SENATE.

THURSDAY, *May 29, 1913.*

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday last was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint and concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Missouri, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MISSOURI,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, Cornelius Roach, secretary of state of the State of Missouri and keeper of the great seal thereof, hereby certify that the following pages contain a full, true, and complete copy of a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Missouri entitled "Joint and concurrent resolution asking Congress to call a constitutional convention or to submit to the several States, through a congressional joint resolution, an amendment to the Constitution of the United States correcting the manner in which the constitutionality of State enactments shall be determined by the Supreme Court of the United States," and that the journals of the proceedings of the house and senate of the forty-seventh general assembly show that said joint resolution was adopted.

In testimony whereof I hereunto set my hand and affix the great seal of the State of Missouri. Done at the city of Jefferson this 15th day of April, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] CORNELIUS ROACH,
Secretary of State.

House joint and concurrent resolution 23, Forty-seventh General Assembly.

Joint and concurrent resolution asking Congress to call a constitutional convention or to submit to the several States, through a congressional joint resolution, an amendment to the Constitution of the United States correcting the manner in which the constitutionality of State enactments shall be determined by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Whereas a single judge of an inferior Federal court has time after time nullified and amended the solemn enactments of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Missouri and of other States of this Union, and has even destroyed provisions of the constitutions of the States made after the most deliberate thought and study in convention or by the sober verdict of the whole people; and

Whereas this manner of destroying and amending the deliberate enactments of a sovereign State has no specific warrant in the Federal Constitution, and is not in keeping with the dignity of this State or of any other State of this Union; and

Whereas it is not in keeping with the spirit of free institutions that the ruling of an inferior Federal court shall nullify the deliberate acts of the people of a whole State: and

That in order to correct these evils an amendment to the Federal Constitution, to be known as Article XVII, be proposed to the several States for their ratification or rejection, to wit:

Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein) as follows: That we apply to the Congress of the United States and respectfully ask that an amendment to the Federal Constitution to correct these evils be proposed to the several States for their ratification, to wit:

To the Congress of the United States:

In pursuance of the rights reserved to themselves by the sovereign States of this Union, we, the representatives of the State of Missouri, regularly met in general assembly, do hereby apply to you and respectfully ask that you either call a constitutional convention for the purpose of proposing to the several States of the Union the amendment to the Federal Constitution given below, or that you propose to the several States for their ratification, according to Article V of the Constitution of the United States, said amendment, to wit:

"ART. XVII. No inferior Federal court shall have jurisdiction over questions involving the constitutionality or the validity of any State law; but a law of any State, when called in question as violating the Constitution of the United States or as conflicting with any Federal statute, shall be certified immediately to the Supreme Court of the United States, and shall be given precedence over all other business before said court. No Federal court shall issue any writ of injunction restraining the execution of any State law, and no appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States involving the validity or the constitutionality of the law of any State shall operate as a supersedeas. Every question involving the rights of a State or the validity or constitutionality of a State law shall be decided by the concurring opinion of every member of the Supreme Court."

And be it further resolved, That every State in the Union be respectfully requested to join with us in this memorial to Congress, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the governor and secretary of state of each State and to such general assemblies of States as are now in session and to all other general assemblies of States as soon as they shall convene, and that copies be sent to the President of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Oklahoma, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 13, as amended by the senate.

Whereas certain lands located in the Big Pasture, Wood Reserve, and other pastures allied therewith and located in Comanche, Tillman, Kiowa, Caddo, and Stephens Counties, in southern Oklahoma, were thrown open to settlement in 1906 under the homestead laws;

Whereas the settlers on said lands were compelled to purchase the same at an auction sale to the highest bidder;

Whereas the purchasers were required to comply with all the conditions of the homestead laws; and

Whereas we believe that it is an injustice to the purchasers of these lands to be required to pay for the same at the prices at which they were purchased, which in most cases were more than the full value of the land, and at the same time be compelled to homestead the same and comply with all the requirements of the homestead laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned and earnestly requested to permit the settlers and purchasers of said land to perfect and secure title by paying the Government therefor the minimum price of $5 per acre; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly authenticated, be transmitted to the President of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each of the Representatives and Senators from the State of Oklahoma.

Passed the house this 23d day of April, 1913.

J. H. MAXEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate this 29th day of April, 1913.

C. B. KENDRICK,
President pro tempore of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution.

Whereas it is desirable that annual sessions of the legislature be had, each session to be limited to 60 and 30 days' duration, one session to be devoted exclusively to the consideration of measures in general (60 days), while the other session be devoted to the consideration of financial measures and appropriation bills (30 days), and that the present compensation of $10 per diem to the legislators be continued: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to amend the organic act of this Territory so as to accomplish this desired object, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Delegate to Congress from this Territory; and be it further

Resolved, That the Delegate to Congress be requested to prepare and advocate in Congress appropriate legislation to accomplish this desired object.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE
TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 30, 1913.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was this day adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii.

H. L. HOLSTEIN,
Speaker House of Representatives.
EDWARD WOODWARD,
Clerk House of Representatives.

Mr. BRYAN presented a resolution adopted by the board of county commissioners of Duval County, Fla., favoring an appropriation to reimburse that county for money expended in the improvement of the St. Johns River, Fla., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have received a communication from the Board of County Commissioners of Duval County, Fla., transmitting a certified copy of a resolution, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the communication and accompanying paper was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF DUVAL COUNTY,
Jacksonville, Fla., May 24, 1913.

Hon. D. U. FLETCHER,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As directed by the board of county commissioners, in session this day, I am inclosing herein certified copy of a resolution, which was unanimously adopted.

Yours, very truly, FRANK BROWN, *Clerk.*

Whereas the county of Duval, in the year A. D. 1893, issued bonds in the sum of $300,000, the proceeds of which were used in the deepening of the St. Johns River; and

Whereas the said bonds are still outstanding and unpaid, and an obligation upon which said county of Duval has since the date of issuance been paying interest; and

Whereas the improvement of navigable streams is within the jurisdiction of and an obligation upon the United States Government for which appropriations are made from time to time by Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of the County of Duval, State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, requested to appropriate a sum of money sufficient to reimburse the said county of Duval for the money expended, as aforesaid, upon the improvement of the St. Johns River, a navigable stream of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of Florida's United States Senators and Congressmen with the request that they urge action thereon.

I, Frank Brown, clerk of the board of county commissioners, Duval County, Fla., do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a resolution which was unanimously adopted at a meeting of said board, held at their office in the courthouse, city of Jacksonville, Fla., on Saturday, May 24, 1913.

Witness my hand and seal of office this 26th day of May, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] FRANK BROWN,
Clerk Board of County Commissioners, Duval County, Fla.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. WORKS. I present the memorial of Alfred Wellington Jones, remonstrating against the reduction of the tariff on sugar. I ask that the memorial be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUGAR BEET TALKS.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS, *Washington, D. C.*

SIR: Although I am attending strictly to business, producing sugar from sun and atmosphere, I have to say to Uncle Sam, "Protect me, and I will do you good; on the other hand, break down my industry, letting in tropical sugars, and calamity will follow."

My history in America has been like the "toad-getting-out-of-the-well" sum in arithmetic of schoolboy days—I have been enabled to make progress in the daylight of Republican politics, but fell back in the night of Democratic free-trade propaganda while being played into the hands of Wall Street cane refiners. The result is I am about 75 years behind the times in "crawfish progressive" America.

It was different in truly progressive Europe, where the first Napoleon, 100 years ago, had the sagacity to see the economic value of producing from home soil in France the nation's sugar.

In this connection he saw, as in a vision, conservation of resources and soil fertility as well.

Statistics show that food production in the United States is not keeping pace with the increase of population, hence the principal reason for the high cost of living. Neither is this condition peculiar to the United States.

The money sent abroad for sugar alone, not to mention other foodstuffs, judiciously laid out in rotation of crops would so increase the fertility of our soils as to make us practically independent of other nations in that regard.

The raising of sugar beets brings about many advantages—first, beet sugar is distinctively first, last, and all the time a labor crop, and some of the benefits to our farmers are:

Beets find a sure market; require little capital to raise them—wealth mined from soil; the poor man's crop, the factory making cash advances while growing; assured price before planting; whole family employed; for owner of land, rotation improves it; other farmers find market for other crops which they raise, sold to growers; intensive cultivation; beets the best resistant crop on alkali soils; by-products valuable as fodder and fertilizer; beets the best conservator of the soil under rotation of any crop.

Development benefits all American consumers, because, being a labor crop, money is put in circulation in immediate vicinity. Although sugar is the cheapest food product of equal sustaining quality, eventually sugar will be cheaper to the consumer when all produced at home, as it already is cheaper than it would be were it not for the beet sugar now produced.

Why the tariff should not be reduced: Tariff should foster a labor crop; tariff should protect the farmer from tropical planters; tariff should keep $100,000,000 at home by producing with American labor all the sugar we, as a Nation, consume; tariff should remain to protect vested interests, both North and South; tariff should remain to permit the white man to produce white sugar with labor paid a white man's wages in a white man's country; tariff should remain, for free trade in sugar will, as sure as thunder sours milk, blight our beet-sugar industry, besides wiping out the Treasury surplus.

Who will suffer? Directly and indirectly all of our 100,000,000 people.

ALFRED WELLINGTON JONES.

Mr. WORKS presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Pasadena, Cal., praying for the enactment of sound banking and currency laws, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WEEKS presented a petition of the Frank Ferdinand Co., of Boston, Mass., praying for the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1604) granting a pension to Henry Hatch, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1591) granting a pension to George R. W. Battis, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1590) granting an increase of pension to Lewis G. Whiting, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1585) granting a pension to Julia N. Jewett, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1581) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Manning, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1582) granting a pension to Sarah M. Stone, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1831) granting a pension to Mary Kehoe, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of F. H. McNett, of Aurora, Ill., and the petition of Josiah Bellows, of Washington, D. C., praying for the exemption of mutual life insurance companies from the operation of the income-tax clause of the pending tariff bill, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to adopt Senate joint resolution 131 and H. R. 16808, introduced during the second session of the Sixty-second Congress.

Whereas the following resolution, S. J. Res. No. 131, was introduced in the United States Senate during the second session of the Sixty-second Congress by Senator LA FOLLETTE:

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

"ARTICLE XVIII.

"The Congress, whenever a majority of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or on application of 10 States, by resolution adopted in each of the legislatures thereof or by a majority of the electors voting thereon, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, to be submitted in each of the several States to the electors qualified to vote for the election of Representatives; and the vote shall be taken at the next ensuing election of Representatives, in such manner as the Congress prescribes. And if in a majority of the States a majority of the electors voting approve the proposed amendments, and if a majority of all the electors voting also approve the proposed amendments, they shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution," and

Whereas the following bill, H. R. No. 16808, was introduced in the House of Representatives during the second session of the Sixty-second Congress by Congressman LENROOT:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 237 of 'An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary,' approved March 3, 1911, is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 237. A final judgment or decree in any suit in the highest court of a State in which a decision in the suit could be had where is drawn in question the validity of a treaty or statute of or an authority exercised under the United States and the decision against their validity; or where is drawn in question the validity of a statute of or an authority exercised under any State, on the ground of their being repugnant to the Constitution, treaties, or laws of the United States; or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is claimed under the Constitution or any treaty or statute of or commission held or authority exercised under the United States, and the decision is against the title, right, privilege, or immunity especially set up or claimed by either party, under such Constitution, treaty, statute, commission, or authority, may be reexamined and reversed or affirmed in the Supreme Court upon a writ of error. The writ shall have the same effect as if the judgment or decree complained of had been rendered or passed in a court of the United States. The Supreme Court may reverse, modify, or affirm the judgment or decree of such State court and may, at their discretion, award execution or remand the same to the court from which it was removed by the writ," and

Whereas the welfare of the people of this Nation will be promoted by the adoption and enactment of said resolution and said bill: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature memorialize Congress to adopt said resolution S. J. Res. 131 and said bill H. R. 16808; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted by the secretary of state to the presiding officers of the respective Houses of Congress and to the United States Senators and Congressmen from this State.

MERLIN HULL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
THOMAS MORRIS,
President of the Senate.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
F. M. WYLIE,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, J. S. Donald, secretary of state of the State of Wisconsin and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of joint resolution No. 63–A has been compared by me with the original enrolled act on file in this department, and that the same is a true copy thereof, and of the whole of such original enrolled act.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State at the capitol, in the city of Madison, this 20th day of May, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

J. S. DONALD,
Secretary of State.

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact a law setting aside certain islands in the Great Lakes for the purpose of establishing thereon bird reserves.

Whereas the people of the North Central States, particularly the States bordering on the Great Lakes, desire and deem it necessary that there be extended further protection to bird life in said States; and

Whereas the wild lands in said States are rapidly becoming settled and the former unoccupied lands in said States are rapidly becoming occupied and devoted to agricultural, industrial, and other pursuits; and

Whereas there are at the present time a great number of unclaimed and unoccupied islands and reefs in the Great Lakes which will soon be occupied and settled, and which would afford appropriate and ideal places for bird reserves: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact a law or laws setting aside such unoccupied or unclaimed islands in the Great Lakes which have not been already set aside by Congress, for the purpose of establishing thereon bird reserves, and turning over to the respective States the islands in said lakes whenever such States are ready to take over such islands and improve and care for them for the purposes herein named: Be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Chief Clerks of the two Houses of Congress and to the United States Senators and Congressmen from Wisconsin.

MERLIN HULL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
H. C. MARTIN,
President of the Senate.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
L. M. WYLIE,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE presented the petition of Richard Olney, Charles W. Eliot, A. Lawrence Lowell, Moorfield Storey, Samuel J. Elder, John D. Long, Henry L. Higginson, and 19 other citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a memorial of the Cigar Makers' International Union, of Jacksonville, Fla., remonstrating against the importation of cigars free of duty from the Philippine Islands, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE PARADE.

Mr. JONES. On behalf of the Committee on the District of Columbia I desire to submit a report, pursuant to Senate resolution 499, relating to the woman's suffrage parade of March 3, 1913.

The VICE PRESIDENT. May the Chair inquire of the Senator from Washington what shall be done with the report?

Mr. JONES. I suppose it should be printed. There is no legislation pending in reference to it. It is a report made to the Senate on a subject referred to the committee. I move that the report (No. 53) be printed and lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 2385) granting a pension to Sussannah M. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 2386) to provide four customs collection districts for the State of Florida; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 2387) to promote First Lieut. C. R. W. Morison to his proper rank in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 2388) prohibiting contract labor by Federal prisoners; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 2389) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate condemned cannon and balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2390) granting a pension to Laura E. Peavey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 2391) relative to legislative counsel and agents; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 2393) granting an increase of pension to David G. S. Gochanauer;

A bill (S. 2394) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Gentner;

A bill (S. 2395) granting an increase of pension to John R. Jones; and

A bill (S. 2396) granting a pension to Caroline S. Mindil; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 2398) to fix and regulate rates to be charged by taxicabs and other vehicles; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GOFF:

A bill (S. 2399) granting an increase of pension to Asa S. Hugill (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS:

A bill (S. 2400) for the relief of Jacob Beekman Rawles; and

A bill (S. 2401) for the relief of Albert Edgerton Buckman and others; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2402) to place control of Columbia Institution for the Deaf entirely under the president and board of directors of the institution and Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 2403) granting an increase of pension to Sallie E. Patrick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 2404) to permit entries on lands withdrawn for power-site purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 2405) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Judd (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 40) appropriating funds to pay expense of delegates to conference of landowners and water users, under the several reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

REORGANIZATION OF CUSTOMS SERVICE.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I rise to offer a bill. Before sending it to the Secretary's desk I wish to make a brief statement. It has to do with an order issued by President Taft on the 4th of March of this year to reorganize the customs service. That order was issued in pursuance of a provision which found its way into the sundry civil appropriation act, passed August 24, 1912. The provision is as follows:

The President is authorized to reorganize the customs service and cause estimates to be submitted therefor on account of the fiscal year 1914, bringing the total cost of said service for said fiscal year within a sum not exceeding $10,150,000 instead of $10,500,000, the amount authorized to be expended therefor on account of the current fiscal year 1912; in making such reorganization and reduction in expenses he is authorized to abolish or consolidate collection districts, ports, and subports of entry and delivery, to discontinue needless offices and employments, to reduce excessive rates of compensation below amounts fixed by law or Executive order, and to do all such other and further things that in his judgment may be necessary to make such organization effective and within the limit of cost herein fixed; such reorganization shall be communicated to Congress at its next regular session and shall constitute for the fiscal year 1914 and until otherwise provided by Congress the permanent organization of the customs service.

The order authorized by this general legislation upon an appropriation bill came into the Senate, as a matter of fact, after the term of office of President Taft had expired by limitation of law. Of course that does not make any difference, because the courts, if that were all that was the trouble, would hold as conclusively binding the Journal of the Senate.

I desire to make the statement upon the introduction of this bill, because it is my purpose to request that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, instead of the Committee on Finance or the Committee on Commerce or some other committee to which it would more naturally go. My reason for making that request is because it seems to me it is very doubtful if this order is valid, and for two reasons. In the first place, the provision of the law places a condition upon the President in executing the order. The condition was that the total cost of the customs service should not exceed $10,150,000. The statement attached to the President's order shows upon its face that the total cost will be $10,381,000. So the first proposition is that the order did not bring itself within the provisions that authorized it.

Another—a relatively small question—is that whereas the provision that Congress enacted authorized the President to consolidate collection districts, the order issued by the President authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to appoint deputy collectors and to fix their salaries. I do not undertake to say, Mr. President, that the Secretary of the Treasury may not be authorized to do that. I know that under the constitutional provision lesser officers may be appointed by the courts, by the President alone, or by heads of departments, and that it is competent for the Secretary of the Treasury to issue such an order fixing salaries and appointing deputy collectors. But Congress did not provide in this law that the President should redelegate the power given to him to his Secretary of the Treasury.

Beyond all that, Mr. President, I ask that the bill may go to the Committee on the Judiciary, because it seems to me to violate section 1 of Article II of the Constitution, which places the legislative power in Congress. In other words, it occurs to me that this is a delegation of legislative power under the decisions of the Supreme Court and under the rules uniformly laid down by the Supreme Court.

I am aware that the court goes as far as it can to uphold an act of the legislature, especially as to the ascertainment of facts, for carrying out the purposes of Congress. I think nowhere in the books can the statement of the limitation or of

the power of Congress to delegate legislative power be found more clearly laid down than in the decision of Field *v.* Clark (143 U. S., 649, text 693), in which the Supreme Court quotes from the Supreme Court of Ohio, as follows:

The true distinction—

*

as Judge Ranney, speaking for the Supreme Court of Ohio, has well said—

is between the delegation of power to make the law, which necessarily involves a discretion as to what it shall be, and conferring authority or discretion as to its execution, to be exercised under and in pursuance of the law. The first can not be done; to the latter no valid objection can be made.

The question therefore arises: Has Congress by this provision made the law and only left to the President the ascertainment of a fact upon the determination of which the law goes into effect? Not at all. The President may or he may not make that order. He may or he may not abolish districts. He may or he may not consolidate districts. He may in some instances abolish some districts established by Congress, some of them for a hundred years, and leave others as they are to-day; yet the President has not undertaken to do anything more himself than to create the districts, appoint the collectors of the districts, and then redelegate the power, if he ever had that power, to the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the salaries and to appoint the deputy collectors who are to have charge of many of the ports. Neither has he come within the limit of cost. The purpose of the act is perfectly evident. In 1912 the cost of the customs service was $10,500,000. In 1913 this act was passed; and it provided that if the President could save $350,000 of the amount of $10,500,000 expended in 1912, he might make the order. The President does not undertake in his message to Congress to state that he had done that thing. He says:

Whereas,

* * * * * * *

I was authorized to reorganize the customs service and cause estimates to be submitted therefor on account of the fiscal year 1914, reducing the total cost of said service for said fiscal year by an amount not less than $350,000.

That is true; but he was not authorized to issue his order unless he brought it within the maximum amount specified in the act itself.

Mr. President, my State is quite largely interested in this order. From one end of Florida to the other is 900 miles. There are two ports in that State that collect customs amounting to nearly $3,000,000 annually, at neither one of which will there be a collector. I am not complaining that by this order collectors of small ports are legislated out of office by the President, and not by Congress, for the purpose of trying to get them back into office, but in the city of Tampa, where are collected nearly $2,000,000 of revenue, a deputy collector will be in charge and his superior officer will be more than 200 miles away. Key West, where there are nearly a million dollars collected, will be in charge of a deputy collector, with his principal over 500 miles away.

I do not complain, however, if an officer qualified and authorized to act for the collector can be in charge of those ports, but it is a very serious matter, if this order is ineffective, that great ports shall be turned over to a person designated by the Secretary of the Treasury who has no legal existence.

The question has been asked of me, Who could object; how could the question be raised? Well, Mr. President, it seems to me the question is, How could it help from being raised? Is it possible that collectors of customs at all the ports in this country, if this order is invalid, are going to lay down their offices and walk out because a man comes and demands the office who has no legal right or power to demand it?

Again, many forms of statements must be filed with the collectors of these ports. They are required to be made under oath. If this order is invalid, no prosecution or punishment could follow the false making of a single one of those affidavits.

The collector of a port is given very large power, and necessarily so, in the administration of the tariff laws of the country; but if a man who has no legal authority undertakes to exercise it, I can not understand how we can expect his assumed authority will not be questioned.

Therefore, Mr. President, it has occurred to me that if President Taft's order is wise, if it should be carried into effect—and I understand the present Secretary of the Treasury is in favor of that—it is the duty of Congress to make it valid by itself enacting the legislation, and not to leave this matter to be determined upon an Executive order. If action is to be taken, it must be done before the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Florida a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. I merely wish to ask a question for information. I understand the provision to which the Senator from Florida refers is in the appropriation act of 1912.

Mr. BRYAN. It is in the sundry civil act of August 24, 1912.

Mr. OVERMAN. In pursuance of that provision there was, as I understand, a reorganization. Does not the sundry civil act for the year beginning July 1, 1913, recognize that reorganization and make appropriation in accordance with the reorganization? That is the point as to which I wanted to ask the Senator.

Mr. BRYAN. I am not sure about that.

Mr. OVERMAN. If it does, does not that really, in effect, enact it into law? That is the point I wish to hear the Senator on.

Mr. BRYAN. I do not think so, Mr. President. I think the mere fact that Congress legislated to carry into effect an invalid provision of the law would not make the provision itself valid.

The bill I have proposed to introduce, Mr. President, is exactly the order the President issued, with the single exception that in my State, where he created only one district, I propose for the four large ports of the State to create a district for each; and I thought it was worth while and of sufficient importance, to call the matter to the attention of the Senate, and to ask that the bill may go to the Committee on the Judiciary for them to consider these legal questions; so that we may know whether the order is valid or not; and, if not valid, that it may be corrected before it is too late.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Florida to another provision in which this Executive order may violate the Constitution of the United States. He has stated the difficulty with the ports of his own State. In the case of Delaware the customs district has been entirely abolished and all of our ports have been placed in the district of Philadelphia. The provision of the Constitution of the United States to which I desire to refer the Senator is in the ninth section of Article I, which reads as follows:

No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to or from one State be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another.

Mr. President, the ports of the State which I have the honor in part to represent have been open to the commerce of the world and the commerce of the world has come to those ports for a period of 125 years. Those ports have been operated and open under the supervision of the citizens of that State. The Executive order of the President has, I think, given preference to the port of Philadelphia and the ports of Pennsylvania over those of the State of Delaware by making us entirely subordinate to the collector or the proposed collector of that district, who will take charge on the 1st of July.

I am extremely glad that the Senator from Florida has called the attention of the Senate to this very serious matter, and I sincerely hope that the reference to the committee which he has asked for will be made. I shall be glad to appear with the Senator before the Judiciary Committee and to advocate a favorable report on that bill, including a provision which will maintain in their integrity the customs districts in each and every State of this Union, so that the Constitution may not possibly be infringed on that point. I am surprised that the matter has come up so early. I had intended to prepare, and have been preparing, a brief on this subject, which I hope at some time to submit to the Senate.

Mr. BRYAN. I will appreciate very much the assistance of the Senator.

I now introduce the bill and ask that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (S. 2392) to reorganize the customs service, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSING COMMISSION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. WORKS. I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask to have read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 39) providing for a housing commission, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, directed to appoint a commission of five persons, three women and two men, who shall serve without compensation, to devise plans and the means of

caring for and housing the indigent, improvident, and needy population of the District of Columbia, to be known as the housing commission.

It shall be the duty of said commission to ascertain and report to the President, who shall transmit the same to Congress with his own views thereon and any suggestions he may desire to make, the following:

First. A suitable location for a sufficient number of model sanitary houses for the accommodation of such persons as should be cared for under the direction of the National Government.

Second. The kind and probable cost of such suitable houses as may be needed for the proper housing and care of such persons.

Third. The best means of renting or otherwise providing such houses for persons able to make compensation therefor.

Fourth. The best and most practicable way of policing, superintending, and securing proper care and sanitation of such houses and the grounds provided for their construction and of improving the moral and sanitary conditions of the people so provided for.

Fifth. Any other data or facts that the commission may desire to submit and suggestions it may desire to make as to the kind of legislation needed to carry out such plan as it may report for the better housing and care of such persons.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, earnest efforts are now being made to eliminate the inhabited alleys and slums in the city of Washington. With that effort I am in entire sympathy; but when we have done that our work is only half done. The National Government is doing this by condemning the land in such places and converting the property into public parks. The practical effect of it is to forcibly eject the tenants living in these places from their homes. There is no provision made for them anywhere else; they will have to find the best places they can, and rents in the city of Washington are so exorbitant that these people, with the means they have, can not rent suitable and sanitary homes. As the Government has deprived them of the homes they have and turned them out of doors, it should provide some means by which they can be housed. This should not be done as a matter of charity, but the Government should provide cheap and sanitary homes for people of this class, where property can be rented to them and afterwards cared for and kept sanitary and clean.

Some charitable and public-spirited citizens of Washington are doing what they can to meet this problem, but I think it is a matter that should be dealt with by the Government. I have for that reason introduced the joint resolution, which involves no expense to the Government, but simply provides for the appointment of a commission to act without compensation and to ascertain the facts and make suggestions as to the best way to provide for this class of people. I take it for granted that there are generous and interested people in Washington who will be glad to serve upon this commission to bring about that result.

Mr. President, my solicitude for the inhabitants of the city of Washington is not confined to what we are pleased to call the "lower class." There are a good many of the rich and well to do who are living in insanitary houses in this city at the present time. We have rows and rows of what are known as attached houses. They sometimes extend the full front of a square, and, I think in some places, they entirely encircle the square. There is no means of ventilating these dwelling houses except from the front to the rear. There are thousands of rooms in houses of that kind in this city that are never touched by a ray of sunshine and that are only ventilated by the passage of the air through some other rooms to reach them, and often it is the kitchen.

The Government never should have allowed the construction of such houses. It should be a criminal offense to erect, maintain, sell, or rent houses of that kind. No man should be willing to live in one of them and bring up his children. Every family in the city of Washington should have free light and sunshine on all sides of the house, and should have at least a small plot of ground. Of course, the Government can not condemn all of these houses and destroy them as it does in the case of the poorer classes, but it can prevent the construction of any more of them; and that this may be done, Mr. President, I am going to offer a bill dealing with that phase of the housing question. I ask to have the bill printed in the RECORD. It is very short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from California inform the Chair what disposition he desires made of the joint resolution?

Mr. WORKS. I would be glad to have it taken up if I can have unanimous consent to do so at the present time.

Mr. GALLINGER rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California asks unanimous consent——

Mr. WORKS. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] is about to object, and I ask to have the joint resolution referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. GALLINGER. I simply wanted to say that I think all bills and joint resolutions ought to first go to committees. The Senator is a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I think the joint resolution had better be referred to that committee.

Mr. WORKS. I have no objection, if the Senator prefers that course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WORKS. I ask that the bill now introduced by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2397) to provide for the construction and location of dwelling houses, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any person to construct or maintain in the District of Columbia any dwelling house or other place of abode nearer than 6 feet of any other such house or abode, or to construct or maintain any number of dwelling houses connected or attached together, commonly known as attached houses, or to construct or maintain any apartment house nearer than 20 feet of any other dwelling house or other place of abode, and no house or building of any kind, to be used as a dwelling place, shall be constructed or maintained nearer than 15 feet of the inside line of the sidewalk fronting the lot upon which it is constructed: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to buildings already constructed.

SEC. 2. Any person who shall construct or maintain any house or other building in violation of the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction be fined not less than $100 nor more than $1,000, and every day that such house or building is maintained in violation of this act shall be a separate and distinct offense.

SEC. 3. That it is hereby made the duty of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to see that this law is enforced.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. CUMMINS submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURTON presented two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

LUCY ST. JOHN TATE.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 96), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to Lucy St. John Tate, sister of William W. St. John, late assistant clerk to the Committee on Coast Defenses of the United States Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 97), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and the same are hereby, authorized, during the Sixty-third Congress, to send for books and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a price not to exceed $1 per printed page, and to employ such assistants as may be required to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before the said committee or under investigation or examination thereby; that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that such committee or subcommittee thereof may sit during the sessions of the Senate or during the vacation of the Senate at any place in the United States.

POSTMASTER AT SALEM, OHIO.

Mr. BURTON. I submit a resolution for which I ask immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 94) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be requested and directed—

1. To transmit to the Senate all papers relating to the appointment of a postmaster at Salem, Ohio.

2. To investigate and inform the Senate whether such postmaster was recommended under an agreement that, if appointed, he would, as a condition of such appointment, publish a Democratic newspaper.

3. To inform the Senate whether it is the policy of the department that postmasters shall devote the whole of their time to the duties of their office; and if so, whether such condition was imposed in the case of this office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. ASHURST. I do not rise to object, Mr. President, but to ask that the resolution be read again.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I will object, and ask that the resolution go over for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the resolution will go over.

VALORIZATION OF COFFEE.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution (S. Res. 95) was read, as follows:

Whereas on the 21st day of April, 1913, the Senate passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate the following information:

"First. Copies of any and all requests asking for the dismissal of the case of the United States of America, petitioner, against Herman Sielcken and others, defendants, heretofore pending in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

"Second. Copies of any and all agreements that were made by the parties to said action during its pendency providing for its discontinuance or its dismissal.

"Third. Copies of any and all correspondence regarding the maintenance or dismissal of said action.

"Fourth. Copies of any and all reports that were made by any agent or special attorney of the Government investigating the existence of any trust or combination in coffee or any scheme or plan for the valorization of coffee.

"Fifth. The names and addresses of the parties purchasing the coffee involved in said suit, together with the price and the amount purchased by each.

"Sixth. Copies of any memoranda, correspondence, letters, or documents on file in the Department of Justice pertaining to or connected with the settlement and dismissal of said action.

"Seventh. Any additional statement that he may desire to make touching any of the above matters;" and

Whereas the Attorney General in his response to said resolution entirely ignored the fifth paragraph thereof: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate the names of the persons and parties purchasing said coffee involved in said suit, together with the prices and the amount purchased by each; and be it further

Resolved, That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate what assurances have been given him of the alleged sale of said coffee, by whom such assurances were given, and if such assurances were given in writing, then to send to the Senate copies thereof.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, on the resolution proper, I think I ought briefly to explain to the Senate one of the reasons why I think it necessary that the resolution should be passed.

At the time of the passage of the other resolution, which, I think, was on the 21st day of April, I supposed—and I think it was generally believed—that the suit involving this valorized coffee had been dismissed. It was on the 16th day of April, I think, that the Attorney General issued a public statement that I understood to mean—and I think was generally taken to mean—that the suit had been dismissed. However, I learned just recently that, as a matter of fact, the suit had not been dismissed, and the motion to dismiss it was not filed in court until last Tuesday. The New York Sun of Wednesday, May 28, prints the following statement of what occurred at the presentation of the motion:

Assistant District Attorney Guiler, in asking for a dismissal of the suit, yesterday said that since the institution of the proceeding the Brazilian Government has taken up the matter with the United States through the proper channels in Washington, and as a result an agreement was reached whereby the coffee was sold. The sales were to more than 70 bona fide purchasers, located in several States.

As has been called to the attention of the Senate, the Attorney General, on the 16th of April, made a statement that the coffee had been sold; but nowhere did it ever appear, and nowhere was I ever able to obtain any evidence as to the bona fides of the sale—the names of the purchasers, the amount that each one purchased, or the price paid for the coffee that he bought.

It has occurred to me that possibly since the passage of that resolution and since my remarks the other day in the Senate upon the subject the Attorney General may have secured additional information. In responding to the resolution which was passed on the 21st of April, the Attorney General entirely ignored this particular paragraph of the resolution, and did not give to the Senate any facts as to the names of the purchasers or the price of the coffee or how and when it had been sold. If he has obtained the information since, or if through any neglect or failure he failed to report before the facts in his possession, then he should do so now, in order to determine, if possible, whether or not there had been a bona fide sale of the coffee in dispute in that suit.

In my mind, at least, there is no doubt; and I do not see how there can be any doubt in the mind of any reasonable man that if there was a bona fide sale according to the agreement the names of the purchasers ought to be known to the public, the price they paid ought to be known, and the amount that each purchaser bought at the sale ought to be known. If those things are all secret, I do not see how it can be claimed that it was a bona fide sale; and if it was not a bona fide sale, then the Attorney General was under no obligation, under the agreement, to dismiss the suit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

CANADIAN WOOLEN INDUSTRY (S. DOC. NO. 49).

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have here a short history, taken from the Daily Trade Record, showing the effect of the tariff upon the Canadian woolen industry. I ask that it be printed as a public document.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I did not understand what the Senator said the article was taken from.

Mr. SMOOT. The article is from the Daily Trade Record, a paper published in New York City. A member of the staff of that paper visited Canada and gathered the history of the Canadian woolen industry from the time the Canadian tariff was changed in 1898 up to the present time, and this simply gives the history of that matter.

Mr. REED. It is merely a newspaper article?

Mr. SMOOT. That is as I stated.

Mr. REED. I shall not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BAUER & CO. V. JAMES O'DONNELL (S. DOC. NO. 47).

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to ask to have the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Bauer & Co. (chemical company) against James O'Donnell, for which there have been numerous calls, printed as a public document, and that 10,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate document room. It is the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the patent case. There is a large demand for it, and I think it ought to be printed as a document. I send the order to the desk and ask for its adoption.

The order was read and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of Bauer & Co. *v.* James O'Donnell (No. 951, October term, 1912), decided May 26, 1913, be printed as a document, and that 10,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

TARIFF ON LIVE STOCK AND MEATS (S. DOC. NO. 48).

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have here a statement signed by the officials of the American National Live Stock Association, the Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas, the National Wool Growers' Association, representatives of the Utah stock raisers, and the Cottonseed Crushers' Association of Texas, setting forth the reasons prompting these associations to request the adoption of an amendment to the pending tariff bill making the meat-inspection laws of the United States applicable to imported meats. Attached to the statement is a copy of the proposed amendment.

I have not studied the subject myself; I am not familiar with its merits; but it is one of such importance that at their request I desire to ask that this statement, with the amendment, be printed as a Senate document and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. KENYON. I have received a number of letters in the form of petitions or resolutions from various lodges and labor organizations in the State of Iowa. I think I shall ask to have one of them inserted in the RECORD, and I ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the petition was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
JULIEN LODGE, NO. 379,
Dubuque, Iowa, May 19, 1913.

Hon. W. S. KENYON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Reading from the columns of the daily press in the past, we noticed comment about the present tariff revision and threats in the event that the tariff reduction would become a law that the wages would be forced downward. As we heartily agree to the tariff legislation as a means to lower the cost of living, the undersigned committee on legislation, for our organization and for the welfare of labor in general, unanimously indorse the proposed method of the President of the United States and Secretary Redfield, of the Department of Commerce, of investigating such wage reductions.

Very respectfully,

[SEAL.] PETER R. MARTIN,
[SEAL.] OTTO WELLMAN,
Committee on Legislation.

TARIFF DUTY ON SUGAR.

Mr. RANSDELL. I desire to give notice that on June 2, at the close of the morning hour, I shall address the Senate on the pending tariff bill, with special reference to the interests of the Sugar Trust and the refiners in destroying the domestic sugar industry.

COMMISSION ON ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY (S. DOC. NO. 50).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Senate:

In compliance with the resolution of the Senate of May 26, 1913, requesting the President "to send to the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, a copy of the report submitted to him on March 25, 1913, by the President's Commission on Economy and Efficiency on the apportionment of appointments made from the registers of the Civil Service Commission of the apportioned service at Washington," I transmit herewith a copy of the said report.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 29, 1913.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message and accompanying paper will be referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment and printed.

Mr. SMOOT. The message of the President transmitting the information was ordered to be printed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to make an inquiry in regard to that, as applying not only to this but to similar communications. I make the inquiry now, because I am particularly interested in the report, and I wish to have an opportunity to examine it. Where it is ordered printed does it mean that it is printed in pamphlet form or in the RECORD?

Mr. SMOOT. It is printed in document form as a document.

Mr. NORRIS. So that it will be accessible to Senators through the document room?

Mr. SMOOT. It goes directly to the Senate document room.

Mr. NORRIS. While I am on the subject and for general information, how many copies will be printed under the rule?

Mr. SMOOT. This could hardly be designated as a public document.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I understand it is not a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. There is generally printed the number likely to be called for.

Mr. NORRIS. But who determines that? Is there not any rule as to the number to be printed?

Mr. SMOOT. There is no absolute rule as to that.

Mr. NORRIS. May I ask, then, what is the practice?

Mr. SMOOT. The practice is that the printing clerk judges as to how many copies would be really needed and orders that number, but if there is a further call for copies, then, of course, they are ordered, up to $200 worth, by the Committee on Printing.

Mr. NORRIS. Has the Senator any information about the practice of the clerk in that respect in a case of this kind? How many would he order printed?

Mr. SMOOT. I will tell the Senator what the rule has been. Generally more have been printed than have been called for.

Mr. NORRIS. That, of course, is not the question I am asking, and I am not particularly interested in that. I wanted to know what the practice was. If anyone else knows, I shall be glad to be enlightened.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I can not state exactly how many would be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF ATTEMPTS TO INFLUENCE LEGISLATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a former day, which will be read.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 92, submitted by Mr. CUMMINS on the 27th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That there be appointed by the Vice President a committee of five Senators to investigate the charge that a lobby is being maintained at Washington, or elsewhere, to influence proposed legislation now pending before the Senate. The committee is instructed to report within 10 days the names of all lobbyists, attempting to influence any such pending legislation and the methods which they have employed to accomplish their ends; and in giving the name of the lobbyist to give the particular bill upon which he is working, and if it be the tariff bill the item he is seeking to change.

The committee is further instructed to take the statements, under oath, of all the Senators as to the names of all persons who have made any representations to them during the present session concerning pending legislation, and especially concerning the tariff bill, and the inquiry shall include the character of the representation and the circumstances under which it was made in order to ascertain whether it was a proper or improper attempt to influence legislation.

Resolved further, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish said committee with the names of the lobbyists to whom he referred in the public statement issued by him on the 26th day of May and any other information about them and their efforts to bring about changes in legislation now before the Senate which will promote the general welfare.

The committee is authorized to administer oaths, subpœna witnesses, and to send for persons and papers in the prosecution of said investigation.

Mr. CUMMINS rose.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Hollis	Oliver	Smith, Md.
Bacon	Hughes	Overman	Smoot
Bradley	James	Penrose	Stephenson
Bristow	Johnson, Me.	Perkins	Sterling
Bryan	Jones	Pittman	Stone
Burton	Kenyon	Pomerene	Sutherland
Catron	Kern	Reed	Swanson
Chamberlain	La Follette	Robinson	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Root	Thompson
Crawford	Lewis	Saulsbury	Thornton
Cummins	Lodge	Shafroth	Tillman
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Townsend
Fall	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	Vardaman
Gallinger	Myers	Shively	Walsh
Goff	Nelson	Simmons	Weeks
Gronna	Newlands	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Hitchcock	Norris	Smith, Ga.	Works

Mr. TOWNSEND. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is unavoidably absent from the city on important business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum is present.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, it has been stated in some of the newspapers that the resolution now before the Senate had for its purpose some partisan advantage. I desire to disavow immediately and emphatically any such motive upon my part. I am not conscious of any ulterior purpose whatsoever. It is entirely immaterial to me what party the investigation may help or what party it may hurt. I care not what person may fall under the condemnation of the investigation or what person may be vindicated by the investigation.

It will be taken for granted, I hope and believe, that the members of a legislative body ought to be guided solely by a desire to advance the public welfare. There are differences of opinion among Senators with respect to the tariff bill now before us. Some Senators believe—and believe with the utmost sincerity and the highest good faith—that it will promote the public interests. There are other Senators, with like high motives and with like sincere faith, who believe that its effect will be disastrous to the American people. In this conflict of opinion, which is common and natural, it is of the highest importance that the vote of every Senator upon this bill shall register his informed and conscientious judgment upon its merits. It is of not less importance that the country shall believe that every vote cast in the Senate as the bill passes through its various stages is the expression of an honest conviction intelligently formed.

I need not say more with regard to the general conditions which surround us.

There have been, as we all know, hundreds of people in Washington within the last two or three months endeavoring to influence the conclusion to which Senators are gradually arriving respecting the merits of the bill as a whole and respecting the justice of its individual items. I would not venture to say how many have been here upon that mission, but there have been a great many, and there are still a great many such persons—I will come presently to ascertain or to inquire what they ought to be called—who are interested in the conclusion which the Senate shall finally reach upon this especial measure.

For instance, I represent a State that probably has as little direct concern in the tariff as any State in the Union. I represent a State that can probably care for itself without any assistance whatever from legislation as well or as completely as any State in the Union. Yet this bill had barely reached the Senate until there came into my office a committee composed of three of the best known and the most estimable men in my State. They constituted a committee raised by what is known as the Corn Belt Meat Producers' Association, an association made up of the farmers of my State, who would be horrified if from any source they were characterized as lobbyists attempting to improperly influence legislation. They came here to protest against admitting meat free and at the same time putting a duty on cattle. I acted simply as their guide to the subcommittee room presided over so graciously and, I am sure, so fairly by my distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. They were received in a perfectly proper way; they were received kindly and decently, and they stated their case to the members of the subcommittee. What impression they made I do not know, nor need I inquire. They did not confine the submission of their case to the subcommittee in formal session. They laid the facts, as they understood them, before every Senator with whom they could secure an audience;

and having done so, like the good people they are, they went home.

I do not know whether their visit here accomplished anything or not; that is yet to be ascertained; but I do not want the people of this country to receive the impression that there was anything wrong in those men from my State coming to Washington for the purpose of putting before individual Senators or a committee of Senators their case as they understood it and explaining how the proposed change in the tariff law would affect them.

The same thing occurred with regard to a committee raised by the employees and the employers in a business in which pearl buttons are manufactured. They came here, and I did for them precisely what I did for the committee of farmers. They laid their case before Senators and before the proper committee, and they went home. I could not find it in my heart to criticize them for the effort they were making to sustain what they believe to be a valuable industry in which they are engaged, in which their capital is employed, and to which their services are given.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. KERN. I rose only to inquire whether the word "lobbyists," as used in the resolution, was intended to refer to men of the character indicated by the Senator, and I ask the question because in looking at the language of the resolution I find it states that—

> The committee is instructed to report within 10 days the names of all lobbyists attempting to influence any such pending legislation and the methods which they have employed to accomplish their ends.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I shall not myself attempt to define the meaning of the word "lobbyist." I intend in a moment or two to present the definition which a very well known and commonly accepted lexicographer gives to that word; and one of the things I hope this committee will do is to define, for the use of the American people, the meaning of the word "lobbyist," so that those people who have a right to come here and have a right to be heard may not be reproached with this term, and so that we may be able to separate, in the public mind, the sheep from the goats, and condemn the one without consigning the other to the pillory.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa permit me to ask him a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator, which is whether it would be in harmony with the purpose he has in mind to add, on line 6, after the word "lobbyists," the words "and any other persons"?

Mr. CUMMINS. I will consider that presently, Mr. President. Just now I am not——

Mr. PENROSE. I suggest that amendment in line 6 of the first paragraph of the resolution.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think probably that would be a wise amendment, although the committee would have no difficulty in entering upon and discharging its duties without it. However, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. PENROSE. The thought I have in mind is that there is so much doubt as to what constitutes a lobbyist, and there might be some individual here who might have been guilty or might not of improper motives, but perhaps would claim he was not a lobbyist; and so that the resolution may cover the whole situation, I make that suggestion.

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly I shall not make any objection to increasing the breadth and scope of the resolution.

Mr. PENROSE. Then I will offer that amendment.

Mr. ROOT. The second paragraph of the resolution covers that.

Mr. PENROSE. It will not do any harm to put those words in line 6, as I suggest.

Mr. CUMMINS. I shall have no objection if, after I have finished, the amendment is offered.

Likewise, Mr. President, there were a great many people in our State who seemed to feel that it was unjust to put a duty on oats and to admit oatmeal, rolled oats, and other like products free. They came here and labored earnestly with those having the matter in charge and with Senators, who must determine whether that is a wise adjustment of the tariff schedules.

There have been hundreds, Mr. President, of such people here on one side and upon the other; and it seems to me, inasmuch as it has been given out that lobbyists are attempting illegitimately to influence the Senate and to change the bill, that we ought to look into the matter and inform the country whether we believe that the people who come here under such circumstances have a right to come, or whether they are to be disparaged and condemned with the term "lobbyist." Whatever that word means, it does not sound good in the American ear. Whatever may be its technical definition, no man cares to be called a "lobbyist." Somehow or other we have gradually formed the conclusion that a lobbyist is doing something selfish, corrupt, or personal, as distinguished from promoting a cause upon its merits.

I have taken the time to copy from the dictionary—Webster's, I believe—these definitions, and I consulted, I think, a recent edition.

> Lobby: The persons, collectively, who frequent the lobbies of a legislative house to transact business with the legislators.

Of course that is not comprehensive enough. The word originated on account of work of that character being done in rooms adjacent to a legislative hall and to which members of the legislative body could be called for conference or for conversation, but long ago the word escaped any such narrow bounds as that. The most successful, the most corrupt, and the most effective lobbyist I ever knew never went within a half mile of the Capitol Building. It is not necessary that a lobbyist shall be physically adjacent to a legislative body or in a so-called lobby. The word has come to mean a kind of service rather than a place in which the service or in which the act is performed. But I read further:

> Persons, collectively, not members of a legislative body, who strive to influence its proceedings by personal agency, whether in a lobby or elsewhere.

Again:

> To address or solicit members of a legislative body, in the lobby or elsewhere, with intent to influence their votes by personal agency. The term "lobbying" does not necessarily imply any corrupt influence, and in some States of the United States statutory provision is made for the registration of persons so engaged in accordance with the conditions provided. At common law it is held illegal as against public policy, irrespective of whether corrupt or not.

I think it is high time, I think this is the most opportune time, to investigate the subject, so that we may distinguish the lobbyist—the man who ought to be stamped with a public sign of some kind, in order that he may be known wherever he is pursuing his vocation—from the other men of the country who come here for the purpose of influencing legislation in a way that is recognized by every man to be not only legitimate and lawful but praiseworthy.

Again, Webster says:

> To urge or procure the passage of a bill, measure, etc., by personal influences addressed to the individual legislators; also to influence (a legislator) by such means.
>
> Lobbyist: A member of the lobby; a person who solicits members of a legislature to influence them in the exercise of their functions.

While these definitions are not very satisfactory—they are a little vague—yet they convey to my mind a meaning; they do trace the difference; they do mark the line between the legitimate and the illegitimate attempt to influence legislation.

In this connection I desire to have the Secretary read what really induced the offering of this resolution. I ask the Secretary to read from an article published in one of the Washington newspapers on Monday afternoon last—a statement which, according to its terms, was issued from the White House.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before that is read will the Senator permit me a moment?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am very much interested, Mr. President, in this matter. I trust this investigation will result in giving a definition of "lobby" and "lobbyist" that will be satisfactory to the Senate and to the country. The definitions the Senator gave are not very enlightening, and I want to read a definition from the Century Dictionary, which would seem to indicate that every man who comes here and has been here is a lobbyist. It is this:

> Lobbyist: One who frequents the lobby or the precincts of a legislative or other deliberative assembly with the view of influencing the votes of members.

It does not say "corruptly influencing," but with a view of influencing in any way members of the body to vote for or against a bill or an item in a bill. That is not satisfactory to me, and I apprehend it is not satisfactory to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is not.

Mr. GALLINGER. So that if this committee should find themselves wise enough to give a definition that would be more satisfactory than any the Senator has read from Webster or than the one which I have read from the Century Dictionary, they would be doing a great service.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, we can not hear the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am sorry. I will repeat that the definitions given by the Senator from Iowa from Webster's Dictionary as well as the one which I have read from the Century Dictionary do not seem to be very satisfactory. I think they will not be satisfactory to any Senator; and I said if this committee in their wisdom shall be able to evolve a definition that will be satisfactory to the Senate and to the country, they will have done a great service, because I can not believe, as the broad definition in the Century Dictionary would seem to imply, that any man who frequents the precincts of a legislative body with a view of influencing the votes of Members can properly be termed "a lobbyist" unless he undertakes to act corruptly or by illegitimate means.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator, I should like to suggest that the important word in that definition is the word "frequents."

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. BACON. A broad distinction is necessarily marked by that word between one who comes here legitimately to represent an interest which concerns either himself or some one whom he represents, and another man whose business it is to frequent legislative corridors with a view by any means—frequently, as this term has become associated in the public mind, improper means and corrupt means—to influence legislation; in other words, a man who is a professional. So I do not think there is much doubt about what that definition means. It seems to me to be a very correct one. If a man comes here legitimately to represent an interest which is to be affected by legislation, he is not engaged in an improper business and is not subject to criticism, while, on the other hand, a man who makes that his profession, and who is ready to endeavor by any means which may be practical in their effect to influence legislation by frequenting the halls or corridors for that purpose, is a lobbyist. The other man is not a lobbyist in the sense in which we generally consider the term to be opprobrious.

Mr. GALLINGER. I thank the Senator from Georgia for that suggestion. It occurred to me that there was that differentiation and that it might well be taken into consideration. A man who frequents the lobbies naturally comes under the definition of a lobbyist, while a man who comes here simply to make a suggestion about an item in a tariff bill or about a general bill, for instance, as the friends of labor legislation are in the habit of doing, ought not to come under the ban.

I thank the Senator from Iowa for permitting me to put in this definition.

Mr. CUMMINS. I now ask for the reading of the extract from the newspaper which I have sent to the desk.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

The President's statement in full is as follows:

"I think that the public ought to know the extraordinary exertions being made by the lobby in Washington to gain recognition for certain alterations of the tariff bill. Washington has seldom seen so numerous, so industrious, or so insidious a lobby. The newspapers are being filled with paid advertisements calculated to mislead the judgment of public men not only, but also the public opinion of the country itself. There is every evidence that money without limit is being spent to sustain this lobby and to create an appearance of a pressure of public opinion antagonistic to some of the chief items of the tariff bill. It is of serious interest to the country that the people at large should have no lobby and be voiceless in these matters, while great bodies of astute men seek to create an artificial opinion and to overcome the interests of the public for their private profit. It is thoroughly worth the while of the people of this country to take knowledge of this matter. Only public opinion can check and destroy it.

"The Government in all its branches ought to be relieved from this intolerable burden and this constant interruption of the calm progress of debate. I know that in this I am speaking for the Members of the two Houses, who would rejoice as much as I would to be released from this unbearable situation."

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, personally, I can neither affirm nor deny the truth of the statement just read. It is natural that I can neither affirm it nor deny it, because not only am I an obscure Member of this body, but I happen for the time being to be a member of the minority, and I assume that whatever influences of this sort have been used have been directed toward the dominant part of this body. I know that if such influences have been used, they have been entirely unavailing. It is not conceivable that any Senator here could fall under the influence or be swayed in the least degree by such a lobby as that described in the statement I have just had read; but this is the time to discover of whom this lobby consists, of what it consists, and what it is trying to do; this is the time to make it impossible that there shall ever gather together another such lobby as is there described. If it is now in existence—I do not know whether it is or not, but if it is—let us expose it so that the whole country may know not only what has been done but who has done it, and never again will a President of the United States feel impelled to state to the country that a great measure is in danger of being modified or amended under an influence such as he has suggested.

Therefore, I hope, Mr. President, that we may hold this investigation. There is nothing like publicity to destroy not only the effect of lobbying such as is there described, but there is nothing like publicity to destroy the lobbyist himself, for such a lobbyist can not live in the full light of the exposure that would follow the investigation which I have proposed. I earnestly hope there will be no opposition to the adoption of the resolution, and that, when adopted, we will carry the inquiry forward with zeal and with promptitude, so that before we even begin to debate the tariff bill we may know whether these influences are still at work.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the senior Senator from Iowa yield to his colleague?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. I simply wanted to ask my colleague if he thought 10 days would give sufficient time to make this investigation. In view of all the other matters on hand it seems to me that 10 days is a very brief time.

Mr. CUMMINS. I feared, Mr. President, that 10 days would not be enough; but so hopeful am I that it can be done before we begin the consideration of the tariff bill that I put the minimum limit. I am quite willing that the time shall be enlarged, but I suggest to my colleague that if the committee finds it impossible to complete the inquiry within the 10 days it could then apply to the Senate for an enlargement of the time.

One thing more, and I am done. I have not asked for an appropriation for this investigation. I do not know whether it can be carried on without an expenditure from the contingent fund of the Senate or not, but I think it can be. I believe there is enough patriotism here, enough unselfishness here, to carry on this investigation without the expenditure of a penny. Every Senator upon the other side, and most of the Senators on this side, are provided with three employees. Most of them are, I take it, stenographers; and we can do this work without incurring any expense. But if it is necessary to incur some expense and have it defrayed from the contingent fund, then the committee, when appointed, ought to ask the Senate for that authority. I ought not to ask the Senate for it, but the committee can ask the Senate and can show its reasons for doing so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to ask the Senator if he does not think it would be better to have this resolution sent to one of the standing committees of the Senate already provided with clerks and stenographers and everything else? If we create a select committee, I am afraid it will be necessary to go to some expense that would be totally unnecessary if the resolution were sent to a standing committee.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not at all particular about that. I want the investigation made, and I asked for a special committee because many Senators who may be on a standing committee to which this resolution would naturally be referred are so employed now that they could not give the necessary time to it. I hoped the Vice President would appoint upon this committee Senators who could give the subject their undivided time and attention, and thus hasten the conclusion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should think either the Judiciary Committee or the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which are at this time comparatively unemployed, could make this investigation thoroughly, if the Senator will substitute either one of the two for the select committee.

Mr. CUMMINS. In answer to the Senator from Mississippi, I will say that I should prefer a special committee, even if it did require a payment from the contingent fund; but, of course, I would rather have the matter investigated by a standing committee than not have it inquired into at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. At the proper time I shall move to substitute one or the other of these committees for the select committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as definitions have been inserted, I should like to call attention to and have printed in the RECORD the definition given in Bouvier's Law Dictionary, because I think it comes nearer to the popular idea of a lobbyist:

One who makes it a business to procure the passage of bills pending before a legislative body.

Then he quotes the definition in Bryce's American Commonwealth:

One "who makes it a business to 'see' members and procure, by persuasion, importunity, or the use of inducements, the passing of bills, public as well as private, which involve gain to the promoters." (1 Bryce Amer. Com., 156.)

Then there are cited the various judicial decisions on the subject and the various judicial definitions. I suggest that the whole paragraph be printed in the RECORD, because I think the reference to the cases will be useful for the purposes of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, it will be printed as requested.

The matter referred to is as follows:

A contract for the employment of personal influence or solicitation to procure the passage of a public or private law is void (21 Barb., 361; 16 How., 314; 34 Vt., 274; 15 Oreg., 330), as contrary to sound morals and tending to inefficiency in the public service (93 Wis., 393) if by its terms or by necessary implication it stipulates for or tends to corrupt action or personal solicitations (69 U. S., 45; 98 Ind., 238; 36 N. Y., 235; 40 id., 543; 127 id., 370; 18 Ohio St., 469; 149 Pa., 375). And if the contract is broad enough to cover services of any kind, either secret or open, honest or dishonest, the law pronounces a ban upon the contract itself. (2 McArth., 268.) It is not required that it tends to corruption If its effect is to mislead, it is decisive against the claimant. It may not corrupt all, but if it corrupt or tend to corrupt some, or if it deceive or tend to deceive some, that is sufficient to stamp its character with the seal of reprobation before a judicial tribunal. (5 W. & S., 315; 7 id., 152; 59 Pa., 19; 100 id., 561.) But it has been held that though the contract contemplates the use of personal solicitation, yet if no personal influence is brought to bear upon the members and no dishonest, secret, or unfair means employed to accomplish the object, it is not illegal. (86 Cal., 542.)

Where the agreement is for compensation contingent upon success, it suggests the use of sinister and corrupt means for the accomplishment of the desired end. The law meets the suggestion of evil and strikes down the contract from its inception. (69 U. S., 45; 98 Ind., 238; and see 60 Minn., 26.) But if the contract does not by its terms or by necessary implication contain anything illegal or tend to any violation of sound morals, the fatal element should not, through an overzealous desire to fortify against the deplorable effects of lobbying contracts, be injected into it by mere suspicion and conjecture that the party intended to do an illegal act or a legal act by illegal means. Presumptions in human affairs are in favor of innocence rather than of guilt, and this rule applies in testing a contract. (93 Wis., 393.) In the last two cases, brought by the same plaintiff, the contracts were somewhat similar; but in the first the decision was based mainly on what was done under and before the contract was entered into, whilst that of the latter was upon the construction of the contract.

A contract for services as an attorney before a legislative body is valid (22 Kans., 692), and where it contains an agreement to labor faithfully before such body to effect the desired end it is not necessarily illegal (34 Vt., 275). It is allowable to employ counsel to appear before a legislative committee or the legislature itself to advocate or oppose a measure in which the individual has an interest (36 N. Y., 241, followed in 52 How. Pr., 144), and an agent may be authorized by the legislature to prosecute claims on behalf of the State which require the procurement of legislation for a contingent fee (164 Mass., 241). Services which are intended to reach only the reason of those sought to be influenced rest on the same principles of ethics as professional services and are no more exceptionable. They include drafting the petition which sets forth the claim, attending to the taking of testimony, collecting facts, preparing arguments and submitting them orally or in writing to a committee, and other services of a like character; but such services are separated by a broad line of demarcation from personal solicitation, and though compensation can be recovered for them when they stand alone, yet when they are blended and confused with those which are forbidden the whole is a unit and indivisible, and that which is bad destroys the good. (21 Wall., 441.)

In Massachusetts, by statute, lawyers or agents endeavoring to secure the passage of a bill must file written authority from their principal; in California lobbying, openly practiced, is declared by the constitution a felony, and in Georgia a crime.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I am in hearty sympathy with the manifest purpose of this resolution. Especially am I interested in having a correct and authoritative definition of the word "lobbyist," so that the men who are here for entirely proper purposes may not be stigmatized in any way, as they seem to be by the language of the resolution.

I am about to offer an amendment to the resolution of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], which I think will in no wise limit the inquiry or interfere with its scope.

The first part of the resolution, down to and including line 11, provides for the constitution of the committee and confers upon it general powers. The second part of the resolution provides an instruction as to taking the statements of all the Senators as to the names of all persons who have made any representations to them concerning pending legislation, the character of the representation, and the circumstances under which it was made, in order to ascertain whether it was a proper or improper attempt to influence legislation. The third part requests the President to furnish the committee with the names of the lobbyists to whom he referred in the public statement issued by him on the 26th of May, and any other information about them and their efforts to bring about changes of legislation, and so forth.

The second part of the resolution, commencing with line 12, on page 1, and ending with line 4, on page 2, requires this committee to hale before it every Senator and compel him to disclose the names of all men who have made representations to him on any subject or on the subject of the tariff. I will say to my friend from Iowa that if that were undertaken to be done a very large part of this session would be consumed. I am sure I should occupy some hours myself if I were to undertake to recount to the committee the names of all the men who have talked to me on the various phases of this tariff bill, and undertake to repeat to the committee all the representations they have made to me on these various subjects.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will say that I think the Senator from Indiana does not quite catch the import of that paragraph.

Mr. KERN. I am only assuming that the language conveys the meaning intended.

Mr. CUMMINS. It would not take long, I am sure, to put down the names of all those the Senator could remember. Those whose names he could not remember, of course, could not be put down.

Mr. KERN. That is obvious.

Mr. CUMMINS. And it would only include the character of the representations and the circumstances under which they were made. I do not think anybody would construe that to mean that the Senator from Indiana must attempt to put down the conversations he has had with all the people who have come to him upon the tariff question, but what we want to know is whether anybody has come to the Senator from Indiana making a representation which was not a fair and legitimate representation to influence legislation.

How can we discover it unless we take the word of the various Senators? Moreover, if it did take the Senator four or five hours to do it, in my judgment he could not render the people of this country a more valuable service than to help restore, if it ought to be restored, the confidence which the people of the country ought to have in the Senate of the United States, and to destroy the idea that we were about to enact legislation under the influence of bad men and for bad motives.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. KERN. In just a moment.

The language to which I am referring requires the committee—

to take the statements, under oath, of all the Senators as to the names of all persons who have made any representations to them during the present session concerning pending legislation, and especially concerning the tariff bill, and the inquiry shall include the character of the representation and the circumstances under which it was made—

That is, as to each representation—

in order to ascertain whether it was a proper or improper attempt to influence legislation.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. KERN. I beg pardon for a moment.

I think it would be very difficult for a committee or for the Senate to draw a conclusion as to whether an attempt to influence legislation was a proper or improper attempt if it was not known specifically what was said by the lobbyist or by the advocate of certain interests to the Senator.

I first yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. I wanted to inquire of the Senator from Iowa if under this resolution Senators would not be required to search through their correspondence and get all their letters and telegrams, because, of course, representations need not be made orally. I should like to ask the Senator if it was his purpose to require Senators to do that.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I hope Senators will not be overtechnical or hypercritical in interpreting the language that is being used. If any Senator can point out any method by which we can ascertain whether he has been approached by any lobbyist concerning any legislation now pending before the Senate that will not require some such disclosure as I have suggested, I shall be very happy to adopt another plan that will be less burdensome. But what I am trying to find out is whether any Senator has been approached by a lobbyist, and whether it has been sought to bring to bear upon him any influence that is unfair, dishonest, illegal, or illegitimate. How can we do that without having those Senators say something?

Mr. BRYAN. Then, as I understand, it is not the Senator's intention to require us to go through our correspondence and search out the names there?

Mr. CUMMINS. I had not correspondence in my mind at all when I drew the resolution. I just thought of the hundreds who have been swarming around Washington and around the Capitol here in the last two months, all of them eager to make representations concerning their business to Senators both in committee and out of committee; and I wanted to know whether among all those hundreds there were some who were using improper methods and so conducting themselves that they could be called lobbyists, and therefore would fall under the just condemnation uttered by the President of the United States in the statement made by him.

Mr. KERN. I now yield to the Senator from Kansas for a question.

Mr. BRISTOW. Referring to the wording of the second paragraph, I was going to inquire of the Senator from Indiana as to how we would know whether lobbyists had improperly approached Senators with a view of influencing their votes or their action upon legislation unless we knew who the men were, the character of their representations to the Senators, and the subjects upon which they were made. There might be a difference of opinion as to whether it was a proper or improper influence, and in order that that may be determined it seems to me we must know what was said and the subject of the conversation.

Mr. KERN. In what I said, Mr. President, I was leading up to the amendment which I propose to offer. I made some criticism of the language of these two parts of the resolution. I had already stated that the first part of the resolution confers ample plenary power upon this committee to reach the facts sought. Keeping that in mind, keeping in mind, now, the second provision, that the committee is required and instructed to bring each Senator before it instead of leaving that matter to his own judgment, and that the third section is in the nature of a cross-examination of the President of the United States, I offer an amendment which I should like to have read at this time.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before the amendment is read, may I be permitted to say a word?

Mr. PENROSE. Let the amendment be read.

Mr. KERN. The amendment fits in so closely that unless it inconveniences the Senator I should prefer to have it read at this time.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] moves to amend the resolution by striking out all after line 11, on page 1, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

The committee is further instructed to ascertain the character of any representations made by such persons to influence legislation, the names of Senators to whom they were made, the names of persons making them, and the circumstances under which they were made. All persons appearing before the committee are required to testify under oath.

It is further resolved, That the President is respectfully invited to aid the committee in its investigation by giving to it any information in his possession with reference to the subject matter of the investigation which he considers it proper to make public. The committee is authorized to administer oaths, subpœna witnesses, and send for persons and papers in the prosecution of the said investigation.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I submit that the object to be attained is provided for in that amendment, and I think it makes the language a little less objectionable. There is no purpose in offering this amendment either to curtail the power of the committee or to narrow the scope of the inquiry.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I wish to say in regard to this resolution that I have no objection to any correspondence I have, and I feel sure that no Senator has any objection to any correspondence he has being given to the committee; but it seems to me there is an effort to put the President in a false position in connection with this resolution in the speeches that have been made. The President has not by insinuation, he has not even indirectly, intimated that a single Senator in this body was improperly approached. He says he knows he is speaking for all of the Members of the House and Senate who wished to be relieved from this lobby. The only thing the President has said is that there is a large lobby trying to influence public opinion and to create the impression that the sentiment of the country is so-and-so on legislation, using the newspapers, and by their numbers and by their insistence trying to create a false evidence of public opinion. He calls on the public that he thinks agrees with him in tariff reform and tariff reduction to let their ideas be known. The President has not in any way by insinuation intimated that any Senator has been improperly approached. I am perfectly willing to have any investigation. The more rigid and the more thorough it is, the more it is pleasing to me. But I am not willing to have the President put in the attitude of having made an accusation that Senators, either as a body or individually, have been improperly approached.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, has the Senator from Virginia read the resolution? I think he must have taken its sense from some one who has misinterpreted it. The resolution does not impute anything to the President. It simply asks that the President shall furnish the names of the lobbyists referred to in the article which has been read at the desk. It does not say the President has made a charge that Senators have been improperly influenced, but he says there is a lobby, and I assume that having ascertained it he knows of whom it is composed, and I ask that he give us the names of those people so that we may deal with them, inasmuch as we only have any power to deal with them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 4 o'clock has arrived, and the morning business is closed.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution we have had under consideration be taken up for further consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. There is no regular order.

Mr. CUMMINS. I move that Senate resolution 92 be taken up by the Senate for consideration.

Mr. KERN. I think there will be no objection to going on with the resolution.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the Senator from Arizona will not insist on displacing the resolution.

Mr. ASHURST. My request was made upon the suggestion of Senators sitting near me, but I withdraw the same.

Mr. KERN. I think there will be no objection to proceeding with the resolution by unanimous consent.

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well; then I withdraw my motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] has the floor.

Mr. SWANSON. As I was stating, the President has no objection to any investigation. But the remarks of the Senator from Iowa, and also the second resolution requiring each Senator to come before the committee with his correspondence and the representations made to him, can have no other purpose except to leave the impression that the President has charged that Senators were being improperly influenced.

The only thing contained in the interview of the President, as I previously stated, is that there was a large number of attorneys or lobbyists trying to create a false public opinion as to the sentiment of the country in regard to tariff reform.

Mr. CUMMINS. May I ask the Senator from Virginia a question?

Mr. SWANSON. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. Is not a lobby intended to create a public opinion—a lobby intended to influence the Senate? For what purpose is a public opinion being created if it is not to influence the legislation that is now pending before the Senate?

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, the President has an idea that persons are active in trying to create a false public opinion; by their activity, by their use of papers, he states in his interview, they are trying to create a false public opinion as to the wishes and sentiment of the country in connection with tariff reduction. His interview simply calls on the public to let their views be known, to let their wishes be ascertained, in order to show that this is a false public opinion.

I have no objection, and no one on this side has any objection, to a thorough and complete investigation, but we are satisfied that the interview of the President does not permit the construction which some gentlemen try to put upon it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I think I am clearly within the facts when I state that a majority of the Senate and of all the people who read the President's article are of the opinion that his statement was made for the purpose of influencing certain Members of the Senate who it was supposed were hesitating about supporting the tariff bill as it passed the House. After the President's statement a Democratic Senator will hesitate before he votes for amendments, even though he conscientiously believes in them. I have no evidence or knowledge that there is or has been any corrupt lobby operating here in connection with the tariff. But the President has intimated that there is, and certainly his party, which constitutes the majority of the Senate, can not afford at this time to split hairs as to what the language of the resolution of investigation shall be. The President has insinuated that a lobby, one of the greatest ever known, one of the most corrupt, is here in Washington and elsewhere for the purpose——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. TOWNSEND. Wait a moment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator has misstated the language used by the President.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am stating what is the clear understanding of everybody.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator said the President intimated that there was a corrupt use of the lobby.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That it was an insidious lobby—a lobby with unlimited money; and I can think of nothing more corrupt than where those two things exist—an insidious lobby with plenty of money—and that it is creating a false public sentiment in the country which is having an effect or may have an effect upon legislation.

The President ought in all fairness to specify what he has on this subject, and I think it is our duty as self-respecting Members of the Senate to request him in no uncertain language to submit such information as he possesses and which induced him to make his statement.

I repeat, there is no misunderstanding about the purpose of his interview. Gentlemen may refine the language as much as they please; he simply had one object in view, and that was to give the impression that a lobby was influencing the Senate, improperly, of course.

We have a right to know on what he based his insinuation. Senators ought not to haggle a great while about the language that it should use in this resolution. There is no reflection upon the President in this proceeding. We simply ask him to submit to the Senate the knowledge that he has which induced him to make the statement and which will form the basis for an investigation on the part of the Senate. If he knows the things which he has charged, he ought to submit them to the Congress, in order that the committee may work intelligently and proceed at once with the investigation. There should be no evasion or false modesty indulged.

I certainly hope that we can pass a resolution which means something and which the committee can use as the basis for their most important work.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, as has been said more than once in this debate, there may be a difference of opinion as to what constitutes an insidious and an improper method of approaching legislators. I have in mind, and every Senator here may well have in mind, because I doubt not it has been his experience as well as mine, that certain great and rich and powerful life insurance companies of the country have sent broadcast all over the country printed slips, to be signed by every policyholder whom they have, asking them in another circular to sign and date the same and send it to their Senators and their Representative, with the view undoubtedly of influencing legislation and with the view undoubtedly of creating in the minds of Senators and Representatives the impression that there was a great upheaval of public sentiment in revolt against the idea of taxing what are called mutual insurance companies. That similar things have taken place with regard to other matters concerning which the income tax and the other features of the tariff-bill deal is known to every one of us.

I think that the language used by the Senator from Indiana is more comprehensive, more searching, broader at any rate, than the language used by the Senator from Iowa, and will bring within the scope of the resolution every possible subject of legitimate inquiry.

The only objection I have to the resolution is the creation of a special committee, which I regard as unnecessary. It might come about that we would have to spend three or four hundred dollars or more out of the contingent fund. The Judiciary Committee of this body is composed upon the whole of its best and its most astute lawyers, men who are in the habit of making investigations and carrying on cross-examinations.

I shall therefore move an amendment, Mr. President, and I ask the attention of the Senator from Iowa while I read the amendment. I move that there be stricken out in lines 1 and 2 the following words:

> There be appointed by the Vice President a committee of five Senators—

And that the resolution shall then be made to read as follows:

> That the Judiciary Committee of the Senate is authorized and instructed—

The first part of the resolution would then read:

> That the Judiciary Committee of the Senate is authorized and instructed to investigate the charge that a lobby is being maintained—

And so forth.

Mr. SHERMAN. May I ask the Senator from Mississippi a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. Has the Senator any objection to inserting in his amendment the exact language of the Executive, that there is a numerous, industrious, and insidious lobby?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, Mr. President, I would have no objection to inserting——

Mr. SHERMAN. Further, I should like to know who they are who are likely to consume by their predatory tactics some of us new Senators in office before they are identified.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to answer the Senator from Illinois. He has asked me a question. If we are in earnest, Mr. President, about this matter, and if you are honest about it, and if you desire to ascertain the truth, we are not going to begin it by ironical flings at the President of the United States; and there could be no object at all in inserting that language in this place except just that identical purpose.

Mr. SHERMAN. May I ask a further question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The effect of it would be something absolutely alien to the investigation itself. It could accomplish no good. The Senator knows that this side of the Chamber is not going to hurl reflections at the President, either by innuendo or otherwise.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask the Senator from Mississippi——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. If that language is ironical and useless, why does the Chief Magistrate of the country use it in applying it to a legislative body?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not say that the language was ironical, and so forth. I said its use in this connection would be ironical. I might very well quote a part of the Lord's prayer in an ironical way, but the language of the Lord's prayer would not be ironical. I am now trying to get the matter before the Senate so that it can be properly investigated. I believe the Committee on the Judiciary is the ablest committee of the body and that it is best fitted to make the investigation.

Mr. CUMMINS. May I interpose a word there?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I want an investigation. I have no desire to reflect on anybody, and I am sure no other Senator has. I hope that feeling will not get into the consideration of the resolution. I prefer a special committee for the reasons I have stated, but that preference is but a slight one, and I, in so far as I can do it, am perfectly willing to have the Judiciary Committee authorized and instructed to do this work.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say to the Senator that I am further of the opinion that the Judiciary Committee would be a better committee for this purpose than any select committee that could be constituted, because they have been selected as the lawyers of this body.

Mr. CUMMINS. I would ask the Senator from Mississippi to change his amendment slightly so that a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee could carry on the investigation. It would be impossible to get a full committee——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection to that. I will modify it so as to read:

> That the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, or a subcommittee appointed by that committee, is authorized and instructed—

And so forth.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am perfectly willing, Mr. President, to accept that amendment.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] should be adopted. I will point out the advantages of it, or at least one, which, I think, will be recognized. The purpose of the resolution, as has been disclosed by the utterances of the author of it and by others in debate, is to reach those who may have attempted to use any improper influences to affect legislation.

Now, the language used in the first paragraph down to line 11 does recognize the distinction between lobbyists such as are included within the definition read by the Senator from New Hampshire, those who are frequenting legislative halls for the purpose of affecting legislation, and, on the other hand, those who are attempting to simply represent legitimate interests and in a legitimate way present those interests to legislators. I say that distinction is properly recognized in the first paragraph, but in the second paragraph it is not. It is the second paragraph that is sought to be displaced by the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The Senate will recognize that in the first paragraph persons concerning whom the investigation is sought to be made are denominated as lobbyists, and we will not be in doubt as to the persons whose acts are sought to be investigated, but in the second paragraph it will be noticed the language is—

> The committee is further instructed to take the statements, under oath, of all the Senators as to the names of all persons who have made any representations to them during the present session concerning pending legislation, and especially concerning the tariff bill, etc.

That would necessarily include all that the Senator from Florida inquired about. It would include every communication which has been made to any Senator. While none of us have any objection to that scope of the inquiry, so far as it could relate to our disclosing every communication which has been received, it is evident that such an investigation would be interminable. I certainly have no objection to having the disclosure of every communication which I have received, and yet

I am satisfied it would take a good long time to present the letters, to say nothing of the oral communications I have had, all of which have been representations made to me by persons in a legitimate way of their legitimate interests, and matters which it would be immaterial to bring to the attention of the Senate with the view it now has in this proposed investigation. But if the language of the second paragraph should be retained that would be necessary. It is a direct instruction to take from Senators, under oath, the names of all persons who have made any representations. It seems to me that language would certainly not only be objectionable but it would be entirely foreign to what is the purpose of the Senate in the adoption of the resolution. What is the purpose of the Senate? As I understand it, and about which I presume there is no doubt, it is to try to ascertain whether there are any parties who are correctly denominated as lobbyists—those who make a profession of trying to influence legislation, those who frequent the corridors for that purpose, who are here and being maintained for this purpose. The language used in the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] is this:

The committee is further instructed to ascertain the character of any representations made by such persons—

Which, of course, would include the persons denominated in the first paragraph as lobbyists—

by such persons to influence legislation, the names of Senators to whom they were made, the names of persons making them, and the circumstances under which they were made.

That, it seems to me, covers the entire ground. I would simply suggest one amendment to that. I think the use of the words "such persons" is not liable to any serious misunderstanding; but in order to make the purpose and the designation more explicit and to leave no possibility of doubt, I would strike out the word "persons" and insert in lieu thereof the word "lobbyists," so that it would read:

The committee is further instructed to ascertain the character of any representations made by such lobbyists to influence legislation, the names of Senators to whom they were made—

And so forth.

I would suggest to the Senator from Indiana—I do not see him here at this moment—to strike out the word "persons," in the second line of his amendment, and to insert the word "lobbyists," so that there can be no doubt as to the purpose and scope of the investigation.

I will make a suggestion in reply to the statements of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW]. The Senator from Kansas suggested, very pertinently, that it would be impossible to judge as to whether the representations were improper unless the representations were disclosed. That, of course, would lead to an investigation as to all representations; and I would suggest that properly the matter might be met when the Senator appears before the committee by him being asked the question, "Has anyone approached you or made any representations to you other than of a legitimate character—such as you recognize to be legitimate? Has any professional lobbyist approached you?" If he said "no" and there was in the possession of the committee any facts which led to the belief that there were such, of course, upon cross-interrogation, that matter could be brought to light and disclosed; but——

Mr. BRISTOW rose.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, it would be certainly impracticable, within the scope of 10 days or a year, for a committee to hear everything that had been said to a Senator or to hear everything which has been represented to him through letters or otherwise in regard to this matter. It could only be done by interrogating him as to whether or not there had been anything which, in his opinion, was improper or of that nature.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator from Georgia speaks about inquiring of a Senator as to whether or not a lobbyist had appeared before him. How are we to know who a lobbyist is, or how do you determine who is a lobbyist?

Mr. BACON. I can imagine in my own case, if the Senate will pardon a personal allusion, if I should appear before the committee and I were asked the question, "Has any lobbyist approached you?" I could say with absolute confidence, "No"; because I can say that I have not been approached by anyone, except by persons who have been in the representation of a legitimate interest in which they were personally concerned, and I do not consider such persons to be lobbyists.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

Mr. BACON. On the contrary—if the Senator will pardon me a moment—if the committee had information that there were around here certain persons who were professional lobbyists, they might ask me, "Has Mr. So-and-so ever spoken to you?" "No." Or they might ask me any other question which might elucidate whether or not I had been improperly approached; but it must necessarily be left at first to a general statement on the part of a Senator whether he had been so approached, and if he had he could disclose that fact.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, it seems to me that the policy suggested by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] would very much limit the scope of this inquiry. In order that the Senate might know whether or not a lobbyist had approached the Senator from Georgia it seems to me that we ought to know who had approached the Senator from Georgia and what the conversation was. Then the committee could judge whether or not it was a proper conversation or whether or not the party was a lobbyist. If you leave it to a Senator to determine whether or not a lobbyist has approached him, you simply limit this inquiry so that the Senator might get up and confess that a lobbyist had importuned him or that he had not. If a Senator submits the names of parties who have come to him, stating the business upon which they came and what they said, then the committee and the Senate will know and form their own judgment as to whether or not they were proper proceedings or improper proceedings.

Mr. BACON. It is not proposed by the terms of this resolution to limit the inquiry to the suggestion made by me. I am simply talking about what would be the practical way in which the committee would proceed. If the committee had reason to doubt what I said, it would have perfect power to say, "Well, Mr. BACON, produce the name of every man who has talked with you." There is nothing in the resolution which would prevent it. If, on the contrary, the committee thought they could rely upon my own judgment in the matter, possibly they would not go further than that, but if the committee had reason to doubt the accuracy of my judgment as to whether or not the man was a lobbyist or whether or not I had been approached by those who were lobbyists, the committee would, in connection with the part of the resolution which it is proposed to retain, have full power to go on and examine me as thoroughly as they wished as to everybody who had spoken to me and as to every communication which had been made to me.

So, Mr. President, I hope that the Senator from Indiana will accept the amendment which I suggest, which is to strike out the word "persons," in the second line, and to insert "lobbyists," so as to make it certain. Otherwise it might lead to some misunderstanding. Of course I shall not press the amendment if the Senator from Indiana does not desire it.

Mr. KERN. I will state that if the word "lobbyist" had a well-defined meaning, I should not hesitate about the substitution.

Mr. BACON. The first paragraph which the Senator from Indiana proposes to retain speaks of lobbyists only.

Mr. KERN. I understood that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] was accepted by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I find that the amendment which I had intended to propose is not necessary, and I have withdrawn it, not on the floor of the Senate, but in conversation with the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I called the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the fact that the second paragraph contained the breadth that he thought the whole resolution should have, and that it was, therefore, not necessary to insert the amendment in order to reach the purpose which the Senator from Pennsylvania desired to accomplish. I accepted the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. BACON. I think it practically means the same thing, but I simply desired to put it beyond any question; but as there is some doubt as to whether or not the amendment would be acceptable I shall not offer it. I do think, however, that the amendment as it stands is certainly not only an improvement but absolutely necessary, unless we propose to impose a burden upon this committee which it would be impossible for them to bear and to open an investigation which it would be impossible for them to correctly make.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only a very few minutes. I can not understand this shrinking on the part of Senators—because there is no other conclusion to draw—from stating to this body with whom they have been conferring. I offered a resolution for that information last week, and it was referred to the Committee on Finance, but nothing has been since heard of it.

I probably have had as many persons calling on me about the tariff bill as has any Member of this body. The State which I in part represent here is close to the Capital, and there is hardly a paragraph in the tariff measure which does not

affect the State of Pennsylvania; but I am prepared this afternoon or to-morrow, or whenever this committee meets, to furnish a complete list to the committee and to the Senate of the full name, occupation, and address of every caller who has entered my committee room or met me on the street or in the hotel to make any representations concerning the tariff bill. Why should not other Senators be willing to do the same thing for the enlightenment of the country in this condition of absolute secrecy regarding the framing of the tariff bill and under the grave charges and innuendoes which have been made by the President in the newspapers?

To say that a Senator is to judge in the secrecy of his own mind as to whether he has been approached by a lobbyist seems to me to be an absurdity. Many Senators may be unsophisticated as to lobbyists; they may not recognize one when he comes along. [Laughter.] These gentlemen are generally well dressed, of attractive demeanor, of cordial manners, and of a hospitable turn of mind, and are not the persons to impress an unsophisticated Senator with the sinister character of the design which lurks beneath their pleasing exterior. [Laughter.]

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. PENROSE. I do.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator's very minute description of lobbyists discloses the fact that he is intimately acquainted with them.

Mr. PENROSE. I am thoroughly acquainted with them, Mr. President. In 15 years' service in this body, and with considerable activity in tariff legislation, I know the lobbyist probably as quickly as anybody in this Chamber. I also know the business man who comes here with extravagant claims and ridiculous assertions to influence Congress and tariff legislation, and, so far as I am concerned, I have never paid any attention to anybody except one in whose patriotism, loyalty to the Government, and knowledge of the subject I had complete confidence. Only the other day we saw in the Washington papers an account of a gentleman of pleasing exterior who undertook to get indorsements for a candidate for the high position of an ambassador to one of the foreign governments, and Senators, apparently without guile, absorbed the suggestions of this plausible gentleman. [Laughter.]

Gold bricks are floating around the Capitol, Mr. President, and we have a number of new Members in this body. Now, it would be very mortifying to these new Members, these unsophisticated gentlemen, if they should appear and under oath testify that they did not consort with a lobbyist and that hideous intimacy should afterwards be disclosed [laughter] in some accidental manner along the line of the episode in connection with the selection of an ambassador to France or to England already referred to. For the protection of these very Senators, it seems to me that they ought, without reservation, to state who has been here. He may have been an importer interested in the free list; he may have been a southern gentleman interested in the cotton schedule, or he may have been a bad man from Pennsylvania interested in modifying the metal schedule. [Laughter.]

But let us have the information made public, and let, at least, there be one feature of the tariff discussion with which the whole American people can be familiar and on which a flood of light may fall, and that is the people who are here in Washington conferring with Senators individually or as a committee.

We heard during the campaign from the stump about the fact that the plain people of the land were not admitted to the councils of the Nation when a tariff bill came up. Perhaps we can find out where the "plain people" or their representatives are. I have not noticed undue crowds in the Union Station in my weekly pilgrimages to Philadelphia and my return to Washington. The only people that I have seen here are the wounded and battered and time-honored warriors who have been addressing themselves to Republican majorities in the Senate for the last 25 years. [Laughter.]

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

Mr. PENROSE. Let us have their names, and if among them there are hid away any obscure representatives of the "plain people" from some fastness in the mountains or remote village let their names be disclosed and let the majority Senators call our attention to them when the tariff bill is up for debate.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. PENROSE. I do.

Mr. KERN. I was about to ask to what Republican majority those gentlemen addressed themselves last fall?

Mr. PENROSE. I do not understand the Senator, Mr. President. If he will repeat his question, I will be very glad to answer it.

Mr. KERN. I say, I was about to ask to what Republican majority those gentlemen addressed themselves last fall.

Mr. PENROSE. I think those gentlemen last fall were in a kind of benumbed condition. [Laughter.] They thought the President was to be taken at his word, and that legitimate industry was not to be injured. All of them thought they were engaged in legitimate industry, and all of them thought that considerable tariff reductions would result in injury. The consequence was they stood like steers in an abattoir, unmindful of the slaughter awaiting them. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the basis of this resolution, as I understand, is the statement of the President. While I am in most hearty accord with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] in advocating the resolution, it seems to me that it only goes into one portion of the facts contained in the President's statement. It might be well at the beginning to notice that the President's statement perhaps does not refer to the Senate in particular. If we are to take the evidence of legislators, the investigation ought to be held in reference to Members of the other House as well as with reference to Members of the Senate.

But laying that aside for the moment, I want to call the attention of the Senate to what to me appear to be the three important suggestions contained in the President's statement. First, his statement as to the existence of a lobby. Second, that—

> The newspapers are being filled with paid advertisements calculated to mislead the judgment of public men—

And also to change public opinion. Third—

> That money without limit is being spent to sustain this lobby and to create an appearance of a pressure of public opinion antagonistic to some of the chief items in the tariff bill.

Those are the charges made by the President; and it seems to me the resolution of the Senator from Iowa only undertakes to investigate one of them. Page 2 of the resolution, beginning with line 5, reads as follows—and it is the first place in the resolution where there is any reference or mention made to the statement of the President:

> *Resolved further*, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish said committee with the names of the lobbyists to whom he referred in the public statement issued by him on the 26th day of May—

And so forth.

It strikes me that if we are to investigate that part of the statement and get from the President the names of those lobbyists, we ought also to investigate the other two propositions contained in the President's statement—one in reference to the publication of paid articles in newspapers having for their object the changing of public opinion and the influencing of public men, and the other statement that unlimited amounts of money are being used for the purpose of sustaining this lobby and carrying on this kind of a propaganda.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NORRIS. I do.

Mr. CUMMINS. If my resolution does not cover the phase of the matter just mentioned by the Senator from Nebraska, it is because I do not know how to use my mother tongue or my language. I have assumed that that was the most offensive type of lobbying—the lobbying that is intended to create public opinion, which, in turn, is to be used for influencing members of a legislative body; and I assumed, of course, that the investigation would cover all efforts made by these people to influence the legislative body before which the tariff bill is now pending.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree most thoroughly with the Senator that that kind of lobbying is the most offensive, and not only the most offensive, but it is the most harmful. But it strikes me that the Senator's resolution, if passed without any amendment on that subject, would not cover the investigation that it seems to me is more important than any other; that is, that we ought to know about the money that is being used without limit; we ought to know about the publication in the newspapers of advertisements intended to influence public opinion and to form public opinion.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am sure the Senator from Nebraska wants to reach the same end that I desire to reach.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not doubt it a bit.

Mr. CUMMINS. But if he will turn to the first paragraph he will find this sentence:

> The committee is instructed to report within 10 days the names of all lobbyists attempting to influence any such pending legislation and the methods which they have employed to accomplish their ends.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. I think that is all very well, although that is followed by a provision that says they shall call before them all the Senators. Evidently that is one of the methods——

Mr. CUMMINS. That is one of the ways in which we will have to investigate.

Mr. NORRIS. Since the President's statement is the basis for all of it, would it not be more logical to go to the President and ask him to disclose the names of these men?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have asked him to disclose the names of these men.

Mr. NORRIS. And ask him to disclose the methods by which advertisements are paid for, and so forth?

Mr. CUMMINS. I assume that he does not know the methods any better than we do. He has stated the methods in his public statement.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no doubt the President has at least some basis for his statement, and it seems to me we ought to go to the head of the charge and ascertain from the man who makes it the basis for it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Let us see; let us read this for a moment, if the Senator from Nebraska will permit it:

> That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish said committee with the names of the lobbyists to whom he referred in the public statement issued by him on the 26th day of May.

Of course, he will also give the names, if he has them, of the men who are putting in these paid advertisements.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know whether he will or not.

Mr. CUMMINS. Why, they are lobbyists, are they not?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know.

Mr. CUMMINS. They are the lobbyists to whom the President refers in his statement—the very men to whom he refers.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not sure about that.

Mr. CUMMINS. If we are not sure of that, we are not sure about anything.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the statement itself discloses that when the President refers to paid newspaper advertisements being used for the purpose of changing and influencing public opinion, he does not necessarily mean that it is being done by the lobbyists he refers to in the beginning of his statement.

Mr. CUMMINS. But the Senator from Nebraska, of course, has not considered this further language in the resolution:

> And any other information about them and their efforts to bring about changes in legislation now before the Senate which will promote the general welfare.

Mr. NORRIS. The last clause read by the Senator from Iowa would cover it in a general way. It is a general clause that would cover everything that could possibly be included in the investigation; but it is not a specific reference to what the President is perhaps referring to.

I have called attention to what I believe to be this particular weakness of the resolution in order to explain what amendment it seems to me ought to be made to the resolution. At this point I want to send to the desk an amendment I have prepared, which I believe will more fully carry out the theory and the idea of the resolution. It will come right after line 11, page 2, and will specifically refer to the particular matters I have mentioned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that everything after line 11 has been stricken out.

Mr. NORRIS. No, Mr. President.

Mr. CUMMINS. When was it stricken out, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] has moved to amend by striking out all after line 11——

Mr. CUMMINS. I hope that has not yet been adopted. I did not hear the motion put, and the argument upon it has not yet been finished.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered has nothing to do with the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Did not the Senator from Iowa accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. CUMMINS. I did not. On the contrary, I very distinctly refused to accept it. I accepted the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the way the Chair understood it; but the pending amendment is the amendment starting at line 11, and the proposed amendment——

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Nebraska will permit the Chair to state the condition of the record as the Chair understands it——

Mr. CUMMINS. The Chair is right. I accepted the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment starts at line 11.

Mr. CUMMINS. And it is the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] that is now pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana, starting at line 11; so that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] must be an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not offer it as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. The Chair has not yet gathered the idea I have been trying to convey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has not gathered the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. NORRIS. It may be that I have not, but I have not offered any amendment on page 1. The Chair is talking about an amendment on page 1. I have offered an amendment to page 2, line 11. There are two lines 11 in this bill, as the Chair will see if he will examine it. One is on page 1 and the other is on page 2.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is stating the record as the Chair understands it. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] moved to amend by striking out all after line 11, on page 1. That amendment is pending before the Senate, and, if adopted, will take the balance of the resolution from the Senate. Pending that amendment, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] offers an amendment, which the Chair believes is not now in order.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I be permitted to be heard on that point of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It must be an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, let me be heard just for a moment. If I can have the ear of the Chair for just a minute, I think I can convince him that my amendment must be voted on before the amendment of the Senator from Indiana is voted on——

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. NORRIS (continuing). Because it applies to the text which the amendment of the Senator from Indiana would strike out, and we must first vote on the amendment that goes to the perfection of the text of the bill before we vote on a motion to strike out. Therefore my motion would be voted on first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no doubt about the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska; but the Chair still insists that it is an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. GALLINGER. May it be read for information? It has not yet been read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment; and the Secretary will kindly read the resolution down to the point where the Senator from Nebraska offered his amendment, so that it may be understood.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] proposes to strike out, beginning on page 1, after line 11, the following words:

> The committee is further instructed to take the statements, under oath, of all the Senators as to the names of all persons who have made any representations to them during the present session concerning pending legislation, and especially concerning the tariff bill, and the inquiry shall include the character of the representation and the circumstances under which it was made in order to ascertain whether it was a proper or improper attempt to influence legislation.
>
> *Resolved further*, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish said committee with the names of the lobbyists to whom he referred in the public statement issued by him on the 26th day of May and any other information about them and their efforts to bring about changes in legislation now before the Senate which will promote the general welfare.
>
> The committee is authorized to administer oaths, subpœna witnesses, and to send for persons and papers in the prosecution of said investigation.

And in lieu of the words proposed to be stricken out the Senator from Indiana offers certain other words. Pending that motion, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] offers to amend the part to be stricken out as follows:

On page 2, after line 11, insert:

> The committee is further instructed to investigate the charges made by the President in said statement in reference to the use of money to sustain said lobby, and in reference to the publication of newspaper advertisements intended to mislead public men and public opinion, and the committee is also instructed to ask the President for all the information in his possession bearing on the charges contained in said statement so made by him.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have no doubt the resolution as it now is or as I prepared it would give abundant and ample authority to the committee to do the very thing proposed in the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska; but I have no objection whatever to making my purpose still more specific and definite. Therefore, in so far as I may do it or can do it, I accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I hope the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana will not be adopted. I think it would go far to emasculate the resolution and render the investigation futile.

I think this is a very serious situation, which is created by the public statement of the President of the United States. That statement opens with the words:

> I think that the public ought to know the extraordinary exertions being made by the lobby in Washington to gain recognition for certain alterations of the tariff bill. Washington has seldom seen so numerous, so industrious, or so insidious a lobby.

That was published in the newspapers of Tuesday, the 27th of May, at a time when the tariff bill had passed the House, had been sent to the Senate, and was pending in the Senate. The efforts of a lobby can be understood only to apply to the Senate, and the effect of that statement must necessarily be that any Senator who votes to change the bill as it came from the House votes under the imputation put upon him by the President of the United States, before the people of the country, of having been influenced by a lobby.

I think it does not comport with the dignity and self-respect of the Senate of the United States to permit that imputation to pass without notice. I think this resolution should be adopted, and I think it should be adopted in such form as to indicate that the Senate is in earnest in intending that there should be a thorough, searching, and effective inquiry and exposure of whatever there may be to expose.

The two things in the resolution as proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] which are softened and in great part taken out by the amendment are the two things which I think it is our duty to insist upon. One is that the Members of the Senate shall make proffer of their testimony and their full disclosure to the people of the country of all communications with them which could, by any construction, form the basis of a finding or a suspicion that a lobby has been influencing them. We can not make that proffer except by a resolution of the Senate. No committee by its course of conduct can take the place of the Senate's own declaration before the people of the United States of its willingness and its desire under oath to make a full statement of the facts. I sincerely hope the Senate will not shrink from making that proffer of full disclosure.

The other thing which is practically taken out is a respectful call upon the President of the United States for the names, which, of course, he must have had in his possession before he made this public statement, and which will enable the Senate to make its investigation effective.

To my mind, the question between the resolution as offered by the Senator from Iowa and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana is the question whether we are in earnest or not; whether we mean the stringent and severe proceeding necessary to make effective our action, or whether we are willing that this shall go down the stream with the ordinary investigation and the finding of no results. I do not think the party of the President, the party in the majority, which is framing this tariff bill, can afford to emasculate this resolution; and I hope they will not amend the resolution in accordance with the proposal of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Has the Senator from Iowa accepted the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska, and if so, is the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana to be considered as an amendment to the resolution which includes the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that the Senator from Iowa had a right to accept the modification of the text of his resolution as proposed by the Senator from Nebraska, and that therefore the question pending before the Senate now is the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana to the resolution as modified.

Mr. REED. To the amendment as offered by the Senator from Indiana I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri offers an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana. The Secretary will read the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the first paragraph of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana add:

> The committee shall further inquire and report—
> 1. Whether any Senator is financially interested in the production, manufacture, or sale of any article or articles mentioned in said tariff bill, and if so, to what extent.
> 2. Whether any Senator represents or is connected, directly or indirectly, with any person, firm, association, or organization engaged in the manufacture, production, or sale of any of said articles.

Mr. REED. I wish to ask the Senator from Indiana if he will not accept my amendment to his amendment?

Mr. KERN. I have no objection to it, Mr. President. It seems to me, if we are going into the inquiry, it ought to be very full and very thorough. While I am on my feet, I want to say——

Mr. CUMMINS. May I ask the Senator from Missouri why he does not offer that as an amendment to the resolution which I have proposed, which is broad and searching, and will be effective on the subject it covers? I would have no objection whatever to the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Missouri as an addition to my own, although it covers an entirely different field. I hope that the Senator will not try to strengthen the weakness of the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana by the stringent proposition upon another subject which he has just offered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I intend to press this amendment as far as I am able, and if the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana is not accepted by the Senate I will then claim the privilege of offering it to the resolution introduced by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. REED. For a question, certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Missouri, in order that there may be absolute fairness and that the Senators who are opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana but do want the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, that he has a right, I understand, under the parliamentary situation, to offer his amendment first to the resolution offered by the Senator from Iowa, and it would properly be voted on first before the amendment of the Senator from Indiana would be voted on. So he can really offer it in both places and give both sides an opportunity to have the benefit of his amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the difficulty I have in agreeing with my friend from Nebraska lies in the fact that I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana improves the resolution offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. President, we have gone somewhat afield in this discussion. The question here is not whether an investigation shall be throttled in any way. If there is a man on this side of the Chamber who does not want to see a full, searching, and thorough investigation, then I am not aware of the fact.

I have no difficulty about the meaning of the word "lobbyist." I do not care in what sense the word is used; neither do I think the purpose of this investigation is to advise the new Members of the Senate who the lobbyists are, in order that they may escape contamination, as was suggested by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN]. Somehow or other I have it in mind that the Senator who made that suggestion, coming from the party he represents and hailing from the great State of Illinois, is scarcely likely to be imposed upon by any lobbyist. If he is in that condition of unfortunate ignorance, I respectfully refer him to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], who has evidenced a thorough and complete knowledge of the entire subject.

I was interested in the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania. His statement was to the effect that the city is full of these so-called lobbyists. He told us they were the same old battle-scarred veterans whom he had met in other days and upon fairer fields.

Mr. PENROSE. I did not say "fairer fields."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. REED. In just a moment.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator is not quoting me correctly. I did not say "fairer fields." That expression is due to the Senator's poetic imagination.

Mr. REED. I said "fairer fields for the lobbyists than the fields that are now presented." That was my language, not the language of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I exculpate him entirely from having used so frank an expression.

The difference between the old days and the present time is that formerly the great manufacturing industries, the big trusts, the great combinations, came here and appeared before committees which believed in big trusts, in big combinations, in big profits, in big tariffs, and in big campaign contributions. The same gentlemen still come, but now, as I undertook to explain the other day, they must confront committees charged by the people of the United States with the pleasant duty of annihilating legalized loot.

The committees as now organized are determined to relieve the country from the exactions so long practiced upon them at the instance of the army of "battle-scarred veterans," to employ the tender phraseology of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr.

PENROSE], who for 20 years have been coming down to Washington to increase their profits by virtue of the policies and friendly interest of the gentlemen who represent the other side of this Chamber. They came here then to write their own bills and arranged to have their own confidential secretaries installed as the confidential secretaries of the Finance Committee. Truly we have entered upon new times, and I doubt not the "battle-scarred veterans" believe "the times are out of joint."

Mr. President, we need no longer attempt to disguise the fact that an attempt is being made to embarrass the President. That purpose was plainly disclosed by the remarks of the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT]. I do not, however, ascribe the same sentiments to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], but the Senator from New York practically puts this case as a direct challenge to the President of the United States. He insists that President Wilson has been guilty of making a charge which impugns the honor and challenges the integrity of Members of this body. He insists that the honor of the Senate is directly involved, and that we must take cognizance of the President's statement and proceed to investigate into its truth or falsity.

Mr. President, I do not believe the Senator from Iowa had that purpose in view, but I do believe that the language employed by the Senator from Iowa in his resolution is subject to a construction somewhat similar to that given by the Senator from New York. Now, if it be a mistake to assume that the President of the United States has impugned the honor or the integrity of this body, then I ask whether we ought to adopt a resolution which can be construed or understood as an affront offered by the Senate to the President, who, I insist, has given no just reason for offense.

Mr. President, I have seen in the Senate in my short time here hours consumed over the phraseology of a resolution calling for papers or documents or information. I have never known a resolution to be passed which in any manner could be construed as an imputation against the President or as a suggestion of an investigation of the President's conduct. I have seen no man upon this side, when a President of a different political faith sat at the other end of the Avenue, attempt in any way to assume the position of an investigator of the President, and I do not believe we have reached a point yet where Senators upon the other side of this Chamber want to take that position.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. Will the Senator from Missouri turn to the resolution and point out where in the remotest degree it imputes to the President of the United States any wrongful or improper purpose or conduct?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa has been reading, and I think he did not hear me, although I twice stated that I exonerated the Senator from Iowa from any thought or purpose of the kind referred to; but I did say that the debate had taken on that character, and I referred especially to the utterances of the Senator from New York. Now, to fully answer the Senator I shall need to go on for a moment, and I will endeavor to show——

Mr. CUMMINS. Let me say just before the Senator goes on that there is no word in this resolution disrespectful, disparaging, or critical of the President of the United States.

Mr. REED. I have said that the Senator did not intend it. I have, however, expressed the opinion that the language of the resolution is not fortunate, and I am about to discuss that phase of it.

Mr. President, the resolution I propose to discuss in a moment; but, first, I want to clear away, if I may so far trench upon what may be almost called the decencies of the occasion, as to ask my friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to let me discuss a question which he himself suggested to me. I am imposing on his good nature, but as I am on my feet I beg his indulgence for doing that which he has just told me it was his purpose to do.

Let us read this statement of the President that has opened the vials of the wrath of the Senator from New York. Reading President Wilson's interview without prejudice, reading it in a spirit of fairness and candor, let us see whether it does, in fact, reflect upon the honor of Members of Congress. If it does, then I have nothing further to say; but if read fairly, if looked at through clear glasses and not through the mists of prejudice, it is not susceptible of the sinister construction insisted upon by the Senator from New York. Then let us, as fair men, give it the proper construction and cease crying out that the honor of Congress has been attacked. Here is the statement—

> I think that the public ought to know the extraordinary exertions being made by the lobby in Washington to gain recognition for certain alterations of the tariff bill. Washington has seldom seen so numerous, so industrious, or so insidious a lobby. The newspapers are being filled with paid advertisements calculated to mislead the judgment of public men not only but also the public opinion of the country itself. There is every evidence that money without limit is being spent to sustain this lobby—

Not to corrupt Members of Congress, but "to sustain the lobby." To sustain it how? The statement is clear on the point, viz, "they are filling the newspapers with paid advertisements."

I read on—

> and to create an appearance of a pressure of public opinion antagonistic to some of the chief items of the tariff bill. It is of serious interest to the country that the people at large should have no lobby and be voiceless in these matters, while great bodies of astute men seek to create an artificial opinion and to overcome the interests of the public for their private profit. It is thoroughly worth the while of the people of this country to take knowledge of this matter. Only public opinion can check and destroy it.
>
> The Government in all its branches ought to be relieved from this intolerable burden and this constant interruption to the calm progress of debate. I know that in this I am speaking for the Members of the two Houses, who would rejoice as much as I would to be released from this unbearable situation.

The last line I have just read is a certificate to every man, woman, and child of the United States that the President has not impugned the integrity of Congress or any of its Members. It gives a complete cast and color to the entire article. What the President was complaining of was not that Members of Congress were being corrupted. What the President was charging was not that Members of Congress were being improperly approached with money or bribes.

The President was charging that there was a large number of men here who were endeavoring to manufacture an artificial public sentiment; that they were expending large sums of money to manufacture that sentiment by paid newspaper articles and otherwise. He was calling the attention of the country to the fact, in order that the country might understand how to read and how to understand the articles and arguments being put before the people of the United States by these interested lobbyists. He was giving the people of the country to understand that only one side was being represented; that large sums of money were being expended for advertising and other purposes. He was not challenging the integrity of either House of Congress. That such was the purpose of the President must be clear to every fair man who reads what the President actually said.

We surely ought to be willing to candidly view the acts of the Chief Executive of this great Nation. We ought, as just men, in weighing and measuring the utterances of the President, to have regard for the concluding words:

> I know that in this I am speaking for the Members of the two Houses, who would rejoice as much as I would to be released from this unbearable situation.

Mr. President, I submit to the candor of gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber, I submit to the candor and fair judgment of the people of the United States the words of the President I have just quoted, and I ask that they be taken into consideration along with the other portions of his declaration. I ask that it be also remembered that the statement was written by the pen of a man who has never been given to making loose charges or recklessly impugning the honor and integrity of the public men of the country. Thus viewed, there can, it seems to me, be found no fair man to longer dispute the character, the purpose, and the intendment of this article. Of course an unfair critic can select a single word from this article and find a sinister meaning in it; so you can take one word or one sentence from any document ever written, tear it from its context, and find in it cause for offense. But Senators in this Chamber will hardly indulge in that kind of criticism.

Mr. President, why do I prefer the amendment that has been submitted by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN]? I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to what I am saying, because I am in full accord with the Senator from Iowa in the fundamental thought of this resolution, because I believe his purpose is right, because I am in sympathy with this and every other resolution that will purge the reputation of Congress of every aspersion and every suspicion that may exist in the mind of any man or woman in the United States. I prefer the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana, because I think it is as complete and as full as is the resolution of the Senator from Iowa, that it will reach the point he desires to reach, and yet, at the same time, it is not subject to a criticism

which I think lies against the resolution offered by the Senator from Iowa. The resolution of the Senator from Iowa reads:

The committee is further instructed to take the statements, under oath, of all the Senators as to the names of all persons who have made any representations to them during the present session.

That seems to imply, Mr. President, that it is necessary to investigate the Senate; it seems to imply not so much an investigation of lobbyists and lobbying as an inquiry into the probity of Senators. It seems to suggest that we suspect each other, and are therefore engaged in requiring each Senator to purge himself under oath.

For that reason I do not like the form in which this resolution is couched. Nevertheless I believe the committee should be empowered to go to every source for knowledge and to inquire of Senators, if they see fit so to do. I think they will so inquire. So, Mr. President, instead of that language employed in the resolution of the Senator from Iowa this is suggested:

The committee is further instructed to ascertain the character of any representations made by such persons to influence legislation, the names of Senators to whom they were made, the names of persons making them, and the circumstances under which they were made.

Thus the desired point is arrived at; but we do not reach it by language which may by some be regarded as self-stultification by the Senate. I do not think that the point I have just discussed of great importance. The matter is, after all, largely a matter of form.

I pass to the last clause of the Senator's resolution, which, I think, is subject to the objection that it does not treat the President of the United States with that delicate consideration which his office entitles him to receive, and I am sure it was no part of the purpose of the Senator from Iowa to treat him otherwise. The resolution reads:

Resolved further, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish said committee with the names of the lobbyists to whom he referred in the public statement issued by him on the 26th day of May and any other information about them and their efforts to bring about changes in legislation now before the Senate which will promote the general welfare.

Mr. President, that, in effect, is putting the President of the United States upon his trial and proof. It is, in substance, a demand that he shall come hither and produce the evidence. I do not believe that is treating the Chief Executive of this Nation with proper consideration. Other Presidents have occupied the presidential chair, and other Presidents have given forth public statements, and it has never been regarded as true that a President dare not open his lips without at once being called to the bar of the Senate and then and there required to answer for that which he has uttered.

Mr. President, I have in the past often heard it here asserted that the President of the United States should not be requested to furnish books and papers unless the request was coupled with the language, "so far as he may deem it consistent with the public interests." So this language has been suggested in lieu of the language proposed by the Senator from Iowa:

It is further resolved that the President is respectfully invited to aid the committee in its investigation by giving to it any information in his possession with reference to the subject matter of the investigation which he considers it proper to make public.

I think that is a more respectful way to phrase a request addressed to the Chief Executive. I am very sure that the President of the United States, under that resolution, will lay before the committee of Congress everything he can lay before it with due regard for the public interests. He may have received some information in confidence; he may be, as we are, the recipient of information in such manner as to make it undesirable to name a particular individual who furnished some important fact; but at the same time he may be in a position, as many of us have been, to give valuable information to a committee or to a court or to an investigating body, at the same time retaining the name of our informant. I submit to the Senator from Iowa, whose candor and fairness I have always admired, if the language proposed in the amendment of the Senator from Indiana is not as effective for all practical purposes as that contained in his own resolution, and if it does not more clearly accord with that difference to which the present Chief Executive is justly entitled?

I am sure the Senate does not desire to do anything that would seem to be offensive against the very niceties of the proprieties, and I am sure the Senator from Iowa does not.

Now, Mr. President, I beg the Senate's pardon for so long taking its time.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, it would be impossible for me, I believe, to be disrespectful toward the President of the United States, for whom I feel a very great admiration and of whom and of whose good faith I hold not the least suspicion. I never dreamed, in preparing the resolution concerning which the Senator has spoken, that it could by any possibility be interpreted as disrespectful. There is not in it the least tinge of challenge. I do not think the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] would be so effective. If I did, I would have no pride of authorship, and would be very glad to accept it. It is not so effective; but I am afraid that what is most desired is that the invitation shall come from a Democratic instead of a Republican source.

Mr. REED. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is the only reason I can imagine that would have prompted my friends on the other side in seeking to change the resolution.

Mr. REED. No; Mr. President, I think I can speak for the Senator from Indiana, and I will say that if the Senator from Iowa will offer the amendment as his we will accept it, so far as I have authority to represent anybody.

Mr. CUMMINS. It seems to me that if I had offered it in that form I would have found my friend from Indiana offering as an amendment the form of my original resolution, because there can not be any disrespect in this resolution; there can not be any challenge in it of the President of the United States, as such, that a lobby is here. The Senate asks him to give the committee the names of the lobbyists; that is all. What possible disrespect can there be to the President of the United States in such a plain, definite proposition?

Mr. REED. Will the Senator pardon me long enough to let me make a statement to him?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. REED. This is not only not an attempt to have a resolution passed by this side instead of one offered from the other side, but I say to the Senator now that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana is defeated I shall vote for the Senator's resolution, offering to it the amendment I have submitted to the amendment. The Senator is in error about an idea or motive so small as that being back of this matter. It is not as generous as the Senator usually is to make such a suggestion.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Missouri seemed to feel that from this side of the Chamber there came a challenge to the President; that we were attempting in some way to question his good faith and to ask him to do this thing because we believed he could not do it. I believe he can do it——

Mr. REED. He will certainly do it, then.

Mr. CUMMINS. To a degree, and I want him to do it, and I am quite willing to insert the word "respectfully." Then the resolution will differ from the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana only in this respect: We want the names of this lobby; I ask for them, and the Senator from Indiana does not. That constitutes the difference between the two forms. I am accustomed to deal candidly and openly, and when I want a thing I ask for it. If the Senate does not want the President of the United States to give the names of the men who are termed lobbyists, then, of course, we ought not to ask for their names. I want to know who they are, and I do not believe that anything but an overzealous imagination could read into this resolution anything other than the most complete respect and deference to the President of the United States.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to one feature. The Senator is a very alert and attentive Senator, and very few things have happened since he has been in this Chamber that have escaped his notice. I am quite sure that I can say with perfect confidence that since the Senator has been a Member of this body—and it has been much to the advantage of this body that he has been here—I am sure the Senator has never known of a resolution passing the Senate calling upon the President of the United States for any information, regardless of how certain the body may have been at the time it passed the resolution that the information was in the possession of the President, that that resolution did not contain the phrase "if, in his judgment, not incompatible with the public interest."

Mr. CUMMINS. I will correct that at once. The moment the Senator from Georgia reminds me of that, I know that language ought to be there, and it is a mere oversight that those words are not in the resolution.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I am glad to have that assurance from the Senator; but that is certainly one very important feature in this proposed amendment correcting what was not found in the original resolution—a proper regard to the courtesy which has always been considered as imperative in addressing any communication or any request to the President of the United States.

If that were all, of course the matter could stand in that way. But, Mr. President, what I desire particularly to take

issue with is the extreme vigor with which Senators attack this amendment as being one calculated in any manner to abridge the fullness and thoroughness of this investigation. What is the purpose of the investigation? The purpose is as disclosed in the first paragraph of the resolution, and I will remark, in passing, that if the purpose were such as the oversensitive apprehension of the Senator from Iowa would indicate, simply to take away from the Republican side of the Chamber the credit of having introduced the resolution, the amendment would not be confined to one clause of his resolution, but would substitute something for its entirety; and there is no pretense of that; there is no such purpose whatever.

On the contrary, the resolution will still remain the resolution of the Senator from Iowa, and the first half of it is left in identically the words which he himself proposed. The purpose of that, which is thus disclosed in the language of the Senator from Iowa himself, is to ascertain who are the parties who constitute the alleged lobby. That is the purpose of it, as declared in the first part of the resolution.

The question I want to submit to the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from New York is whether or not, in the proposed amendment, there is anything which will defeat that purpose or which will in any manner render the work of the committee less effective? Bearing in mind that that is the purpose—to ascertain the names of those who constitute this alleged lobby—what is the language of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana? It is this:

The committee is further instructed to ascertain the character of any representations made by such persons to influence legislation, the names of Senators to whom they were made, the names of persons making them, and the circumstances under which they were made.

I ask the Senators to suggest to the Senate any information required, either as to the name of the person to be discovered, or the character of the representation, or the person to whom the representation was made which could not be obtained under this language. With the committee clothed with that power, what name of a person could be withheld as not being authorized under the resolution as thus amended, what representation could be withheld as not authorized to be investigated by the resolution, and the name of what Senator could be withheld?

Senators grow earnest and eloquent in the charge that the purpose is to contract and narrow the investigation. With the purpose, as disclosed, to ascertain those three things, I ask the Senator from New York or the Senator from Iowa to suggest one single fact that could exist in connection with this matter the ascertainment of which could not be made under the authority granted in that sentence—one single supposititious case. I pause for a reply.

Is there a supposititious case that the Senators themselves can suggest to-day which might exist and which the committee would not have the power to bring out under that language? I do not think either of the Senators can do it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I will try to do it.

Mr. BACON. I shall be very happy to have the Senator do it.

Mr. CUMMINS. The objection I have to the second paragraph, as it would be if the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] were adopted—the first paragraph of the amendment itself—is that it refers directly to the term used in the first paragraph, namely, "lobbyist"; and it would permit every Senator, or every other person, to put his own construction upon the act of influencing legislation and determine whether it was a lobbying act or otherwise. I want the resolution broad enough so that Senators will be called upon to disclose all the representations that have been made to them touching the tariff bill—I do not mean in detail, but I mean their character—and then the public and the Senate can determine whether those representations were of a lobbying character or were made in a lobbying way.

That is the difference between the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana and my resolution; and therein not only would the range of investigation be narrowed but the opportunity of investigation would be greatly foreclosed.

Mr. BACON. If the amendment which I suggested to the Senator from Indiana had been adopted the pending amendment might be subject to the criticism now made by the Senator from Iowa. I proposed, myself, to strike out the word "persons" and insert "lobbyists." The Senator from Indiana objected to it; I withdrew the suggestion, and that word is not in it. It uses the word "persons." I can conceive, myself, of no possible information which it is sought to secure by means of this resolution which would not be secured under the language I have just read; and it goes on further to require all persons appearing before the committee to testify under oath.

Now as to the second proposition, whether this is sufficiently full in the call made upon the President:

It is further resolved, That the President is respectfully invited to aid the committee in its investigation—

What investigation? Why, the investigation as to whether or not any persons have attempted to influence this legislation. It is not an ambiguity by any means. The purposes of the invsetigation are set out in the first paragraph, as drawn by the Senator from Iowa himself. Those purposes thus alluded to in this clause of the amendment are designated specifically as those in which the President is asked to aid by giving his assistance to the committee. How?

By giving to it any information in his possession with reference to the subject matter of the investigation.

Mr. President, while that is couched in more courteous language, it is exactly the same in effect as if we asked for the specific information and requested that he give it, if in his judgment not incompatible with the public interests.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. FALL. I have been listening with a good deal of interest to the argument of the Senator from Georgia, and I should like to know why he prefers the amendment to the original resolution if the amendment does not change the original resolution. If it is the same thing, why change it? Why adopt the amendment rather than the resolution?

I have been listening with a great deal of attention; and I should like to know why the Senator prefers the amendment to the original resolution if there is no difference.

Mr. BACON. It is a question of taste, if the Senator pleases.

Mr. FALL. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. BACON. It is a question of taste. We think the language fully covers it, and that it is more respectful in every way, and intrusts the committee with this investigation in the more usual language, particularly the part of it which applies to the President of the United States.

I myself do not sympathize with any purpose to narrow the scope of the investigation. I do not think a man who comes here for the purpose of representing to a committee or to the Senate or to any Senator facts which relate to that which will affect his personal interests, or the interests of those with whom he is associated, has in any manner committed any impropriety. I do not understand Senators on the opposite side to make any suggestion of the kind; but I understand the purpose is to try to ascertain whether any improper or undue methods are being used for this purpose.

Before I take my seat I wish to say that we hear a great deal about the improvement in public and political morals and in political methods; and I want to express my very great gratification with the evidence which the Senators on the opposite side of the Chamber are to-day giving as to their increasing sensibility and sensitiveness upon the subject of improper influences being used in the procurement of legislation. Four years ago, when this Capitol literally swarmed with those who were interested in the tariff bill then under discussion, I recollect that day after day, for weeks, not one or two or dozens of men but streams of men were going from this Capitol building to the Senate Office Building, where the then majority members of the Finance Committee were holding their sessions, and from the office building returning to the Capitol Building. The charge was made on this side that such was the fact; that these influences were being brought to bear; and we had the highest evidence that such was the case through Senators rising in their places day after day and saying that this industry and that needed so much of protection, and that without it they could not live. With the charge thus made, we had no such extreme desire then on the part of Senators on the opposite side of the Chamber for an investigation as to the truth of that charge.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. FALL. Did the Senator from Georgia at that time, or did any Senator on that side, ask for an investigation by resolution or otherwise?

Mr. BACON. There was no investigation made, because we made the charge and it was never denied.

Mr. FALL. I understand that the President of the United States differs from the Senator from Georgia, as I understand the statement of the President to be that there never have been so many lobbyists as now.

Mr. BACON. Of course, the Senator understands that is a matter of computation.

Mr. FALL. That is another matter of taste, then.

Mr. BACON. I do not recollect what the language is, but I will say that if there are as many lobbyists now as there were

four years ago, this committee, when it begins its investigation, will have no trouble in finding them, because I know and every Senator who was here then knows that they were so much in evidence that a man had to shut his eyes not to be conscious of their presence. They were not only streaming between the Capitol Building and the Senate Office Building but they swarmed these corridors, and every man was here for the purpose of insisting that there should be this, that, and the other increase made in the pending tariff bill in order that he might have that much more of contribution from the general public for the purpose of maintaining his private business and promoting his personal prosperity.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] as modified by the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Newlands	Smith, Md.
Bacon	Hollis	Norris	Smoot
Borah	Hughes	Oliver	Sterling
Bradley	James	Overman	Stone
Brandegee	Johnson, Me.	Penrose	Sutherland
Bristow	Johnston, Ala.	Pittman	Swanson
Bryan	Kenyon	Pomerene	Thomas
Burton	Kern	Ransdell	Thompson
Catron	La Follette	Reed	Thornton
Chamberlain	Lane	Robinson	Townsend
Clark, Ark.	Lewis	Root	Vardaman
Crawford	Lippitt	Shafroth	Walsh
Cummins	Lodge	Sheppard	Warren
Dillingham	McLean	Sherman	Weeks
Fall	Martin, Va.	Shively	Williams
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	
Gore	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	
Gronna	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. PAGE] is necessarily absent from the Senate to-day.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. My colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] is absent by reason of sickness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present. The question is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] as modified by the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, while I regard the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] as introducing a subject entirely foreign to the resolution which I originally offered, nevertheless there is no reason why such an inquiry should not be made. I am so solicitous that no one shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana—which narrows and I think paralyzes to a great degree this inquiry—on account of the presence of the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri, that I offer the same amendment to the resolution proposed by myself. It is the same amendment with these words added, which I think will follow the inquiry to its end. Where the amendment of the Senator from Missouri says:

> Whether any Senator represents or is connected, directly or indirectly, with any person, firm, association, or organization engaged in the manufacture, production, or sale of any of said articles—

I add:

> and whether any such Senator has sought to influence any other Senator as to the duties upon any such article.

Mr. REED. Is that where the Senator's amendment ends? Did the Senator read his entire amendment?

Mr. CUMMINS. No; I read simply the addition which I have made to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Is the amendment the same as the one I offered, with those words added?

Mr. CUMMINS. I will ask the Secretary to read it at length.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa offers to modify the resolution by adding language which will be read by the Secretary.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to offer it to come in immediately after line 11.

Mr. BACON. The Senator has a right to modify it without offering it. He has a right to modify his own resolution.

Mr. CUMMINS. I assume I have that right, but I want the Senate to understand just what it is, and therefore I ask the Secretary to read it. It will be added after line 11 on page 2.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that, on line 11, page 2, the amendment which I offered has already been offered. So it ought to follow that.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is true. Let it follow the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The modification will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Iowa modifies his resolution as follows:

> Following the modification of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], accepted by him, add:
>
> "The committee shall further inquire and report:
>
> "1. Whether any Senator is financially interested in the production, manufacture, or sale of any article or articles mentioned in said tariff bill; and if so, to what extent.
>
> "2. Whether any Senator represents or is connected, directly or indirectly, with any person, firm, or association or organization engaged in the manufacture, production, or sale of any of said articles, and whether any such Senator has sought to influence any other Senator as to the duties upon any such articles."

Mr. LIPPITT. Before that modification is adopted, I should like to propose an amendment to it. In the first part, where it says the committee shall further inquire and report whether any Senator is financially interested in the production, and so forth, I should like to add the words "or professionally," so that the inquiry will read "shall inquire and report whether any Senator is financially or professionally interested," and so forth.

Further on, where it says "in the manufacture or sale of any article or articles mentioned in said tariff bill," I should like to insert the words "or in any other legislation now pending or that has been considered during his term as a Senator."

In the second paragraph, where it says, "whether any Senator represents or is connected, directly or indirectly, with any person, firm," and so forth, after the word "connected" and before the words "directly or indirectly," I should like to insert the words "professionally or otherwise," so that it will read "whether any Senator represents or is connected, professionally or otherwise, directly or indirectly," and so forth.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator offer that to the amendment which I offered to the resolution? If so, I accept it.

Mr. LIPPITT. I hoped the Senator would.

Mr. CUMMINS. While I believe that we will lose some of the strength of the inquiry, which I had hoped would be made with earnestness, nevertheless I accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. FALL. I should like to ask the Senator if he would not also accept an amendment to inquire whether any Member of this body is in any way directly or indirectly interested in the welfare of any business interest in the United States?

Mr. THOMAS. Or abroad.

Mr. FALL. Or abroad.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] as modified.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I can not vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana because I believe that it is a limitation upon the proposed investigation. The amendment proposes to strike out all after line 11, on page 1. That which precedes it, and which it is important to consider in connection with it, I want to read to the Senate:

> The committee is instructed to report within 10 days the names of all lobbyists attempting to influence any such pending legislation and the methods which they have employed to accomplish their ends; and in giving the name of the lobbyist to give the particular bill upon which he is working, and if it be the tariff bill the item he is seeking to change.

Now comes the proposed amendment of the Senator from Indiana:

> The committee is further instructed to ascertain the character of any representations made by such persons.

By whom?

By lobbyists. The Senate has been at some pains this afternoon to have incorporated in the RECORD of this day's debate the definition of the various lexicographers upon this term, and quite an elaborate argument was made by the Senator from Georgia for the limitation of the investigation to lobbyists.

Mr. President, the country has not forgotten, if the Senate has, that one of the worst scandals which ever touched this body grew out of a tariff bill where the corrupt influence that was used, or attempted to be used, was not by a lobbyist but by the head of a great trust, the owner of a great business. Surely, sir, the owners or part owners of the great protected interests should be brought within the scope of this investigation——

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. KERN. Would the substitution of the words "or any person or persons" meet the objection of the Senator?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana could be so altered in its terms that it would be as broad as the resolution proposed by the Senator from Iowa. But why not accept the original amendment? As perfected by the Senator who in-

troduced it it is far-reaching and is now couched in even more respectful language in the paragraph addressed to the President than is the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. President, I do not believe that there ought to be any partisan lines drawn on this resolution. The communication which the President issued has been so construed by the press and the country as to call for prompt action by the Senate. The public is quick to suspect these protected interests. I have no criticism to make of the President, for whom I have the greatest respect. He must have had a basis for his statement. I believe that the Senate should insist upon the fullest, most searching, and thoroughgoing investigation which can be provided.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I ask leave to modify my amendment. After the words "such persons," in the third line of the amendment, add the further words "or any person or persons," so as to read "such persons or any person or persons."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana as modified.

Mr. CUMMINS. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LIPPITT. I hope it will be read, so that we can understand what it is; there has been so much modification to it.

Mr. STONE. I desire to say that I have been absent from the Senate during almost the entire session on committee work. I have just come in. I should like very much to have the question stated by the Secretary, so that I will know what I am to vote upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the question.

The SECRETARY. Strike out all of the resolution after line 11, page 1, and in lieu of the words stricken out insert——

Mr. BRISTOW. Let me ask that the original resolution as modified be read and then the amendment, so that we may have both.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read in compliance with the request of the Senator from Kansas.

The SECRETARY. The original resolution as modified reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, or any subcommittee appointed by that committee, be, and is hereby, authorized and instructed to investigate the charge that a lobby is being maintained at Washington or elsewhere to influence proposed legislation now pending before the Senate. The committee is instructed to report within 10 days the names of all lobbyists attempting to influence any such pending legislation and the methods which they have employed to accomplish their ends; and in giving the name of the lobbyist to give the particular bill upon which he is working, and if it be the tariff bill the item he is seeking to change.

The committee is further instructed to take the statements, under oath, of all the Senators as to the names of all persons who have made any representations to them during the present session concerning pending legislation, and especially concerning the tariff bill, and the inquiry shall include the character of the representation and the circumstances under which it was made in order to ascertain whether it was a proper or improper attempt to influence legislation.

Resolved further, That the President be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested, if, in his judgment, the same is not incompatible with the public interest, to furnish said committee with the names of the lobbyists to whom he referred in the public statement issued by him on the 26th day of May and any other information about them and their efforts to bring about changes in legislation now before the Senate which will promote the general welfare.

The committee is further instructed to investigate the charges made by the President in said statement in reference to the use of money to sustain said lobby and in reference to the publication of newspaper advertisements intended to mislead public men and public opinion, and the committee is instructed to ask the President for all the information in his possession bearing on the charges contained in said statement so made by him.

The committee shall further inquire and report: (1) Whether any Senator is financially or professionally interested in the production, manufacture, or sale of any article or articles mentioned in said tariff bill, or in any other legislation now pending or that has been considered during his term as a Senator, and if so, to what extent. (2) Whether any Senator represents or is connected, professionally or otherwise, directly or indirectly, with any person, firm, association, or organization engaged in the manufacture, production, or sale of any of said articles, and whether any such Senator has sought to influence any other Senator as to the duties upon any such articles.

The committee is authorized to administer oaths, subpœna witnesses, and to send for persons and papers in the prosecution of said investigation.

The amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] proposes to strike out all of the resolution after line 11, on page 1, and in lieu of the words stricken out to insert the following words:

The committee is further instructed to ascertain the character of any representations made by such persons or any person or persons to influence legislation, the names of Senators to whom they were made, the names of persons making them, and the circumstances under which they were made. All persons appearing before the committee are required to testify under oath.

The committee shall further inquire and report: (1) Whether any Senator is financially interested in the production, manufacture, or sale of any article or articles mentioned in said tariff bill, and, if so, to what extent. (2) Whether any Senator represents, or is connected, directly or indirectly, with any person, firm, association, or organization engaged in the manufacture, production, or sale of any of said articles.

It is further resolved, That the President is respectfully invited to aid the committee in its investigation by giving to it any information in his possession with respect to the subject matter of the investigation which he considers it proper to make public.

The committee is authorized to administer oaths, subpœna witnesses, and send for persons and papers in the prosecution of the said investigation.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, it seems that the amendments offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] are not incorporated in the amendment as perfected of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. KERN. That was the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], I will say.

Mr. BRISTOW. They are accepted, of course, as a part of the resolution. I understand from the reading that the original resolution offered by the Senator from Iowa requires every Senator to state who has appeared before him in behalf of legislation, the names and the subjects that were discussed by them, so that the Senate may judge whether or not the influence was proper or improper, and it requires the President to give the names of the lobbyists referred to, if not incompatible with the public interest; but the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana does not require every Senator to state who appeared before him and what he talked about, and does not require the President to give the names of the lobbyists who are swarming the Capitol.

Mr. KERN. The amendment gives to the Judiciary Committee full, complete, and plenary power to make a full and complete investigation of all charges of this kind, and I think we have a Judiciary Committee that can be trusted.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in the reading of the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana the amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], and which was accepted, is not included. It should be included.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary is now incorporating it.

Mr. REED. The Secretary got it, I think, in the wrong resolution. It was accepted upon this side, but I did not understand that it was accepted on the other. If it was, then it ought to be incorporated in both.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is now incorporated in both.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Secretary hears well. It was accepted on this side. He did not hear its acceptance upon the other side, although I did.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is now on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CUMMINS. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LIPPITT. Before that demand is put, I should like to know whether it is understood that the amendment which I offered to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, and which was accepted by him, is a part of the original resolution and is a part of the amendment as now proposed by the Senator from Indiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in both. Is the demand for the yeas and nays seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] as modified.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRANDEGEE (when his name was called). I am paired for the remainder of this afternoon with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when Mr. BURLEIGH's name was called). I am requested to announce that the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA].

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. If I were privileged to vote, I should vote "nay," but I refrain from voting because of my pair.

Mr. GOFF (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SWANSON (when the name of Mr. MARTIN of Virginia was called). My colleague [Mr. MARTIN of Virginia] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when Mr. PAGE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. PAGE] is unavoidably detained from the Senate to-day, but he is paired upon this question and upon all other questions with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS]. Were my colleague present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota

[Mr. McCumber]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Shafroth] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. Smith of Michigan was called). The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Smith] is necessarily absent on business. He is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. Reed].

Mr. REED (after having voted in the affirmative). I voted inadvertently, not noticing the absence of my pair, but I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Smith] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Owen], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. KERN (when the name of Mr. Smith of South Carolina was called). I am requested to state that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Smith] is necessarily detained from the Senate on account of sickness in his family.

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Clark]. If he were present, I should vote "yea." Under the circumstances, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WEEKS. I have been requested to announce that the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. Burleigh] is paired on this question with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Lea]. If he were present, the Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER. I have announced my general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'Gorman], but I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Brady] and vote. I vote "nay."

I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Colt] is paired with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Saulsbury]; that the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. du Pont] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. Culberson]; that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Jackson] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Chilton]; and that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Sutherland] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Clarke].

Mr. OVERMAN. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from California [Mr. Perkins]. He is absent, but he authorized me to vote on this resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. Shafroth] was obliged to leave the city a few moments ago. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SHEPPARD. My colleague the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Culberson] is necessarily absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea." As has been already stated, he is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. du Pont].

Mr. LEWIS. I am requested by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Chilton] to explain that he was called away by necessary business. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. As has already been stated, I am paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Sutherland]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND. The senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] has been called from the Senate on important business.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have previously announced my pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Smith], but I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Stephenson] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. Bankhead] is necessarily absent because of sickness in his family. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—38.

Ashurst	Johnson, Me.	Pomerene	Swanson
Bacon	Johnston, Ala.	Ransdell	Thomas
Bryan	Kern	Reed	Thompson
Chamberlain	Lane	Robinson	Thornton
Fletcher	Lewis	Sheppard	Tillman
Gore	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Vardaman
Hitchcock	Myers	Simmons	Walsh
Hollis	Newlands	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Hughes	Overman	Smith, Ga.	
James	Pittman	Smith, Md.	

NAYS—28.

Borah	Cummins	Lippitt	Root
Bradley	Dillingham	Lodge	Sherman
Brandegee	Fall	McLean	Smoot
Bristow	Gallinger	Nelson	Sterling
Burton	Gronna	Norris	Townsend
Catron	Kenyon	Oliver	Warren
Crawford	La Follette	Penrose	Weeks

NOT VOTING—30.

Bankhead	Culberson	O'Gorman	Smith, Mich.
Brady	du Pont	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Burleigh	Goff	Page	Stephenson
Chilton	Jackson	Perkins	Stone
Clapp	Jones	Poindexter	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	Lea	Saulsbury	Works
Clarke, Ark.	McCumber	Shafroth	
Colt	Martin, Va.	Shields	

So Mr. Kern's amendment to the resolution was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, before that question is put I would suggest to the author of this new resolution that possibly the Judiciary Committee had better be admonished to investigate itself and its own membership, as they will not have authority to do so under the resolution, as I understand it.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I hope there will be no investigation of any Senator who shrinks from the investigation or who modestly wants to retire from the situation. [Laughter.]

Mr. FALL. Of course, in that view, I will withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. PENROSE. There seems to be a considerable backwardness on the part of Senators, according to what has happened, and I sincerely hope that the sensibilities of no Senator will be hurt during the conduct of this investigation.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, with the permission of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, I will say that, so far as he is concerned, there is no apparent shrinking.

Mr. PENROSE. No; I have announced to the Senate that I shall be early and voluntarily before the committee with a full list of my callers.

The resolution of the Senator from Iowa having been completely emasculated, so that response to it is now entirely voluntary, those Senators who are guileless and innocent as to what a lobbyist is—and some of them have already been taken in during the short period of the special session—are at perfect liberty to withdraw from the scene of action. [Laughter.]

Mr. STONE. Fortunately, Mr. President, very few of us have to offer apologies or explanations in advance. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMOOT. I move to strike out the word "ten," in line 6, and to insert "twenty," so that it will read "report within 20 days." The resolution has been added to, and it seems to me that it would be impossible to conclude the proposed inquiry in 10 days.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hope that amendment will not be adopted. If you allow the time to remain at 10 days, it will hasten the work of the committee, and in the meanwhile if the committee find that they can not complete the investigation in 10 days they can come in and get further time; but giving a longer time will be merely an encouragement to the committee to go slow instead of going to work right away.

Mr. SMOOT. I will withdraw the amendment if any Senator thinks the work can be done within 10 days.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If we find that it can not be finished within the time specified, we will join with you in extending the time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, or any subcommittee appointed by that committee, be, and is hereby, authorized and instructed to investigate the charge that a lobby is being maintained at Washington, or elsewhere, to influence proposed legislation now pending before the Senate. The committee is instructed to report within 10 days the names of all lobbyists attempting to influence any such pending legislation and the methods which they have employed to accomplish their ends; and in giving the name of the lobbyist to give the particular bill upon which he is working, and if it be the tariff bill the item he is seeking to change.

The committee is further instructed to ascertain the character of any representations made by such persons or any person or persons to influence legislation, the names of Senators to whom they were made, the names of persons making them, and the circumstances under which they were made. All persons appearing before the committee are required to testify under oath.

The committee shall further inquire and report: (1) Whether any Senator is financially or professionally interested in the production, manufacture, or sale of any article or articles mentioned in said tariff bill, and if so, to what extent, or in any other legislation now pending or that has been considered during his term as a Senator. (2) Whether any Senator represents or is connected, professionally or otherwise, directly or indirectly, with any person, firm, association, or organization engaged in the manufacture, production, or sale of any of said articles.

It is further resolved, That the President is respectfully invited to aid the committee in its investigation by giving to it any information in his possession with respect to the subject matter of the investigation which he considers it proper to make public.

The committee is authorized to administer oaths, subpœna witnesses, and send for persons and papers in the prosecution of the said investigation.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. KERN. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn until Monday next at 2 o'clock p. m.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL CLERKS TO SENATORS.

Mr. BACON. I move that the Senate——

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the Senator will withhold his motion for a moment.

Mr. BACON. I will withhold it.

Mr. SMOOT. I have given notice at several of the sessions of the Senate that I would call up, immediately after the dis-

position of morning business, Senate resolution No. 19, but the business of the Senate has been such that I have been unable to do so. I now give notice that on Monday next, immediately after the conclusion of the morning business, I shall call up resolution No. 19 and move that it be then considered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 25 minutes spent in executive business the doors were reopened.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE FORREST GOODWIN, OF MAINE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Joseph Sinnott, Doorkeeper of the House, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. FORREST GOODWIN, late a Representative from the State of Maine, and transmitted resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. MCGILLICUDDY, Mr. LOBECK, Mr. FERRIS, Mr. HILL, Mr. CRISP, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. RAKER, Mr. GUERNSEY, Mr. HINDS, Mr. LANGLEY, Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma, Mr. GREENE of Vermont, and Mr. DYER as the committee on the part of the House to attend the funeral of the deceased.

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

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
May 29, 1913.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. FORREST GOODWIN, a Representative from the State of Maine.

Resolved, That a committee of 14 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect, this House do now adjourn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for their present consideration.

The resolutions (S. Res. 98) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of the Hon. FORREST GOODWIN, late a Representative from the State of Maine.

Resolved, That a committee of five Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to take order for superintending the funeral of Mr. GOODWIN at Skowhegan, Me.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives and to the family of the deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed under the second resolution Mr. JOHNSON of Maine, Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. HOLLIS, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. DILLINGHAM as the committee on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I move, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 2, 1913, at 2 o'clock p. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 29, 1913.

FIRST ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Andrieus A. Jones, of Las Vegas, N. Mex., to be First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice Samuel Adams, resigned.

COMMISSIONER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE.

Clay Tallman, of Nevada, to be Commissioner of the General Land Office, vice Fred Dennett, resigned.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE.

Charles M. Bruce, of Virginia, to be Assistant Commissioner of the General Land Office, vice Samuel V. Proudfit.

CONSUL GENERAL.

Evan E. Young, of South Dakota, now a foreign trade adviser in the Department of State, to be consul general of the United States of America at Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, vice James W. Ragsdale, resigned.

CONSUL.

William H. Robertson, of Virginia, now consul general at Callao, Peru, to be consul of the United States of America at Manchester, England, vice Church Howe, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Joseph B. Russell, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Boston and Charlestown, in the State of Massachusetts, in place of Edwin U. Curtis, resigned.

NAVAL OFFICER OF CUSTOMS.

William M. Croll, of Pennsylvania, to be naval officer of customs in the district of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, in place of Walter T. Merrick, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Cadet Fletcher Webster Brown to be third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to take effect from date of oath, to fill an original vacancy.

Cadet Henry Montgomery Carr to be third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to take effect from date of oath, to fill an original vacancy.

Cadet Henry Coyle to be third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to take effect from date of oath, to fill an original vacancy.

Cadet Robert Donohue to be third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to take effect from date of oath, to fill an original vacancy.

Cadet James Alexander Frost, jr., to be third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to take effect from date of oath, to fill an original vacancy.

Cadet Frank Joseph Gorman to be third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to take effect from date of oath, to fill an original vacancy.

Cadet Loyd Vineyard Kielhorn to be third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to take effect from date of oath, to fill an original vacancy.

Cadet Gordon Whiting MacLane to be third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to take effect from date of oath, to fill an original vacancy.

Cadet Earl Griffith Rose to be third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to take effect from date of oath, to fill an original vacancy.

Cadet Edward Hanson Smith to be third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to take effect from date of oath, to fill an original vacancy.

Cadet Elmer Fowler Stone to be third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to take effect from date of oath, to fill an original vacancy.

Cadet Carl Christian von Paulsen to be third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to take effect from date of oath, to fill an original vacancy.

Cadet John Elliot Whitbeck to be third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to take effect from date of oath, to fill an original vacancy.

JUDGE OF THE JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

J. Wilmer Latimer, of the District of Columbia, to be judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, vice William H. De Lacy, whose term has expired.

COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Cato Sells, of Cleburne, Tex., to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs, vice Robert G. Valentine, resigned.

SOLICITOR FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

John B. Densmore, of Montana, to be Solicitor of the Department of Justice for the Department of Labor, as provided for by the act approved March 4, 1913, entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor."

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Fred Robertson, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas, vice Harry J. Bone, whose term has expired.

SURVEYOR GENERAL OF WASHINGTON.

Edward A. FitzHenry, of Port Angeles, Wash., to be surveyor general of Washington, vice Edward P. Kingsbury, resigned and term expired.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Ralph R. Reed, of Buffalo, Wyo., to be register of the land office at Buffalo, vice William F. Brittain, resigned.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

J. A. Cluck to be postmaster at Bridgeport, Ala., in place of J. Percy Freeman, resigned.

H. H. Farrar to be postmaster at Blocton, Ala., in place of Newton L. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

J. A. Huggins to be postmaster at Oakman, Ala., in place of Alice A. Sartain, deceased.

Welborn V. Jones to be postmaster at Auburn, Ala., in place of Felix T. Hudson. Incumbent's commission expired June 29, 1910.

Henry C. Oswalt to be postmaster at Fairhope, Ala. Office became presidential October 1, 1911.

James H. Shepherd to be postmaster at Cordova, Ala., in place of Henry L. Jones, resigned.

ARKANSAS.

C. A. Berry to be postmaster at Huttig, Ark., in place of James U. Brown, removed.

A. W. Cammack to be postmaster at Portland, Ark., in place of J. E. Herren, deceased.

J. F. Gillespie to be postmaster at Carlisle, Ark., in place of B. D. Muzzy. Incumbent's commission expired May 18, 1913.

D. B. Thompson to be postmaster at Hope, Ark., in place of J. E. Woodson. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1912.

CALIFORNIA.

G. E. Arnold to be postmaster at Loyalton, Cal., in place of William S. Collins. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1913.

R. J. Bagby to be postmaster at Visalia, Cal., in place of Elbert S. Lamberson, removed.

Otto Haese to be postmaster at Mojave, Cal., in place of Cyrus F. Demsey, deceased.

Earle Hughes to be postmaster at Fresno, Cal., in place of John W. Short, removed.

Flora S. Knauer to be postmaster at Reedley, Cal., in place of Flora S. Knauer. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1913.

W. A. Lucas to be postmaster at Cucamonga, Cal. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Charles S. Martin to be postmaster at Sawtelle, Cal., in place of Walter Mundell, deceased.

J. M. Qualls to be postmaster at Sanger, Cal., in place of George P. Manley. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

COLORADO.

F. T. Donovan to be postmaster at Longmont, Colo., in place of Ira L. Herron. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1913.

H. E. Maxville to be postmaster at Paonia, Colo., in place of John A. Bunker, deceased.

E. F. Street to be postmaster at Englewood, Colo., in place of Mary E. Williams, resigned.

CONNECTICUT.

William I. Austin to be postmaster at Noroton Heights, Conn., in place of Jerome S. Gainer. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Thomas McGrath to be postmaster at Washington, Conn., in place of Frederick W. Wersebe. Incumbent's commission expired May 18, 1913.

Allen W. Rathbun to be postmaster at Noank, Conn., in place of George E. Andrews. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

DELAWARE.

John P. Murphy to be postmaster at New Castle, Del., in place of George W. Vantine. Incumbent's commission expired May 27, 1912.

William H. Robinson to be postmaster at Milford, Del., in place of Frank W. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1912.

FLORIDA.

Florida E. Gay to be postmaster at Lynn Haven, Fla. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

J. N. Willis to be postmaster at Williston, Fla. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

GEORGIA.

W. H. Beddingfield to be postmaster at Unadilla, Ga., in place of Adam J. Branan, removed.

R. H. Dunlap to be postmaster at Chipley, Ga., in place of Howard A. Poer, resigned.

Ralph E. McKnight to be postmaster at Senoia, Ga., in place of Hugh B. Sasser. Incumbent's commission expired May 18, 1913.

Carrie B. Padgett to be postmaster at Glennville, Ga., in place of Arthur H. Prince, resigned.

L. J. Pritchard to be postmaster at Tennille, Ga., in place of Isaac A. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired May 18, 1913.

Robert L. Stephenson to be postmaster at Royston, Ga., in place of Gordon C. Ridgway. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1912.

IDAHO.

Franklin A. Miller to be postmaster at St. Anthony, Idaho, in place of Charles C. Moore, resigned.

ILLINOIS.

E. F. Bieser to be postmaster at Nashville, Ill., in place of Samuel A. Muller, deceased.

John D. Brady to be postmaster at Buda, Ill., in place of G. B. Bushee. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1913.

E. E. Burton to be postmaster at Newton, Ill., in place of James P. Jack. Incumbent's commission expires June 9, 1913.

John C. Crawford to be postmaster at Jonesboro, Ill., in place of Philip H. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Thomas J. Cunningham to be postmaster at Taylorville, Ill., in place of William D. Hardy. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1913.

William B. Davis to be postmaster at Mount Sterling, Ill., in place of John F. Regan. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1913.

Daniel Du Russell to be postmaster at Trenton, Ill., in place of Benjamin F. Louden. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

William Foran to be postmaster at Sorento, Ill., in place of Oliver M. Edwards, resigned.

Henry Gilbert to be postmaster at Ashley, Ill., in place of Joel P. Watson. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

E. P. Kimball to be postmaster at Virden, Ill., in place of Henry Noll. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

C. M. Lewis to be postmaster at Bridgeport, Ill., in place of Clark M. Piper. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1913.

W. F. Lutyen to be postmaster at Flanagan, Ill., in place of Herman F. Mette. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

W. J. McKenna to be postmaster at Melvin, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

William McNeill to be postmaster at Prophetstown, Ill., in place of Edgar Rodee. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

John R. McWhorter to be postmaster at North Crystal Lake, Ill., in place of Albert S. Corl. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

A. E. Martin to be postmaster at Benton, Ill., in place of Harry L. Frier, resigned.

J. W. Payne to be postmaster at Lamoille, Ill., in place of Alice M. Clement. Incumbent's commission expired May 18, 1913.

Robert L. Rich to be postmaster at Cobden, Ill., in place of Henry P. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Henry S. Rolwing to be postmaster at Thebes, Ill., in place of Holly C. Marchildon. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

T. N. Sutton to be postmaster at Mason City, Ill., in place of Claude L. Stone. Incumbent's commission expired April 19, 1913.

Charles H. Ware to be postmaster at Barry, Ill., in place of Charles H. Hurt. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1913.

Lewis A. Westbrook to be postmaster at Creal Springs, Ill., in place of Robert J. Morray. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

INDIANA.

Charles A. Daniels to be postmaster at Akron, Ind., in place of Charles F. Hoover. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1913.

James P. Hawkins to be postmaster at Shoals, Ind., in place of Addison M. Catterson, resigned.

Geston P. Hunt to be postmaster at Rushville, Ind., in place of Charles A. Frazee. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

Eddy Mason to be postmaster at Hagerstown, Ind., in place of Knode D. Porter. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1913.

Quincy A. Wright to be postmaster at Fortville, Ind., in place of John C. Jenkins. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1913.

Daniel C. Zehner to be postmaster at Windfall, Ind., in place of William E. Sholty. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1913.

IOWA.

David D. Darby to be postmaster at Hamburg, Iowa, in place of W. R. Harris, resigned.

Jacob S. Forgrave to be postmaster at Farmington, Iowa, in place of J. C. Schee, removed.

Harry C. Fox to be postmaster at Monona, Iowa, in place of George H. Otis. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1913.

Edward F. Glau to be postmaster at Charter Oak, Iowa, in place of Isaiah A. Mains, resigned.

Charles W. Harris to be postmaster at Coin, Iowa, in place of Thomas R. Shaw. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

J. J. Herbster to be postmaster at Milford, Iowa, in place of E. E. Heldridge. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

Bradley B. Hopkins to be postmaster at Forest City, Iowa, in place of Eugene Secor. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1911.

Le Roy H. Lyon to be postmaster at Colfax, Iowa, in place of William W. Hawk. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1912.

Charles W. McCarty to be postmaster at Ottumwa, Iowa, in place of Frank A. Nimocks. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1913.

William F. McCarty to be postmaster at Clarence, Iowa, in place of Charles Smith. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Thomas R. McKaig to be postmaster at Corwith, Iowa, in place of S. L. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1912.

Sam T. Manatt, jr., to be postmaster at Kalona, Iowa, in place of Alfonzo Z. Rawson. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1912.

Stephen C. Maynard to be postmaster at Grand Junction, Iowa, in place of Stephen C. Maynard. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1909.

Jacob Meyer to be postmaster at Calmar, Iowa, in place of Hans Evenson. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Charles N. Nelson to be postmaster at Bedford, Iowa, in place of James P. Flick. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1913.

George A. Pruitt to be postmaster at Blanchard, Iowa, in place of James N. Hutcheson. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

Robert M. Reid to be postmaster at Lake City, Iowa, in place of J. W. Colvig. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1913.

R. C. Spencer to be postmaster at Audubon, Iowa, in place of Harper W. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Charles H. Woodard to be postmaster at Gowrie, Iowa, in place of J. E. T. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

KANSAS.

J. W. Achelpohl to be postmaster at Argonia, Kans., in place of Esther G. Colin. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1913.

Frank J. Castle, sr., to be postmaster at Norcatur, Kans., in place of Joshua M. Roney, resigned.

C. A. Hopper to be postmaster at Pratt, Kans., in place of John K. Cochran, deceased.

L. F. Niece to be postmaster at Natoma, Kans., in place of Carl C. Hunt, removed.

J. H. Slanbery to be postmaster at Attica, Kans., in place of J. H. Stanberry, to correct name.

P. D. Spellman to be postmaster at Plainville, Kans., in place of George W. Benedick, resigned.

KENTUCKY.

John Baker to be postmaster at Hazard, Ky. Office became presidential October 1, 1912.

A. K. Bowles, jr., to be postmaster at Jenkins, Ky. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

John J. Hagan to be postmaster at Corbin, Ky., in place of Isaac N. Bryant. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

LOUISIANA.

Ulysses J. Barrios to be postmaster at Lockport, La., in place of Edgar A. Barrios. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1913.

Hattie M. Cooke to be postmaster at Washington, La., in place of Jacob Plonsky. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1913.

Tina Collins to be postmaster at Bastrop, La., in place of John Dominique. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1913.

Gaston Gonsoulin to be postmaster at Patterson, La., in place of Theodore W. Schmidt. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1913.

B. H. Miller to be postmaster at Clarks, La. Office became presidential April 1, 1913.

William C. Stewart to be postmaster at Longville, La. Office became presidential April 1, 1913.

MAINE.

William R. Frost to be postmaster at Gardiner, Me., in place of George D. Libby. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

MASSACHUSETTS.

George P. Cooke to be postmaster at Milford, Mass., in place of George G. Cook, resigned.

Jesse W. Crowell to be postmaster at South Yarmouth, Mass., in place of Jesse W. Crowell. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1913.

Robert J. Crowley to be postmaster at Lowell, Mass., in place of Joseph A. Legare, resigned.

John Howe to be postmaster at North Brookfield, Mass., in place of Harold A. Foster, removed.

Thomas E. Luddy to be postmaster at East Bridgewater, Mass., in place of Joseph C. Sheehan. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

MICHIGAN.

Frank D. Baker to be postmaster at Flint, Mich., in place of Fred P. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1913.

C. D. Downing to be postmaster at St. Charles, Mich., in place of William C. Mertz. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1913.

Frank M. Ennis to be postmaster at Baraga, Mich., in place of Jennie Vaughan. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1913.

William Grant to be postmaster at Coloma, Mich., in place of John V. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired May 7, 1913.

George H. Mitchell to be postmaster at Birmingham, Mich., in place of John Hanna. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1911.

MINNESOTA.

Amos F. Avery to be postmaster at Stewart, Minn., in place of William J. Bliss, removed.

George A. Blackmun to be postmaster at Hancock, Minn., in place of John Atz. Incumbent's commission expired April 22, 1912.

H. L. Buck to be postmaster at Winona, Minn., in place of George P. Tawney. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1911.

Herman N. Dahl to be postmaster at Minneota, Minn., in place of Gunnar B. Bjornson, resigned.

E. L. Flaten to be postmaster at Moorhead, Minn., in place of Edward L. Bjorkquist, deceased.

Nels E. Hawkinson to be postmaster at Grove City, Minn. Office became presidential January 1, 1909.

Edward Hurley to be postmaster at La Crescent, Minn., in place of Everett B. Webster. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1911.

J. S. Jacobson to be postmaster at Elbow Lake, Minn., in place of Charles M. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1913.

W. P. Lemmer to be postmaster at Belgrade, Minn., in place of Ole C. Reiquam. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1913.

Walter W. Parish to be postmaster at Rushford, Minn., in place of George E. Kirkpatrick, resigned.

C. H. Phinney to be postmaster at Herman, Minn., in place of Hattie J. Hodgson. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

Joseph H. Seal to be postmaster at Melrose, Minn., in place of John Kolb. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1910.

Charles L. Skaug to be postmaster at Crookston, Minn., in place of Elias Steenerson. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

MISSISSIPPI.

Walter L. Bourland to be postmaster at Amory, Miss., in place of L. H. Tubb. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1913.

William G. Edwards to be postmaster at Enterprise, Miss., in place of William G. Edwards. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

T. M. Fuller to be postmaster at Hattiesburg, Miss., in place of Walter A. Collins. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1913.

Monroe L. Lott to be postmaster at Sumrall, Miss., in place of Monroe L. Lott. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

Charles W. McKeithen to be postmaster at Woodville, Miss., in place of Nannie B. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Minnie L. Rees to be postmaster at Purvis, Miss., in place of Benjamin A. Weems. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

L. W. Smith to be postmaster at Shubuta, Miss., in place of Thomas R. Gates. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

Charlie P. Wadley to be postmaster at Tunica, Miss., in place of William J. Brigham. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1913.

MISSOURI.

Roy C. Barnes to be postmaster at Sturgeon, Mo., in place of Willard A. Seymour. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1913.

Charles Ferguson to be postmaster at Burlington Junction, Mo., in place of John H. Bryant. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1913.

William D. Johnson to be postmaster at Crocker, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Simeon E. Juden to be postmtster at Hayti, Mo., in place of Bayless L. Guffy. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

Cora D. Perdue to be postmaster at Orrick, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1912.

William S. Walker to be postmaster at Bethany, Mo., in place of B. P. Stigler. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1913.

Willis Wiley to be postmaster at Crane, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

MONTANA.

John Dailey to be postmaster at Medicine Lake, Mont. Office became presidential October 1, 1912.

B. L. Golden to be postmaster at Sheridan, Mont., in place of Sydney L. Foster, resigned.

Harry S. Green to be postmaster at Big Sandy, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

J. S. Pearson to be postmaster at Belt, Mont., in place of Eugene R. Clingan. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1913.

NEBRASKA.

Gus Diers to be postmaster at Petersburg, Nebr., in place of Benton Cotterman. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

A. J. Ferris to be postmaster at Palmer, Nebr., in place of Orrin Peck, deceased.

B. S. Littlefield to be postmaster at Syracuse, Nebr., in place of John F. Diener. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

R. V. McPherson to be postmaster at Craig, Nebr., in place of George A. Blackstone. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1913.

Fred H. Ossenkop to be postmaster at Louisville, Nebr., in place of Wilfred C. Dorsey. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1913.

Harry N. Wallace to be postmaster at Coleridge, Nebr., in place of William A. Grant. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

NEVADA.

W. J. Bonner to be postmaster at Mason, Nev. Office became presidential April 1, 1913.

George Foley to be postmaster at Round Mountain, Nev. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Horace C. Phaneuf to be postmaster at Nashua, N. H., in place of John A. Spalding, deceased.

NEW JERSEY.

James J. Davidson to be postmaster at Swedesboro, N. J., in place of Howard V. Locke. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1913.

Harry M. Knight to be postmaster at Camden, N. J., in place of Robert L. Barber, deceased.

Charles McCue to be postmaster at Lakewood, N. J., in place of Albert M. Bradshaw. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

NEW MEXICO.

Howard S. Boise to be postmaster at Hurley, N. Mex. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

A. B. Wagner to be postmaster at Clovis, N. Mex., in place of W. A. Davis, removed.

NEW YORK.

Samuel F. Andrews to be postmaster at Homer, N. Y., in place of Zera T. Nye, removed.

Fred J. Dunham to be postmaster at Montour Falls, N. Y., in place of Charles W. Fletcher. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

J. Marvin Lotridge to be postmaster at Cincinnatus, N. Y., in place of Philo C. Wheeler. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

William E. McDonell to be postmaster at Alexandria Bay, N. Y,. in place of Elbert E. Makepeace, deceased.

Charles Ray to be postmaster at Barker, N. Y., in place of George M. Nellist. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1912.

William H. Sullivan to be postmaster at New Brighton, N. Y., in place of Thomas A. Braniff. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

Miles G. Wellman to be postmaster at Youngstown, N. Y., in place of Herbert B. Eaton, resigned.

William F. Wild to be postmaster at Lindenhurst, N. Y., in place of Frederick Torns. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

NORTH CAROLINA.

W. T. Chambers to be postmaster at Madison, N. C., in place of Thomas P. Newnam. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1912.

G. H. Currie to be postmaster at Clarkton, N. C., in place of Augusta Meares. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1912.

D. D. French to be postmaster at Lumberton, N. C., in place of Richard M. Norment, deceased.

O. K. Holding to be postmaster at Wake Forest, N. C., in place of Edward W. Timberlake. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1912.

E. T. Lee to be postmaster at Dunn, N. C., in place of Thomas J. Jackson, deceased.

R. J. Lewellyn to be postmaster at Elkin, N. C., in place of Charles N. Bodenheimer. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1913.

Leonidas M. Michaux to be postmaster at Goldsboro, N. C., in place of John F. Dobson. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1911.

Andrew Lewis Pendleton to be postmaster at Elizabeth City, N. C., in place of John P. Overman. Incumbent's commission expired May 14, 1912.

John B. Petteway to be postmaster at Jacksonville, N. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1910.

J. H. Weddington to be postmaster at Charlotte, N. C., in place of John B. Spence. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1911.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Andrew D. Cochrane to be postmaster at York, N. Dak., in place of Andrew D. Cochrane. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1913.

John Robertson to be postmaster at Willow City, N. Dak., in place of Frank Sims, resigned.

OHIO.

D. F. Akers to be postmaster at New Carlisle, Ohio, in place of E. Calvin Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1913.

T. O. Armstrong to be postmaster at Middle Point, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1912.

D. C. Brown to be postmaster at Napoleon, Ohio, in place of W. A. Ritter. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1913.

Louis C. Brown to be postmaster at Warren, Ohio, in place of George C. Braden. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1912.

J. H. Connor to be postmaster at West Union, Ohio, in place of Charles E. Frame. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1913.

Daniel D. Duty to be postmaster at Wellsville, Ohio, in place of James L. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1913.

Jacob Fraker to be postmaster at Sherwood, Ohio. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

E. E. France to be postmaster at Kent, Ohio, in place of William W. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1913.

Orange V. Fritz to be postmaster at West Alexandria, Ohio, in place of Herman C. Glander. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1913.

George H. Gee to be postmaster at Salem, Ohio, in place of William S. Atchison. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1913.

Louis J. Golling to be postmaster at Bedford, Ohio, in place of Edward H. Collins. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1913.

Elmer E. Green to be postmaster at Byesville, Ohio, in place of Charles R. Austin, deceased.

Charles H. Hackett to be postmaster at Yellow Springs, Ohio, in place of Charles H. Ellis. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1913.

C. C. Hadsell to be postmaster at Cortland, Ohio, in place of John C. Burrow. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1913.

Fred H. Johnson to be postmaster at Quaker City, Ohio, in place of William W. Dowdell. Incumbent's commission expired May 16, 1912.

J. W. Kissell to be postmaster at West Unity, Ohio, in place of William T. Orton. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1913.

W. A. Lowry to be postmaster at Urbana, Ohio, in place of Lee G. Pennock. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1913.

Hoyt B. Mahon to be postmaster at Dunkirk, Ohio, in place of Guy M. Kingsbury. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1913.

William T. Mann to be postmaster at Clyde, Ohio, in place of Charles J. Tiffany. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1913.

Harry E. Marshall to be postmaster at Bergholz, Ohio. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Edward J. Meagher to be postmaster at Glendale, Ohio, in place of Peter Schatzman. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1913.

Harley W. Purdy to be postmaster at Bradford, Ohio, in place of Albert W. McCune, resigned.

C. A. Rush to be postmaster at Wickliffe, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1912.

H. B. Sibila to be postmaster at Massillon, Ohio, in place of John Ellis. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1913.

Frank Wasmer to be postmaster at Oak Hill, Ohio, in place of John O. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1913.

George J. Windle to be postmaster at Sebring, Ohio, in place of Henry M. Larkins. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1913.

OKLAHOMA.

J. P. Brawley to be postmaster at Hastings, Okla., in place of Newton S. Figley. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1912.

J. R. Capshaw to be postmaster at Chattanooga, Okla., in place of Benjamin G. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

Mary F. Cumpston to be postmaster at Lenapah, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Sydney A. Doyle to be postmaster at Maud, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1912.

A. Tarlton Embree to be postmaster at Henryetta, Okla., in place of Olin W. Meacham. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

Jesse L. Gallaway to be postmaster at Foss, Okla., in place of Charles F. Hartronft. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

Morris D. Gibbins to be postmaster at Fort Sill, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Andrew J. Grayson to be postmaster at Blanchard, Okla., in place of Robert E. L. McLain, resigned.

George H. Hancock to be postmaster at Welch, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Edward Hensley to be postmaster at Mountain Park, Okla. Office became presidential October 1, 1911.

Della Hickman to be postmaster at Spiro, Okla., in place of Howard E. Wallace. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1913.

John Huskey to be postmaster at Fort Towson, Okla., in place of Thomas Fennell. Incumbent's commission expired May 7, 1913.

George P. Lawson to be postmaster at Coweta, Okla., in place of Downey Milburne. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1912.

Robert Burton Mayfield to be postmaster at Blair, Okla., in place of Jack Fletcher, resigned.

O. P. Ramsey to be postmaster at Kiefer, Okla., in place of N. H. Hibbard. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1913.

N. L. Sanders to be postmaster at Broken Arrow, Okla., in place of William T. Brooks. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

Bettie Smythe to be postmaster at Marlow, Okla., in place of Ransom H. Drewry, deceased.

C. E. Steele to be postmaster at Sayre, Okla., in place of Benjamin F. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1912.

Galen B. Townsend to be postmaster at Mangum, Okla., in place of Harry L. Crittenden, deceased.

Simon Peter Treadwell to be postmaster at Ryan, Okla., in place of Mary H. McBrian. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1913.

P. W. Tucker to be postmaster at Comanche, Okla., in place of George W. Mellish. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1913.

Henry T. Vanderford to be postmaster at Sentinel, Okla., in place of David N. Smith, resigned.

G. B. Williams to be postmaster at Manitou, Okla., in place of Jay Collins. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

OREGON.

Archie F. Eaton to be postmaster at Sheridan, Oreg., in place of Lee Rowell. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1913.

R. L. Guiss to be postmaster at Woodburn, Oreg., in place of William P. Pennebaker. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1910.

John Larkin to be postmaster at Newberg, Oreg., in place of C. B. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1913.

O. J. Skiff to be postmaster at Union, Oreg., in place of Marion F. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1912.

Guy E. Tex to be postmaster at Central Point, Oreg., in place of Guy E. Tex. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1913.

Lewis Ulrich to be postmaster at Jacksonville, Oreg., in place of Mabel Miller, deceased.

Ben Weathers to be postmaster at Enterprise, Oreg., in place of Ben Weathers. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Mamie Winters to be postmaster at Burns, Oreg., in place of John E. Loggan. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Earl L. Anderson to be postmaster at Parnassus, Pa., in place of Renwick Rowan, deceased.

Margaret W. Buchanan to be postmaster at Scalp Level, Pa., in place of Margaret W. Buchanan. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

Fletcher C. George to be postmaster at Lilly, Pa., in place of John A. Leap. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1911.

Harry Hagan to be postmaster at Uniontown, Pa., in place of William W. Greene. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1912.

Bernhart Helbling to be postmaster at Aspinwall, Pa., in place of Samuel R. McMorran, resigned.

James Kingsbury to be postmaster at Pottsville, Pa., in place of Frank W. Leib. Incumbent's commission expired April 10, 1913.

Robert W. Lange to be postmaster at Belle Vernon, Pa., in place of Frank A. Springer. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1913.

John S. Leiby to be postmaster at Newport, Pa., in place of Lehman E. Gantt. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1913.

R. J. McGee to be postmaster at Dunbar, Pa., in place of William C. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1913.

Edward Raker to be postmaster at Shamokin, Pa., in place of John W. Zerbe. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1913.

Albert E. Rumberger to be postmaster at Patton, Pa., in place of Edward Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1912.

James F. Singer to be postmaster at New Freedom, Pa., in place of John H. Grove. Incumbent's commission expired May 14, 1912.

J. H. Smith to be postmaster at Yardley, Pa., in place of Samuel B. Willard. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1913.

W. H. Strauss to be postmaster at Johnstown, Pa., in place of Levi J. Foust. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1913.

A. J. Sweeny to be postmaster at Gallitzin, Pa., in place of Matthew P. Frederick. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

E. C. Bethea to be postmaster at Latta, S. C., in place of John L. Dew. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1912.

James A. Cannon to be postmaster at Fountain Inn, S. C., in place of James A. Cannon. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

Pearle H. Padget to be postmaster at Saluda, S. C. Office became presidential April 1, 1913.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Henry B. Baer to be postmaster at Bowdle, S. Dak., in place of Hiram A. Mason, resigned.

F. B. Boyle to be postmaster at Corsica, S. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

A. A. Closson to be postmaster at White Lake, S. Dak., in place of Albert H. J. George. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1913.

D. J. Delaney to be postmaster at Custer, S. Dak., in place of Joseph Kubler. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1913.

Michael Dougherty to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, S. Dak., in place of Edward C. Bromwell. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1913.

E. J. Engler to be postmaster at Ipswich, S. Dak., in place of Arthur B. Chubbuck. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1913.

Stephen Jones to be postmaster at Canton, S. Dak., in place of Thomas T. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1912.

Albert Lewis to be postmaster at Conde, S. Dak., in place of Fannie F. Holliday. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

J. B. Lundy to be postmaster at Mellette, S. Dak., in place of Arthur W. Jeffries, resigned.

M. E. McCormick to be postmaster at Tyndall, S. Dak., in place of Charles H. Stilwell. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1912.

J. E. McNeil to be postmaster at Wessington, S. Dak., in place of Charles N. Curtiss. Incumbent's commission expired April 19, 1913.

Carl Oldewurtel to be postmaster at Freeman, S. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

T. J. Sullivan to be postmaster at Iroquois, S. Dak., in place of Frank E. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1913.

W. M. Walters to be postmaster at Fairfax, S. Dak., in place of William H. Barger, resigned.

P. G. Williams to be postmaster at Montrose, S. Dak., in place of William P. Antrim. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1911.

Charles L. Wohlheter to be postmaster at White, S. Dak., in place of Sumner E. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1913.

TENNESSEE.

A. B. Cook to be postmaster at Woodbury, Tenn., in place of William Brewer, declined.

J. N. Maxwell to be postmaster at Somerville, Tenn., in place of W. S. Latta, removed.

O. L. McCallum to be postmaster at Henderson, Tenn., in place of William M. Bray. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1912.

Adam S. Nichols to be postmaster at Dandridge, Tenn. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

I. R. Roberts to be postmaster at Erwin, Tenn., in place of Grover S. McNabb, removed.

R. L. Strong to be postmaster at Collierville, Tenn., in place of Jasper N. Fitzwater. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

TEXAS.

Pope Allen to be postmaster at Valley Mills, Tex., in place of Charlie Simmons, removed.

E. B. Barnes to be postmaster at Snyder, Tex., in place of Kate Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1912.

William C. Boyett to be postmaster at College Station, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1912.

Minnie Burke to be postmaster at Blossom, Tex., in place of Newton H. Eades, deceased.

P. H. Clements to be postmaster at Goldthwaite, Tex., in place of Andrew J. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

C. S. Davis to be postmaster at Ranger, Tex., in place of Joseph W. Barber. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

J. J. Erwin to be postmaster at Ballinger, Tex., in place of Henry A. Cady. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1910.

M. Ezell to be postmaster at Timpson, Tex., in place of Anderson C. Vinson. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

W. D. Foster to be postmaster at Miles, Tex., in place of John D. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

Sam K. Hailey to be postmaster at Conroe, Tex., in place of William L. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1913.

John M. Hembree to be postmaster at Cross Plains, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1912.

William E. Jenkins to be postmaster at Smithville, Tex., in place of Lottie E. Turney. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1913.

W. J. Lamb to be postmaster at Mabank, Tex., in place of Louise A. Ackerman. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1913.

S. S. McClendon to be postmaster at Tyler, Tex., in place of Jeff D. Burns, deceased.

R. K. McCleskey to be postmaster at Rule, Tex., in place of James E. Lindsey. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

P. B. McNatt to be postmaster at Arlington, Tex., in place of James I. Carter. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1912.

C. E. Maxwell to be postmaster at Strawn, Tex., in place of Robert B. Gordon. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

B. F. Mitchell to be postmaster at Gainesville, Tex., in place of Jerra L. Hickson. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1913.

John W. Person to be postmaster at Colorado, Tex., in place of Prince A. Hazzard. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Shaw D. Ray to be postmaster at Winnsboro, Tex., in place of George C. Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

S. P. Robbins to be postmaster at Lubbock, Tex., in place of S. T. Stubbs. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1913.

J. Wiley Taylor to be postmaster at Midland, Tex., in place of Theodore Ray. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1910.

S. W. Thomas to be postmaster at Aspermont, Tex., in place of George A. Gray, removed.

Shadrac S. Tullos to be postmaster at Grand Prairie, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1912.

Young C. White to be postmaster at Hamlin, Tex., in place of W. L. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

VERMONT.

A. H. Gleason to be postmaster at St. Johnsbury, Vt., in place of Arthur F. Stone. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1913.

VIRGINIA.

George E. Cunningham to be postmaster at Buena Vista, Va., in place of James M. Updike. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1912.

R. Henry Cobb to be postmaster at Franklin, Va., in place of F. W. Rose. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

W. E. Hailey to be postmaster at Keysville, Va., in place of Frederick I. Hanmer. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

H. Lester Hooker to be postmaster at Stuart, Va., in place of Joseph E. Rangeley. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1913.

William F. Kennedy to be postmaster at Kenbridge, Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

J. S. Lauck to be postmaster at Shenandoah, Va., in place of Robert S. Pritchett. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1912.

J. F. Lowman to be postmaster at Hot Springs, Va., in place of Arthur M. Stimson. Incumbent's commission expired June 29, 1910.

Sadie A. Southall to be postmaster at Amelia Court House, Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1910.

W. W. Tuck to be postmaster at Virgilina, Va., in place of William D. Amis. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1912.

Charles F. Russell to be postmaster at Herndon, Va., in place of Harry A. Sager. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

E. L. Toone to be postmaster at Boydton, Va., in place of Charles Alexander, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA.

James Brady to be postmaster at Barboursville, W. Va., in place of James H. McComas, resigned.

Floyd J. Brown to be postmaster at Bluefield, W. Va., in place of Hugh I. Shott, resigned.

Thomas F. Henritze to be postmaster at Welch, W. Va., in place of J. W. Edwards. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Benjamin F. Patton to be postmaster at Harrisville, W. Va., in place of Romeo H. Freer, deceased.

Andrew Price to be postmaster at Marlinton, W. Va., in place of Andrew Price. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1913.

Robert E. Wood to be postmaster at Charleston, W. Va., in place of J. F. Hudson. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1913.

WISCONSIN.

George E. Forward to be postmaster at Brandon, Wis., in place of Frank C. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1912.

John Henninger to be postmaster at Markesan, Wis., in place of Ernest S. Mottram, resigned.

John S. Meldeen to be postmaster at Palmyra, Wis., in place of Martin J. Gosa. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1913.

F. A. Partlow to be postmaster at Clear Lake, Wis., in place of Thomas Stout, jr. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

William J. Riedner to be postmaster at Columbus, Wis., in place of Herman M. Blumenthal. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Paul E. Stiehm to be postmaster at Johnson Creek, Wis., in place of W. H. Schallert. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1913.

George Wildermuth to be postmaster at Sheboygan Falls, Wis., in place of George A. Robbins. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1912.

WYOMING.

J. R. Baird to be postmaster at Powell, Wyo. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Juan Jenkins to be postmaster at Upton, Wyo. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 29, 1913.

FIRST ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Andrieus A. Jones to be First Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Harry J. Kelly to be register of the land office at Lewistown, Mont.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Boatswain Thomas F. Greene to be a chief boatswain.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

D. Hayden Linebaugh to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Dora G. Wendel, Tallassee.

CALIFORNIA.

Lutie M. Anderson, Roseville.
Luke F. Morgan, East Auburn.

FLORIDA.

John W. Alvarez, Starke.

GEORGIA.

Jackson C. Atkinson, Midville.
Charles Beaty, Moultrie.
Minnie E. Hogan, Collegepark.
Charles Jackson, Palmetto.
John F. Jenkins, Ashburn.
William F. Jones, Hogansville.
Vivian McCurdy, Stone Mountain.
B. A. Parker, Whigham.
James P. Stewart, Tallulah Falls.
J. L. Wells, Smithville.

ILLINOIS.

James E. Caley, Mackinaw.
Daniel A. Grady, Waukegan.
William F. Hagebusch, Okawville.
George Kirkbride, Vermont.
J. P. McPherren, Homer.
B. E. Prater, Cowden.
H. Poffenberger, Freeport.
William A. Reeds, Oakland.
George Reuss, Bethany.
A. O. Rupp, Chenoa.
O. Cammie Seeders, Palestine.
J. H. Sipe, Tremont.

INDIANA.

Oliver J. Chapman, Eaton.
David D. Corn, Petersburg.
Warren L. Dick, Pierceton.
Frank Fletcher, Wakarusa.
Walter D. Hunt, Gas City.
Harry Hunter, Ossian.
Charles C. Leisure, Earl Park.
Erastus C. Palmer, National Military Home.
Charles M. Snepp, Kewanna.
William J. Ten Barge, Poseyville.
Lewis Walker, Loogootee.

KANSAS.

E. J. Buckley, Marion.
M. V. Dunlap, Osawatomie.
S. J. Hampshire, Overbrook.
C. A. Hopper, Pratt.
William McHaley, Toronto.

LOUISIANA.

J. W. Bouanchaud, New Roads.
Carl C. Brown, Haynesville.
George D. Domingeaux, Breaux Bridge.

MICHIGAN.

William J. Gleason, Ludington.
Mortimer D. Snow, Standish.

MISSISSIPPI.

W. W. Cain, West.
C. E. McAlexander, Holly Springs.
Rosa Mayers, Shelby.
Fielden H. Mitts, Tupelo.
Marshall Spiva, Ackerman.
Mary E. Tubb, Aberdeen.

MISSOURI.

C. W. Brady, Independence.
Alvin Chapman, Senath.
P. L. Connolly, Norwood.
Walter L. Cox, Osceola.
Harry R. Culp, Alton.
S. D. McMillen, Lockwood.
James E. Phillips, Meadville.
G. W. Summers, Hartville.
H. J. Von Gremp, Dixon.
M. J. Watkins, Bourbon.

NEW JERSEY.

Joseph Atkinson, Freehold.
John V. L. Booraem, Milltown.
Frank Hampton, Sea Bright.
Peter H. S. Hendricks, New Brunswick.
Frank Pittenger, Red Bank.
John F. Ryan, Woodbridge.
Daniel W. Sheldon, jr., Franklin Furnace.

NORTH CAROLINA.

M. M. Faison, Roanoke Rapids.
R. S. Galloway, Winston-Salem.
W. E. Gary, Henderson.
Ira T. Hunt, Kittrell.
J. E. Ligon, Lillington.
Elijah B. Perry, jr., Littleton.
N. G. Rowland, West Raleigh.
George L. Whitfield, Franklinton.
J. H. Weddington, Charlotte.

OHIO.

W. F. Uhle, Attica.
Harmon Wensinger, Fremont.

OKLAHOMA.

Cassius L. Byrne, Ardmore.
K. C. Cox, Granite.
Samuel M. Flournoy, Elk City.
J. T. Holley, Stigler.
J. F. Larecy, Hugo.
T. I. Truscott, Olustee.

TEXAS.

R. L. Bronaugh, Edna.
C. J. Davis, Madisonville.
A. Y. Donegan, Nacogdoches.
Ada Duffey, Emory.
Henry Eilers, jr., Schulenburg.
S. A. Hill, Bellville.
Jean Hornbuckle, Venus.
G. D. Martin, Donna.
R. A. Motley, Overton.
D. U. Ramsay, Gonzales.
J. M. Richards, Weatherford.
O. B. Slayden, Rusk.
W. W. Sloan, Falfurrias.
John L. Spurlin, Hamilton.
C. C. Teas, Karnes City.
W. W. Trow, Trinity.
J. A. White, Goliad.
J. C. Woodworth, Cuero.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Sarah K. Rush, Newell.

WITHDRAWALS.

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate May 29, 1913.

SURVEYOR GENERAL OF WASHINGTON.

Richard Roediger, sent to the Senate May 1 for said office, in view of his death.

POSTMASTER.

KANSAS.

A. C. Hopper to be postmaster at Pratt, in the State of Kansas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *May 29, 1913.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee for the deep and ever-abiding gratitude which comes welling up from our hearts at this season of the year for our sacred dead. The sound of drum, the clash of arms, the roar of battle is hushed. In the silent bivouac of the dead they sleep "on fame's eternal camping ground." May the winds blow gently and the sun shine softly over their tents of green. We thank Thee that the Nation has not forgotten. They live in the hearts of the true; they live in the deeds they wrought. Their graves we strew with flowers; for them we sing our songs of praise. Long may their memory live, and longer yet their deeds inspire "our free-born sons with patriot fire"; and long may Old Glory float in peace over a people whose God is the Lord. So may Thy blessing be upon us, so may Thy providence guide us, by the memories of the past and the glories of the present, to a faithful service as citizens of a Republic whose genius is peace, happiness, and good will to all mankind.

Once more the mysterious visitor we call death has taken from this legislative body one of its Members, who promised faithful and efficient service to his State and Nation. Comfort us with the blessed hope of the immortality of the soul; and be very near to the stricken wife, that she may look forward to an everlasting reunion in a realm beyond the confines of earth. And glory and honor and praise be Thine, in the spirit of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 27, 1913, was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. At what time?

The SPEAKER. At the regular time, 12 o'clock.

There was no objection.

WATER SUPPLY OF LOS ANGELES AND SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in parallel columns, the bill H. R. 4319 and the grant to Los Angeles, so as to show a comparison of the two, with a summary of points of difference between the two bills, so that they may be used by Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to print certain bills in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Reserving the right to object, are these bills that have been introduced?

Mr. RAKER. One is a bill that has been introduced and the other is an act passed in 1906. I want the RECORD to show, in parallel columns, the difference between the Los Angeles act and the San Francisco bill, so as to avoid any question hereafter, and so that it may be easily accessible.

Mr. MANN. Does this relate to the Los Angeles Exposition proposition?

Mr. RAKER. No; this relates to the water supply of San Francisco.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The document referred to is as follows:

A statement showing that the proposed grant to San Francisco of right of way privileges through the public lands for the purpose of a municipal water supply, as contained in House bill 4319, introduced in the House of Representatives April 25, 1913, is substantially the same as the grant made by Congress to the city of Los Angeles for its municipal water supply. (U. S. Stat. L. 1905–1907, vol. 34, pt. 1, p. 801.)

(Important changes and new matter in italics.)

GRANT TO SAN FRANCISCO. (As amended.)	GRANT TO LOS ANGELES.
Granting to the city and county of San Francisco certain rights of way in, over, and through certain public lands, the Yosemite National Park, and Stanislaus National Forest, and certain lands in the Yosemite National Park, the Stanislaus National Forest, and the public lands in the State of California, and for other purposes.	An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the city of Los Angeles, Cal., certain public lands in California; and granting rights in, over, and through the Sierra Forest Reserve, the Santa Barbara Forest Reserve, and the San Gabriel Timber Land Reserve, Cal., to the city of Los Angeles, Cal.
SECTION 1. *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That there is hereby granted to the city and county of San Francisco, a municipal corporation in the State of California, all necessary rights of way, not to exceed 250 feet in width, in, over, and through the public lands of the United States in the counties of Tuolumne, Stanislaus, San Joaquin, and Alameda, *in* the State of California, and in, over, and through the Yosemite National Park and the Stanislaus National Forest, *or portions thereof lying within the said counties,* for the purpose of constructing, operating, and maintaining *aqueducts,* canals, ditches, pipes, pipe lines, flumes, tunnels, and conduits for conveying water to the city and county of San Francisco *and such other municipalities on the Bay of San Francisco or adjacent thereto which may, with the consent of the city and county of San Francisco or in accordance with the laws of the State of California, hereafter participate in the beneficial use of the rights and privileges granted by this act,* and for the purpose of constructing, operating, and maintaining power and electric plants, poles, and lines for generation and sale and distribution of electric energy; *also for the purpose of constructing, operating, and maintaining telephone and telegraph lines, and for the purpose of*	SECTION 1. *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That there is hereby granted to the city of Los Angeles, Cal., a municipal corporation of the State of California, all necessary rights of way, not to exceed 250 feet in width, over and through the public lands of the United States, in the counties of Inyo, Kern, and Los Angeles, State of California, and over and through the Sierra and Santa Barbara Forest Reserves and the San Gabriel Timber Land Reserve, in said State, for the purpose of constructing, operating, and maintaining canals, ditches, pipes and pipe lines, flumes, tunnels, and conduits for conveying water to the city of Los Angeles, and for the purpose of constructing, operating, and maintaining power and electric plants, poles, and lines for the generation and distribution of electric energy, together with such lands as *the Secretary of the Interior may deem to be* actually necessary for power houses, diverting and storage dams and reservoirs, and necessary buildings and structures to be used in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of said water, power, and electric plants whenever said city shall have filed, as hereinafter provided, *and the same shall have been approved by the Secretary of the Interior,* a map or maps showing the boundaries, locations, and

constructing, operating, and maintaining roads, trails, bridges, tramways, railroads, and other means of locomotion, transportation, and communication, together with such lands in said counties and also within the Yosemite National Park and the Stanislaus National Forest, *irrespective of the width or extent of said lands,* as may be actually necessary for *surface or underground* reservoirs, diverting and storage dams, power houses, and necessary buildings and structures to be used in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of said water, power, and electric plants, *telephone and telegraph lines, and such means of locomotion, transportation, and communication as may be established: Provided,* That said city and county of San Francisco shall file, as hereinafter provided, a map or maps showing the boundaries, location, and extent of said proposed rights of way and lands for the purposes hereinabove set forth, *together with the right to take, free of cost, from the public lands, the Yosemite National Park, and the Stanislaus National Forest stone, earth, gravel, sand, tufa, and other material actually necessary to be used in the construction of its said water, power, and electric plants, and its said telephone and telegraph lines, and its said means of locomotion, transportation, or communication under such conditions as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, respectively, for the protection of the Yosemite National Park and the Stanislaus National Forest.*

SEC. 2. That within *three* years after the passage of this act said city and county of San Francisco shall file with the registers of the United States land offices in the districts where said rights of way or lands are located a map or maps showing the boundaries, locations, and extent of said proposed rights of way *required* for the purposes stated in section 1 of this act; but no *permanent* construction work shall be commenced on said land until such maps shall have been filed, as herein provided, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided, however,* That any changes of location of said rights of way *or lands* may be made by said city and county of San Francisco *before the final completion of any of said work and operations so permitted in section 1 hereof* by filing such additional map or maps as may be necessary to show such changes of location, said additional map or maps to be filed in the same manner as the original map or maps, and the approval by the Secretary of the Interior of extent of said proposed rights of way for the purposes hereinabove set forth.

SEC. 2. That within one year after the passage of this act the city of Los Angeles shall file with the registers of the United States land offices in the districts where the lands traversed by said rights of way are located a map or maps showing the boundaries, locations, and extent of said proposed rights of way, for the purposes stated in section 1 of this act; but no construction work shall be commenced on said land until said map or maps have been filed as herein provided and approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided, however,* That any changes of location of said rights of way may be made by said city of Los Angeles within two years after the filing of said map or maps by filing such additional map or maps as may be necessary to show such changes of location, said additional map or maps to be filed in the same manner as the original map or maps; and the approval of the Secretary of the Interior of said map or maps showing changes of location of said rights of way shall

said maps showing changes of location of said rights of way or lands shall operate as an abandonment by the city and county of San Francisco to the extent of such change or changes of the rights of way *or lands* indicated on the original maps: *And provided further,* That any rights inuring to the city and county of San Francisco under this act shall, on the approval of the map or maps referred to herein by the Secretary of the Interior, relate back to the date of the filing of said map or maps with the register of the United States land office, as provided herein, *or to the date of the filing of such maps as they may be copies of, as provided for herein: And provided further, That with reference to any maps heretofore filed by said city and county of San Francisco with the Department of the Interior or with the Department of Agriculture, or with any officer of either of said departments, that the provisions hereof will be considered complied with by the filing by said city and county of San Francisco of copies of any of such maps with the register of the United States land office, as provided for herein.*

SEC. 3. That the rights of way hereby granted shall not be effective over any lands upon which homestead, mining, or other existing valid claims shall have been filed or made *and which now in law constitute prior rights to any claims of the city and county of San Francisco,* until the city and county of San Francisco shall have procured proper relinquishment of all such entries and claims, or acquired title by due process of law and just compensation paid to said entrymen or claimants, and caused proper evidence of such fact to be filed with the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided, however,* That this act shall not apply to any lands embraced in rights of way heretofore approved under any act of Congress *for the benefit of any parties other than said city and county of San Francisco* or its predecessors in interest, and that no private right, title, interest, or claim of any person, persons, or corporations in or to any of the lands traversed by or embraced in the rights of way or lands *granted to said city and county under this act* shall be interfered with or abridged, except with the consent of the owner or owners, or claimant or claimants thereof, or by due process of law and just compensation paid to such owner or owners or claimants.

SEC. 4. That the city and county of San Francisco shall conform to all regulations adopted and prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior gov-

operate as an abandonment by the city of Los Angeles to the extent of such change or changes of the rights of way indicated on the original maps: *And provided further,* That any rights inuring to the city of Los Angeles under this act shall, on the approval of the map or maps, referred to herein, by the Secretary of the Interior, relate back to the date of the filing of said map or maps with the register of the United States land office, as provided herein.

SEC. 3. That the rights of way hereby granted shall not be effective over any land upon which homestead, mining, or other existing valid claims shall have been filed or made until the city of Los Angeles shall have procured proper relinquishments of all such entries and claims, or acquired title by due process of law and just compensation paid to said entrymen or claimants and caused proper evidence of such fact to be filed with the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided, however,* That this act shall not apply to any lands embraced in rights of way heretofore approved under any act of Congress, *nor affect the adjudication of any pending applications for rights of way by the owner or owners of existing water rights,* and that no private right, title, interest, or claim of any person, persons, or corporation, in or to any of the lands traversed by or embraced in said right of way shall be interfered with or abridged, except with the consent of the owner or owners or claimant or claimants thereof, or by due process of law, and just compensation paid to such owner or claimant.

SEC. 4. That the city of Los Angeles shall conform to all regulations adopted and prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture governing the for-

erning the Yosemite National Park and by the Secretary of Agriculture governing the Stanislaus National Forest, and shall not take, cut, or destroy any timber within the Yosemite National Park or the Stanislaus National Forest, except such as may be actually necessary to remove to construct its said reservoir, dams, power plants, *water power and electric works*, and other structures above mentioned, *or is actually necessary to be used in the construction thereof;* and it shall pay to the *United States* the full value of all timber and wood cut, *injured*, or destroyed on *or adjacent* to any of the rights of way and lands, as required by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided*, That the city and county of San Francisco shall construct and maintain in good repair bridges or other practicable crossings over its rights of way within the Stanislaus National Forest when and where directed in writing by the Forester of the United States Department of Agriculture, and elsewhere on public lands along the line of said works, and within the Yosemite National Park, as required by the Secretary of the Interior, and said grantee shall, as said waterworks are completed, if directed by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture or the Forester of the Department of Agriculture, construct and maintain along each side of said right of way a lawful fence, as defined by the laws of the State of California, with such lanes or crossings for domestic animals as the aforesaid officers shall require: *Provided further*, That the city and county of San Francisco shall clear its rights of way within the Yosemite National Park and the Stanislaus National Forest of any débris or inflammable material as directed by the Secretary of the Interior and the Forester of the Department of Agriculture, respectively, and said city and county shall allow any road or trail which it may construct over the public lands, the Yosemite National Park, or the Stanislaus National Forest to be freely used by the officers of the Interior Department, the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, and by the public, and shall allow to officers of the Interior Department *and to the Forest Service*, for official business only, the free use of any telephone or telegraph lines, or equipment, or railroads it may construct and maintain within the Yosemite National Park and the Stanislaus National Forest, or on the public lands, together with the right to connect with any such telephone or telegraph lines private telephone wires for the exclusive use of the said Interior Department and the said Forest Service.

est reserves, and shall not take, cut, or destroy any timber within the forest reserves, except such as may be actually necessary to remove to construct its power plants and *structures, poles, and flumes*, storage dams and reservoirs, and it shall pay to the *Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture*, the full value of all timber and wood cut, *used*, or destroyed on any of the rights of way and lands within forest reserves hereby granted: *Provided further*, That the city shall construct and maintain in good repair bridges or other practicable crossings over its rights of way within the forest reserves when and where directed in writing by the Forester of the United States Department of Agriculture, and elsewhere on public lands along the line of said works as required by the Secretary of the Interior, and said grantee shall, as said waterworks are completed, if directed by the Secretary of the Interior, construct and maintain along each side of said right of way a lawful fence as defined by the laws of the State of California, with such lanes or crossings for domestic animals as the aforesaid officers shall require: *Provided further*, That the city of Los Angeles shall clear its rights of way within forest reserves of any débris or inflammable material as directed by the Forester of the United States Department of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That the said city shall allow any wagon road which it may construct within forest reserves to be freely used by forest officers and the officers of the Interior Department and by the public, and shall allow to the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture and to the officers of the Interior Department, for official business only, the free use of any telephone, telegraph, *or electric railroads* it may construct and maintain within the forest reserves or on the public lands, together with the right to connect with any such telephone lines, private telephone wires, for the exclusive use of said Forest Service or of the Interior Department: *And provided further, That the Forest Service may, within forest reserves, protect*, use and administer said land and resources within said rights of way under forest-reserve laws and regulations, but in so doing must not interfere with the full enjoyments of the right of way by the city of Los Angeles: *And provided further*, That in the event that the Secretary of the Interior shall abandon the project known as the Owens River project for the irrigation of lands in Inyo County, Cal., under the act of June 17, 1902, the city of Los Angeles, in said State, is to pay to the Secretary of the Interior, for the account of the reclamation fund established by said act, the amount expended for preliminary surveys, examinations, and river measurements, not exceeding $14,000, and in consideration of said payment the said city of Los Angeles is to have the benefit of the use of the maps and field notes resulting from said surveys, examinations, and river measurements, and the preference right to acquire at any time within three years from the approval of this act any lands now reserved by the United States under the terms of said reclamation act in connection with said project necessary for storage or right-of-way purposes upon filing with the register and receiver of the land office in the land district where any such lands sought to be acquired are situated a map showing the lands desired to be acquired, and upon the approval of said map or maps by the Secretary of the Interior, and upon the payment of $1.25 per acre to the receiver of said land office, title to said land so reserved and filed on shall vest in said city of Los Angeles, and such title shall be and remain in said city only for the purposes aforesaid, and shall revert to the United States in the event of the abandonment thereof for the purposes aforesaid: *Provided, however*, That the terms of this act shall not apply to any lands upon Bishop Creek or its branches in said county of Inyo.

SEC. 5. That all lands over which the rights of way mentioned in this act shall pass shall be disposed of subject to such easements: *Provided, however*, That the construction of the aforesaid works *shall be diligently prosecuted to completion;* and if there shall be a cessation of such construction for a period of three consecutive years, then all rights hereunder shall be forfeited to the United States, *unless the Secretary of the Interior shall find that the construction of the works has been delayed or prevented by the act of God or the public enemy, or by engineering difficulties that could not reasonably have been foreseen, or by other special and peculiar causes beyond the control of said city and county of San Francisco.*

SEC. 5. That all lands over which the rights of way mentioned in this act shall pass shall be disposed of subject to such easements: *Provided, however*, That if construction of said *waterworks shall not have been begun in good faith within five years from the date of approval of this act*, or if after such period of five years there shall be a cessation of such construction for a period of three consecutive years, then all rights hereunder shall be forfeited to the United States.

SEC. 6. That the city and county of San Francisco is prohibited from ever selling or letting to any corporation or individual, except a municipality *or municipal water district or irrigation district*, the right for such corporation or individual to sell or sublet the water sold or given to it or him by the said city and county.

SEC. 6. That the city of Los Angeles is prohibited from ever selling or letting to any corporation or individual, except a municipality, the right for such corporation or individual to sell or sublet the water sold or given to it or him by the city.

SEC. 7. That the right to amend, alter, or repeal this act at any time is hereby reserved.

Summary of points in which the San Francisco bill (H. R. 4319) differs from the Los Angeles act.

(Page 2, line 7.)

The San Francisco bill provides in distinction from the Los Angeles act that—

1. Other cities on San Francisco Bay be allowed use of water with San Francisco's consent or by State law.

The city's plans have always contemplated that the development of the Hetch Hetchy source of water supply shall be for the benefit of all the cities about the Bay of San Francisco. The presentation of the city's case at the hearing before the Secretary of the Interior last year, as shown by the report of the advisory board of Army engineers, showed that the Freeman plan provided for the supplying of all the cities about the bay for a century hence.

(Page 2, line 14.)

2. Rights of way granted for telephone and telegraph lines, roads, trails, bridges, tramways, and railroads for use in conjunction with main purposes.

Practically the same thing is contemplated in the Los Angeles act, where, in section 4, it is provided, as in section 4 of the San Francisco grant, that free use to the Federal departments for official business shall be allowed of any telephones, telegraphs, or railroads constructed on public lands.

(Page 2, line 21.)

3. Such lands be granted for the enumerated purposes as "may be actually necessary" instead of such as the "Secretary of the Interior may deem to be actually necessary."

This is carrying out the intent of the Los Angeles grant; that is, it is, of course, intended that Congress make a grant of such lands as are actually necessary for the enumerated purposes.

(Page 2, line 21.)

4. Such lands to be granted, not for the aqueduct right of way, but for reservoirs, buildings, and so forth, "irrespective of the width or extent of said lands."

This is the clear intent of the Los Angeles grant, the limitation "not to exceed 250 feet in width," which is in both grants, being intended for the canals, ditches, pipe lines, and so forth. A reservoir, such as the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir, would be at some points from half a mile to a mile wide.

(Page 3, line 7.)

5. The taking from the public lands of stone, earth, gravel, sand, tufa, and other material actually necessary for construction purposes under conditions to be fixed by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture is permitted.

This is manifestly necessary.

(Page 3, line 18.)

6. Three years instead of one be allowed for filing maps.

This is simply a precaution taken, owing to material changes which the city has in the past found it necessary to make in its plans for a municipal water supply.

(Page 3, line 24.)

7. Only permanent construction work be prohibited prior to approval of maps.

San Francisco has already been granted permission by Secretary of Interior Lane, under the order of March 12, 1913, to do preliminary work.

(Page 4, line 22.)

8. Where maps have already been filed, copies of such maps may be filed in compliance with requirements of the act.

San Francisco has filed several maps, including those filed early in 1913, in conformity with the request of Secretary of Interior Fisher, and it is desired that, with reference to any such maps, the filing of copies thereof may be a sufficient compliance with the act of Congress.

(Page 4, line 5.)

9. Changes in location may be made at any time before final completion of the works instead of within two years.

It may be that a change in location may be desired by the city, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, at a time subsequent to two years after the filing of an original map. So long as this is prior to the completion of the works and is approved by the Secretary of the Interior, it is desired that the city have permission to make any such changes.

(Page 5, line 8.)

10. Existing claims prior to the city's claims shall be protected.

This is the clear intent of the Los Angeles grant.

(Page 5, line 18.)

11. Act shall not apply to lands embraced in rights of way heretofore granted to any parties other than city of San Francisco and its predecessors in interest.

The city has acquired several right-of-way privileges by purchase, some of which have been recognized by the Department of the Interior, as the Cherry Valley Reservoir site, the city being the successor in interest to the Sierra Ditch & Water Co.

(Page 5, line 17.)

12. Omits provisions that adjudication of pending applications shall not be affected.

It has been decided by the Forestry Bureau that property of application by an individual as against a city does not necessarily work to the disadvantage of a city.

(Page 6, line 16.)

13. City shall pay the United States for timber "cut, injured, or destroyed, on or adjacent to lands or rights of way as required by Secretary of Interior or Secretary of Agriculture" instead of being required to pay the Forest Service for "timber and wood cut, used, or destroyed on any of the rights of way and lands within the forest reserves hereby granted."

The city is required to pay for all timber cut, rather than only for timber cut on the rights of way, as in the Los Angeles act.

(Page 7, line 25.)

14. Omits local provisions applying to Owens River project.

This was of interest to Los Angeles only.

(Page 8, line 4.)

15. Work must be "diligently prosecuted to completion," instead of that it must begin within five years from date.

It is impracticable to specify exact dates when there is always a possibility of delay on account of litigation, etc.

(Page 8, line 8.)

16. Secretary of Interior may waive forfeiture for noncompliance with conditions of grant if he finds that city is prevented from continuing construction by unforeseen engineering difficulties or special and peculiar causes.

This is manifestly a just and proper provision. See "The National Forest Manual," issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, to take effect February 24, 1913, Regulation L, 16, and Form No. 61, page 35, the aforesaid "The National Forest Manual," article 6, article 7.

(Page 8, line 17.)

17. City may sell water to municipal water districts or irrigation districts in addition to municipalities.

This is to make possible the consummation under the law of California of a municipal water district, by which all the cities about the bay might be united, the city to sell to the district organization, which would in turn distribute to the different cities, which, again, would sell to the inhabitants thereof. Also, for the protection of such irrigation districts as the Modesto-Turlock irrigation districts, the city would want privilege of selling water to them, in order that they in turn might sell to the land owners within their districts.

(Page 8, line 19.)

18. Section 7 of Los Angeles grant is omitted.

There seems no purpose to be accomplished by including this section. The law as to right to repeal, amend, and so forth, is thoroughly established.

THE WATER SUPPLY: WARNING.

The water consumption in San Francisco now exceeds the safe, dependable supply available for distribution. Until the city or the company can increase the development of sources now owned and install more aqueducts to San Francisco, extreme care must be exercised in the use of water—

Or the supply will fail. Stop all waste; stop hosing steps and sidewalks with water. Please prevent all unnecessary use of water. We earnestly ask for your cooperation in maintaining the supply.

SPRING VALLEY WATER CO.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed joint resolutions and bill of the following titles:

On May 21, 1913:

H. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the postal service for the fiscal year 1913.

On May 22, 1913:

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution authorizing the President to accept an invitation to participate in the International Conference on Education; and

H. R. 4234. An act providing certain legislation for the Panama California Exposition to be held in San Diego, Cal., during the year 1915.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House meets on Monday, after the reading of the Journal, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] be permitted to address the House for one hour. I will say that that will not interfere with the Democratic caucus in any way.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks that immediately after the reading of the Journal on Monday next—of course, barring the usual little routine matters—the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] be permitted to address the House for one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object, is there any reason why the gentleman from Illinois should not announce the subject matter of the gentleman's address?

Mr. MANN. I think it is something in relation to the Forestry Service.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Reserving the right to object, would that prevent taking up any little matters that it might be desired to take up in this hour?

The SPEAKER. It would not prevent that. The practice has been that these little matters, such as the gentleman has presented and such as other Members have, are allowed to come in ahead of a request like this, although if it was literally construed, of course, as soon as the Journal was read, the gentleman from Washington would have to begin his speech. The practice is the other way—that these little matters be attended to when they take no great amount of time.

Mr. HENRY. Let me remind the gentleman that we have a caucus at 2 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. MANN. I stated that this would not interfere in any way with that caucus. If for any reason the time was occupied otherwise before the gentleman had a chance to address the House, he would not impose upon the Democratic Members or delay an adjournment in time for that caucus.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman upon what subject?

Mr. KEATING. I desire to insert an editorial from Mr. Bryan's Commoner.

Mr. MANN. For fear the Democratic Members will not get a chance to read it in any other way I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, one of the Senators from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] read into the RECORD of Tuesday an editorial from the pen of former Senator T. M. Patterson, which appeared in the Rocky Mountain News of Denver on May 11. Former Senator Patterson urged the Senators from Colorado to combine with the Senators from Louisiana for the purpose of forcing the Democratic majority in this Congress to place a duty of 1 cent a pound on refined sugar.

I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from Bryan's Commoner of May 23 in answer to former Senator Patterson's editorial.

The editorial is as follows:

SUGAR IN THE STATE OF COLORADO.

[From Bryan's Commoner.]

It is not often that the Commoner has occasion to differ from its esteemed friend, ex-Senator Patterson, of Colorado, but it feels it its duty to dissent from him in the matter of the sugar schedule.

It is outside of the purpose of this comment to enter into an argument upon the merits of the case. It is enough at this time to say that the arguments which Senator Patterson presents are, from beginning to end, a reproduction of the arguments that have been made for a hundred years in behalf of every industry for which protection has been asked. For a century each industry that asks for the privilege of taxing the rest of the people has been accustomed to marshal figures to show that a failure to comply with its demand would mean the sure destruction of the industry and ultimate suffering to the country.

Mr. Patterson's argument follows the protectionist line even to the final warning that the reduction may only be temporary, and that "if" favored industry is destroyed, the consumer will become the victim of higher prices. He says:

"That putting sugar on the free list will make sugar cheaper in the end is justly open to challenge, for should free sugar destroy or seriously cripple the American sugar industry the last condition of the consumer may be worse than the first."

And then he adds:

"But I make no issue on this point; only the future can determine it."

This saving clause does not save. If it is not intended as an argument, it ought not to be advanced. It is merely a speculation and indicates the extent to which Mr. Patterson has allowed his advocacy of this particular industry to lead him into the language employed by the protectionist.

The purpose of this editorial, however, is to combat the conclusion which he presses upon the Senators from Colorado. Mr. Patterson says:

"Our Senators should, it seems to me, stand side by side with the two Democratic Senators from Louisiana. They should insist that the sugar schedule be taken up and disposed of by itself."

He then proceeds to say that the tariff is being revised "in a lump," "to intimidate the weak." This is an unfair impeachment of the purposes of the party and of the motives of the President. He concludes:

"United States Senators are now elected by the people. They must even be nominated in an open primary. Patronage and White House favor will not take the place of services patriotically and faithfully performed."

This is an injustice to Senators THOMAS and SHAFROTH. He does a wrong to the Senators in suggesting that their support of the bill will be due to "patronage and White House favor." It is, in effect, an attempt to impose a different course of action upon them under the threat that they will not be considered as patriotic or faithful in the performance of their duties as Senators unless they take Mr. Patterson's view of the subject.

The Commoner is sure that its distinguished and beloved friend does not mean to set himself up as a final judge in this matter or to demand acquiescence in his opinion as the price of his confidence and good will.

Senators THOMAS and SHAFROTH were elected as Democrats, and they will be justified in considering themselves as Democrats, not merely as representatives of a particular industry. Comparatively few of the voters of Colorado are personally interested in the production of sugar. Why should the Senators from Colorado consider the wishes of sugar producers only? Have not those who pay the tax as much right to be regarded as those who receive the benefit of the tax?

And does not Mr. Patterson know that Senators THOMAS and SHAFROTH must act with the tariff reformers or against the tariff reformers? The Louisiana Senators may be willing to join with the Republicans and defeat a tariff law and thus deny to the people of the country the reform for which they have labored for so many years, but will the Senators from Colorado be performing a "patriotic and faithful" service if they cast in their lot with those who make everything subordinate to sugar?

If Mr. Patterson desires to consider the effect of the votes on their political future, why not remember that Congressman KEATING, of Colorado, was elected to the House of Representatives after boldly taking his stand in favor of free sugar? Would this not be some indication of the temper of the people of Colorado? Can Mr. Patterson give bond that the voters of his State will applaud its Senators if they become responsible for the defeat of tariff reduction? Would it not be well also for him to recall the fate of the Democratic Senators who in the past have put the interests of special industries above the demand of the Nation?

The Commoner commends the spirit in which Colorado's Senators have addressed themselves to the work of fulfilling the pledges of the party, and is glad to believe that they will consult their Democratic colleagues who are striving to assist the President in the carrying out of his high purpose rather than Senators who are willing to jeopardize the party's fate merely because they believe that some industry in which they are specially interested may suffer injustice. The injustice which the tariff has wrought for so many years still exists and that injustice will continue until the rates are materially lowered. The Senators from the sugar-producing States can not afford to make all tariff reform dependent on what they regard as fair rates to a single industry.

BRYAN VOICES COLORADO'S VIEWS.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bryan voices the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of the voters of Colorado on this sugar question.

In support of this statement, I wish space would permit me to quote the scores of editorials from Colorado papers which I have received during the last few weeks. Almost without exception the Democratic press of Colorado, outside of Denver, is vigorously supporting free sugar.

For a quarter of a century I have been connected with the papers of Denver, but I want to be placed on record now as saying that the cause of genuine Democracy in Colorado must look for support to the courageous and untrammeled country press of the State.

It is very gratifying to be able to state that the most ardent supporters of free sugar are the Democratic papers published in the cities and towns which contain sugar factories. They have disregarded the cajoleries and the threats of the sugar companies and have fearlessly championed the policy outlined by the President of the United States.

The following editorial from the Swink (Colo.) Advocate of May 23 is representative of the position taken by the independent press of the sugar towns in Colorado:

DO NOT WORRY ABOUT SUGAR TARIFF.

Regardless of the amount of discussion that the Underwood tariff bill (providing for the removal of tariff on sugar and other things) has caused, farmers of the fertile Arkansas Valley are very little worried.

Our farmers realize that this vast, rich, and productive area of the best soil in the Golden West will produce melons, alfalfa, and many grains and grasses, as well as fruits, vegetables, etc., that will enable them within a short time to forget that sugar beets ever were an income producer. And the market never will be glutted, either, with the quality of excellent products such as can be grown in this valley.

True, it may be, that sugar beets have added much to the wealth of a large portion of this valley, but it is just as true that our resourceful farmers can easily turn their hands to some other line to which both they and this splendid soil are so well adapted.

Farmers of this section of the valley are not inclined to guzzle down a lot of hot air about certain things that are "sure to happen" to them and "the whole country," if certain tariff measures become a law, and sugar factory-attachés' salaries are reduced to help make up for what the trust will "lose" in favor of the consumers.

To be sure! Our farmers are entirely too wise to be fooled, and they well know that they can and will produce just as much revenue-

bringing products as ever before, and that they will get that revenue, tariff or no tariff, and the market will not be flooded, except with the highest grade of foodstuffs such as are in daily demand.

SUGAR COMPANIES EXPANDING.

That the sugar companies themselves do not believe that the removal of the tariff will destroy the sugar industry in Colorado is shown by the following item which appeared a few days ago under a Rocky Ford date line in the Pueblo Chieftain, the most uncompromising "stand-pat" Republican newspaper in Colorado:

The factory of the American Beet Sugar Co. is the busiest place in the city at the present time and the largest gang of men ever employed during the off season is now at work there. A large sum of money is being expended in the alterations and improvements which, when completed, will make the Rocky Ford factory the largest and best in the State.

With the present outlook on tariff regarding sugar the company realizes that if it is to continue the manufacture of beet sugar it must devise every plan possible to manufacture the product with as little expense as possible, and improved machinery will be installed to do all the work possible, thereby keeping the pay roll down to the minimum.

Mr. Speaker, I want to heartily indorse the testimony given by this Republican witness. Efficiently and economically managed, Colorado sugar factories can compete with the world.

SENTIMENT OF BUSINESS MEN.

The following letter, which I have just received from the secretary of the Gilpin County (Colo.) Chamber of Commerce, reflects the sentiments of that element in Colorado's business life which has refused to be stampeded by the calamity howling of the beneficiaries of the sugar tariff:

CENTRAL CITY, COLO., *May 26, 1913.*

Congressman EDWARD KEATING,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Am writing you to apprise you of the attitude of the Gilpin County Chamber of Commerce, in regard to the petition which the Denver Chamber of Commerce will shortly forward to the Colorado Members of Congress in reference to the sugar tariff. Following is the telegram received by our organization from Denver:

"DENVER, COLO., *May 24, 1913.*

"W. J. STULL,
"*Secretary Gilpin County Chamber of Commerce,*
"*Central City, Colo.:*

"All commercial organizations of Denver are joining with the chamber of commerce in petition to President and Congress, asking that the three-year clause placing sugar on the free list be eliminated. We would like your concurrence in order to help protect one of Colorado's greatest industries. Please wire answer collect by Monday if possible.

"DENVER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE."

Following is the reply I sent, after interviewing a large number of our citizens. One leading Republican, who is favorable to free sugar, said if it was necessary he could circulate a petition among the members of his party, showing that they were also in favor of the elimination of the tariff on sugar.

"CENTRAL CITY, COLO., *May 26, 1913.*

"DENVER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
"*Denver, Colo.:*

Sentiment in this county is very strong in favor of free sugar and would like sugar on the free list now instead of in three years. We do not believe in a tariff policy for the benefit of the comparatively few engaged in or connected with an industry as against the many numbered among the consumers. The greatest good to the greatest number is the policy which should guide the commercial organizations of Colorado in the upbuilding of the State.

"GILPIN COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
"W. J. STULL, *Secretary.*"

Respectfully, W. J. STULL.

THE CURRENCY.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address by Mr. Festus J. Wade, of St. Louis, to the American Bankers' Association on the currency question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great questions that demands the attention of the Congress of the United States is the necessity of a change in the banking system, and one that will provide a more elastic currency. Under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this subject, I include an address by Festus J. Wade, of St. Louis, Mo., delivered before the trust-company section of the American Bankers' Association in the city of New York on the 8th instant. Mr. Wade is one of the leading financiers and bankers of this country. He is president of the Mercantile Trust Co., of St. Louis, and also president of the Mercantile National Bank, of the same city. His address follows:

"I have come a thousand miles from the interior of this country to make an urgent appeal for help, for aid, for assistance. I appeal to those from the far West, the Middle West, the North, and the South for help; I appeal to the New York bankers present, and also those ambitious to be New York bankers. I appeal to you regardless of your political affiliation, social or financial condition, or religious belief for help. I appeal to you as American citizens to join forces in an endeavor to bring about a reduction in the high cost of living, and to stop the invidious tirade against railroads, which is gradually and insidiously undermining the good sense and economic principles of the whole Nation.

"There are several causes for the present high cost of living. To-night I will touch upon only one, and that is the weak financial credit system of the Government, with monetary laws totally inadequate to meet the needs of our ever-growing commerce. To solve that serious problem why not adopt ordinary business methods, first, by endeavoring to discover the foundation of the evil, and, secondly, the remedy to be applied.

"There is no problem without a solution; no difficulty insurmountable by the American people; no enterprise too large; no undertaking too great for them to carry to a successful issue if they can once be aroused to join hands and hearts in a united effort for the benefit of mankind. Such has been the history of the American Republic since its birth 137 years ago.

"If you have in your respective establishments a well-regulated credit department, you frequently refer to the manager of same to keep you posted in regard to various borrowers whose credit you have reason to believe a shade doubtful. If that manager should demonstrate to you that a certain corporation was keeping up its credit through fictitious means not generally understood by the public, then your confidence would be shaken, and if that credit manager further demonstrated to you that the rate at which the stockholders of that particular corporation were borrowing money was 25 per cent to 50 per cent higher than paid by competitors, then you would hesitate and cease to make further loans until you could investigate the cause, with a view to applying a remedy that would increase the security to your trust company and the profits of the corporation, that your loan might be more secure. If in your investigation you discovered the corporation's methods and systems to be antediluvian, unsound, unscientific, you would immediately send for the head of the establishment you had been lending money to and point out to him the inherent weakness found, and then insist that proper and conservative methods of conducting that business be applied.

"In dealing with an economic question concerning a corporation, the same principles may be applied to the Government; the people are the stockholders; the Government officials the officers and directors. If the Government is financed upon an unsound basis, its officers know it. If true, then you must admit a governmental wrong which ought to be righted. On the other hand, if the financial basis of the Government be unsound, and the governmental officials are ignorant of that fact, then they are proven incompetent.

"Even those who have given the matter only casual consideration acknowledge that the Government 2 per cent bond is kept at par on a fictitious financial basis. You and I, and every other thinking banker, know these bonds are not held by the people of the United States, but through a fictitious financial scheme are deposited in Washington as security for the issuance of national-bank circulation, or governmental deposits. England, France, Germany, and Italy, notwithstanding their stupenduous expenditure for army and navy, have their Government securities on a 3½ per cent basis, which is about the average annual banking rate of discount in the financial centers of Europe—London and Paris—on all railroad and commercial loans. The average rate of bonded interest paid by the great railway companies of England will not exceed 3½ per cent; while here in the United States our Government bonds are on a 2 per cent basis, fictitiously bolstered up, and the railroads of our great country are on a 7 per cent basis for their enormous requirements.

"Why is it the discount rate in London and Paris to-day on prime commercial bills is only 3½ per cent? Why is it the average rate throughout England and France the last 10 years has not been over 4 per cent except when financing a money stringency in America? Because they are on a sane financial basis; their monetary laws are sound and safe. They have not, within the recollection of any man in this hall to-night, ever suspended cash payments. They have had their great crises, disasters, misfortunes, panics, but have never yet repudiated their obligations nor declined to pay gold or currency as we did in the dark days of 1907 and 1893.

"The facts are, to enable the corporation (our Government) to sell its 2 per cent bonds at par, legislators have obliged stockholders (the people), by failure to revise the monetary laws, to pay on an average more than 6 per cent to finance large railroads and industrial enterprises, because of our weak financial system.

"Occupying as we do a most enviable position in the realms of commerce, and possessing an inexhaustible fund of ingenuity,

energy, and indomitable spirit; with agricultural resources and manufacturing industries constantly increasing; with commercial establishments and financial institutions on a firmer basis than ever before, the rate of money charged our people is abnormally high—all because of the inherent weakness of our monetary laws.

"Appeal after appeal has been made to Congress by merchants, manufacturers, and other classes, but I have not heard of a concerted and united appeal being made by the trust companies of the country, although out of a total of all deposits in all banks and financial institutions in the country the trust companies represent fully 30 per cent. And with this great power behind them they have practically sat silently by and left the work of reformation of the monetary system almost entirely to the national banks.

"At present the only system of expanding the currency of the Nation is through bond-secured currency of the national bank. The national banks represent only 38 per cent of the banking interests of the United States. Forty years ago, as a measure to overcome the ravages of war, it accomplished wonders, but it is entirely obsolete in the present day and generation, and no one will, on reflection, insist that the note-issuing power or privilege be given to the national bank to the exclusion of the State institutions, provided always that the State institutions—private and State banks and trust companies—comply with the strict letter of the law governing national banks.

"In England and France large corporations buy money on a 3½ per cent basis. In this country they must pay at least 6 per cent. Therefore the European manufacturer or railroad operator has an advantage over us of fully 40 per cent in the interest he is obliged to pay for every dollar borrowed, yet in the face of this fact the tariff on nearly every product will be lowered and increased competition created, while as yet no effort has been put forth to reduce the high cost of money, the primary cause of which is our weak monetary and credit system. Lower the tariff if you will, but when you do so, correct your monetary laws to make your interest rates lower and steadier.

"And now I come back to my appeal for help—not personal help from the East, West, North, or South, but for a united effort from all parts of the country—all its people; help for Senator OWEN, of Oklahoma, and Congressman GLASS, of Virginia, as chairmen of the respective congressional Committees on Banking and Currency, in so revising the monetary laws as to put trust companies, national and State banks, on an equal basis and create a flexible credit currency that will meet the necessities of the Nation's development. And with equal emphasis do I beg, nay, urge and plead, that Senator OWEN, of Oklahoma, and Congressman GLASS, of Virginia, appeal to the greatest bankers of this great Nation—a preponderance of them are found in New York City—to give them counsel and advice in the forming of a bill that will meet the needs of the Nation. To ignore New York City and its great financiers in the forming of such a measure would, in my judgment, be almost fatal to its being constructed on proper lines. Every bank west of the Hudson River, every locality west of the Hudson River, must and do appeal to New York in times of distress and go there to lend its money in times of redundancy. New York is the mecca of the Nation on financial matters, the financial center of the United States, and with proper monetary laws would immediately become the financial center of the world. Its financiers have the practical experience so necessary to give counsel and advice on such a vitally important question. Properly revised monetary laws will bring about a reduction in interest rates to borrowers, encouraging the owners of the farm, the mine, the factory, to increase their productions, and thus lowering the cost of living.

"No monetary plan should be submitted to Congress for vote unless it gives trust companies an equal right with banks, both State and National, to participate in carrying the burdens of this country and also to participate in any benefits accruing from a reformation of the monetary system.

"I know at first blush trust-company officials will put up a vigorous protest at being placed on the same plane as national banks in carrying the reserve required under the present system. They will claim the character of the trust-company business is so different from that of the national bank they do not require a reserve. I simply refer you to the panic of 1907, and, without mentioning names, call your attention to the fact that trust companies, the same as any other financial institution, require a reserve against demand deposits to meet emergencies in times of distress and to be on a sound basis in placid times.

"National banks will protest against this doctrine of allowing trust companies to participate in all of the benefits that might accrue from a reformation of the monetary laws, and one of their first objections will be: 'How can a trust company be permitted to issue currency?' The answer is plain and simple: If they comply with every requirement as to security, supervision, and reserve, the same as national banks, why should they not be permitted to have all the privileges and prerogatives of national banking institutions? Mark you, I say, provided they comply with all the obligations of the national institutions.

"When I advocate again that the privilege be given national banks of loaning on real estate, say, to the extent of 10 or 15 per cent of their gross deposits, confining them strictly to the limit of owning or loaning not more than 10 per cent of their gross deposits, I know it will be met with a storm of protest, and I shall doubtless be subjected to severe and honest but undesirable criticism. Nevertheless, I here and now assert that nothing could occur that would so tend to reduce the cost of living as to allow the 7,000 national banks in the country to loan, under proper supervision, 10 to 15 per cent of their $8,360,000,000 deposits on real estate, thus encouraging development of the agricultural as well as the industrial resources of the Nation. At present the national banks of the country own over $200,000,000 real estate, principally office buildings. How much more safely would that be invested in, say, 200,000 mortgages on good farms, and how greatly this would reduce the interest rate to the farmers, enabling them to produce more at less cost.

"The second topic which I am going to discuss to-night is the adverse, drastic, foolish legislation that has been directed against railroads, which represent the greatest purchasing power of any branch of trade or commerce in the country. Why is it railroad companies are unable to find a market for their securities at a reasonable rate? Why have they had to resort to the short-time note issues which bear tremendous discounts and high rate of interest? Simply because on the one side organized labor the last 10 years has demanded and secured increased wages of from 15 to 40 per cent; on the other hand, legislators in different States have demanded a decrease in railroad rates of from 25 per cent to 50 per cent, thus creating fear, making it more difficult to finance railroad bonds and notes, and actually have increased the yearly cost of hiring money 20 per cent to 30 per cent. Is it not therefore manifest, with this increase in expenditures and decrease in revenue, that the cost of living is not only increasing to the danger point but that the very lifeblood of the Nation is threatened with ruin and disaster?

"Therefore I appeal to you as trust-company men not only to lend a helping hand but to bend every energy to arrest the tirades directed against corporations in general and railroads in particular. To do this in a practical way, urge all your friends in the various State legislatures, and particularly your Senators and Congressmen, to study and understand the situation, to the end that they will not only advocate but urge the Interstate Commerce Commission to grant the increase of 5 per cent in the railroad rates, as now asked by the railroads, to meet existing conditions, bearing in mind that it costs the railroads of our country annually to buy money 40 per cent more than railroads of competing nations, while transportation rates charged by the roads of France, Germany, England, Russia, Austria, and Italy are more than 75 per cent higher than in the United States. Your efforts in this direction will redound to the benefit of the whole country, enable the railroads to keep up their present high standard of service, install even more effective safeguards for the protection of life, and better equip themselves for the further development of the wonderful and marvelous natural resources of our great country. This will increase the productions of the factory, farm, and mine, supply an abundance of food and raiment to the people, thus showing a net earning capacity sufficient not only to justify and demand but to be able to buy money at a proper and legitimate rate, the same as exists in Europe at the present time. When railroads are forced to reduce rates to a point making it almost impossible to meet obligations, the greatest purchasing power of the country is hampered and retarded, dissatisfaction ensues, investors the world over discredit the securities.

"In conclusion, let us resolve before we leave this banquet hall to-night that we will shun as we would a pestilence any individual, be he pauper or millionaire, banker or artisan, manufacturer, farmer, or politician, who decries the railroad simply because it is a railroad, wealth merely because it is wealth, for such an individual is an enemy to society and a menace to the Government."

FOREST SERVICE.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a resolution which I am

going to introduce and upon which I am going to speak next Monday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a resolution which will be the text of his remarks next Monday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That a special committee of five members be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the Members of that body, which committee is hereby empowered and directed to make a complete and thorough investigation of the conditions, the methods, and practices of the Forest Service.

SEC. 2. That said committee is especially hereby empowered and directed to make a complete investigation of the following facts:

First. The giving to the Santa Fe Railroad and the Northern Pacific Railroad, and other private corporations, more than 2,000,000 acres of valuable public land, most of it timbered, in exchange for an equal number of acres of barren treeless and practically worthless land, included in forest reserves.

Second. What relation exists, if any, between the Forest Service, the Weyerhaeuser syndicate, the Northern Pacific Railroad, and other large timber owners of the Pacific Northwest, and especially as to what understanding there is, if any, in regard to the fixing of prices of timber and as to the keeping of timber off the market.

Third. As to why many million acres of nontimbered lands are included and kept in the forest reserves.

Fourth. The reason for the creation and the maintaining of forest reserves in Alaska.

Fifth. As to why five or six billion feet of merchantable timber annually rots in the forest instead of being cut, and why only $1,000,000 worth is sold while $15,000,000 worth is permitted to decay.

Sixth. The character, competency, and conduct of those employed in the Forest Service.

SEC. 3. That said committee shall report to the House all the facts disclosed by said investigation and what legislation, if any, it deems advisable in relation thereto.

SEC. 4. That said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby empowered to sit and act during the sessions or recess of Congress at such place or places as may be found necessary and to require the attendance of witnesses, the production of books, papers, and other documents, by subpœna or otherwise, to swear such witnesses and take their testimony orally or in writing.

SEC. 5. That said committee is hereby authorized to employ such counsel and experts and clerical and other assistance as shall be necessary to perform its duties hereunder.

SEC. 6. That the Speaker shall have authority to issue subpœnas for witnesses, upon the request of the committee, during the recess of Congress in the same manner as during the sessions of Congress.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON ALCOHOLISM (S. DOC. NO. 44).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of Congress, a report by the Secretary of State covering the report of the delegates of the United States to the Thirteenth International Congress on Alcoholism, at The Hague, in September, 1911, appointed in pursuance of a provision in the diplomatic and consular appropriation act approved March 3, 1911.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 26, 1913.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence until Monday, June 23, 1913, on account of important business.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE FORREST GOODWIN, OF MAINE.

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Speaker, it is my painful duty to announce to the House the death of my colleague, Hon. FORREST GOODWIN, of the third Maine district, which occurred at Portland yesterday afternoon. He had attained distinction at the bar and in both branches of the Maine Legislature. Twenty years ago, under the Speakership of Thomas B. Reed, he served this House as parliamentarian. At a later date I shall ask the House to set apart a time for pronouncing eulogies upon his character and public services. At this time I present the following resolutions:

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 113.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. FORREST GOODWIN, a Representative from the State of Maine.

Resolved, That a committee of 14 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed as the committee to attend the funeral the following Members: Mr. MCGILLICUDDY, Mr. LOBECK, Mr. FERRIS, Mr. HILL, Mr. CRISP, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. RAKER, Mr. GUERNSEY, Mr. HINDS, Mr. LANGLEY, Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma, Mr. GREENE of Vermont, and Mr. DYER.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the remaining resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, June 2, 1913, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Warwick River, Md. (H. Doc. No. 57); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of Immigration in regard to the immigration of Asiatic laborers (H. Doc. No. 56); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5609) to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands," approved June 17, 1902; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5673) providing that the marriage of a homestead entryman to a homestead entrywoman shall not impair the right of either to a patent; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5674) to amend section 9 of the act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, and to provide for a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States, approved June 29, 1906, to permit the taking of the depositions of witnesses residing a long distance from the court; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5675) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in the city of O'Neill, State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 5676) to further protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5677) to authorize reduction of value of improvements required by act of April 28, 1904, and acts amendatory thereof, providing for homestead entries of certain lands in Nebraska of not exceeding 640 acres; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5678) to amend the second clause of section 4 of chapter 784 of the United States Statutes at Large, volume 32, page 195; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5679) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in the city of Broken Bow, State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5680) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in the city of Lexington, State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 5681) to refund the cotton tax realized to the Government under the various acts of Congress; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5682) to amend section 15 of the act to regulate commerce as amended June 29, 1906, and June 18, 1910; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5683) to prevent the nullification of State antigambling laws by international or interstate transmission of race gambling bets or of racing odds; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5684) to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5685) to provide for a road to the Shiloh National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5686) declaring the selling, exchanging, or giving away any pistol, bowie knife, dirk or dirk knife, blackjack, dagger, sword cane, slung shot, brass or other metal knuckle in the District of Columbia a misdemeanor; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5687) declaring the carrying openly or concealed about the person any pistol, bowie knife, dirk or dirk knife, blackjack, dagger, sword cane, slung shot, brass or other metal knuckle in the District of Columbia a felony; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5688) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in the city of Scottsbluff, State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 5689) to make it unlawful for certain public officials to own capital stock or bonds in any and all public-service corporations doing business in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5690) declaring all highways in the several States used for the purpose of transporting rural mail to be post roads and authorizing the improvement of same; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5691) to regulate the issuance of injunctions in suits instituted in court to enjoin, set aside, annul, or suspend orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5692) to erect a post-office building in the city of Huntingdon, State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 5693) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate condemned cannon and balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5694) to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 5695) to prevent the sale or transportation of articles of food which have been held in cold storage or refrigerating warehouses beyond the periods of time fixed herein, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5696) to create a commission on social insurance; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 5697) authorizing a survey of Tradewater River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5698) providing for the construction of a dredge boat to be used upon the Ohio River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5699) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station in Christian County, in southwestern Kentucky; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5700) for the erection of a public building at Madisonville, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5701) to admit free of duty certain articles manufactured in the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5702) for the erection of a cold-storage warehouse in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5703) to prohibit persons engaged in the manufacture and sale of railroad cars, locomotives, railroad rails, and structural steel, or in the mining and sale of coal, from becoming directors or other officers or employees of railroads engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5704) authorizing a survey of Pond River, Ky., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5705) for the relief of farmers, merchants, and other dealers in leaf tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5706) to provide for the securing of plans for additional buildings for the Department of Agriculture in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5707) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct experiments and determine the practicability of making paper material out of cornstalks, and to erect buildings and purchase apparatus therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5708) relating to punishment for contempt in Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5709) for the construction of a lock and dam in the Ohio River below the mouth of Green River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5710) for the relief of the drafted men of Henderson County, Ky., and other counties of Kentucky; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5711) relating to punishment for contempt in Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5712) requiring a more complete record of all unmanufactured tobaccos; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 5713) to give effect to the provisions of a treaty between the United States and Great Britain concerning the fisheries in waters contiguous to the United States and the Dominion of Canada, signed at Washington, on April 1, 1908, and ratified by the United States Senate April 13, 1908; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 5714) to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States by adding thereto section 4547a, to provide for a more efficient remedy for the collection of seamen's wages and to provide fees for officers issuing and serving process; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 5715) providing that the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing shall be a practical plate printer; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5716) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, as amended June 18, 1910"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5717) to prohibit holding companies from engaging in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5718) to regulate the ownership of common carriers engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 5719) to place control of Columbia Institution for the Deaf entirely under the president and board of directors of the institution and Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5815) to amend section 108, chapter 5, of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 90) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the nomination and election of President and Vice President by a direct vote of the people of the several States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. SIMS: Resolution (H. Res. 112) amending the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Resolution (H. Res. 114) for the appointment of a committee to investigate the Forest Service; to the Committee on Rules.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in regard to reducing the tax on electric light plants, cigar stands, banks, etc.; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Alaska, in regard to proposed amendments to school laws; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Alaska, in regard to patrolling the coast by revenue cutter; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Alaska, in regard to appointment of attorney general and secretary of state for Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Alaska, in regard to development and extension of the town site of Juneau; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, favoring the amending of the organic act of the Territory in regard to sessions of the legislature; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, suggesting and favoring amendment to the Constitution of the United States correcting the manner in which the constitutionality of State enactments shall be determined by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, favoring the speedy enactment of House bill 4825

opening the surplus and unallotted land in the Colorado River Indian Reservation to sentlement and entry under the provisions of the Carey Land Acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of Arizona, to ask Congress to legislate for relief of settlers of school lands in that State who settled before such lands were surveyed; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, requesting Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the election of the President and Vice President by a direct vote of the people; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial of the Legislature of Wisconsin, asking Congress to enact a law setting aside certain islands in the Great Lakes for the purpose of establishing thereon bird reserves; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of Wisconsin, favoring the adoption of Senate joint resolution 131 and House bill 16808, introduced during the second session of the Sixty-second Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Memorial of the Legislature of Michigan, favoring the passage of House bill 7661, relative to the loaning of money by the Government on farms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 5720) granting a pension to Malissa Sands; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5721) granting an increase of pension to William H. Mize; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5722) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Dunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5723) granting a pension to Ebb Workman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5724) granting a pension to Edward H. Osmond; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5725) granting a pension to Elizabeth Pierson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5726) granting a pension to Walter Zogg; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5727) granting a pension to Foster Rine; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5728) granting a pension to Josephine Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5729) granting an increase of pension to David R. Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5730) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Headley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5731) granting an increase of pension to Azuba Burch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5732) for the relief of J. Walter Duncan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5733) for the relief of S. C. Gist; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5734) for the relief of Oakley Randall; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5735) for the relief of Charles L. Barnes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5736) for the relief of James H. McGill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5737) for the relief of E. H. Hoult; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5738) for the relief of J. Walter Duncan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5739) for the relief of Henry Borman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5740) for the relief of Samuel Harrison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5741) for the relief of Frank Sheldon; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5742) for the relief of the heirs of Elijah M. Hart; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5743) for the relief of the heirs of James A. Cummins; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5744) for the relief of the heirs of E. C. Trimble; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5745) to execute the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William Erskine, administrator of John M. Doddridge, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DONOVAN: A bill (H. R. 5746) for the relief of Marcus L. Pelham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 5747) granting a pension to Polly R. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5748) to waive the age limit for admission to the Pay Corps of the United States Navy for one year in the case of Paymaster's Clerk Joseph O'Reilly; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAMMOND: A bill (H. R. 5749) granting a pension to Mary A. Frazier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5750) for the relief of William Keough; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5751) for the relief of Grace Harris; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5752) for the relief of Uriah S. Town; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5753) to correct the military record of John Minahan, alias John Bagley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 5754) granting a pension to Theodore T. Simon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5755) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5756) granting certain land to the Northern Minnesota Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 5757) granting an increase of pension to James Buchanan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5758) granting an increase of pension to George H. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5759) granting an increase of pension to Abby M. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: A bill (H. R. 5760) granting a pension to Amy Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5761) granting a pension to Addie M. Paff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5762) granting a pension to Rosa A. Abbott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5763) granting a pension to Marcia H. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5764) granting a pension to Clara G. Branch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5765) granting a pension to Lizzie E. Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5766) granting a pension to Alice Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 5767) granting a pension to Juliett Wentworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 5768) to perfect the title of the heirs of James S. Rollins, deceased, to bounty land warrant No. 58479, issued to George Hickum, teamster, United States Quartermaster Department, War with Mexico; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 5769) for the relief of Mildred J. Bray; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5770) for the relief of David W. Reed; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5771) for the relief of the heirs of W. H. Sneed; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5772) for the relief of the legal representatives of William Goad, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5773) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry Roberson, deceased; to the Committe on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5774) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Green, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5775) for the relief of the legal representatives of V. B. Walker, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5776) for the relief of the legal representatives of Joseph R. Mathews, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5777) for the relief of Thomas Kennedy, executor of the estate of Margaret Kennedy, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5778) for the relief of Edwin Moore; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 5779) granting a pension to George Price; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5780) granting a pension to Ulysses S. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5781) granting a pension to William E. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5782) granting a pension to Columbus Wise; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5783) granting a pension to Stephen H. Harrel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5784) granting a pension to Mary S. Overby; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5785) granting a pension to Sophia Goodman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5786) granting a pension to Escar Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5787) granting a pension to Robert S. Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5788) granting a pension to William H. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5789) granting a pension to Emmett Puckett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5790) granting a pension to Elise G. Irving; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5791) granting a pension to Edwin Cline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5792) granting an increase of pension to Catharine May; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5793) granting an increase of pension to Marcus E. Cartwright; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5794) granting an increase of pension to William A. Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5795) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Pearce; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5796) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Jacobs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5797) granting an increase of pension to Perry Knox; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5798) granting an increase of pension to John Coombs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5799) granting an increase of pension to S. G. Ragsdale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5800) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel S. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5801) for the relief of George D. Blakey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5802) for the relief of Frank W. Clark; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5803) for the relief of Francis M. Price; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5804) for the relief of Martha A. Troop; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5805) for the relief of Walter Langley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5806) for the relief of George W. Lackey, surviving partner of the firm of William Lackey & Sons; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5807) for the relief of the estate of Ben Whitaker, sr., deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5808) for the relief of the estate of Joel F. Yager, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5809) for the relief of the estate of Leopold Harth, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5810) for the relief of the estate of David O. Conn, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5811) for the relief of the estate of W. C. Russell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5812) for the relief of the estate of John M. Higgins, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5813) for the relief of the estate or heirs of Philip P. Phillips, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5814) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of A. W. Richards, administrator of estate of Kinchen Bell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the First Baptist Church of Elgin, Ill., favoring the passage of legislation making polygamy unlawful in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Springfield, Mo., protesting against the passage of the proposed legislation for the establishment of a committee on public health; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Fred Lang, Herman, Mo., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of the Cleveland (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of legislation making an appropriation for the control of the waters of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of the Board of County Commissioners of Duval County, Fla., favoring an appropriation sufficient to reimburse the county of Duval for money expended for the improvement of the St. Johns River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the Traffic Club of New York, New York, N. Y., favoring an appropriation for the continuance of the Commerce Court; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of James E. Carroll, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Joint Advisory Board, New York, N. Y., protesting against the removal of the duty on Philippine tobacco and cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George W. Houck, Ellicottville, N. Y., protesting against the creation of a committee on public health; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petitions of Henry C. Taylor, 205 Besse Building, Springfield; Frederick Carlsen, 8 Brimmer Street, Boston; Charles Albion Clark, Salem; L. F. Fleming, 39 Mount Pleasant Avenue, Roxbury; R. Putnam, Dorchester; Edmond R. Sargent, 41 Sherwood Street, Roslindale; Charles T. Morgan, 5 Pleasant Street, Bradford; Elmer E. Chain, 57 Foster Street, Peabody; Mr. and Mrs. H. C. Oersted, 328 Huntington Avenue, Hyde Park; H. A. Stoddard, 256 Essex Street, Salem; B. R. Davis, 57 White Street, Haverhill; Mildred H. Wright, 3 Ruthven Street, Roxbury; William C. Keith, Salem; S. Flewelling, 5 Elm Hill Park, Roxbury; John F. Eccles, 84 Huntington Avenue, Boston; Isabelle C. Cressey, 24 Nightingale Street, Dorchester; L. E. Seeley, 33 Elm Hill Park, Roxbury; William R. Knox, 220 Clarendon Street, Boston; Lambert H. Farnham, 112 Corey Road, Brookline; Ina M. Farnham, 112 Corey Road, Brookline; Della C. Farnham, 112 Corey Road, Brookline; M. Guy Archibald, 17 Railroad Square, Haverhill; Mrs. L. A. Carter, 16 Everett Street, Hyde Park; W. F. Armstrong, 93 Lyndhurst Street, Boston; Harrison James, 50 Franklin Street, Boston; M. S. Flewelling, 4 Elm Hill Park, Roxbury; Nathan C. Harrison, 5 Dorchester Avenue Extension, Boston; Miss M. C. Grant, 35 Mount Pleasant Avenue, Roxbury; Anna E. Appleton, 52 Townsend Street, Roxbury; Henry C. Nickerson, 4 Albany Street, Boston; Helen Appleton, 52 Townsend Street, Roxbury; Ruth Appleton, 52 Townsend Street, Roxbury; Mrs. Thomas C. Carter, 73 Humboldt Avenue, Boston; Stewart G. Lawrence, 71 Beaumont Street, Ashmont; Mrs. Jennie M. Skinner, 60 Clarkwood Street, Mattapan; H. Bruce Fletcher, 32 Ocean Street, Dorchester; William E. Rumrill, Boston; Mrs. B. C. Piper, 26 Bellevue Street, Dorchester; E. W. Fletcher, Boston; Gretchen P. Bartlett, 9 Ware Street, Dorchester; L. M. Greene, Dorchester; Louis G. Hirtz, 9 Elm Hill Park, Roxbury; Albert L. Ware, 24 Ellsworth Avenue, Cambridge; Charlotte L. Swift, Milton; John Swift, Milton; Forest E. Goodrich, Haverhill; James W. Bennett, 288 St. Botolph Street, Boston; Wilfred Carter, 12 Franklin Terrace, Hyde Park; William A. Pike, Pittsfield; Dr. H. J. Baker, 471 Columbia Road, Dorchester; Miss Eliza Bruce Ryan, 348 Walnut Avenue, Roxbury; Miss Lucy E. Lane, 91 Munroe Street, Roxbury; Sadie M. Ray, 16 Stanley Street, Dorchester; F. O. Tarbox, Haverhill; Joseph F. J. M. Brown, 7 Louise Park, Roxbury; H. C. Brown, 7 Louise Park, Roxbury; Mrs. Ida L. Henry, 288 Chestnut Avenue, Jamaica Plain; Mrs. Florence H. Houghton, 288 Chestnut Avenue, Jamaica Plain; Mrs. Ella F. Nickerson, 33 Alpine Street, Roxbury; Mrs. Amy P. Blanchard, 60 Clarkwood Street, Mattapan; Annie A. Rea, 45 Mount Pleasant Avenue, Roxbury; Ralph P. True, Amesbury; Mary A. Fowkes, 7 Louise Park, Boston; Sarah C. Linscott, 8 Ruthven Street, Roxbury; Martha I. Emery, 35 Waverly Street, Roxbury; E. L. Willis, 179 Lincoln Street, Boston; Miss Edith Calchpole, 24 West Street, Boston; C. L. Hudsley, 80 Glendale Street, Dorchester; Charlotte D. Wesson, Boston; B. W. Skinner, 185 Congress Street, Boston; Mrs. Mary L. Weaver, 485 Washington Street, Dorchester; Miss Edith A. Tuttle, 7 Larchmont Street, Dorchester; D. L. Crawley, Dorchester; Mrs. Bertha Davis Weston, Riverbank Court, Cambridge; Frank B. Homans, Hyde Park; Katharine L. Smith, 30 Wyoming Street, Roxbury; P. F. Hood, 45 Milk Street, Boston; Elnora Ginn Cord, 34 Spencer Avenue, West Somerville; Ruth J. Morse, 55 Hastings Street, West Roxbury; J. W. Robbins, 20 Rockland Avenue, Boston; A. J. Lavery, 22 Holborn Street, Roxbury; Miss Mabel Blaisdell, 38 Quincy Street, Roxbury; Carolyn Glidden, 45 Metropolitan Avenue, Roxbury; Helen Maude Binney, Roxbury; Gertrude E. Harrison, 84

Melville Avenue, Dorchester; Mrs. Alice E. Linnell, 100 Boylston Street, Boston; Florence E. Shattuck, 61 Moreland Street, Roxbury; A. E. Starks, Boston; George Lord Starks, Boston; Clarence J. Carlisle, 29 Millet Street, Dorchester; Horace M. Carlisle, 29 Millet Street, Dorchester; Mrs. C. V. Chipman, 560 West Park Street, Dorchester; Nancy B. Lawrence, 560 Park Street, Dorchester; E. M. Klotzbach, 99 Bowdoin Avenue, Dorchester; A. P. Ryder, 10 North Devon Street, Roxbury; J. Lee Robinson, editor Cambridge Tribune, Cambridge; George S. Haddock, 9 Crawford Street, Roxbury; J. D. Blaisdell, Symphony Hall, Boston; J. W. Lewis, Pittsfield; Mary C. McLain, 23 Castlegate Road, Dorchester; Frances M. McLain, 23 Castlegate Road, Dorchester; Lilian E. Fales, 23 Castlegate Road, Dorchester; Mrs. Jeanette Phillips, 33 Glendale Street, Dorchester; Mrs. Jeannette W. Mitchell, 33 Glendale Street, Dorchester; Mrs. Lulu S. Dawson, 4 Franklin Terrace, Hyde Park; Gertrude F. Whitcomb, 86 Ridge Road, Dorchester; Clarence W. Scott, 14 Westland Avenue, Boston; Mrs. Caroline A. Parker, 4 Cushing Avenue, Dorchester; Louis C. Ochs, Haverhill; J. S. Moore, Haverhill; A. M. Estabrook, Haverhill; L. C. Stephens, Boston; A. E. Stephens, Dorchester; Mrs. J. E. True, 15 Castlegate Road, Dorchester; Mrs. Adeline E. Lewis, 27 Wabore Street, Roxbury; Ephraim W. Lewis, 27 Wabore Street, Roxbury; George M. Parker, 4 Post Office Square, Boston; Frederick L. Bauer, 354 Belgrade Avenue, West Roxbury; Miss Rachel Perne Amen, 5 Elm Hill Park, Roxbury; W. H. Armstrong, Dorchester; Emily E. Adams, 6 Elm Hill Park, Roxbury; Nellie E. Sherman, 6 Elm Hill Park, Roxbury; Lametta W. Blish, 16 School Street, Dorchester; Caroline W. Davis, 3 Ruthven Street, Roxbury; Miss Edith Preston Foster, 3 Ruthven Street, Roxbury; A. M. Howe, Mattapan; Mrs. Arrington, 57 Peter Parley Road, Jamaica Plain; Esther Boyden, Mattapan; H. C. Ellis, 117 Sherman Street, Springfield; Torrance Parker, Boston; George S. Taber, New Bedford; John T. Champion, New Bedford; Elisha B. Seeley, Roxbury; George H. Cooper, Pittsfield; Frank M. Atkins, Boston; A. E. Vaulistrand, Pittsfield; Frank H. Sprague, Quincy; Fred A. Noyes, Boston; Henry L. Upton, Quincy; George MacFarlane, Dedham; Joseph C. Palmer, manager Hodkins Shoe Store, Lynn; Isaac N. Harrington, Lynn; Albert W. Symonds, Lynn; Elbridge O. Welch, Lynn; Sebina Snow, Lynn; Homer B. Clement, Lynn; George A. Churchill, Lynn; Wallace P. Jeffrey, Lynn; Walter L. Winchester, Lynn; Frank L. Arey, Lynn; J. W. Bonney, Lynn; George A. Beacon, Springfield; O. M. Crocker, Braintree; Simon Adams, Roxbury; Giles M. Smith, Watertown; Guy S. Perkins, Longmeadow; O. D. Greene, president Roxbury Historical Society, Boston; W. G. Corthell, Wollaston; Clarence E. Stone, Dorchester; G. B. Whelden, Brockton; William H. Hawes, Brockton; Thomas B. Fales, Dorchester; George H. Wilkins, Boston; Frank A. Colburn, 19 Ware Street, Cambridge; John E. Sedman, 1010 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge; Sherwin L. Cook, Boston; L. C. Sampson, Brockton; S. J. McFaun, Brockton; Ralph R. Robinson, Brockton; C. Chesley French, Brockton; John B. Hutchinson, Riverbank Court, Cambridge; Mrs. Fred D. Annett, Brockton; George A. Stevens, Brockton; W. M. Woodward, Brockton; Erastus G. Stiles, Brockton; Willard Hanson, Brockton; Martin F. Toby, Brockton; George Knox, Brockton; Benjamin F. Bowker, Brockton; Lucy E. Dee, Brockton; Eva Moore, Brockton; C. L. Tobey, Brockton; Levi J. Harper, Brockton; C. N. Bacon, Springfield; George Ferry, Brockton; Reginald Hoyt, Brockton; G. T. Thompson, Brockton; P. Edward Foster, Boston; Ellis C. Johnson, Haverhill; George C. Turner, Somerville; John M. Harrison, Haverhill; Charles E. Brown, Concord; George A. Newhall, Boston; George O. Willis, jr., Dedham; C. F. Harris, Boston; Austin W. St. John, Somerville; G. H. Moore, Boston; Gardner I. Jones, Boston; Arthur P. Gay, 6 Beacon Street, Boston; Fred L. Howard, Boston; F. C. H. Gibbons, Springfield; all in the State of Massachusetts, protesting against the creation of a committee on public health; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Massachusetts State Board of Trade, protesting against the provision in the sundry civil bill forbidding the use of any part of the appropriation for the enforcement of antitrust laws in the prosecution of special classes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAY: Petition of Jesse French & Sons' Piano Co., of Newcastle, Ind., favoring the passage of an amendment to the bankruptcy law to secure more speedy action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOBECK: Petition of Thompson, Belden & Co., of Omaha, Nebr., favoring the passage of the 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Miss Stella Taylor, of Blair, Nebr., protesting against the creation of a committee on public health; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Cozard Commercial Club, favoring the passage of the 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEVY: Petition of E. J. Burton and Martin Klein, both of New York, protesting against the passage of House resolution 33, to create a new committee on public health; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Traffic Club of New York, favoring appropriation for the continuance of the Commerce Court; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of the Traffic Club, of New York, N. Y., favoring an appropriation for the continuance of the Commerce Court; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Russian Caviar Co., of New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation making a specific rate of duty on caviar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Double Trouble Co., of Toms River, N. J., favoring the passage of House bill 4899, to fix standard barrels for fruits, vegetables, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the J. Wilckes Co., of New York, N. Y., protesting against the assessment of a fee for protests against assessments of duty by collectors of customs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Alex C. Sopers, of Lakewood, N. J., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of citizens of Washington, Pa., favoring the passage of legislation for the control and regulation of the sale of opium and cocaine except for medicinal uses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *June 2, 1913.*

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, some time since I entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution (S. Res. 64) amending Rule XII was adopted. I desire to call that matter up for consideration at this time. It is in the nature of a privileged motion, I take it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment of the rule.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That Rule XII be amended as follows:

"3. Immediately after and before the result of each roll call is ascertained and announced the Secretary shall call the names of the absentees."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas on the 1st of May entered a motion to reconsider the action of the Senate adopting this amendment to the rules.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Has unanimous consent been yet obtained to consider it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely wish to say, Mr. President, that I was the author of that rule. I had hoped that the purpose which was accomplished in the House by a like rule would be accomplished here, to wit, stopping Senators from coming in after a roll call and calling the attention of the President and having their names called, and then being recorded. In the House, however, immediately after the second roll call no Member of the House can consume the time of the body in stating why he was not present or in having himself recorded.

I find that I merely put in one additional roll call while Senators keep up the old abuse. I think the amendment ought to be reconsidered and defeated.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, when the amendment was offered I called the attention of the Senate to it and stated that I thought it was a mistake; and I remember well saying that I thought it would be reconsidered within the next two months. I think not quite that time has elapsed. I certainly approve of a reconsideration of the rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would have saved time if the vote had been announced immediately after the second roll call, but the clerks always waited to let Senators stray in.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I have devoted a considerable part of my life to the practice of the law, and one of the things which came to my knowledge that I profited by was never to argue a case after the court had announced a decision in my favor.