secretary to distribute between them this class of duties which I have described.

I think it would be very much to the advantage of the work of the Department if he were allowed this legislation, and I hope the gentleman will not insist on his point of order.

Mr. BURLESON. In addition to the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I desire to direct his attention to the fact that the Secretary of the Interior stated that it would effect a saving, as he confidently believed, of about $300,000 a year to the Government if he was permitted to reform the force.

Mr. GILLETT. That was by the whole plan of reorganization.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the gentleman from Illinois will not insist on his point of order; and my reason for that statement is the fact that this particular paragraph is involved in, and is an essential part of, reorganization of the Interior Department. The committee felt that it was warranted in approving that part which will result in better administration and effect economy.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] has said the estimates as submitted by the Department to the committee contemplated the entire reorganization of the Interior Department. That is true; but it was not deemed necessary to effect or approve the entire reorganization in order to bring about the economy and better administration which the Secretary contemplates will result from the reorganization.

There is one particular fact in connection with this reorganization I want to call attention to. Under the old organization there was in the Interior Department an intermediate division;

that is, a division to which the work of the bureau went before going to the Secretary. These intermediate bureaus were, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, absolutely unnecessary, and, in his judgment, better results could be obtained by their elimination, holding the bureau chiefs responsible for their work and letting whatever work they performed requiring his approval come to him to his office direct. That is one of the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior which the committee has approved and recommends to the House.

The forty-odd employees that have heretofore been employed in the intermediate division have been distributed to the several bureaus in the Interior Department whose work has been in areas, and the work of these bureaus is now being brought up current as the result of changing these employees who heretofore have been employed in the intermediate division.

Now, the Secretary of the Interior who, when he appeared before the committee, made a very clear and convincing statement as to the beneficial results of this organization, claimed that he wanted two undersecretaries, who should perform generally under his supervision the duties now devolving upon the chief clerk and the chief of the appointment division of the Interior Department, so that the physical property belonging to the Government under the control of the Interior Department could be placed under control of one of these undersecretaries, and the supervision of the personal accounts, etc., could be placed under the control and supervision of the other undersecretary.

The committee, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, did not believe that it was for the best interests of the service to have a divided responsibility there, and did not favor the creation of officers designated as "undersecretaries" contradistinguished from assistant secretaries. The committee thought it was for the purpose of giving somebody a high-sounding title, regardless of what the duties of the office might be; therefore the committee kept as close to the existing organization as possible, providing for a chief clerk and an assistant chief clerk, which will enable the Secretary to have the service of these two officers under his control in his office and perform all the services which, in the judgment of the Secretary, are necessary for the best administration of his Department and in addition to such services as are now required by law of the chief clerk of that Department.

If this paragraph is eliminated, then, of course, that involves an entire recasting of this particular paragraph and of providing for the office of the Secretary of the Interior Department along the lines of current law. I might say, as the result of that reorganization, the Secretary of the Interior is satisfied, and the committee so thought, that he would effect economies aggregating over two or three hundred thousand dollars a year in the administration of his Interior Department.

Every member of this House who has paid any attention at all to the consideration of the legislative appropriation bill knows that there is no Executive Department of the Government so much in need of reorganization as was the Interior Department. I want the gentleman from Illinois and the Members of the House to understand that the ideas of the Secretary have not been adopted and are not recommended in full by the Committee on Appropriations or by the subcommittee reporting this bill to the whole committee; only those recommendations which appealed to the committee as being in the interest of better administration or greater economy in the prosecution of the business of that Department have been recommended by the committee.

And if the gentleman insists upon making this point of order he ought to be able to justify his action on the ground that the proposed reorganization will not effect economies and will not result in better administration. If the statement is made, as I heard it a moment ago, that this change is for the purpose of taking care of somebody in the Interior Department, I want to say that there is no foundation for that statement at all. No information that the committee could elicit from the Secretary of the Interior indicated that there was a particle of personal favoritism involved in the recommendation of the Secretary, and certainly it is not the intention of the committee in recommending this provision to encourage or approve of any favoritism in the Interior Department or in any other Department. I sincerely hope that the gentleman from Illinois, before insisting upon his point of order against this paragraph, will consider the question whether or not this reorganization, so far as we have approved of it, will be of less advantage than the organization under the current law. One or the other must necessarily be adopted, and if this paragraph goes out it involves a recasting of all the provisions for the Interior Department, and for that reason I sincerely hope the gentleman from Illinois will not insist upon his point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Minnesota seriously insist that this whole appropriation for the Interior Department depends upon whether this particular man is taken care of in the bill?

Mr. TAWNEY. There is no particular man to be taken care of.

Mr. MANN. Well, this position?

Mr. TAWNEY. I say that if you change this, take out this paragraph and return to the old plan——

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is referring to the whole paragraph.

Mr. TAWNEY. I am referring to the effect that it has on the entire paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I reserved the point of order on the paragraph because there are several things in it which I propose to make the point of order upon, but the point of order that is now pending is against nothing but the assistant chief clerk. Does the gentleman seriously contend——

Mr. TAWNEY. The point of order not only relates to the assistant chief clerk, but also refers to the language which gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to require these officers to do certain duties in addition to those provided by law, and that is one of the vital points in the proposed reorganization in so far as the committee has approved it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it may be true, though it will take a great deal more than even the eloquence of the gentleman from Minnesota to convince me, that putting in a new officer at $2,500 a year will save $300,000 a year expense in the management of the Interior Department. I think that the statement itself bears on its face sufficient evidence that it is ridiculous, so that the gentleman from Minnesota would not for a moment insist upon it. I understand it is true that the Secretary of the Interior, for whom personally I have great admiration, endeavored to promote a scheme of reorganization in his Department, which would save a number of officials in the Department; but that it saves $200,000 or $300,000 I do not understand. I understand the contrary to be, that in order to reorganize the Department economically it requires more money to carry it on, and that is the usual case when all of these propositions come in to us. I am perfectly willing to reorganize any Department of the Government upon a more economical basis, or upon a more expensive basis if there be reason for it; but I undertake to say that the proposition that was submitted to the gentleman's committee did not propose a reduction in expenses, but proposed an increase in expenses, if you take out the men who are dropped from the Pension Office because they have not sufficient work to employ them. I ask the gentleman if that is not true?

Mr. TAWNEY. No; it is not true. The Secretary of the Interior, upon my personal request, filed a statement with the committee showing in detail where these economies would be effected, and what they would aggregate, independent of the reduction in the Pension Office.

Mr. MANN. Most of them were in the Pension Office. Now, if they desire to have an assistant chief clerk, as they have in the Treasury Department, I have no objection. They have more bureaus in the Treasury Department than they have in the Interior Department, but if they need an assistant chief clerk in the Interior Department, I have no objection. But I object, when we have several assistant chief clerks under the Government at lower salaries, to fixing this one at $2,500 for a specific individual, and then I object to changing in this the law which provides——

Mr. TAWNEY. Who is the specific individual that the gentleman refers to?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am naming no names.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman has more information on this subject regarding the personnel in the Interior Department than the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANN. I may say to the gentleman that that is not the first time that has happened. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAWNEY. I am speaking of the personnel of the Interior Department.

Mr. MANN. I am speaking of the personnel also.

Mr. TAWNEY. We have all the acquaintance we desire.

Mr. MANN. It is not the first time. The Committee on Appropriations does great service, and I have the greatest respect for them, but they do not extract all the information that is in the minds of men who appear before them, nor do they obtain all knowledge upon the subjects which come before them. Now, the gentleman has given, and can give, so far as I believe, no reason for changing the law in reference to any division of power given under the law to the chief clerk. I can see no occasion for putting in such a provision as this, that these people shall perform such other duties as the Secretary may direct. He may send them to California upon some duty of his own, he may send them to New York, he may

put them in the Indian Service, he can do anything with these two people that he pleases under this provision of law. They are not confined to the duties now provided for a chief clerk, they are not confined to the duties ordinarily conferred on chief clerks, but he may have within his power the discretion to put upon them such duties as he may direct. There is no such provision in the law anywhere in reference to officials which are created, and it is a vicious principle of law, which undoubtedly passed by the Committee on Appropriations without due scrutiny.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman permit an interruption right there?

Mr. MANN. I will permit the gentleman anything.

Mr. TAWNEY. Does the gentleman contend on this floor that it is vicious to give to the superior or head of a Department the power to require services that he deems for the interest and benefit of the Department? Does the gentleman characterize authority in the heads of the Departments to control their subordinates as vicious?

Mr. MANN. I characterize as vicious the principle, where you provide that a clerk shall perform certain duties, that you shall give to the Secretary power to say that he shall perform such other duties as the Secretary may direct.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is a very common provision in relation to all the public service.

Mr. MANN. Well, that is not my observation nor experience.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I am not interested except in a general way in this paragraph, but I should like to ask my friend this question. Supposing this paragraph is stricken out under the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois, and the Senate reinserts it, which in all likelihood will happen, because this paragraph has the support and influence of a great Department behind it. Then the bill will come back to the House, and having the support of the Committee on Appropriations. What will happen then? Will these paragraphs against which points of order are being made not finally go into the bill and will the House not, by doing business in this way, deprive itself of the benefit of the influence it might otherwise have in initiating beneficial changes in appropriation bills? We here observe the rule religiously—we say there shall be no legislation on appropriation bills; but when the bill goes to the Senate these same amendments are inserted, in fact we here are being told, if we want a change of this kind, an increase of salary or whatever it may be, to go over to the Senate in order to secure it. Then these bills come back here, and the House usually concurs, and what is the result? The Members of the House deprive themselves of the credit which through changes and modifications of this kind would otherwise accrue to them, and the only men who have any standing with the Departments as influential enough to effect legislation are the Senators of the United States.

Mr. MANN. Well, that would not be the case if the gentleman would stand by the action of the House. It very often happens that the Committee on Appropriations, when it is defeated in this House on a point, through some underground method obtains the insertion of the item in the Senate, or perhaps the heads of Departments do. I do not hold myself responsible to follow either the Committee on Appropriations or the Department. I try to perform the functions of my office. They endeavor to perform the functions of their office.

If in the end they have their way, that is their good luck; if I have my way, that is my good luck. Sometimes I do.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me, the purpose of the few remarks I submitted was to call attention to the fact that the House should insist upon its rules, even if the bill comes back from the other House. Then, there would never be any legislation upon an appropriation bill, and the Senators could not derive any special credit at the expense of the House. If possible, at such a late date, I desire to see the parity of the two Houses and their membership reestablished, and I hope the majority will concur in this view.

Mr. MANN. I am very glad the gentleman called attention to that fact. We ought not to need anybody to call our attention to that fact. The Committee on Appropriations ought to stand strong, like a stone wall, against these legislative items being put in by the Senate. I think they do pretty well about it.

Mr. TAWNEY. May I make an inquiry?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. You are referring to these two positions. I see in the note on the bill, which I hold in my hand, that the two undersecretaries were recommended by the Secretary of the Interior in lieu of a chief clerk at $3,000 and one clerk, now chief of a division, at $2,250. Now, the salaries which were recommended for the two undersecretaries were $3,000 each. The chief clerk is now receiving $3,000 and the chief of the division, who by this provision is made assistant chief clerk, is receiving $2,500, so we are not creating any new places and we are not increasing any salaries.

Mr. MANN. You are increasing salaries.

Mr. TAWNEY. No; we are not increasing salaries.

Mr. MANN. You are not only increasing salaries, but paying a higher salary in this case to the assistant chief clerk than is paid anywhere else by the Government. You do that in this very item.

Mr. TAWNEY. The appointment division is abolished; there is no provision made for it.

Mr. MANN. In this identical bill you have no assistant chief clerks at any such salary as this. I have said I have no objection to providing for the place at the ordinary salary, but——

Mr. TAWNEY. The salary the assistant chief clerk is to receive is the salary now paid to a man filling a position that is dropped, namely, the chief of the appointment division, $2,500, and the salary of the chief clerk remains the same as it is now, $3,000. The important part about this is enlarging the scope of the Secretary's control over the actions of these two men so that he may divide the responsibility of the chief clerk and an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, giving to the one control over the physical property under the control of the Interior Department and to the other control over the personnel and the accounts and supplies. It is involved in the whole reorganization.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would suggest to my colleague, Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the gentleman from Illinois, that the labor of these two men is divided in this way under his recommendation. One looks after the personnel of the Interior Department and the other after the business transactions which come up in the Department, and the salaries added together are just the same that they now draw. There is no increase of salary.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can offer his amendment as he pleases in regard to it. I make the point of order commencing in line 6 with the word "assistant" down to the word "direct" in line 10.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to the chair that the language upon which the gentleman from Illinois raised the point of order is clearly legislative. The chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN. I make the further point of order upon line 13, beginning "to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior"——

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an inquiry——

The CHAIRMAN. Wait until the gentleman from Illinois has finished making his point of order.

Mr. MANN. On the words in line 13, "to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior." The same in line 15, "to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, to be subject to his direction."

Mr. TAWNEY. Does the gentleman make the point of order as to the limitation placed upon their employment? That is new legislation.

Mr. MANN. I understand it is.

Mr. TAWNEY. And to be consistent the gentleman ought to make a point of order on that.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will define his own consistency. I do not make the point of order upon your bill on everything subject to the point of order. If I did you could not recognize a single page of it.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to mix up in this controversy. I always, with the greatest uniformity, stand by my committee whenever I can. [Laughter.] And I am with the committee now, and I wanted to find out from the Chair, or from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], whether he proposes to go through this paragraph with points of order against parts of it, and when he gets through insist upon his point of order against the whole of it?

Mr. MANN. I do not, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEIFER. Then he withdraws his point of order against the paragraph, as I understand it?

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order upon the paragraph.

Mr. KEIFER. The two things are inconsistent. He must insist upon his point of order against the paragraph or waive it before going to the other.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order in order to let the

gentleman explain the paragraph. If it will suit the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] any better, I will withdraw the point of order against the paragraph and make the point of order, and that will end this discussion.

Mr. KEIFER. I wish to say——

Mr. MANN. I wish to make a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEIFER. I would like to have one-hundredth part of the time for five minutes—just a one-hundredth part of the time for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has insisted that I make a point of order.

Mr. KEIFER. No, sir; I did not. I insist that you should not.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] will permit, the Chair understands that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has made a point of order to the language "to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior," lines 13 and 14, and also to the language "to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, to be subject to his direction," in lines 15 and 16.

Mr. MANN. And on page 111, line 8, "to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. KEIFER. Do I understand the gentleman from Illinois can have the floor all the time and take anybody off his feet?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has the floor, and is entitled to make his point of order.

Mr. KEIFER. He did not have it, though, except to answer my question.

Mr. MANN. I am perfectly willing to yield the floor to the gentleman, although he was endeavoring to take me off the floor.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I want to make a suggestion in connection with one of these points of order. I understand that the language from line 14, page 109, down to line 24 is new legislation?

Mr. TAWNEY. I would suggest to the gentleman from Indiana that this is new legislation only in this sense. At the present time in the current law the authority exists for the appointment of twelve inspectors, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior without any limitation whatever. We reduced the number from twelve to eight, leaving the authority for the appointment where it exists to-day under the law. But we do place a limitation upon their employment, while heretofore they could be employed for the purpose of inspecting anybody and anything. And the Secretary of the Interior suggested to the committee that he would be perfectly satisfied to have their employment limited to the inspection of the outside offices of the Interior Department, so that the limitation here is all that is really new. The other is a reduction from twelve to eight inspectors, leaving the authority for their appointment just as it is at the present time.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Upon that hypothesis these eight inspectors would seem to be authorized for the purposes expressed in the clause, the limitation for this particular purpose, and it would seem to me that the balance of the clause standing without any objection being made to it, or any point of order being made against it, this being only a portion of it, it will be like an amendment to an amendment, against which a point of order would lie. The only question that could be made upon that would be whether it would be germane. If an amendment should be offered to a bill, and no point of order is made against it, although it might be new legislation, then any amendment that is germane to that would be in order. Now, if this provision is subject to a point of order, this whole clause, it would seem any portion of it would be in order if it is germane to the clause. And I submit that observation to the Chair for his consideration in ruling upon the particular point of order—that the whole clause is subject to a point of order, and the objection to a particular part of the clause on the ground that it is new legislation does not lie. It would stand exactly upon the same basis as an amendment proposed to an amendment that is not in order, but, no point having been made to it, the objection can not be taken advantage of.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Illinois as making the point of order to the language "to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior," in lines 13 and 14. Does the gentleman in charge of the bill desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BINGHAM. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman from Illinois also makes the point of order against the language "to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, to be subject to his direction and." The Chair sustains that point of order. What was the other point of order?

Mr. MANN. On page 111, line 8, "to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair also sustains that point of order.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I called the attention of the Chair to the fact that these inspectors are now, under existing law, appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. If this provision be stricken out, then who will appoint and who will direct these inspectors?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not for the Chair to determine. The Chair asked the gentleman in charge of the bill if he desired to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. TAWNEY. I made the statement a moment ago that these inspectors were appointed by the Secretary of the Interior under existing law, that there were twelve of them serving under those appointments, and we merely reduced the number to eight.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, then, was acting under a misapprehension and will hear the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANN. There is no provision of law.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment. Allow the Chair to withdraw the ruling on the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois to the language in lines 15 and 16. The Chair will then hear the gentleman upon that point.

Mr. MANN. There is no provision of law in reference to these except the civil-service law. The same provision, exactly in the same language, was stricken out of the Indian appropriation bill last week on a point of order.

Mr. TAWNEY. That was a new provision.

Mr. MANN. No, it was not; it had been carried in the appropriation bill for years.

Mr. TAWNEY. These men are now in the employ of the Government.

Mr. MANN. And they will remain.

Mr. TAWNEY (continuing). Under existing authority in the current legislative appropriation act, and we only reduce the number from twelve to eight; but that does not change in any way the authority under which these men have heretofore been appointed.

Mr. MANN. The matter is very clear, Mr. Chairman. These Indian inspectors who were carried in this bill, I am inclined to think, are also carried in the Indian appropriation bill which we have passed. Under existing law they are appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. That is in the existing appropriation law only, which expires on the 30th of June next. The existing law in reference to the appointment of the officials of the Government is the civil-service law, which authorizes the President to cover all these employees into the classified service and have them appointed by the Civil Service Commission. If they are not covered into the classified service, then the law has provided that they shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, subject to the provision that they might be covered into the classified service. That is the law. It was in the appropriation law. The fact that it is in the appropriation law for last year does not make it in order upon this bill, because that only applies to that appropriation year. If there is any desire to have these people appointed different from the classified service, all the Secretary has to do, and he has the nerve to make the request if it is proper, is to ask the President to except these employees from the civil-service law, and let the President take the responsibility of putting them out of the classified service instead of shoving that responsibility upon Congress.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, there are twelve of these inspectors now, and we will reduce the number to eight. The fact exists all the same, notwithstanding the gentleman from Illinois, that they were appointed by the Secretary of the Interior under the present law, and it is a law which carries with it their appointment by the Secretary and under his direction. That is all there is in it, and when the gentleman undertakes to say that an act of Congress, though it be an appropriation act, is not a law and can not be binding, he contradicts every proposition upon which these points of order have been made in this House. They go out because they were not in the last appropriation bill. Then it is a change of law, and is the basis of law determining and settling that question. Now he comes and crosses it over and says because they are in the law now and the Secretary has the right and power not only to appoint but to direct them, it is subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if there is any other authority for the appointment of these special inspectors by the Secretary of the Interior than that contained in an annual appropriation bill?

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say to the Chair I know of no other authority for the appointment of these twelve inspectors except

the authority of existing law, which authorizes their appointment and which carries the appropriation to compensate them for their services.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. There is no other law.

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not admit that the current appropriation is not law.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to be impossible to get the Committee on Appropriations to understand the distinction which is made in the rulings in regard to what is in the current appropriation act.

The rulings are to the effect that the creation of an office in the current appropriation act authorizes a provision in the bill, covering the same thing; but a legislative provision in the current appropriation act expires at the end of the current fiscal year and does not authorize anything beyond that. While that is a purely arbitrary ruling, originally made probably without any logical reason, the rulings exist as a precedent, and they have been followed, and I hope that the Committee on Appropriations will study these decisions and learn in the course of time what these rulings are.

Mr. TAWNEY. It is impossible for the Committee on Appropriations to understand the illogical rulings which the gentleman from Illinois has just referred to. We have not that mental facility which the gentleman possesses that would enable us to understand illogical parliamentary rulings in this House.

Mr. MANN. I got that illogical facility in following the Committee on Appropriations. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. So far as the Chair can learn, these inspectors have been appropriated for from year to year, and their appointment provided for in the current appropriation bills, and that is the only legislative authority which it is claimed makes this provision at the present time proper. The Chair understands that the rulings formerly made are to the point that an item or a provision in an appropriation bill only makes law for the current year, and can not be made the basis for future appropriations when the point of order is raised. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, on page 109, line 4, I move to insert the words "first assistant secretary, $4,500; assistant secretary, $4,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 109, after line 3, insert "first assistant secretary, $4,500; assistant secretary, $4,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

General Land Office: For the Commissioner of the General Land Office, $5,000; assistant commissioner, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall be authorized to sign such letters, papers, and documents, and to perform such other duties as may be directed by the Commissioner, and shall act as Commissioner in the absence of that officer or in case of a vacancy in the office of Commissioner, $3,500; chief clerk, $2,500; chief law clerk, $2,500; two law clerks, at $2,200 each; three inspectors of surveyors-general and district land offices, at $2,000 each; recorder, $2,000; two chiefs of division, at $2,400 each; nine chiefs of division, at $2,000 each; two law examiners, at $2,000 each; ten principal examiners of land claims and contests, at $2,000 each; two examiners of mineral claims and contests, at $2,000 each; thirty-eight clerks of class 4 (including one transferred from Secretary's office); sixty-four clerks of class 3; sixty-nine clerks of class 2 (including two transferred from Secretary's office); seventy-two clerks of class 1 (including three transferred from Secretary's office); sixty clerks, at $1,000 each (including three transferred from Secretary's office); sixty copyists; two messengers; ten assistant messengers; six skilled laborers, who may act as assistant messengers when required, at $660 each; sixteen laborers; one laborer, $480; one packer, $720; one depositary acting for the Commissioner as receiver of public moneys, $2,000; librarian for the law library of the General Land Office; in all, $572,100.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order, on line 5, page 112, on the words "to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." That relates to the Assistant Commissioner of the Land Office. I know of no provision of law authorizing that. So far as I know, he is the only assistant anywhere in the Government appointed by the President. Why should this be?

Mr. TAWNEY. It has been the uniform custom and practice for years. The Assistant Commissioner of the General Land Office has been appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate. The gentleman from Illinois seems to be having a private conference with the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], who was formerly the Assistant Commissioner, and I hope he will give the committee the benefit of it.

Mr. MANN. Until the gentleman from Minnesota interfered, I was about to withdraw the point of order, and now since he has interfered, I will withdraw the point of order. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAWNEY. I will ask the gentleman whether he withdraws his point of order in consequence of private information which he has received from the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. MANN. While I do not wish to divulge any private information I have received, I may say that the only information I have received was from the gentleman from Wyoming and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], and I did not withdraw the point of order on account of any information received from the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk, to come in at the end of the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 7, on page 114, insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to designate an officer or employee of the General Land Office to act temporarily as an Assistant Commissioner of that Office during the absence of the Assistant Commissioner or in case of a vacancy in the office of such Assistant Commissioner, or when such Assistant Commissioner is acting as Commissioner, and all acts performed by any officer or employee while acting under such designation shall have the same force and effect as if performed by said Commissioner or Assistant Commissioner."

Mr. GILLETT. I see no objection to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 114, in line 6, after the word "office," insert "one thousand dollars."

Mr. MACON. Well, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BINGHAM. This does not make any increase. It is to make a correction.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert the following paragraph at the close of the amendment just adopted:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to designate an officer or employee of the General Land Office to perform the departmental duties of recorder of that Office in the absence of that officer, and in case of a vacancy in the office of such recorder the acts of such person so designated shall have all the effect of an act so performed by the recorder."

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has reported a bill covering the two amendments which he has just offered. I suppose that he desires them to be permanent law, but in the manner in which they are presented here they will only be law for the fiscal year in which the appropriation is made.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman was of the opinion that this would be a permanent law.

Mr. MANN. Then I venture to put my opinion against the opinion of the gentleman. The ruling is that unless you use the word "hereafter" it only relates to the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made. I see no objection to making it permanent law.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, following the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois, I move to amend my amendment by inserting the word "hereafter" after the word "That."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming modifies his amendment as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert the word "hereafter" after the word "That" in the first amendment which I offered and which was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to modify the amendment heretofore offered and agreed to by inserting the word "hereafter" after the word "That." Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Patent Office: For the Commissioner of Patents, $5,000; Assistant Commissioner, who shall perform such duties pertaining to the office of Commissioner as may be assigned to him by the Commissioner, $3,000; chief clerk, $2,500; 2 law clerks, at $2,500 each; 3 examiners in chief, at $3,000 each; examiner of interferences, $2,500; examiner of trade-marks and designs, $2,500; 42 principal examiners, at $2,500 each; 58 first assistant examiners, at $2,000 each; 68 second assistant examiners, at $1,800 each; 78 third assistant examiners, at $1,600 each; 100 fourth assistant examiners, at $1,400 each; financial clerk, who shall give bonds in such amount as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, $2,250; librarian, $2,000; 6 chiefs of division, at $2,000 each; 3 assistant chiefs of division, at $1,800 each; 9 clerks of class 4; 9 clerks of class 3; 15 clerks of class 2; 90 clerks of class 1; skilled laborer, $1,200; 3 skilled draftsmen, at $1,200 each; 4 draftsmen, at $1,000 each; 85 clerks, at $1,000 each; messenger and property clerk, $1,000; 106 copyists; 100 copyists, at $720 each; and during the fiscal year 1909 classified laborers in the Patent Office may be appointed copyists at $720, but may not be further promoted unless they shall have passed the civil-service examination; 3 messengers; 25 assistant messengers; 14 laborers, at $600 each; 15 laborers, at $480 each; 39 messenger boys, at $360 each; in all, $1,131,310.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to page 120, commencing at the word "and," line 15, down to the word "examination," in line 19. This gives apparently an unlimited authority to employ classified laborers as copyists, without any limit to the number or anything else. What is the purpose of it?

Mr. GILLETT. The purpose of the provision is that there are in the Patent Office thirty classified laborers. They are on the roll as laborers, but they are doing the work of copyists.

Mr. MANN. They are there now?

Mr. GILLETT. They are there now.

Mr. MANN. Well, there might be sixty next year.

Mr. GILLETT. We dropped them as laborers and put them in as copyists.

Mr. MANN. There is no limitation on this at all. If this goes through, there will be many Members who will want one of these clerks. When we provided copyists a few years ago in this same Department—twenty-five of them, I think—they divided them up at a Cabinet meeting. [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETT. The intention of the committee was to provide for only those that are now employed. I am quite willing to put in as an amendment the words "now employed."

Mr. MANN. "During the year 1909 classified laborers now employed."

Mr. GILLETT. Yes; that would remedy the gentleman's objection, and that was our purpose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GILLETT. Now I offer an amendment that, on line 16, page 120, after the word "laborers," the words "now employed" be inserted.

The amendment was considered and agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Education: For Commissioner of Education, $5,000; chief clerk, $2,000; statistician, $1,800; specialist in charge of land-grant college statistics, $1,800; translator, $1,800; collector and compiler of statistics, $2,400; specialist in foreign educational systems, $1,800; specialist in educational system, $1,800; two clerks of class 4; two clerks of class 3; four clerks of class 2; seven clerks of class 1; five clerks, at $1,000 each; six copyists; two copyists, at $800 each; copyist, $720; two skilled laborers, at $840 each; one messenger; one assistant messenger; three laborers, at $480 each; laborer, $400; in all, $57,000.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language "five thousand dollars," in line 19, page 121, it being an increase of salary.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point of order to the words "five thousand dollars," in line 19, page 121, on the ground that it is a change of existing law. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 18, page 121, after the word "Education," insert:
"For Commissioner of Education, $3,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds: For Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, $5,000; chief clerk $2,000; chief electrical engineer, $2,000; draftsman, $1,000; assistant draftsman, $800; one clerk, $1,400; stenographer and typewriter, $1,200; foreman, $1,500; compensation to disursing clerk, $1,000; one messenger; person in charge of the heating of the Supreme Court and central portion of the Capitol, $864; laborer in charge of water-closets in central portion of the Capitol, $660; seven laborers for cleaning Rotunda, corridors, Dome, and old library portion of Capitol, $660 each; two laborers in charge of public closets of the House of Representatives and in the terrace, at $720 each; in all, $24,720.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the words "one thousand five hundred dollars," in lines 6 and 7, on page 123, it being an increase of salary.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman if he will reserve his point of order?

Mr. MACON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this is not one of the matters the gentleman has had in mind, with which I largely agree with him. This is the foreman under the Superintendent of the Capitol. He has had his work very largely increased on account of the new Office Building, and while I have nothing to do with the matter of increasing his salary, it is not great at the utmost, and I really think that with the work that is now put upon him it is not possible to keep a man there at a salary of $1,200 a year who does the work that he does. I only say that because on account of the work I have had in connection with the new building I have more or less come in contact with this foreman, and he is an exceedingly bright man.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, it being specifically known that this employee's services have been increased I have no desire to make a point of order against his salary, because if his services have been increased, his compensation no doubt should be. For that reason I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of offices for surveyor-general, pay of messenger, stationery, printing, binding, drafting instruments, typewriters, books of reference for office use, furniture, fuel, lights, and other incidental expenses, $2,000.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask if the chairman can state about how much the Government is paying now in rentals in the city of Washington?

Mr. BINGHAM. About $400,000 a year.

The Clerk read as follows:

For surveyor-general of the Territory of Arizona, $2,000; and for the clerks in his office, $7,000; in all, $9,000.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 19, page 125, after "Arizona," strike out "two" and insert "three," so as to read "$3,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MACON. I reserve the point of order on that.

Mr. BINGHAM. My recollection is that for thirty-two years we have run that appropriation at $2,000.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I think I have the floor. I have not yielded it.

Mr. BINGHAM. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, it is true that they have been doing that very thing, and that is the shame of it. The law gives them $3,000, and the committee gives them $2,000. No point of order can lie on that account. Besides, during this time, I will say to the chairman of the committee, there has been other compensation than the mere salary. Now, that has been all cut off, and the amount allowed in this bill is clearly insufficient. But I shall not detain the House on that, for every one of the States having surveyors-general are interested in this, and the gentlemen representing those States must see the necessity of this amendment. I have already occupied more of the time of the committee than is necessary, and I shall be very glad to have this amendment agreed to, because I can see that the amendment to all these surveyors-general ought to go as this goes. Therefore I insist upon the amendment, and yield the floor.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to the fact that not only does section 2210, Revised Statutes, provide for the payment of $3,000 per annum for the surveyors-general of most of the States, but the estimates submitted to the committee this year by the Department provides for the payment of $3,000.

Now, $3,000 has never been too large a salary. I do not know why the salaries were gradually reduced during a series of years unless it was because these officers were receiving fees in addition to their salaries, but finally they were all placed upon a plane of $2,000. These offices are exceedingly important. They are certainly as important as the offices of registers and receivers of the land offices, and those officials receive $3,000. These men have charge of all the public-land surveys in their respective States. They are under a bond of at least $30,000 for the faithful execution of those surveys. They have the letting of all contracts for all the public-land surveys. They pass on all the public-land surveys, and their action in that regard is final save in and alone for the final indorsement of the survey by the General Land Office. Now, there is another reason why these salaries should be increased at this time, and I call attention to the fact that in the note on page 106 of the Book of Estimates attention is called to the fact that the surveyors-general have heretofore been allowed to collect certain fees for copies of records in their office. The Commissioner of the General Land Office considered this matter and concluded that it was not in the interest of the public service to have those fees remain in the hands of the surveyors-general, so by a recent order those fees now flow into the Treasury. Just how much surveyors-general obtain in the way of fees it is impossible for us to determine at this time.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman permit a question on that point?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the law provide whether the surveyors-general shall be allowed to retain those fees?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I assume that there is no mandatory provision of law on the subject.

Mr. NORRIS. The point I want to get at is, I do not see how the Commissioner of the General Land Office can determine that. Either those fees belong to the surveyors-general

legally or they do not. If they do not, and they have been taking them wrongfully in the past——

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman lives in a public-land State, and I presume he is acquainted with the practice that formerly prevailed in the offices of registers and receivers, under which clerks in the office, after hours, made plats for those desiring them, retaining the funds so received. I assume the Department has the authority which it exercised whereby all fees received by offices of surveyors-general now flow into the Treasury. Now, as I said a moment ago, Mr. Chairman, I am not able to say to what extent surveyors-general have profited by this long-established custom. I inquired of the Commissioner of the General Land Office in regard to that, and he said he had no information on the subject, but that it was undoubtedly a considerable sum in many instances, and he called attention to the fact that the salaries now received by those men, in view of the importance of the duties they perform and the character of the men required for those positions are altogether too small.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. MARSHALL. This paragraph of the bill provides for clerks in the office to be paid $7,000. Does the gentleman know how these clerkships are farmed out, or who fixes the salary, or by what law or discretion they are made so?

Mr. MONDELL. As I understand it, I will not be positive about that, the salaries of these clerks are fixed by regulation.

Mr. MARSHALL. If the gentleman will permit, these employees of the Surveyor-General's office are all under civil-service regulations. The chief clerk receives about $1,600 and the rest are graduated from that down.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman inquired how the compensation was fixed.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Why are they not provided for specifically instead of giving them a lump sum?

Mr. MONDELL. That has been the practice for years.

Mr. MANN. It is fixed by the Secretary and the Land Commissioner——

Mr. MACON. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. MONDELL. I would be pleased to.

Mr. MACON. You say existing law provides that these surveyors-general shall be paid $3,000?

Mr. MONDELL. It does as to most of them.

Mr. MACON. Well, these particular surveyors-general?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. MACON. That being the case I do not see how an objection could be proper. I think it would be an act of injustice to not appropriate the full amount of a man's salary employed by the Government when the law directs that he shall receive that amount.

Mr. MONDELL. We feel that it is, particularly in view of the fact that a considerable revenue heretofore enjoyed by the surveyors-general has now been cut off.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Does the gentleman say that the law provides for this particular surveyor-general?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Yes, sir; it does.

Mr. BONYNGE. In section 2210 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I will be pleased to do so.

Mr. MANN. What duties do these surveyors-general perform?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I regret I have not the law before me, for the law very clearly outlines them.

Mr. MANN. I would much rather have the gentleman's opinion in general language than the law.

Mr. MONDELL. The surveyors-general have charge of the execution of all of the public-land surveys within their respective States. They let all the contracts for public-land surveys. The lump-sum appropriation for public-land surveys in the public land States is apportioned by the Commissioner of the General Land Office under the law to the various States in accordance with their needs and the demands of the service, and within that lump-sum appropriation the surveyor-general is authorized to enter into contracts, after advertisement, with deputy surveyors to survey the public land. There is a corps of clerks in the surveyor-general's office who makes the original plats, who transcribe the original notes, and who make the original records of all these surveys which are finally filed in the General Land Office and become the foundation of the record of the survey of the public lands. The surveyor-general supervises all of this work.

Mr. MANN. Suppose the Department here orders some portion of land in Arizona surveyed?

Mr. MONDELL. The Department here does not do that.

Mr. MANN. The Department here can do it. Congress frequently does it.

Mr. MONDELL. I doubt if the Department would have authority to do it, but the Department, at any rate, never does it.

Mr. MANN. Who determines, then, whether a piece of land shall be surveyed?

Mr. MONDELL. The surveyor-general determines what land shall be surveyed, and when——

Mr. MANN. We pass an act of Congress requiring a piece of land to be surveyed——

Mr. MONDELL. On the contrary, we pass acts of Congress authorizing the resurvey of lands. We never pass an act of Congress providing for the survey of a piece of land unless it be an Indian reservation.

Mr. MANN. I was going to say we have passed a good many acts since I have been here, opening up Indian reservations, that provided that they should be surveyed.

Mr. MONDELL. I excepted the Indian reservations. They are not public lands.

Mr. MANN. Does the surveyor-general act in reference to this on his own motion?

Mr. MONDELL. As to Indian reservations, I will say to the gentleman, they are surveyed in accordance with specific provisions of law, and the appropriation for those surveys is ordinarily made in the bill providing for the opening of the reservation, and that appropriation can only be used for the survey of that particular tract.

Mr. MANN. What I wanted to get at was——

Mr. MONDELL. And the surveyor-general must proceed to the survey of those lands. But what I intended to refer to was the public lands generally.

Mr. MANN. I suppose there is a large amount of unsurveyed land in Arizona yet. Who has the responsibility of determining whether any of this land shall be surveyed or not?

Mr. MONDELL. The surveyor-general.

Mr. MANN. Of Arizona?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. And he receives an apportionment of the total appropriation for that Territory?

Mr. MONDELL. He does.

Mr. MANN. He spends that as he pleases?

Mr. MONDELL. He does.

Mr. MANN. And makes the contracts with whom he pleases?

Mr. MONDELL. He does, after advertisement—not with whom he pleases, but with the lowest responsible bidder.

Mr. MANN. Unfortunately not the lowest responsible bidder in many cases under the provisions of the law. He is the one who is responsible for the whole surveying business in the Territory?

Mr. MONDELL. He is.

Mr. KEIFER. I think that is not true as a general proposition.

Mr. MONDELL. It is, absolutely.

Mr. KEIFER. It is, within the amount of the appropriation that is assigned to him, but, to take it broadly, that answer is not accurate.

Mr. MONDELL. Of course he can not make contracts for a sum in excess of that in his hands.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I will ask the gentleman if the surveyor-general can not let contracts in excess of the amount in his hand?

Mr. MANN. This is the total amount appropriated, and this is apportioned.

Mr. KEIFER. He enters into contracts to the extent of the surveys he shall make.

Mr. MANN. And the extent of money that he can use.

Mr. KEIFER. Yes; that is the measure of it.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add to the statement made by the gentleman from Wyoming as to the duties and responsibilities of the surveyor-general. In addition to those recited by him he is custodian of all the records of all the surveys that have ever been made in the State. He is therefore placed under a very heavy and expensive bond for their safe-keeping.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a word as to the extent of the duties of the surveyor-general. And that is that he is charged with all mineral surveys in the mining States, and it is under his direction that surveys are made upon which all mining patents are issued, and upon which he incurs a great deal of responsibility in passing on their being in proper form and shape.

I will also add that in all the surveys that are made in the surveying of the public lands it is the duty of the surveyor-general to pass upon the character of the lands, as to whether they are mineral lands or whether they come in other various classes; and at times he exercises practically a judicial authority in passing upon these matters. It requires a man of a

good deal of knowledge on the subject, and he must be competent to fill that position. I indorse this amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the gentleman from California has referred to the fact that mineral surveys are also under control of the surveyor-general. There are a great many surveys executed on deposits made by mineral claimants and not chargeable to the public funds. In every mining State these surveys are executed, and they are very complicated. It is a very important interest.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I would like to ask the gentleman from Arizona if he knows the man who is now surveyor-general of Arizona?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I do not know that I do.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I would like to ask the gentleman if the present surveyor-general of Arizona is a duly admitted surveyor or engineer?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Now, you have me there. As to the surveyor, I suppose I have met him; I knew the former surveyor-general, but I do not know the present surveyor-general so as to know whether he is qualified. I think that he is a qualified man, but I am not able to speak of that thoroughly.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Is he a professional engineer and qualified to make these surveys?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If he is not, he ought to be.

Mr. MONDELL. Most of them are.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Are these surveyors qualified as surveyors and engineers?

Mr. MONDELL. Many of them are. The surveyor-general in the State of Wyoming is one of the best in the West.

Mr. DRISCOLL. My information is that the surveyors-general in many of these States are only ordinary men, without qualifications, who have gone out there and by politics have got a job of $2,000 a year, and they are not qualified to do the work they are required to perform, and that they have been becoming less and less competent for many years.

Mr. MONDELL. I know the gentleman does not want to make a misstatement. The fact is, that while some of the States may not recently have expended as large a sum as formerly for the survey of lands, the average amount that is expended for surveys is now larger than formerly.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Who makes the surveys?

Mr. MONDELL. They are made by deputy United States surveyors, and under contracts made with the surveyor-general.

Mr. DRISCOLL. They are real surveyors?

Mr. MANN. They ought to be, but often it is guesswork, and very poor guesswork at that?

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman from Wyoming stated a moment ago, if I understood him, that the surveyor-general of Wyoming was the best land surveyor in that State?

Mr. MONDELL. One of the best.

Mr. TAWNEY. Does he not do a great deal of work outside his duties as surveyor-general as surveyor for other people?

Mr. MONDELL. He does none at all; and if I understand the law correctly, the surveyor-general is prohibited from doing so. I never heard of a surveyor-general doing any outside work.

Mr. MARSHALL. I will say that there is not a line in the law that makes it necessary that the surveyor-general should be a surveyor, and it is not necessary that he should be, in order to perform his duties properly. I think I have a right to speak on this subject, because I have been familiar with the workings of the surveyor-general's offices in North and South Dakota for thirty-five years, having worked in person for many years under one or the other; and I would say that the responsibilities of the surveyor extend far beyond that of merely running a line. I want to say that there is absolutely no justification for the statement that these surveys are worse than guesswork. Years ago there were more or less frauds in the Government surveys, but the service has improved from year to year, and the fact is to-day that not one single mile of Government survey is accepted, much less paid for, until it has undergone the rigid inspection of a representative of the General Land Office, and the service never was in such good condition as it is to-day.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman read the report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office for the last year?

Mr. MARSHALL. I have not.

Mr. MANN. I thought not.

Mr. MARSHALL. But I know this much, that there has not been a mile of survey accepted that has not been accepted in accordance with my statement. The report may apply to surveys that were made years ago, but I doubt very much if there is any criticism of recent surveys.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, this is not a proposition alone to increase the salary of the surveyor-general of the Territory of Arizona, but to increase the salaries of fourteen surveyors-general of the United States. There are fourteen in all. Their present salary was fixed thirty-two years ago, and I am satisfied that the responsibilities of their office are no more now than they were thirty-two years ago, when their compensation was fixed at $2,000 a year. And inasmuch as this committee has not approved of a single increase in salary from the beginning of the bill down to the present time, I trust that the committee will continue to carry out its policy of adhering to existing salaries and existing compensation for the service employees of the Government are required to do. If we are going to commence here at this end of the bill to increase the salaries of all these surveyors-general, as is now proposed, we ought to return to the beginning of the bill and make increases in compensation where stronger arguments can be made in favor of increases than have been made in favor of this proposed increase.

This office is purely administrative. It does not require any technical skill, knowledge, or education to be a surveyor-general. I have in mind a surveyor-general whom I know personally, whose appointment was made, as I feel almost certain most of them have been made, because of political influence. This surveyor-general knows no more about surveying than I do, and for six years he has used his office as a private office. He has discharged absolutely no duties with respect to the service, except the mere supervisory duties that are performed. I submit that it is not in keeping with the policy of the Committee of the Whole, in respect to the question of salaries, for us to begin here at this end of the bill to increase the salaries of the surveyors-general throughout the United States.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Is it not a fact that this is simply a proposition to appropriate the salary provided by law, and not a proposition to increase the salary?

Mr. TAWNEY. That proposition doubtless was made upon this floor at a time when the Government was far better able to pay the salary fixed by law than it is now or than it will be during the next fiscal year. The salary fixed by law has not been followed by Congress for thirty-two years, and I submit that it is rather a poor time to commence increasing the salaries of these surveyors-general, especially in view of the fact that in every succeeding Congress the Land Office proposes to abolish a number of them because they have become of absolutely no consequence and the work of the office is being completed.

Mr. NORRIS rose.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the gentleman for my own information, and I think for the information of the House, whether there is any doubt about the statement heretofore made in this discussion that the surveyor-general is prohibited by law from performing any other work except official work of his office?

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not know whether he is prohibited or not. The surveyor-general to whom I referred a moment ago has conducted his business all the time he served as surveyor-general. I do know he is not a surveyor.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TAWNEY. I now yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. HOWELL. Has the gentleman taken into consideration the fact that the honorable Commissioner of the Land Office has certified to the fact that by giving the salary to the surveyors of the General Land Office that heretofore prevailed, it is in effect a reduction, for he has issued an order prohibiting them from taking the perquisites which they have heretofore enjoyed?

Mr. TAWNEY. The principal reason for the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to this increase is put on a comparative basis between the salaries paid to the surveyor-general and the salaries paid to the registers and receivers of the General Land Office, and also a comparison of the inspectors and special agents. It is not put upon the ground that because the Executive order or administrative order perquisites heretofore enjoyed by these surveyors-general have been taken away. It is true the Commissioner of the General Land Office refers to that fact, but the Commissioner of the General Land Office, through the Secretary of the Interior, has made a great many recommendations for increases of salary in his Department, none of which has the Committee on Appropriations approved or recommended. If we had done so, none of them would have met with the approval of the Committee of the Whole. As I said from the beginning of this bill down to the present time, not a single increase of salary has been allowed. Even when the proposed increase was to bring the salary up to the maximum fixed by law the increase has not been allowed to pass the scrutiny of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] and the gentleman from

Illinois [Mr. MANN] and other gentlemen who have carefully guarded against any increases of salary. I will now yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BONYNGE. I want the floor in my own right after the gentleman is through.

Mr. JONES of Washington rose.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Is it not a fact that every other salary has been paid to these men where it is fixed by law except to the serveyors-general?

Mr. TAWNEY. No, sir; there are a number of salaries in this bill that are less than the maximum fixed by law, and in determining the question whether or not we would follow the recommendations of the heads of Departments who recommended increases of salary, we were not governed by the amount allowed by law. We were governed primarily by the amount which these employees have heretofore received, and by the fact that under existing conditions of our public revenue we are not justified in making the increases of salary.

Mr. JONES of Washington. What particular official in this bill is there where the salary is fixed by law that is not receiving the amount the law fixes?

Mr. TAWNEY. I can not recall now definitely, but nearly all the officers in the Territory have greater salaries fixed by law than are carried in the bill, and greater than Congress has heretofore allowed. I want to remind Members that these salaries were fixed thirty-two years ago, and Congress has never seen fit to increase them prior to this time, and that this is no time to begin an increase of salaries.

Mr. MACON. The gentleman says these salaries were fixed thirty-two years ago.

Mr. TAWNEY. They were reduced to $2,000 thirty-two years ago.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. How were they reduced?

Mr. TAWNEY. From the amount authorized by law.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. You mean that when Mr. Randall went through and cut down appropriations without any reference to the service. You have got them all back except those referring to the Territories.

Mr. TAWNEY. I am obliged to the gentleman from Arizona for giving to the Committee on Appropriations the indorsement of that distinguished man who served as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. If the Committee on Appropriations reduced these salaries to $2,000 thirty-two years ago because of the then existing conditions of the public revenue and Congress since that time has not seen fit to increase them to the maximum fixed by law, I say that this would be a very poor time to depart from the precedent established by Mr. Randall and all succeeding Congresses for thirty-two years.

Mr. HACKNEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question. I would like him to state to the House whether there has been any complaint to the committee that if these salaries were not increased above $2,000 there would be any vacancies in the office?

Mr. TAWNEY. None whatever.

Mr. BONYNGE. Mr. Chairman, this is not a proposition, and I want to impress it upon the committee, for any increase in the salary of any officer. The statute expressly provides in the case of nine surveyors-general, and not fourteen as the gentleman has stated, that the salary shall be $3,000 per year. The section is 2210 of the Revised Statutes, and it reads:

> The surveyors-general of Colorado, New Mexico, California, Idaho, Nevada, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, and Arizona shall each receive their salary at the rate of $3,000 a year.

I do not believe that the gentleman is correct, either, in his statement that the salary has been fixed at $2,000 for the past thirty-two years. In a letter directed to Mr. MONDELL by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, dated January 22 of this year, the Commissioner states:

> The foregoing salaries relating to those now provided for by the statute were gradually reduced in the appropriation acts—

Not by one reduction from $3,000 to $2,000, but—

> Were gradually reduced in the appropriation acts until the passage of the act of March 2, 1895, since which date no salary at over $2,000 per annum has been provided for these offices, and several of them have been allowed but $1,800.

So that instead of being for thirty-two years, the Commissioner of the General Land Office gives the authority and refers to the statute, 28 Statutes at Large, 799, when the salary was fixed at $2,000. But, Mr. Chairman, we are not asking for any increase, either in the amount fixed by statute or compensation heretofore paid to these officers.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is the gentleman not asking for an increase of the amount appropriated from $2,000 to $3,000?

Mr. BONYNGE. But not that fixed by statute.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman is not proposing now to increase the maximum allowed by law, but he does propose to increase the amount they are receiving for their services from $2,000 to $3,000.

Mr. BONYNGE. No; as I now propose to show the gentleman, and to give the reason why we are not proposing to increase their compensation. The amount appropriated by the bill that is reported to the House in effect is a reduction in the salary of these officers, and not an increase. It has already been stated in this debate that these officers have been receiving heretofore certain fees for the preparation of maps and plats. In my State the surveyor-general wrote me and stated that the annual amount that he received for such certified copies and maps amounted to from $750 to $1,000, so that heretofore he has been receiving compensation at the rate of $3,000 or thereabouts per annum, $2,000 appropriated by the Appropriation Committee and the other $750 or $1,000 that he received from these certified copies. Now, because of the order made by the Commissioner of the General Land Office only a short time ago—and it is because of that order that the Commissioner chiefly based his recommendation for the increase—these officers have been deprived of that other source of revenue. So that if we now appropriate only the sum of $2,000 per annum we are at this time in effect reducing the compensation that these officers have received for their services, and not in any way increasing—not only not increasing, but not giving them the same compensation that they have heretofore received.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Has any one of these officers in all these long years attempted to get his lawful salary?

Mr. BONYNGE. I can not answer that. I am glad the gentleman asked the question, for I have no doubt that when the Appropriation Committee brought in in the first instance the allowance of $2,000 they used, undoubtedly, the argument against these officers for not appropriating the entire amount that they were receiving this additional compensation by way of fees that they received for the copies of plats and maps, and I have no question in my own mind that originally that was the reason the Appropriation Committee did not appropriate the entire amount allowed by statute for their compensation. Now that you have taken from them this additional compensation, we are simply asking you to give them the same salary that they received heretofore.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let me suggest to the gentleman that it is usual when the Appropriation Committee appropriates a sum of money less than the salary allowed by law it is conditioned upon their accepting that in lieu of the salary allowed by law.

Mr. BONYNGE. Very well; but they were at that time, when you did not appropriate the entire amount allowed by statute, receiving these additional fees and allowances with the full knowledge and consent of their superior officers.

Having cut them off from that emolument we are now asking you to simply do them justice and give them the salary the statute authorizes. This is no time, I submit to the gentleman from Minnesota, to commence reducing salaries of these officers who have not had an increase. Some gentleman asked some time ago if there was any danger of there being a vacancy in these offices if the salary should not be increased to the $3,000. I have not any idea, Mr. Chairman, that if we do not appropriate the full $7,500 compensation for the Members of the House that there would be any trouble in filling the office of Representative in the district from which the gentleman hails who asked that question——

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. At $2,000 a year?

Mr. TAWNEY. Your proposition is to increase these salaries to $3,000 a year on the basis we have taken from these men certain emoluments. Have you any evidence to show that these emoluments even approximate $1,000 in any other district or State except your own?

Mr. BONYNGE. I can not answer for any district or State except my own.

Mr. TAWNEY. Do you think it would be good business sense for this committee to proceed upon the theory that because these emoluments given in your State amounted to $700 a year it would amount to the same in other States where possibly they were simply nominal if there were any receipts at all?

Mr. BONYNGE. I do not believe they were merely nominal——

Mr. TAWNEY. I know some are.

Mr. BONYNGE. And my authority for saying they were not merely nominal is the Commissioner of the General Land Office in the same letter to which I have heretofore referred. In that letter the Commissioner says:

> Surveyors-general were authorized by a circular of October 13, 1886, to charge fees at the rates allowed registers and receivers for exem-

plified copies of plats or other records, which authority was revoked by circular letter "A" of April 15, 1907. The income derived from this source was considerable; just how much was realized can not be stated, as the moneys thus earned were not reported to this Office.

I have given what they were in my particular State on the authority of the surveyor-general of Colorado, and I can not answer as to any other State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say further, in line with the question asked by the chairman of the committee, that at no later day than day before yesterday, in a conversation with the Commissioner of the General Land Office he made the statement similar to that embodied in the letter quoted by the gentleman from Wyoming. The surveyor-general throughout the West, in addition to the compensation that has been paid to them as a salary, have been receiving fees because of extra work they have done. In reply to the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that these men who are appointed to the positions of surveyor-general are not men of sufficient consequence to really fill a position that would entitle them to $3,000 a year—I do not know to what surveyor-general the chairman referred——

Mr. TAWNEY. I would say to the gentleman from Idaho the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations made no such statement the gentleman has just uttered.

Mr. FRENCH. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations made a statement to the effect that a certain surveyor-general was using his office for a loafing office and from that point was exercising a sort of general supervisory direction of the force of his office. In line with that I want to say every surveyor-general in the State of Idaho so long as I have been familiar with the office, has been one of the very best surveyors there is to be found within the State of Idaho. Another statement he made, or inference that can be drawn from a statement he made, is, that the work of surveyor-general's offices has in some way pinched out, and because of that fact the surveyor-general should receive less compensation. I want to say that if there is merit for that statement from conditions in some States, it does not bear out in the State of Idaho. In the State of Idaho not less than 80 per cent of all the lands in that State are to-day unsurveyed lands. In the State of Idaho 28,000,000 acres of land are unsurveyed, that are to-day not either included within the forest reserves, or that are not included in land heretofore surveyed and owned by private individuals. In that State, according to the estimates of the surveying division of the office of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, $1,000,000 will be required to ultimately survey the land that will need to be surveyed within the State of Idaho.

The surveyor-general's office in that State has a force of something like from ten to fifteen or sixteen men and women working constantly. That body is under the direction of the surveyor-general as in every other State where there is a surveyor-general. A man who has the direction of the work of such a body of men and women, a man who has direction of the work that has to do with the survey of the land in States that are new, like the States of Idaho, Colorado, and Wyoming, that have been mentioned, is worthy to receive the compensation that was provided in the law when the office was established within those States. In Idaho it was provided that $3,000 should be the compensation. You have now in this bill proposed to cut that amount of salary to $2,000 per year. I have no doubt, as has been suggested, but that the office could be filled at that, or even at a less salary, but I have a serious doubt, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that the office of surveyor-general in Idaho or in other States can be filled by a man who is willing and capable of assuming the responsibilities of the office and directing it as it should be directed, if the office shall be cut to a salary of $2,000 a year without any prospect of the extra thousand dollars being received by him either in form of fees or by direct appropriation at the hands of some future Congress.

Mr. DRISCOLL. How many years has the surveyor-general of the State of Idaho been receiving only $2,000 a year?

Mr. FRENCH. He should have been receiving $3,000 a year. He has been receiving fees in addition to $2,000 a year up until, I think, April, 1907.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Is the gentleman or anyone else able to state what amount of fees he received?

Mr. FRENCH. Why, no; I do not know the amount of fees that he has been receiving.

Mr. DRISCOLL. There has been a lot of talk about fees, but nobody seems to be able to give any facts or information.

Mr. BONYNGE. I gave you the facts from Colorado. They amount to from $750 to $1,000.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Where did the gentleman get the facts?

Mr. BONYNGE. In a letter from the surveyor-general to me.

Mr. DRISCOLL. What are those fees for?

Mr. BONYNGE. For exemplified copies of plats and maps.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Did he get the fees?

Mr. BONYNGE. He got the fees himself.

Mr. FRENCH. And the reason why the policy of permitting the surveyor-general to receive fees has been discontinued is because the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Interior Department believed the policy was an iniquitous one; that it was a policy that might lead to certain practices that might be questionable, and because they believed that these offices that had a definite line of work to perform had better be paid a definite salary than to be paid in part a definite salary and for the remainder of the salary be permitted to receive fees that might be much or might be little, and might lead to questionable practices in their office.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOUTELL in the chair). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GILLETT. It seems to me that we have debated this question as long as the House cares to do so. I would like five minutes, perhaps longer. I would suggest——

Mr. SMITH of California. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to make a little inquiry. I would like to know what has become of the fees that have been taken away. Do they now go into the General Treasury of the country?

Mr. BONYNGE. They do.

Mr. SMITH of California. They are enriching the Treasury of the country to the extent of these fees which have heretofore gone to the surveyors-general, and deprives them of that much. It seems to me it is quite clear, if the Treasury is to receive the benefit of those fees——

Mr. TAWNEY. It is also proposed to increase the expenditures from the Treasury a specific amount on the basis of an indefinite and uncertain amount of fees that are going into the Treasury. Nobody, except the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BONYNGE], can give the House any information at all as to what these fees amount to, and therefore we are not justified in increasing or creating a specific or direct obligation on the Treasury on the basis of an uncertain quantity, the amount of which nobody can state.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] rises to a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman will please state it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Under the rule is debate not exhausted on this paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. There is a point of order pending, and the entire debate is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I did not know that a point of order was pending, Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to the statement of the Chair.

Mr. MACON. I reserved the point of order until I found the existing law provided for the payment of $3,000 to these surveyors-general, and then, of course, it did not apply.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment close in ten minutes, five minutes to be occupied now by somebody in favor of the amendment and five minutes by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] moves that debate on this amendment close in ten minutes, five minutes to be controlled by those in favor of the amendment and five minutes by himself. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I am willing to have debate close in ten minutes; but I will make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves that all debate close in ten minutes.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. Now, just another word of debate on this matter. It seems hardly fair for the chairman of the committee, who is presumed to bring to the House full information with reference to the legislation that is proposed, to accuse us of dereliction in not bringing him information as to how much these fees amounted to.

Mr. TAWNEY. Not accuse you.

Mr. SMITH of California. Then "josh" us.

Mr. TAWNEY. The Commissioner of the General Land Office or the Secretary of the Interior did not even make an oral request of the committee when they were before the committee for this increase, and if it was so urgent and so necessary it would seem that they, being at the head of the Department, would have made the request in this case.

Mr. SMITH of California. It is more a question of fairness than of urgency and necessity from the standpoint of the Commissioner. I do not imagine the offices are going to be vacated if this amount is not allowed; but it is a matter of fairness, and when these gentlemen have been deprived of the fees which are now going into the Treasury it is only fair that they should be compensated by way of the salary allowed by law out of that much of the fees which are now going into the General Treasury of the country.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah. I wish the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota. He makes the statement that nothing was said by the Commissioner of the General Land Office in favor of this increase of salary for surveyors.

Mr. TAWNEY. No; I said there was no oral statement made by an officer, the Commissioner of the General Land Office or the Secretary of the Interior, in favor of this increase when they appeared before the committee urging increase of salaries, promotions, and increases of offices in other branches of the service. They submitted a statement with the annual estimates, giving the reasons for it.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota to the statement made by the Commissioner when he was interrogated upon the subject. Mr. Ballinger says:

I would say in connection with this matter that through the Secretary an order was promulgated cutting off surveyors-general from any right to receive compensation for plats, maps, and other papers made outside of office hours, which amounted to quite a little compensation to them and which they had been getting for a good many years. In view of that being cut off—and we believed it was good administration, so that the Government would get the compensation from the work done by the force and not part of it go into the pockets of the surveyor-general and his clerks—we believe it is now proper to return the salary to the amount fixed by statute, $3,000.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, as there seems to be some little doubt as to whether there are any fees in connection with this office, I dropped in at the Land Office a few days ago at the request of one of the engineers of my district who wanted some copies of certain papers. I left a deposit of $3.60 with the Commissioner to pay for these papers. I had to apply to him for these copies on account of the records in San Francisco having been destroyed. That is a sample of the fees that have been going to the office of the surveyor-general. I am well aware that the fees the surveyor-general of the State of California received in former times amounted to large figures. My first business relations with that office were about thirty years ago, and at that time the fees were supposed to be worth $5,000 a year, and the fees, certainly, at this time should be greatly in excess of a thousand dollars a year. So that there is no excuse in the world why the actual salary provided in this statute should not be paid to these officers.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, one feature about this question is impressive to me, and that is that when in the committee we took this subject up not a word was said to the committee as to any raise in these salaries.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman refer to the fact that no Member of the House appeared before the committee?

Mr. GILLETT. No Member of the House or Department officer suggested it.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Utah has just read a statement which Mr. Ballenger made before the committee.

Mr. BONYNGE. Before the committee in the hearings.

Mr. GILLETT. I did not hear him.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, that was my understanding. I did not have that understanding from any member of the subcommittee, but my understanding was that there was not going to be any question but the committee would follow this recommendation of the Commissioner and the Secretary, based as it was upon the equities of the case and upon justice.

Mr. GILLETT. It is rather singular, if the gentleman had that understanding and others had that understanding, that no Member of the House suggested to the committee that that understanding should be carried out.

Mr. MONDELL. We thought, of course, the committee were going to do their duty.

Mr. GILLETT. The committee were trying to do their duty. There seems to be gentlemen who are asking this increase present to-day who yesterday were not present when in another place in the bill there was an attempt to raise the salary up to the statutory amount. This similar motion was made when these gentlemen were not present.

This is not the only place in the bill where the statutory salary is not appropriated for.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. More's the pity for the bill.

Mr. GILLETT. We are following here the precedent which we have followed every year. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BONYNGE] says that when this was cut down it was probably cut down because then the surveyor-general was allowed the fees; but the statute he cited disproves his logic, because it seems that away back from 1866 they were allowed the fees. I suppose the reason it was cut down was because these men are getting as much salary now as other men are getting in those States for similar services. I believe that is so, and I think that is the reason the salary has been cut down.

This bill gives the same salaries which have been appropriated in recent years. And I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that if they should carry this it would not apply to all these surveyors, because while nine whom the gentleman mentioned have by statute an authorized salary of $3,000, some of the salaries fixed by statute since then have been fixed at $2,000 only. Increase in those salaries are subject to a point of order, and that shows what was the intention of Congress. The intention of Congress was to give these men but $2,000, of recent years, and then, when they passed laws creating new surveyorships, they fixed their salaries, not at $3,000, but at $2,000, the same sum which the others had been receiving.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. The gentleman is just reversing that.

Mr. GILLETT. Obviously this is the course which Congress has deliberately marked out, and it seems to me now, when we have a bill in which we have sedulously avoided raising other salaries, it is the last time that the gentleman should come in and ask to raise salaries in this case. I wish to read just a word from the Secretary of the Interior on the subject of these surveyors. He says:

The general question of the system of surveys under the surveyors-general demands the most careful attention. The present system is not satisfactory. It is both expensive and subject to very great delays. I believe that a very great saving, both in efficiency and expedition, would be made if the Secretary were given authority to have the surveys made under the direct control of the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

So they are not doing their work satisfactorily, and we are giving them the same appropriation that they have had for the last forty years.

Mr. TAWNEY. Thirty-two years.

Mr. BONYNGE. Since 1895.

Mr. GILLETT. I think it is thirty years, but it is better for my argument if it is only since 1895, because since that time the country has been in a much better position to pay $3,000 than it is to-day.

This bill has been formulated on the theory that we would not raise salaries above what they have been in recent years, and I hope the committee, after refusing to raise other salaries, will refuse to raise the salaries of these officials who live in the States of the Members urging the increases.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The time for debate on this amendment has expired.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the merits of the proposed amendment have been fully and ably presented by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BONYNGE] and others who have participated in the discussion. I wish to add a word in support of this amendment, which I consider most reasonable and just. The law especially fixes the salary of these officers at $3,000 per annum, but for a number of years past the law has been ignored by the Appropriations Committee and an arbitrary compensation of $2,000 per annum given for this service. In addition to this compensation the surveyors of the several districts have been allowed the fees arising from furnishing copies of maps, plats, and other official records of their offices, which have constituted perquisites of the office. The Commissioner of the Land Office by a recent order has deprived these officers of all such perquisites and requires that they account for and pay over all fees into the public Treasury.

This matter was presented to the committee by the Land Commissioner, and he strongly recommended that in view of his action in this respect that the salary provided by law—$3,000—be appropriated for these officers.

The Commissioner has also directed attention to the importance of the service rendered by and the responsibility of these officers, and pointedly states that they are really deserving and entitled to a greater compensation than registers or receivers.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the duties incumbent upon the surveyor-general require a high order of ability and integrity. He represents the Government in awarding contracts for all

surveys of the public lands within his district. These contracts often involve many thousands of dollars. He also has jurisdiction over the surveys of mining claims, involving interests of the greatest value. He is required to furnish a large bond, and all the surrounding conditions of this office, particularly in the mining States, demand an officer of high character and ability. Now, the committee, while disclaiming any intention to reduce these salaries, have utterly ignored the fact that by the cutting off of the fees heretofore allowed as perquisites of the office by order of the Commissioner, that in effect these officers are being subjected to reduction of salary.

The committee has brought in increases of salary for certain high officers in the Deparments above that provided by law, and justify their action by asserting that these salaries were fixed by law a long time ago, and that, conditions having changed, these departmental officers are justly entitled to a more liberal compensation. This argument, I confess, seemed plausible and convincing to me, and I was considerably surprised in the course of this debate to hear members of the committee urge as a reason for opposing this amendment the fact that the salary provided in this bill had been the same for a great number of years, despite the fact that it has been clearly shown to the committee that the action of the Department has deprived them of remuneration in the shape of fees that has heretofore been allowed.

In the light of the facts shown, the position of the committee is utterly inconsistent and untenable. I believe the committee can not fail to have been convinced in the course of this discussion of the reasonableness and justice of this amendment, and I hope no pride of opinion will operate against their approval of the fair and just pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming, to strike out in line 19, page 175, the word "two" and insert the word "three."

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BONYNGE. Let us have a division.

Mr. TAWNEY. Let the amendment be reported again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 19, strike out "two" and insert "three,"

So that it will read:

For surveyors-general in the Territory of Arizona, $3,000.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 33, noes 30.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chairman appointed Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. BONYNGE.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported—ayes 37, noes 49.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 125, line 20, after the word "thousand," where it first occurs, insert the words "five hundred."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the salaries of the surveyors-general of eleven States are the only salaries reduced by this bill, and that at a time when the salaries paid for a number of years have been a thousand dollars less than the salaries provided by law, this committee proceeds, as regards eleven Western States not represented on that committee, to reduce the salaries of surveyors-general, the only reduction carried in the bill. And while the salaries of officials of the Departments here in the District of Columbia are increased all along the line, the salaries of these western officials, charged with important duties out in the mountain States, unfortunately not represented on the Committee on Appropriations, are reduced. That reduction is called to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations—their attention is called to the fact that these salaries have been below the amount provided by law, and their attention has been further called to the fact that by reason of the cutting off of certain fees, the continuation of the salary heretofore provided amounts to a reduction of salary. I was unable to answer the question that was asked me, how much that reduction would amount to in my own State, but I have no doubt the surveyor-general of Wyoming has been receiving a considerable amount. Years ago, at the time these appropriations were reduced below the amount provided by law, the fees, in many instances, were very large, because at that time we had not provided for photolithographic township maps. Some years ago we began to provide for photolithographic maps of townships, and there has been nothing like the demand on surveyors-general for plats executed in their offices since. The salaries were probably reduced because they were receiving fees in addition to their salaries. Now the fees have been cut off and there can be no question but that the fees in every instance amounted to more than $500 a year. So my proposed amendment, Mr. Chairman, is simply to retain these salaries at somewhere near the compensation paid to surveyors-general in the past. Surely, this committee does not want to single out these officers in these Western States and reduce them at a time when we are generally increasing the salaries of public officials?

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I will just take a moment, because this is a repetition of the debate that has gone before. I suppose the gentleman is repeating it now because there are a few gentlemen in the House who were not in then. I wish to say that the gentleman from Wyoming is mistaken when he says these are the only cases in the bill that have not been appropriated for up to the amount provided by law. If the gentleman had been in the House yesterday and heard the debate on another case, he would not have made that statement.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Wyoming did not say that this was the only case where the appropriation was not the amount provided for by law. Although I call the attention of the committee to the fact that——

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I claim my time; I did not yield to the gentleman to make a speech.

Mr. MONDELL. May I correct the gentleman's statement?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes; if the gentleman will do that; but I do not think it is courteous, after I yielded to him, to go making a speech.

Mr. MONDELL. What I said was that this was the only reduction in salary provided for in this bill.

Mr. GILLETT. That is exactly what I thought the gentleman said, and it is unfortunately a mistake. There are other places in the bill where the amount appropriated is not the full amount, and that is the only way in which this is a reduction. We are giving them exactly the same that we have given them year after year since 1895. This is not a bill where we are raising salaries; the bill goes on exactly the other theory—that this is not a time to raise salaries, and that we must stand on the present basis. There are no salaries being raised in this bill, and therefore, instead of this being a discrimination against the surveyors-general, if it were possible, it would be a discrimination against the gentlemen who have come in here this afternoon and tried to pass the amendments.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Is it not a discrimination when you retain the salaries of these officers at the rate carried in previous bills in face of the fact that your attention has been called to the fact that certain fees which they heretofore received are now turned into the Treasury—that these fees amounted to a considerable sum?

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, we can not tell how much they amounted to, except in one State, but I can not see how they had any right to take these fees.

Mr. BONYNGE. Under the order of the Commissioner.

Mr. GILLETT. The Commissioner can not make a law; he can not give them fees or take away fees. If they are taking fees against the law, the Commissioner can stop it. If the law gives them fees, the Commissioner can not stop it. We are the only ones who can give or take away fees. Therefore, we are giving them exactly what we have appropriated year after year, and this is not the time, I think, when the House wants to abandon the practice.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I called the attention of the committee a while ago to the fact that very often the proposition for economy was to be effected at considerable increase over the amount paid. This is one of the illustrations. The gentleman says that now the Department has cut off the fees, amounting in the highest that has been mentioned from $750 to $1,000 a year, in order to recompense the gentleman who lost the fees that have been cut off as a matter of economy, we should therefore increase the salary $1,000 a year.

Mr. MONDELL. Only $500.

Mr. MANN. That is in the principal case. The Colorado office does one of the principal businesses in surveys, but in most of the cases the fees have not amounted to $150 a year, certainly not to $250 a year. In order to accomplish that little economy, they say the Department recommends that the salary should be increased by $1,000 a year. Economy! Economy! Now, what does the Land Office say? What does the Secretary of the Interior say about the whole system? We know the difficulty of abolishing offices. At $2,000 a year no office is vacant and nobody declines to accept the office, so far as we know. There is no surveyor-general's office to which some one has not been appointed at $2,000 a year. The Department

wants to abolish all of the offices. If you can not abolish them at $2,000 a year, what chance will there be of abolishing them at $3,000 a year?

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman from Illinois consider that a fair argument as against a fair salary, that even at the low salary the offices do not go begging?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows I do not make unfair arguments. I am talking about the abolition of the office. I am not arguing against the proposition that the salary ought to be increased. What does the Secretary of the Interior say about the offices themselves? He says in his report, on page 9, and I call this to the attention of the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. MARSHALL], who says the methods of the surveyor-general's office are entirely satisfactory. He says:

The general question of the system of surveys under the surveyor-general demands the most careful attention. The present system is not satisfactory. It is both expensive and subject to very great delay.

Yet in the face of the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior that this method is expensive, the gentleman proposes to increase the expense without in the slightest degree increasing the efficiency.

Mr. MARSHALL. I do not know that I made the statement that the surveys were satisfactory to the Department. I said they were well made and thoroughly made and thoroughly inspected.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman when he made the statement—and I only yield for a question—undoubtedly had reference to the time when he was in the office of the surveyor-general himself, and I have no doubt that the work was well done then, but it has deteriorated since he left the office and came to Congress. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARSHALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. MARSHALL. It does not necessarily make it so, does it, because the Secretary of the Interior says that these surveys could be expedited if the business was handled from Washington? That is the peg on which he hangs his recommendation. The Postmaster-General might recommend that everybody's mail should go to Washington, but that would not expedite the work.

Mr. MANN. Of course the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior does not make a thing so. It is his opinion. That is all we want. It is his opinion that the system is unsatisfactory and expensive.

The gentlemen from the States involved do not propose any method to increase the efficiency, but only a method of increasing the expense. I would much rather increase the efficiency than increase the expense.

Mr. SMITH of California. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of California. I think if the gentleman will read that quotation again, the gentleman will find that it is not a criticism of the surveyors-general, but of the system of surveys provided by law.

Mr. MANN. I have read the opinion a number of times and if the gentleman had listened to what I had said, he would have understood that I was criticising the system.

Mr. SMITH of California. I was listening all the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. COOK of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question. I would like to know if the gentleman has had any experience or known anything about the laborious work of the surveyors-general and the duties which they are required to perform?

Mr. MANN. Well, if the gentleman wants to know that, I can tell him that I have. I have been engaged in legal work relating to land all my life, ever since I was admitted to practice at the bar.

Mr. COOK of Colorado. At what point?

Mr. MANN. Well, at the city of Chicago, which deals with a great many questions of surveys, but I do not propose to enter into a personal controversy with the gentleman.

Mr. COOK of Colorado. I would like to ask the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, if there are any Government lands for entry in the State of Illinois?

Mr. MANN. Why, Mr. Chairman, that is an idle question. Every foot of land in the State of Illinois is supposed to have been surveyed by surveyors-general. Does the gentleman think the only land that surveyors-general have anything to do with are lands they have not surveyed? I take my judgment of the surveyors-general by the work that they have done, not by the work that remains to be done.

Mr. COOK of Colorado. I would like to say, in answer to the gentleman from Illinois, these surveys were no doubt made before the gentleman from Illinois was on this earth.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman pays me a great compliment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. MONDELL), there were—ayes 29, noes 36.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend line 20, page 125, by inserting after the word "dollars" the following words:

And all fees received by the surveyor-general not in excess of $1,000, but all fees in excess of $1,000 shall be placed in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order upon the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 125, line 20, after the word "dollars," insert:
"And all fees received by the surveyor-general not in excess of $1,000, but all fees in excess of $1,000 shall be placed in the Treasury of the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. Upon this amendment the gentleman from Massachusetts reserves the point of order.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order; we have had discussion enough.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Idaho desire to be heard upon the point of order.

Mr. FRENCH. I would like to be heard on the point of order. The proposition that I make goes to the very essence of the question of salaries received. The members of the Committee on Appropriations contend that the amount of fees is a very nominal amount. I have offered this amendment in order to provide that those fees shall go to the salary of the surveyor-general, but if they are in excess of a thousand dollars the excess shall go into the Treasury of the United States.

The adoption of my amendment would obviate the necessity of making a direct appropriation of either $1,000 or $500; and at the same time it takes the words of the gentlemen for their full value, that the fees amount to a very small figure. I would like to have the point of order withdrawn, or if it shall not be sustained, that a vote be taken upon this amendment in order to test the sincerity of the gentlemen who have opposed the increase of salary or, rather, the maintenance of salary, at $3,000, on the ground that the fees amount to nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of office for the surveyor-general, stationery, binding records, drafting supplies, books of reference for office use, typewriter and repairs, repairs of furniture, freight and drayage, filing cases, drafting tables, and other incidental expenses, $1,000.

Mr. MONDELL. I move to strike out the last word. I think we should not pass this question of public-land surveys after what has been said in the recent discussion without a brief statement in regard to the present contract system of public-land surveys and the execution of those surveys through the offices of the surveyors-general. Now, I am not surprised, Mr. Chairman, at the suggestion made by the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

Mr. MANN. By the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, very well; the Secretary makes the statement.

Mr. Chairman, you may search the reports of all the Department officials of this Government for years past, and I do not believe you will find in them many favorable statements with regard to any public service not performed under their immediate charge and directly from Washington. We all appreciate the fact that the civil-service people in the bureaus here are constantly working to make this more and more a Government of centralized and all-powerful bureaus. We all know that those in the bureaus who influence and color the views of the heads of Departments are prone to exaggerate, if not in some instances to possibly slightly misrepresent, with regard to the execution of Government business not performed directly under the charge of the bureaus. They can not believe that any good thing can come out of a western Nazareth.

A number of years ago, Mr. Chairman, we tried the experiment of departing from the contract system of public-land surveys. One of the charges against the contract system is that it is expensive. A certain bureau of the Government has for many years sought to enlarge the field of its activity and acquire jurisdiction over public-land surveys, and no one connected with that great bureau at least ever has any good thing

to say with regard to the present system. A number of years ago in the Indian Territory the experiment was made of giving this bureau an opportunity to execute some surveys under a special law. I have no knowledge but that those surveys were well executed. Probably they were. I do know that they were not particularly expeditiously executed. I know that they were not executed as expeditiously as the public-land surveys are often executed under the surveyors-general, and I do know that they cost more per mile than the same class of surveys over the same kind of country costs under the contract system. A little later, Mr. Chairman, this same bureau was given an opportunity to survey a State boundary line, State boundary lines having been up to that time surveyed by deputy surveyors under contract. This survey was executed, not specially expeditiously, and it cost more than twice as much to execute it as had ever been paid, so far as I know, or as had been paid up to that time for any other similar survey and establishment of monuments. The expense was practically prohibitive. If we were to continue to mark out our State boundaries and establish our important lines through that method, we would bankrupt the Treasury. So that when the Secretary says that this method is expensive he certainly could not have had in mind the experience we have had of the execution of surveys by the Geological Survey in the Indian Territory and on a certain State boundary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, there was a time when the contract system of surveys was a failure. Aye, more than that, it was a fraud, when there was no examination in the field of these surveys, and when they were not well executed and not well monumented. But that condition ceased to exist many years ago, and I have personal knowledge, and I think the Commissioner of the General Land Office will certainly insist, that those surveys are to-day well executed.

If they are not, it is the fault of the Land Office, for they have a large and efficient force of examiners who go over these surveys, examine them as to distances and directions, and as to the character of the monuments.

Now, as to the work of the surveyor-general's office, I appreciate the fact that the departmental officials would prefer to have 100 more clerks in one of the Departments here rather than have 100 clerks in offices of surveyors-general throughout the public-lands States; that they would prefer to have more officials directly under their control here, traveling back and forth, executing surveys, rather than to have local men in the intermountain States doing that work.

Mr. Chairman, this system has been in existence ever since we were a Government. It brings close to the work of surveying the men charged with responsibility for it. It does give employment in some of the Western States for a few Government clerks and officials, and it gives the people of that country—the young men and women of that country—who prepare themselves for that kind of work an opportunity of Government service. That opportunity is largely denied them if all the work of the Government is to be carried on in the bureaus here. I believe the contract system, as now carried on, is a good system. I believe that the surveyor-general system is a good system. If we have surveyors-general who are not qualified, they should make way for those who are. If the work is not well done in any respect, the Interior Department should insist on its being well done. But it is a fact that surveys are being well executed. They are being executed under contract at a price at which it would be utterly impossible for the Government to send a force of men from Washington out into those regions and make surveys. From $500 to $800 for a survey of 36 square miles of rough and broken territory certainly is not an expensive system; and if the work is not well done it is the fault of the General Land Office, and no one else.

The Clerk read as follows:

For surveyor-general of California, $2,000; and for the clerks in his office, $11,400; in all, $13,400.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move, on line 3, page 126, to strike out the word "two" and insert the word "three."

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 126, line 3, strike out the word "two" and insert the word "three;" so as to read "three thousand dollars."

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I recognize here this afternoon that this subject is being discussed from two points, from two directions, one from the East and one from the West. With all due respect to the gentlemen who are on this committee, they certainly must admit that this is a subject upon which they are not fully posted. So far as the office of the surveyor-general of the State of California is concerned, I ought to know something about it. When we consider what this subject amounts to and what are the interests of the United States, it is impossible to expect a $2,000 man to do the business of that office. The duties of that office are entirely different from what those of the surveyor-general were when there was such an office in the State of Illinois. It is an entirely different problem to deal with, when the mineral lands of this State are sending into the Treasury of the United States from the surveyor-general's office in fees thousands of dollars annually. Again, these are not the fees that the surveyor-general has been in the habit of receiving. The fees that he has been receiving are for copies of documents and copies of maps from his office, and the surveyor-general has the benefit of taking to himself the difference between what it costs to make the copies of these documents and what he receives. It is these fees that the recent ruling or order of the Department takes away from him.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know how much of the $400,000 appropriated last year for surveys was apportioned to California and under the control of the surveyor-general of California?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. I do not.

Mr. MANN. Only $10,000.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. But does the gentleman from Illinois know how much money the mining interests of the State of California paid into the surveyor-general's office for surveys? If you will examine into the fees paid by them, you will come to an entirely different conclusion about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Division.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 15, noes 34.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For surveyor-general of the State of Colorado, $2,000; and for the clerks of his office, $17,225; in all, $19,225.

Mr. BONYNGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the word "two" in line 12 and inserting in lieu thereof the word "three."

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 126, line 12, strike out "two" and insert "three."

Mr. BONYNGE. Mr. Chairman, I realize that it is a good deal like tempting fate to discuss this proposition after we have had such a prolonged debate upon it. But it has seemed to me that it can not be possible that the members of this committee understand the nature of the question that is here before them, or they would not act in this picayunish manner. There is nothing else to it, Mr. Chairman, except that it is being penny wise and pound foolish. Here is an officer, with a staff of clerks under him, drawing $17,500 a year for clerical services; an officer who is obliged to furnish a bond in the sum of $30,000; an officer who is not only obliged to keep all of the surveys of the State of Colorado, but every single mining patent that is issued in that State, upon the most valuable mining properties, is based upon field notes that have to pass under his observation. We are only asking here that he be given the salary authorized by the statute and the compensation that he has heretofore received.

Now, mark you, gentlemen, we are not asking that he shall have his compensation increased. All we are asking is that he shall receive in the future the same compensation that he has received in the past. Some will say that in the past we have appropriated only $2,000. That is true; but the Commissioner of the General Land Office, in the circular that has been called to your attention, shows that in the past the surveyors have received the fees under an order issued by the Commissioner himself, and in the State of Colorado, according to the information that I have, those fees have amounted in the past to from $750 to $1,000 a year; so that practically it is no increase in his compensation.

Mr. Chairman, years ago, during the mining activity in the State of Colorado, this office was worth many thousands of dollars per annum. The surveyor-general was not restricted to the $2,000 appropriated by Congress, but the fees that he received for these plats, maps, and copies amounted to many times his salary. By the present proposition, which is not to increase his salary, but simply to pay him the same compensation that he has received in the immediate past, the Government can not lose more than perhaps $250 at the outside, because, under the recent order of the Commissioner, these fees now go into the Treasury; and as they amount to some $750

to $1,000, we are not taking out of the Treasury in excess of $250 more than has heretofore been taken from the Treasury for this purpose. So I say it does seem to me it can not be possible that this Congress, which in the past has increased the salaries of so many officers, will now single out for a reduction a little petty office, the salary of which is only $2,000 a year, and where the total compensation has been but $3,000, and that the same men upon this floor, who but one year ago voted to increase their own salaries $2,500 a year, or 50 per cent, will now cut down the salary of this one officer 33⅓ per cent, making a total saving of less than $1,000, and all to avoid a deficit in the National Treasury. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BONYNGE) there were—ayes 23, noes 32.

Mr. BONYNGE. I demand tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were refused, only twelve Members seconding the demand therefor.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For surveyor-general of Idaho, $2,000; and for the clerks in his office, $10,500; in all, $12,500.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 126, line 33, strike out the word "two" and insert the word "three," so as to read "$3,000."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is not often that I occupy the attention of the committee, but I am prompted to do so at this time because of my earnestness in this matter. I feel that the committee in an attempt to do what they believe is right and just is doing an injustice to several States of the West whose public lands have not as yet been surveyed.

In my remarks a few minutes ago I took the position that the fees had been taken away from the surveyor-general's salary about a year ago. The gentleman from Minnesota, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, said that the fees could not and did not amount to any considerable sum. In order to test the sincerity of the gentlemen of the committee, I introduced an amendment providing that in addition to the $2,000 they should receive, the fees that accrue to the respective offices, not to exceed $1,000, should be paid to the officer, and the balance in excess of a thousand dollars should be placed in the Treasury of the United States. It remained for members of the committee to raise the point of order upon the proposed amendment, and thereby keep the proposition from being considered on its merits by the members of the committee.

Again, I want to reaffirm my belief that the offices of surveyors-general in these States are offices that require heavy work, worthy of men capable of earning and deserving to be paid $3,000. In various land offices the policy of the Government is to permit the officer that has little work to do to receive a small compensation. There are numerous receivers and registers of land offices receiving a few hundred dollars per annum in order to close up the work of their respective offices. In my own State in one land office up to a year or so ago, because of the small amount of work in the land office, the register and receiver received something like $2,900, and not $3,000; nor until the work had been brought up to the work of a land office of maximum rating did the receiver and register receive the maximum of salary provided by law. So it might be in this work. If there are States where lands that were public have been so sufficiently surveyed as to minimize the work of the surveyor-general, then, by all means, as a matter of economy, let the General Land Office close up the balance of the work and let us abolish the office of surveyor-general in such States.

But in my State only 20 per cent—yes, less than 20 per cent—of the domain has been surveyed. Over 80 per cent, or 28,000,000 acres within the State outside of forest reserves, have never been surveyed, and the work that will be required of the surveyor-general is the same character of work as that which was required of the surveyors-general in the States of Indiana, Illinois, Nebraska, and Kansas in the days gone by. The older States have cleared up their lands and had them surveyed, so that the office of surveyor-general may not be abolished, because there is no more work to do. That is not a valid argument why the pay of the surveyor-general in the States whose lands have never been surveyed should be cut down, the fees taken from him, and the capability of the office for efficient service most seriously hampered. I trust my amendment may prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For surveyor-general of Montana, $2,000; and for the clerks in his office, $11,000; in all, $13,000.

Mr. PRAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

In line 12, page 127, strike out the word "two" and insert the word "three," so that it will read: "Three thousand dollars."

Mr. PRAY. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose or desire to occupy the attention of this committee in view of what has already transpired with reference to other amendments of like character, but I do feel, inasmuch as it is, or should be, within the knowledge of every member of the committee that the State of Montana is one of the greatest public-land States in the Union; that it has a large area of unsurveyed public land, and likewise immense tracts of unsurveyed mineral lands; that there is, and necessarily must be, great responsibilities devolving upon the surveyor-general, and I submit to the gentlemen of this committee that, in all fairness, you ought to add to the salary of the surveyor-general of Montana rather than reduce the compensation given him by section 2210 of the Revised Statutes of the United States. It is my recollection from a conversation had with the surveyor-general of Montana a few months ago, that his fees heretofore have amounted to about $600 to $1,000 a year. At any rate, whatever his fees were, he is now deprived of them. All such emoluments heretofore received by him are now covered into the Treasury, and you propose by this paragraph to deprive him of one-third of the salary that the statute says he shall have.

I hope that my amendment will not meet with the fate heretofore accorded the amendments that have been submitted. I trust that the gentlemen here will stop and reflect for a moment before they vote it down. The case of this official is worthy of better treatment at your hands. Demands upon him are constantly increasing with the influx of settlers and homeseekers into this great new State. Only a short time ago I received a petition from some of the citizens of one of the great counties in the northern part of my State—a county larger territorially than many of the Eastern States, urging a special appropriation for the survey of all of the unsurveyed lands of that county, by reason of the insistent demands of the army of settlers for more surveyed lands for entry.

Mr. MANN. In that connection will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PRAY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I notice that for the last fiscal year there were surveyed in Montana 2,818,000 and odd acres of land, more than one-third of all the land surveyed in the United States. Can the gentleman inform us whether that ratio is likely to keep up, or whether the unsurveyed lands have been in the main surveyed in the State?

Mr. PRAY. I am glad that the gentleman brought that out. I think it will exceed that very greatly. I think that $50,000 was appropriated at the last session for the survey of these lands, which is in excess of the appropriations for other States, but far too small for Montana.

Mr. MANN. Out of the $400,000 which is appropriated for the last fiscal year, $50,000 was apportioned to Montana, which was $20,000 more than was apportioned to any other State, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. PRAY. That simply goes to show, and, in fact, amounts to proof of my contention, that the responsibilities of the surveyor-general of my State are as great, if not greater, than that of any other State, and that he should not be deprived of the salary provided by law.

Mr. MARSHALL. May I make one suggestion, that in addition to the $50,000 that was apportioned to the State of Montana, unquestionably the surveyor-general had supervision of a large amount of surveys made on Indian reservations, which is paid for ultimately out of the sale of the Indian lands and was appropriated for in the bills opening the reservation, so that the $50,000 would not indicate in any considerable degree the total amount of work.

Mr. MANN. The $50,000 for that State was $20,000 more than was appropriated for any other State.

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And the amount surveyed in that State was six or eight times more than was surveyed in any other State.

Mr. MARSHALL. That is explained by the fact that it was Indian lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. PRAY) there were—ayes 17, noes 28.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of messenger, stationery, printing, drafting instruments, plats, drawing paper, binding records, telephone, registration of letters, post-office box rent, drayage, towels, books of reference for office use, and other incidental expenses, $1,000.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 128, after line 8, insert the following:
"For surveyor-general of North Dakota, $2,000, and for clerks in his office, $4,000; in all, $6,000."

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this amendment is not subject to a point of order. It does not change existing law. Section 2208 of the Revised Statutes provides for the appropriation of $2,000 as salary of the surveyor-general of North Dakota, and I am offering this amendment in conformity to that law. Mr. Chairman, I offer it in conformity to the appropriation that was made at the last session of the Fifty-ninth Congress, and I hope that the amendment will prevail. I consider, Mr. Chairman, that it will be an injustice to the people of the State of North Dakota to abolish this office at this time. We have thousands—yes, hundreds of thousands—of acres of mineral lands in our State that are yet to be surveyed. It is true that most of the public lands have been surveyed, but it is also true that we have reservations in that State and lands in those reservations that are unsurveyed. We also have lands on reservations that, while they have been surveyed, will have to be resurveyed, the same as lands on other reservations that have heretofore been resurveyed.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. It is proposed, is it not, by the Interior Department to abolish the office in North Dakota on July 1? That is the reason that no estimate has been submitted to Congress for the appropriation to continue this office. Now, upon the abolition of the office, then, the Commissioner-General of the Land Office is ex officio the surveyor-general and has full power and authority to approve all surveys in that State, as in the State of Minnesota, which office was abolished on the 1st of January of this year.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in answer to the gentleman from Minnesota, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that I do not know that is so; and if it is a fact, if either the Secretary of the Interior or the Commissioner of the General Land Office has so informed the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I will be obliged to him to make that statement upon this floor; but, Mr. Chairman, even though such a recommendation has been made, I will say to this committee that it is not a wise recommendation—not at all—because we have in our State, as I have said before, hundreds of thousands of acres of mineral lands—that is, coal lands—that are now public lands, all of which must in the future be surveyed or resurveyed.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman inform the House how much of the $400,000 appropriated the last fiscal year ending June 30 was set apart for surveys in the State of North Dakota?

Mr. GRONNA. I understand the provisions of that law. A certain amount was appropriated for surveys last year. The amendment I offer has reference only to the surveyor-general's salary and other specific expenses.

Mr. MANN. Four hundred thousand dollars was appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, for surveys. That was apportioned by the Department of the Interior among the various States, public-land States, and that is expended through the surveyors-general. Now, can the gentleman inform us how much of that was apportioned to the State of North Dakota?

Mr. GRONNA. The gentleman has the list and can inform the committee.

Mr. MANN. I will be glad to do so, indeed; not a single red cent.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in reply to the gentleman that that is no reason why this office should be abolished. It is no reason why the amount should not be appropriated at this session the same as it was at the last session of Congress, so long as the surveyor-general has his duties to perform. I am not asking for an increase. I am simply asking, Mr. Chairman, for the same appropriation that we had during the Fifty-ninth Congress, and I sincerely hope that my amendment will prevail. The Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to bring in a bill to this House making no appropriation for the office of surveyor-general of North Dakota, which means the abolishment of that office.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois points out the fact that of the $400,000 which was appropriated by Congress for public-land surveys in the United States or in the public-land States not a single dollar was apportioned to North Dakota. It does not necessarily follow because of this that surveys are not being executed there at this time. It does not necessarily follow that the surveys in North Dakota are completed because no part of that $400,000 was apportioned for that State last year. I called up the Assistant Commissioner of the General Land Office, who is familiar with the conditions there, since this debate commenced, and I am advised there are a number of contracts pending there which are incomplete. Now, there are perhaps two objects in cutting this item from the bill: One of them is economy. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he believes for one moment that if they bring the business of that office from Bismarck, N. Dak., to Washington it can be done cheaper than it is being done out there. How far would $6,000 go in the Department down here toward paying the expenses of conducting the business of an office of that kind? Now, about this suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior (for whom I have the highest respect) of centralizing this work in Washington. I have had experience in this matter of surveys, and for that matter with other matters in which the question of expense to the Government comes into account, and I want to say to the gentlemen of the committee that there is not a man of us but who knows the nearer you get to the city of Washington the more the work will cost. This Government would be bankrupt if all the work that is done in little country places, far-distant points from this city, cost what it does to do similar work in Washington. [Applause.] Six thousand dollars! It will cost more than that to guard the archives of this office if it was brought here to Washington. [Applause.] This office is a convenience to the public of the State of North Dakota. It is located at the capital. The various county surveyors go there to examine the records and make extracts from them or procure copies of them, and the State officials visit the office almost daily for data and information. Now, I am not in the habit of taking up much of the time of this committee, and I will simply say that there is absolutely no excuse for—and there is certainly no economy in—abolishing this office, and I sincerely hope every man in this committee will do us justice and support this amendment.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MARSHALL. Just one moment. I note in the report that there is coupled along with the State of North Dakota the offices of Florida and Minnesota. These offices in Florida and Minnesota have been maintained for years, and I am very safe in making the statement that neither one of them needed the office for the last twenty years one-half as badly as North Dakota will need it for the next twenty years.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, the office of the surveyor-general was abolished on the 1st of January, and it is now proposed, as the gentleman from North Dakota now says, to abolish it at the end of the present fiscal year. The office in Florida and the office of North Dakota it is proposed by the Land Department to abolish, and the effort that is being made to prevent the Department from carrying out this recommendation here to-day is only another evidence of the difficulty of getting rid of offices created by Congress, or personal service of any other character.

Mr. MARSHALL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. In just a moment. Now, in the judgment of the General Land Office this office is no longer necessary. They can complete the work of the office and turn over the records to the State of North Dakota by the end of the current fiscal year, and the surveys, or the charts, maps, and plats that must be completed and certified hereafter, can be and will be certified to by the Commissioner of the General Land Office as ex officio surveyor-general for the State of North Dakota. It is because the office is no longer necessary, in the judgment of the men charged with the responsibility of administering this branch of the public service, that no estimate was submitted to Congress, and I submit the committee would not be justified in continuing it longer in view of those facts.

Mr. MARSHALL. Does the chairman of the Appropriation Committee believe that it would be economy to abolish this office? Does he not believe it would cost the Government more

to perform the duties that are now being performed by the surveyor-general of North Dakota here at Washington than the amount asked for in my amendment?

Mr. TAWNEY. The amount which the Government is now paying for the land office in North Dakota is $7,000. Now, I can only answer the gentleman from North Dakota by stating what has been the saving by the abolition of the office in the State of Minnesota. That office was likewise receiving $7,000 a year for clerical services. All of these services and all of these salaries have now ceased, and the Government is saving that amount and doing the work that remains to be done here in the Department with no additional expense to the Government.

Mr. GRONNA. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him another question?

Mr. TAWNEY. Certainly.

Mr. GRONNA. Does the gentleman think it is economy, providing this amendment is put on in the Senate and sent back to the House?

Mr. TAWNEY. If the amendment is put on in the Senate and sent back to the House, I can only say I think the conferees on the part of the House will resist concurring in the final adoption of an amendment which proposes to take money out of the Treasury merely to perpetuate a few clerks in office.

Mr. MARSHALL. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Does the committee know or have any means of knowing whether they have a lease of this office or not? Is it not a fact that they have a lease?

Mr. TAWNEY. That is clearly an administrative act of the Department. If they have a lease, it will expire at the end of this fiscal year, when it is proposed to abolish the surveyor-general's office in North Dakota.

Mr. MARSHALL. Are those the terms of the lease?

Mr. TAWNEY. They can not lease for more than a year.

Mr. MARSHALL. Oh, yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. They are not allowed to do so under the law.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, there was some merit in the proposition to increase the salary of an official who was needed, but it has been recommended in two annual reports that this office be dispensed with. It only illustrates the greed—I will not say the greed, but the desire of gentlemen representing their States to show how active they are on the floor of the House in behalf of their States. In the last annual report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office he says, under the title of "Closing surveyors-general offices:"

I beg to repeat the suggestion of last year as to this matter and to report that conditions remain the same in the cases of three States, Florida, Minnesota, and North Dakota.

Which he recommended be abolished last year.

The gentlemen from Florida have not had the nerve to ask that their surveyor-general be increased; the gentleman in charge of the bill has not had the nerve to present to the House such a proposition; but the distinguished gentlemen from North Dakota, very properly, I suppose, present to the House, and will receive great acclaim at home, for insisting that a useless office be continued at great expense, without any benefit.

Mr. GRONNA. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in the western part of North Dakota it is only within the last few years that it has been necessary to make surveys so far as coal lands are concerned?

Mr. MANN. I am aware of this fact, that out of $400,000 appropriated by the Government last year for the survey of public lands, not a dollar of it was spent in North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. Seven thousand dollars of the money appropriated was spent.

Mr. MANN. I have got the report of the Commissioner of the Land Office in my hands, giving the full apportionment of $400,000, and not a cent is apportioned to the State of the gentleman.

Mr. MARSHALL. I know the gentleman from Illinois wants to be fair, and is always that. I have explained twice to him, and I think three times, but without results, that the activity of this office did not depend upon the portion of the money apportioned. We are opening Indian lands and surveys are being made of them all the time.

Mr. MANN. I am willing to admit one thing to the gentleman—that the activity of the official who wants his office increased does not depend upon the amount of money or the amount of work that he is to perform.

Mr. MARSHALL. But I want to say that they are opening the Indian reservations there and making surveys.

Mr. MANN. The Indian reservations are all taken care of in the bills that pass.

Mr. MARSHALL. But they never expend the money.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that no land will go unsurveyed in North Dakota because of the abolishment of this office.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota.

The question was taken and the chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. GRONNA. Division!

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 24, noes 25.

Mr. GRONNA. I demand tellers.

The question was taken on ordering tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Seven gentlemen have arisen in support of the demand for tellers; not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of congratulating the House that one office which seems to have passed into innocuous desuetude has been stricken out for the time being. It gives me a good deal of hope; and I am seriously considering the proposition of introducing a bill, and asking the Committee on Ways and Means to report it to the House, to abolish at least one port of the United States where the expenses are $600 to $800 and the collection only $1. I hope for better things. [Laughter and applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For the surveyor-general of Utah, $2,000; and for the clerks in his office, $10,000; in all, $12,000.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on line 25, page 121, by striking out "two" and inserting "three," so as to read "three thousand dollars."

Mr. HOWELL of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the questions involved in this amendment have been pretty thoroughly thrashed out this afternoon, and I regret that the committee has seen fit to stolidly refuse to recognize the merits of the several amendments proposed. In behalf of the State which I have the honor to represent I desire to say that the work in the surveyor's office is constantly increasing. But a small part of the vast area of public lands within the State has yet been surveyed. There is a marvelous development of the mineral resources of the State constantly going on. During the past year new oil fields were discovered in the southern part of the State, and the result is that there is a demand for a survey of these oil-bearing lands. A careful estimate has been made of these oil-bearing lands, and in order to survey these public lands embraced within only three counties will require an expenditure of $142,000. I desire to read a communication to the officers of the land office in Utah bearing upon this subject:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,
January 14, 1908.

Hon. THOMAS HULL, *Surveyor-General;* E. D. R. THOMPSON, *Register;* M. M. KAIGHN, *Receiver, Salt Lake City, Utah.*

GENTLEMEN: Coal has long been known to exist in southern Utah, and recently petroleum in commercial quantities has been discovered in Washington County, and there is abundant reason for believing that the oil formation underlies nearly all of Washington County, the west half of Kane County, and considerable parts of Iron and Garfield counties of the said State.

Petroleum seeps were discovered in southern Utah and in that part of Arizona north of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River many years ago, and some locations were made under the placer act, but no systematic development was attempted until 1907, when parties from Nevada brought in machinery and sunk a well a few hundred feet deep on North Creek, in the Virgin River valley, near the town of Virgin, T. 41 S., R. 12 W.

This first well, as soon as completed, began to yield a good grade of oil in large quantities, which was immediately utilized for fuel in place of cedar and pine wood at other rigs that had been installed in the neighborhood to sink additional wells.

In all, sixteen wells have been started, the deepest being about 1,100 feet in depth.

The success of the Nevada oil men and the excellent quality of the oil found in their first well created an excitement, and a rush to secure oil locations ensued and has been continued until the field is nearly covered with filings, from near St. George east almost to the west line of Kane County, and from near Cedar City south to and far beyond the Arizona line.

The petroleum locations have been made under the provisions of the laws relating to placer mineral claims, as provided in the act of Congress approved February 11, 1897. (See United States mining laws and regulations thereunder approved May 21, 1907, pages 19, 34, and 35.)

A small percentage of the petroleum territory has been surveyed by the Government as agricultural land, but far the larger part remains unsurveyed.

Wherever the lands had been surveyed the claimants were able to make their claims conform to legal subdivisions of 10, 40, 80, and 160 acres, and usually did so; but upon unsurveyed land, having nothing to guide them, they have made and are still making locations that are far from conformable with the rectangular subdivisions of the public-land surveys as required by the regulations.

In the majority of cases locations are intended to cover 160 acres, but the boundary lines of such of these as are located on unsurveyed lands are far in excess of the legal length, and deviate greatly from the directions prescribed by law, viz, north, south, east, and west.

The locators, in nearly all cases not being surveyors, can not be expected to make their claims conform to legal subdivisions, either in size or direction of lines, and they do not do so.

The result of these erroneous locations will be litigation or violence, or both, as the ground becomes more valuable, unless the Government intervenes in time and extends its surveys over the land in question.

The oil belt being wide and extending apparently in a northeast and southwest direction, covers all of Washington, the west half of Kane, the western part of Garfield, and the eastern part of Iron counties, Utah, and as petroleum locations will soon be made over the entire oil region, I, like many others who have visited the field, am of the opinion that it is advisable for the Government to extend the public-land surveys over all the unsurveyed land in the region outlined above, and so recommend.

Day by day locations are being made as nearly according to law as the locators are able, but still in such manner as to leave opening for dispute, and it is to be hoped Congress and the Department of the Interior will intervene in time to prevent the confusion of lines which is always the prime cause of mining litigation.

Unlike lode claims, which are usually isolated, petroleum claims are located consecutively until a territory many square miles in extent is covered, involving enormous expense to individual claimants if surveyed under the procedure prescribed to obtain patent to mineral lands.

Yours, respectfully,

M. T. BURGESS.

I will also insert in the RECORD the report of the surveyor-general of Utah to the Commissioner of the General Land Office in reference to the survey of this oil region:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF UNITED STATES SURVEYOR-GENERAL,
DISTRICT OF UTAH,
Salt Lake City, Utah, January 16, 1908.

Honorable COMMISSIONER GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith copy of letter received from Mr. M. T. Burgess, which is self-explanatory.

Some time ago I received a communication from the commissioners of Washington County, Utah, dated November 25, 1907, stating that the citizens of Washington County were forwarding a petition to the honorable Secretary of the Interior upon this same subject and asking my support in the matter. To this communication I replied, suggesting that persons desiring to locate oil claims should proceed under the United States land laws and the regulations of the Interior Department.

The letter of M. T. Burgess, however, emphasizes the need of some relief for the situation existing in the territory referred to, and I respectfully submit the matter to you. I feel that the subject is worthy of consideration.

I inquired of Mr. Burgess as to the probability of the sale of land in case the surveys were made, and he assures me that there is no doubt that large quantities would be purchased, for there is every indication of permanency of the flow of oil. In addition to this there is a great deal of land valuable for dry farming, but which can not be settled under any of the land laws which contemplate residence upon the land to secure title.

I have compiled, and submit herewith, an estimate of the number of miles and acres to be surveyed, and have the honor to submit same to you with an estimate of the cost of field and office work. This estimate is necessarily approximate and is submitted simply to guide you in the consideration of this matter. No account is taken of the expense of field examination. The estimate follows:

For surveys and resurveys in Garfield, Iron, Kane, and Washington counties, State of Utah:

Township, standard, and guide meridian	miles	1,548
Section lines	do	7,214
Total number of acres		2,754,140

Estimated cost of above surveys:

Township, standard, and guide meridian	$27,864
Section lines	93,782
Total cost of field work	121,646
Total cost of office work	20,354
Entire estimated cost	142,000

The number of full and fractional townships are as follows:

In Garfield County	45
In Iron County	10
In Kane County	45
In Washington County	58
Total	158

Very respectfully,

UNITED STATES SURVEYOR-GENERAL FOR UTAH.

I have introduced a bill providing for a survey of these lands and making an appropriation for the same, which I hope will meet with the unanimous support of the distinguished and broad-minded members of the Committee on Appropriations. My object at this time in calling attention to this is to present before this committee the character and importance of the work now pending before the surveyor-general of Utah and to refute the intimation of the honorable chairman of the committee that the work of these officers is on the decrease. In the case of my own State he is certainly mistaken, and I believe that his statement is not well founded by the facts in the other States.

In conclusion, I am proud to state that the surveyor-general of Utah is a gentleman of ability and fitness for the duties of the office. He can command the salary I propose to give him in private employment. He is industrious, painstaking, and efficient in the discharge of his duty, giving to the Government, in looking after its interest, his full time and conscientious effort. I hope this committee will show its appreciation of these qualities by adopting the amendment I have offered.

The question being taken on the amendment, it was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For surveyor-general of Washington, $2,000; and for the clerks in his office, $7,800; in all, $9,800.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After "two thousand," in line 8, page 29, insert "five hundred," so that it will read "$2,500."

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I see that the committee appreciates the justice of this amendment, and I ask for a vote. [Applause and laughter.]

The question being taken on the amendment, on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Washington) there were—ayes 19, noes 22.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For surveyor-general of Wyoming, $2,000; and for the clerks in his office, $10,500; in all, $12,500.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the word "two," in line 16, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "three."

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 16 strike out "two" and insert "three."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment as an evidence of good faith. [Laughter.] I realize that in the present frame of mind of this committee all arguments fall on deaf ears. Gentlemen have concluded that for the present they will not do us justice. Later, of course, in another place, these items will all be inserted, and then other gentlemen, without the expenditure of any effort on their part, will have all the credit that the membership of the House are entitled to for their efforts to secure justice for efficient public officials. In due course of time that increase will be accepted, after some sparring, of course, by the House, and we shall have taken another step along that road which removes the House from its rightful position as the originator of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That no expenses chargeable to the foregoing appropriations for clerk hire and incidental expenses, in the offices of the surveyors-general, shall be incurred by the respective surveyors-general in the conduct of said offices, except upon previous specific authorization by the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LAWRENCE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 16882, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

STATUE OF JABEZ LAMAR MONROE CURRY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Concurrent resolution 17.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the statue of Jabez Lamar Monroe Curry, presented by the State of Alabama to be placed in Statuary Hall, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered the State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for his distinguished civic services.

Second. That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of Alabama.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

JOINT PRINTING COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

To the Speaker:

It has just come to my knowledge that I am still a member of the Joint Printing Commission.

It has been and still is my opinion that membership of the Joint Committee on Printing is intended to carry with it ex officio membership on the Joint Commission on Printing. I therefore tender herewith my resignation as a member of said Joint Commission on Printing in order that the gentleman from South Carolina, the Democratic member of the Joint Printing Committee, may be appointed in my stead on the Joint Commission on Printing.

Respectfully,

JAMES M. GRIGGS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests——

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. If that resignation be accepted, it is within the power of the Speaker to appoint the member of the Joint Committee on Printing to membership on this Commission.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that the Joint Commission referred to is a statutory office, created by law. The gentleman may resign from it without leave from the House.

Mr. MANN. The question is, Who can fill the vacancy?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will examine the law.

Mr. MANN. I ask that the communication lie temporarily on the Speaker's table until that can be determined.

The SPEAKER. It might be treated in the nature of surplusage; however, there is no objection to its lying on the table.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 712. An act granting a pension to Agnes Lange Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, February 17, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named as follows:

Mr. BENNET of New York, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13079) to amend section 21 of the immigration law, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 957), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 138) to continue in full force and effect an act entitled "An act to provide for the appropriate marking of the graves of the soldiers and sailors of the Confederate army and navy who died in northern prisons and were buried near the prisons where they died, and for other purposes," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 958), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee on the Whole House as follows:

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1037) granting an increase of pension to Edward A. Russell, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 902), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOYD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1063) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas S. Chrisman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 903), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1484) granting an increase of pension to Marshall W. Rogers, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 904), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ANSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2355) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Donaldson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 905), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KIPP, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2711) granting a pension to Simon Levy, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 906), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3329) granting a pension to Theodore F. Kendall, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 907), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3611) granting an increase of pension to Alexander McNabb, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 908), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4674) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Fancher, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 909), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6038) granting a pension to Edwin May, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 910), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6057) granting an increase of pension to Katharine Seiberlich, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 911), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KIPP, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6065) granting an increase of pension to George M. Coykendall, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 912), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6641) granting an increase of pension to James A. Cobb, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 913), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6875) granting an increase of pension to James S. Walsh, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 914), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7012) granting an increase of pension to Jacob B. Nelson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 915), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7300) granting a pension to Magdalena Hansman, reported to the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 916), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7946) granting an increase of pension to William Brogan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 917), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8142) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Graham, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 918), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOYD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8332) granting an increase of pension to George Uhles, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 919), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8610) granting an increase of pension to John Shields, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 920), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ANSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8978) granting an increase of pension to Marques D. Mason, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 921), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9748) granting an increase of pension to Herbert C. Mattoon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 922), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10163) grant-

ing an increase of pension to Myron A. Hawks, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 923), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10436) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hill, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 924), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10698) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Lyons, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 925), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10723) granting an increase of pension to William H. White, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 926), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KIPP, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10763) granting an increase of pension to William C. Milliken, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 927), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10824) granting an increase of pension to Caswell Lovitt, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 928), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KIPP, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11043) granting a pension to Elisha Cole, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 929), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11282) granting an increase of pension to John W. McCormick, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 930), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11471) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Spackman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 931), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11868) granting a pension to Alexander Hyde, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 932), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12619) granting a pension to Hannah M. Crowley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 933), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ANSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12990) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Long, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 934), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13245) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. B. Davis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 935), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13336) granting a pension to Regina Albert, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 936), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KIPP, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13372) granting an increase of pension to John H. Seagrist, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 937), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13683) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Treadwell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 938), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOYD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13920) granting an increase of pension to Fernando D. Stone, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 939), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ANSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14310) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Porter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 940), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14747) granting a pension to William B. Haines, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 941), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14818) granting an increase of pension to Roswell L. Nason, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 942), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14978) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Dixon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 943), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ANSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14989) granting an increase of pension to Jerome King, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 944), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOYD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15167) granting an increase of pension to Titus W. Allen, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 945), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15193) granting an increase of pension to Milo Brewster, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 946), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15579) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo C. Abbey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 947), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOYD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15616) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Irwin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 948), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KIPP, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15686) granting an increase of pension to William H. Turner, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 949), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15821) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Larkin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 950), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16019) granting a pension to Grace S. Wood, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 951), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16020) granting an increase of pension to Moses T. Kelly, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 952), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOYD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16335) granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Tomlin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 953), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16394) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Forman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by

a report (No. 954), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16533) granting an increase of pension to James S. Anderson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 955), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles, which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15824) granting an increase of pension to Christine M. Hamre—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 15825) granting a pension to Abraham T. Angell—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 15827) granting a pension to Margaret Quirk—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13558) granting an increase of pension to Abby A. Brightman—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14321) granting a pension to Minnie R. Bacon—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10119) granting an increase of pension to William Mayer—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12820) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Amberg—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14478) granting a pension to Robert E. Taber—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on pensions.

A bill (H. R. 17086) granting a pension to Nancy E. Clark—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14985) granting a pension to Thomas J. Bradshaw—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 17215) for the erection of a dwelling for the keeper of the Cape Vincent, New York, lighthouse—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 17216) relating to liability of common carriers to their employees—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17217) to provide for the erection of a public building at Ottumwa, Iowa—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 17218) to aid in the erection of a memorial monument to Pocahontas at Jamestown, Va.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 17219) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend the act of Congress approved March 3, 1875, entitled 'An act to determine the jurisdiction of circuit courts of the United States, and to regulate the removal of causes from State courts, and for other purposes, and to further regulate the jurisdiction of the circuit courts of the United States, and for other purposes'"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 17220) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Fayette Bridge Company to construct a bridge over the Monongahela River, Pennsylvania, from a point in the borough of Brownsville, Fayette County, to a point in the borough of West Brownsville, Washington County," approved April 23, 1906—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGGOTT: A bill (H. R. 17221) providing for the resurvey of a certain township of land in the county of Kiowa, Colo.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17222) providing for the resurvey of certain townships of land in the county of Archuleta, Colo.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17223) providing for the resurvey of a certain township of land in the county of Routt, Colo.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17224) providing for the resurvey of the lands in Cheyenne County, Colo.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 17225) to amend an act approved June 4, 1906, authorizing the use of the waters of Coosa River at Lock No. 4, in Alabama—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 17226) to define vagrancy in the District of Columbia and prescribe the punishment therefor—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 17227) to authorize the city of St. Joseph, Mich., to construct a bridge across the St. Joseph River at or near its mouth—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 17228) to promote the safe transportation in interstate commerce of explosives and other dangerous articles, and to provide penalties for its violation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTLER: Resolution (H. Res. 240) concerning the revenue and support of the Post-Office Department—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: Resolution (H. Res. 241) directing the Committee on Ways and Means to report to the House bills reducing import duties; also income-tax bills—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolution (H. Res. 242) requesting the Secretary of the Navy to send to the House certain information concerning the wreck of the battle ship *Maine*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: A bill (H. R. 17229) granting an increase of pension to Henry Fuersbach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17230) granting an increase of pension to Michael Umbehaun—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17231) granting an increase of pension to Elijah M. Sandford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17232) granting an increase of pension to William H. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 17233) for the relief of Fred A. Emerson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 17234) granting an increase of pension to Gifford Ramey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 17235) granting a pension to William L. McFarland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17236) granting a pension to Annie C. Almond—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17237) for the relief of heirs or estate of Thornton Martin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 17238) granting an increase of pension to John Strahley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17239) granting an increase of pension to John A. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 17240) granting an increase of pension to John L. Bryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOK of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 17241) for the relief of William E. Moses—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CRAWFORD: A bill (H. R. 17242) granting an increase of pension to James Berry Duckett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17243) granting an increase of pension to William H. Deaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17244) to correct the military record of Joseph S. Penland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17245) for the relief of F. M. Rhineheardt, H. R. Cook, and Joseph S. Penland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17246) to extend the time for filing claims for property taken from Confederate soldiers at the close of the civil war—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 17247) granting an increase of pension to Wesley I. Bond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS of Oregon: A bill (H. R. 17248) granting an increase of pension to William H. Steel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17249) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mathis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 17250) granting an increase of pension to James D. Timmoney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILHAMS: A bill (H. R. 17251) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Amos—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 17252) granting an increase of pension to Matthias J. Brower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAGGOTT: A bill (H. R. 17253) granting an increase of pension to William Lockstone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17254) granting an increase of pension to Frank G. Sayre—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17255) granting an increase of pension to Emily M. J. Cooley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17256) granting an increase of pension to George F. Gibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17257) granting an increase of pension to Oliver M. Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17258) for the relief of George Ivers, of Boone, Pueblo County, Colo., administrator of William Ivers—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 17259) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Breithaupt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 17260) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel B. Petts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 17261) granting an increase of pension to Logan M. Tays—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 17262) granting an increase of pension to Madison Chapel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 17263) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of the heirs and legal representatives of John P. Maxwell and Hugh H. Maxwell, deceased—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 17264) to place the name of Charles Webster upon the retired list of the United States Navy as commander—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LILLEY: A bill (H. R. 17265) granting an increase of pension to Anna Schneider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 17266) granting an increase of pension to Milton P. Noel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 17267) for the relief of the Georgia Railroad and Banking Company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 17268) granting an increase of pension to J. Davis Duffield—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 17269) for the relief of George Wollett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17270) for the relief of Thomas B. Gourley—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 17271) granting an increase of pension to John R. Knudson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHINOCK: A bill (H. R. 17272) granting a pension to Julius Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17273) granting a pension to Frank Taphorn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17274) granting an increase of pension to N. L. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 17275) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James Quinn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 17276) for the relief of S. R. Hurley—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 17277) for the relief of George S. Patten, of Williams, Coconino County, Ariz.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 17278) for the relief of George W. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17279) for the relief of Frank W. Clark—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17280) granting an increase of pension to John Coombs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 17281) granting an increase of pension to John McIntosh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17282) granting an increase of pension to Newton K. Andrew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17283) granting a pension to Dennis O'Shey—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 17284) for the relief of the heirs of Peter Anderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17285) for the relief of the estate of Samuel D. Kelley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17286) for the relief of the estate of R. A. Myrick, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 17287) to appoint Edgar C. Sturges a captain in the Army and place him on the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ACHESON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Nicholls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Catherine Crockett (previously referred to Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Gifford Ramey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Joseph Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: Petitions of Union Label League No. 1 and International Association of Mechanics, of Denver, Colo., for building battle ships in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bethel, Me., against use of mails for circulating liquor advertisements—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of National Funeral Directors' Association, against burial at sea—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Petition of National German-American Alliance, against immigration legislation—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Mrs. H. B. Asher, for forest reservations in White Mountains and southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of National German-American Alliance, against interstate liquor legislation—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. Dora Nester and others, against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of National Funeral Directors' Association, against burials at sea—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of B. J. Ross, A. M. Hemphill, U. G. Riley, C. M. Hemphill, and H. A. Hoch, all of Broughton, Kans., against sale of intoxicants on all Government property—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Kansas State Retail Merchants' Association, for enlargement of power of Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Kansas State Retail Merchants' Association, for increase of pay for officers and enlisted men of Army and Navy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of J. J. Pennell, against amendment to copyright bill inimical to photographers—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petitions of D. A. Brodbeck and Kansas State Retail Merchants' Association, of Topeka, Kans., against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CHANEY: Papers to accompany bill for special act of Congress for relief of John Strahley, late of Company F, Forty-third Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUDREY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Edward P. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of National Supreme Lodge, C. S. P. S., against all prohibition legislation—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petition of Muskogee Typographical Union, for removal of duty on white paper and wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENVER: Petition of Mrs. Joseph H. Richards, for the Altruistic Club of Hillsboro, Ohio, for forest reservations in White Mountains and southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of Merchants' Association of New York, for a permanent tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, for pensions for widows and children of Dr. Jesse W. Lazear and Maj. James Carroll—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Sadie Doan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Franklin County, Pa., for additional protection to dairy interests—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORNES: Petition of Stephen Mummery, of Brooklyn, N. Y., for the Kittredge and Barchfield bills on copyright—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of Edward Favenza, for amendment of copyright law beneficial to musical composers—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FULLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James D. Timmoney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULTON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Benjamin Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of Lake Seaman's Union, North Tonawanda, N. Y., favoring H. R. 14941—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of New York Post-Office Laborers' Protective Association, for increase of salaries of laborers in such post-offices as New York and Brooklyn from $700 to $900 per year—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRONNA: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Park River, Bowdon, Turtle Lake, Lakota, Cavalier, Page, and Walhalla, all in the State of North Dakota, for the Littlefield original-package bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Letter of committee and resolution of Augusta Exchange and Board of Trade, against H. R. 67; also minority report of said organization in support of H. R. 67—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorials of Chamber of Commerce of Augusta, and Manufacturers and Merchants' Association, of Rome, Ga., for river and harbor legislation—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of National German-American Alliance, against immigration legislation until commission reports to Congress—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Petition of Sweet Candy Company, for uniform classification of railway freights—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: Petition of Tacoma Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade, for application of civil-service rules to employees of Thirteenth Census—to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. KELIHER: Petition of congregation of Bethlehem of Israel Church, of Malden, Mass., protesting against amendments to immigration law—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KNAPP: Petition of M. S. Lovell, of Oswego, N. Y., against amendment of the proposed copyright law—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of Josiah S. Tyhe et al., for a pension of $30 per month for all honorably discharged soldiers of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Mayer (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of Miss Jessie F. Lindsay, of Fairfield, Nebr., against proposed amendment to the copyright bill—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of citizens of Bloomington, Nebr., protesting against establishing parcels-post routes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Rear-Admiral Pickering Garrison, No. 4, of Erie, Pa., for increased pay of officers and enlisted men of Army, Navy, and Marine Corps—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Grand Army of the Republic of Albany, N. Y., protesting against abolishment of pension agencies—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Southern Illinois Division of National German-American Alliance, asking repeal of act prohibiting sale of wines and beer in post exchanges—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petition of Edward Pomeroy Post, No. 48, Grand Army of the Republic, of Jackson, Mich., for the Sherwood bill (H. R. 7625)—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Adrian, Mich., for restoration of motto "In God we trust" to coins—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WALLACE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Virginia Tirrell (previously referred to Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of J. A. Tanner and 30 others, of Mercer County, Pa., in favor of S. 3152—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of H. G. Preston and 123 others, of Warren County; W. H. Williams and 11 others, of Venango County; R. G. McGarr and 23 others, of Mercer County; and J. W. Morester, of Elk County, all of the Twenty-eighth District of Pennsylvania, in favor of S. 3152—to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *February 17, 1908.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last, when, on request of Mr. LODGE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of William O. Robards *v.* United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14638) to enable the city of Tucson, Ariz., to issue bonds for the extension and repair of its water and sewer system, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 12401. An act to legalize a bridge across the Mississippi River at Rice, Minn.;

H. R. 15660. An act to provide for the repayment of certain commissions, excess payments, and purchase moneys paid under the public laws; and

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution for the appointment of a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message further announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution accepting the statue of Jabez Lamar Monroe Curry, presented by the State of Alabama, to be placed in Statuary Hall, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Indiana State Live Stock Breeders' Association, praying for the ratification of treaties looking to the betterment of the markets abroad for agricultural and live-stock products, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the National German-American Alliance, remonstrating against the enactment of further legislation to regulate immigration until the investigation of the Immigration Commission has been completed, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 17, International Stereotypers and Electrotypers' Union, of Washington, D. C., praying for the repeal of the duty on white paper, wood pulp, and the materials used in the manufacture thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of sundry organizations of Fort Wayne, Ind.; Charleston, S. C.; Washington, D. C.; Nashville, Tenn.; Wheeling, W. Va.; Kansas City, Mo.; St. Louis, Mo.; Philipsburg, Mont.; Baltimore, Md.; West Hammond, Ill., and Memphis, Tenn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.