Also, petition of the Brooklyn Traffic Club, favoring the continuance of the Commerce Court; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of 2,000 citizens of Merced and Stanislaus Counties and Livingston, Cal., protesting against diversion of water from lands requiring irrigation; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, protesting against the passage of legislation repealing, suspending, or amending the present liability laws, Federal or State, unfavorably to the employee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of sundry merchants of the twenty-first Illinois congressional district, requesting a change made in the interstate-commerce laws in regard to the selling of goods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of Senate bill 1344 and House bill 1733, for the permanent improvement of the Consular and Diplomatic Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of the Connellsville (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the establishing of Federal residences in foreign countries for occupancy by the United States ambassadors, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Art Institute of Chicago, Ill., protesting against increase of duty on paintings and sculpture; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE: Petition of the Pennsylvania State Launderers' Association, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: Papers to accompany bill for increase of pension for Tennessee A. Blackburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: Affidavits to accompany bill (H. R. 1528) for the relief of T. A. Roseberry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, of Sacramento, Cal., favoring passage of bill (H. R. 4322) for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Democratic county committees of Alameda County, Cal., indorsing the Underwood tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Board of Education of San Francisco, Cal., favoring passage of Senate joint resolution 5; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of the Meriden Business Men's Association favoring a more efficient and businesslike administration of our consular business, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Switchmen's Union of North America, protesting against the passage of the workmen's compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry manufacturers and merchants of the city of Hartford, Conn., protesting against free cigars from the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of the Cambridge (Mass.) Board of Trade, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SLOAN: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Nebraska, favoring change in the interstate-commerce laws relative to mail-order houses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of J. C. Jenson, of Scogmo, N. Dak., protesting against the passage of House bill 4653, relative to the sale of drugs and patent medicines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, *July 18, 1913.*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

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

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

### COTTON STATISTICS (S. DOC. NO. 134).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 26th ultimo, certain information showing how the figures referring to cotton goods in the table on page 39 of the report of the Department of Commerce entitled "Foreign Tariff Systems and Industrial Conditions" were obtained, and also the correctness of the statement that it takes 504 horsepower in the United States to add the same value to cotton goods as 114 horsepower does in the United Kingdom, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 32) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge in and for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CLAYTON, Mr. WEBB, and Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma conferees on the part of the House.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented memorials of William Leon Dawson, of Santa Barbara, Cal.; Ellen A. Freeman, of Westerly, R. I.; Mrs. Viola Gray, of Lodi, Cal.; G. F. Kasch, of Akron, Ohio; and of the Pasadena Audubon Society, of Pasadena, Cal., remonstrating against the adoption of any amendment to the clause in Schedule N of the pending tariff bill prohibiting the importation of the plumage of certain wild birds, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PERKINS presented a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the permanent improvement of the Diplomatic and Consular Service, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Berkeley, Cal., favoring an appropriation for the construction of a naval station and dry dock on San Francisco Bay, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. McLEAN presented a resolution adopted by the Connecticut State Branch, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, remonstrating against the repeal of the present civil-service law, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. LODGE presented the memorial of R. D. Loveland and 81 other citizens of Melrose, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Fruit and Produce Exchange of Boston, Mass., favoring the adoption of 1-cent letter postage, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. WEEKS presented a memorial of Rebecca Pomroy Tent, No. 44, Daughters of Veterans, of Malden, Mass., remonstrating against any change or alterations being made in the United States flag, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### TARIFF DUTY ON LEMONS.

Mr. WORKS. I submit a short editorial from the Los Angeles Express bearing on the question of the tariff, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

AN OBJECT LESSON.

[From the Los Angeles Express.]

The East is afforded an object lesson as to the consequencs that will befall the consumers of lemons when the tariff bars shall have been removed and the Sicilian importers given a practical monopoly of the market along the Atlantic seaboard.

It is a matter of common knowledge throughout the country that an unprecedented period of low temperature last winter enormously injured the lemon crop of southern California. Consequently this section, that of late years has supplied over half the lemons consumed in the United States, has been unable to meet the demand. Sicilian lemons during the first week of July were selling in New York at $8.50 a box, more than twice the price that was asked for them at the same time last year, when they encountered the competition of the California product. It is predicted that the price may go to $10 a box.

Are the consumers of the East so short-sighted as not to see that the Sicilian importers are able to make these extortionate demands only because last winter's frost shut out California's competition this season? Do they not perceive that the proposed reduction of the duty will prove equally effective and exclude California growers hereafter as certainly as if a series of frosts swept their groves?

It is possible that the Treasury will derive a little larger revenue, but its gain will be achieved at tremendous cost to eastern consumers. Freed from California's competition, the Sicilian importers will make eastern lemon consumers pay every year the same extortionate prices this year witnesses.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, my attention was diverted for a moment, and I inquire what the paper is which was read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is an editorial from the Los Angeles Express, which the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] asked permission to have read. The Chair heard no objection to the reading of it.

Mr. STONE. I shall object to any future readings of that kind. I do not see why a Los Angeles newspaper or any other newspaper should be advertised through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It may be supposed to do somebody a little local good, but it is hardly the proper course to pursue.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. WORKS. I am unable to hear what the Senator from Missouri is saying.

Mr. STONE. I said I object to the notion of putting into the RECORD editorials of newspapers and advertising the newspapers through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Everybody has heard this kind of talk a good while, and the Senator from California could state it himself, if he concurs in this view, with a good deal more of ability.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, the Senators on the Democratic side have not heard this quite often enough or the tariff bill would not be as it is to-day. This is a perfectly legitimate argument on the tariff question, submitted by an intelligent newspaper, and I see no reason why it should not be incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. STONE. Oh, it is in the RECORD, but I object to having that sort of thing continued.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The matter which has been read will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. KENYON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 234) to enjoin and abate houses of lewdness, assignation, and prostitution; to declare the same to be nuisances; to enjoin the person or persons who conduct or maintain the same and the owner or agent of any building used for such purpose; and to assess a tax against the person maintaining said nuisance and against the building and owner thereof, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 82) thereon.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 654) to accept the cession by the State of Montana of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Glacier National Park, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 83) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 655) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to survey the lands of the abandoned Fort Assinniboine Military Reservation and open the same to settlement, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 84) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 657) to authorize the reservation of public lands for country parks and community centers within reclamation projects, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 85) thereon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 1243) directing the issuance of patent to John Russell, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 86) thereon.

Mr. JONES, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 2415) relating to the exclusion of traffic from streets and avenues of the city of Washington during parades, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 87) thereon.

ADDITIONAL LAND DISTRICT IN NEVADA.

Mr. PITTMAN. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 2727) to create an additional land district in the State of Nevada, and I submit a report (No. 88) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That an additional land district is hereby created for the State of Nevada to embrace the lands contained in the following-named counties, to wit: Churchill, Elko, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Lincoln, Nye, and White Pine, described as follows, to wit: Commencing at the common corner between townships 38 and 39 east, range 47 north, Mount Diablo base and meridian, being on the north boundary line of the State of Nevada; thence south on the dividing line between townships 38 and 39 east, to its intersection with the third standard parallel north, said parallel being the dividing line between ranges 15 and 16 north, of Mount Diablo base line; thence east along said third standard parallel north to the intersection of the Ruby Valley guide meridian, being the dividing line between townships 55 and 56 east; thence south along said Ruby Valley guide meridian to its intersection with the first standard parallel north, being the dividing line between ranges 5 and 6 north, of Mount Diablo base line; thence east along said first standard parallel north, between said ranges 5 and 6, to the east boundary line of the State of Nevada; thence north along the east boundary line of the State of Nevada to the north boundary line of the State of Nevada; thence west along the north boundary line of the State of Nevada to the point of beginning. The city of Elko, in the county of Elko, is hereby designated as the site of said land office, and the district shall be known as the Elko land district.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior shall cause all plats, maps, records, and papers in the Carson City land office which relate to or form a necessary part of the records of the lands embraced in the district hereby created to be transferred to the Elko land district.

SEC. 3. That the President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a register and a receiver for said land district, and they shall be subject to the same laws and be entitled to the same compensation as is or may be hereafter provided by law in relation to the existing land offices and officers of said State.

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

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. KERN. There seems to have been an impression prevailing among Members on this side of the Chamber that the adjournment was until 2 o'clock to-day. I make the point of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Dillingham | Martine, N. J. | Smith, Md. |
| Bacon | Fletcher | Myers | Smith, S. C. |
| Bankhead | Gallinger | Norris | Smoot |
| Borah | Gronna | O'Gorman | Sterling |
| Brady | Hollis | Page | Stone |
| Brandegee | James | Perkins | Sutherland |
| Bristow | Johnson, Me. | Pittman | Thomas |
| Bryan | Johnston, Ala. | Pomerene | Thompson |
| Chamberlain | Jones | Root | Thornton |
| Chilton | Kenyon | Saulsbury | Tillman |
| Clapp | Kern | Shafroth | Townsend |
| Clark, Wyo. | Lane | Sheppard | Vardaman |
| Clarke, Ark. | Lewis | Sherman | Warren |
| Colt | Lodge | Shields | Weeks |
| Crawford | McLean | Shively | Williams |
| Cummins | Martin, Va. | Smith, Ariz. | Works |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

TARIFF DUTY ON LEMONS.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. The Senator from Missouri made a statement a few moments ago in relation to the printing in the RECORD of editorials from newspapers. I want to know if I understood him correctly when I thought he said that in future he would object to any editorials being printed in the RECORD?

Mr. STONE. I did not mean to say, if I am so quoted, that I would object. I did mean to say that I thought I would protest; that printing such editorials in the RECORD was merely a bad habit; that if Senators wanted to make arguments on the floor they could do so, and refer other Senators to what the newspapers had said.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I am tempted to go a little further than the Senator from Missouri signifies his intention of going. I think that in future I shall object to the printing of newspaper editorials as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Of course I do this in no spirit of hostility to the newspapers or to the writers of editorials, or, as the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] interpolates, to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think it would be far from an injury to the RECORD if such editorials were excluded; but my idea about it is this: The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in my opinion, should be an authoritative record of the doings and proceedings in the Congress of the United States, and that part of it which pertains to the Senate, in my view, should report accurately the speeches and votes and proceedings of the Senate of the United States.

Of course, I know that under the rule a Senator, when he is addressing the Senate, may, with the permission of the Senate, read any editorial which seems to him to throw light upon the question that he is discussing.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator from Connecticut mean to say that in making a speech a Senator must get permission of the Senate to read an extract, either from a newspaper or from any other source?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. GALLINGER. The consent of the Senate must be had for the Secretary to read such matter, but to say that a Senator himself can be denied the privilege of reading it I think is not quite accurate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I may be mistaken about the rule, Mr. President—I have not looked at it recently—but I was under the impression that such a paper could not be read except by permission of the Senate. I think, however, the Senator from New Hampshire is probably correct about it, that the Secretary can not read such a paper without the consent of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is right, if objection is made.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But the Senator himself may read it. If any Senator thinks that an editorial writer has stated his position upon the proposition which he is discussing in a

fashion better than he himself can state it, so that he thinks the matter would be more properly presented by making the editorial a part of his remarks, I, of course, should have no objection to his including it in his speech; and I want to say to the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] that what I say has no reference whatever to the fact that he has this morning asked to have an editorial printed in the RECORD; but it has reference to the fact that I think it is a growing practice here, which is not a good practice. The principal thing I object to about the printing of editorials in the RECORD as a part of the record of Congress is that there is no end to it. No Senator wants to object to another Senator doing it if other Senators do not object to his doing it; so it becomes a matter rather of discourtesy to object. Therefore I want to give notice that I think, unless upon reflection I shall have cause to change my present intention, I shall object to the printing of editorials as a general thing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There is another reason why I think they should not be so printed. Such editorials are accessible to all the country and can be copied from one newspaper into another. Nobody will be deprived of the argument contained in an editorial if it is excluded from the RECORD.

Another reason why I do not think editorials should be included in the RECORD is that they are always anonymous; nobody knows who writes them; nobody is responsible for them. If any Senator wants to combat an argument raised by an editorial he must stand up here and debate the question with some anonymous person out of his reach and out of his knowledge, and be answered in the newspaper. The newspaper having the last say, and not being subject to the rules of parliamentary debate which prevail in the Senate, has an unfair advantage in such a discussion, even if a Senator wanted to continue the controversy.

So I think the orderly proceedings of the Senate, the dignity of the Senate, and the economical expenditure of the public funds will be promoted by preventing the stuffing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with anything that any Senator wants to put into it. If that practice is continued, it will produce a rivalry between the different sides of the controversy, which, by the introduction of rival or hostile editorials, would extend the RECORD to an amount of printing that would be absolutely disgraceful for us to countenance. Therefore, Mr. President, I think I shall object to any further printing of unsigned editorials.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I am very glad that some Senators have awakened to the fact that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is being encumbered by matter that ought never to find its way into its columns. The editorial I offered this morning was a very brief one, containing a statement of fact bearing upon an important piece of legislation which was actually pending in the Senate. I did not offer it because of any argument that was advanced by the editor, but merely as a statement of facts that I think are very important as affecting one of the great industries of my State. The custom of introducing matter of that kind in the RECORD has been followed ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. I have felt many times that it has been abused. If any Senator had objected to this editorial going into the RECORD, I should have gracefully submitted to that objection.

I am going further than that, Mr. President. It has been intimated here by two Senators already that there should have been objection made to the introduction of that editorial into the RECORD. Therefore, I am going to ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that the editorial may be withdrawn.

It has been stated by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] that I might have made this same statement myself, but possibly I might not have made it as well as it was made by the editor of the newspaper, who is interested in the industries in my own State, and certainly I do not desire to encumber the RECORD with any matter that ought not to be there. I sympathize with what has been said by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE]. Therefore, in order to show my own good faith with respect to the matter, I am going to ask leave to withdraw the editorial, so that it may not appear in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I object.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, does that require unanimous consent?

Mr. GALLINGER. Objection has been made.

Mr. BORAH. I was going to say——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will rule that it requires unanimous consent, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] has objected.

Mr. BORAH. If this matter is to be controlled, it ought to be controlled by the rules of the Senate rather than by the action of some Senator upon a particular occasion by making objection; and until the matter is distinctly settled by the rules of the Senate, I myself should hope that we would not have to depend upon some Senator making objection every time such a case arises.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think, Mr. President, that during my somewhat lengthy service in the Senate I never have asked to have any extracts from a newspaper printed in the RECORD. I think the RECORD will substantiate that statement. It occurs to me, however, that this is "a tempest in a teapot" this morning and that no good will result from it. A very brief editorial has been inserted in the RECORD, which the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] could himself have read, and the fact of its withdrawal will serve no good purpose.

There are times, Mr. President, as I look at the matter, when it is very important to put in the RECORD even the opinions of newspaper editors on great public questions. For that reason, and not having been an offender myself in this respect in the past—and I probably will not be in the future—I feel constrained to object to the request for the withdrawal which the Senator from California has made. He did not violate either the proprieties or the rules of the Senate in presenting and asking for the printing of the article, and there is no reason why he should be forced in any way, by criticism or otherwise, to ask for an unusual disposition of the matter. Therefore I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The ruling of the Chair is that under the rules of the Senate, if it is desired to have the Secretary read a paper, unless unanimous consent is given, it may be read by a vote of a majority of the Senators. The Senator from California asked unanimous consent to have the editorial read. There was no objection. It was read. The Chair holds that the same rule must apply with reference to the withdrawal of the matter from the RECORD—that it can not be withdrawn without unanimous consent. There is now a well-defined rule in the Senate that the Senate itself may determine whether papers shall or shall not be read into the RECORD.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey:

A bill (S. 2774) for the relief of George B. Hughes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THORNTON:

A bill (S. 2775) to transfer Commander Arthur Bainbridge Hoff from the retired to the active list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 2776) for the relief of Stilman Stotts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2777) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Rutter; and

A bill (S. 2778) granting a pension to Marshall Smithhart; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 2779) to authorize the conveyance of the steel bridge over the Snake River between Lewiston, Idaho, and Clarkston, Wash., to the States of Idaho and Washington or local subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 2780) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Hanover, in the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 2781) providing for the recognition of certain persons, for rank only, as commissioned officers in the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2782) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton M. Steele (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 2783) for the relief of the estate of Edward Allsworth; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 2784) granting an increase of pension to Sidney Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 2785) granting an increase of pension to Willet Van Winkle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 2786) for the relief of the New England Steamship Co., owner of the American steamer *Commonwealth;* to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2787) granting an increase of pension to Elinor F. Rodenbough (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:

A bill (S. 2788) for the relief of Templin Morris Potts, captain on the retired list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 59) to discontinue the washing of money; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENTS TO TARIFF BILL.

Mr. NORRIS submitted an amendment 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 was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADLEY submitted three 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 ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THE TARIFF—GOODS IN BOND.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I submit an amendment to the pending tariff bill, and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Strike out subdivision Q of Section V and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Q. That all goods, wares, and merchandise imported prior to the day when this act shall go into effect, for which no entry has been made, and all goods, wares, and merchandise previously entered without payment of duty and under bond for warehousing, transportation, or any other purpose, for which no permit of delivery to the importer or his agent has been issued, shall be subjected to the duties now in force upon the entry or the withdrawal thereof."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, it is reported that there is now in bonded warehouses something over $100,000,000 worth of imported merchandise, most of which has been imported with a view of being held to await the passage of the pending bill, in order to take advantage of the lower duties that will be afforded by that bill. The duties upon those imported articles under existing law amount, I am informed, to about $35,000,000. Importations are going on all the time, and by the time this bill shall have been passed they will probably amount to more than double the quantity now on hand, with a consequent loss to the Treasury of the United States that nobody can accurately estimate, but which will amount to many million dollars.

In addition to that, there will be a vast accumulation of these goods in the country ready to be dumped upon the country immediately upon the passage of the tariff bill. I think it is worth while for the Senate to consider whether or not this amount of money should be saved to the Treasury, and whether or not the demoralization which, it seems to me, will result from the precipitation of this large quantity of goods upon the country at one time should be prevented. I ask that the amendment lie on the table.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President there is evidently some considerable force in what the Senator has said. He suggests a subject which well merits consideration. If the Senator desires his proposed amendment to the tariff bill to lie on the table, of course I have no objection; but I was about to suggest—it may not accord with his view—that it be referred to the Finance Committee.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have no objection to that being done, Mr. President. I ask that the proposed amendment be referred to the Finance Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be printed and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SUBSTITUTE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I submit a proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute for House bill 3321, which I ask to have read, printed, and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Strike out the entire bill, including the enacting clause, and insert the following:

Whereas the Democratic Party is in control of the National Government; and

Whereas a tariff bill (H. R. 3321) is under consideration by the United States Senate; and

Whereas any tariff bill affects every citizen of the United States either favorably or adversely; and

Whereas the Democratic Party has repeatedly declared its adherence to the policy of referring national matters to the electorate; and

Whereas in several States now represented, in whole or in part, by Democratic Senators there is strong disapproval of some of the provisions in the pending bill: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That further consideration of the bill be postponed until the first Monday of December, 1914, and that meanwhile the bill be submitted to a referendum of the legal voters of the United States at the State and congressional elections to be held during that year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

THE TARIFF—INCOME TAX.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the pending tariff bill and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out, on page 172, line 24, the word "March," and on page 172 all of line 1, and in line 2 the words "both dates inclusive" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the passage of this act."

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I shall ask to have the amendment referred to the Committee on Finance; but I should like to call the attention of the members of the majority of the committee who are here to the precise point of the amendment. I do not see the chairman of the committee here.

Mr. SMOOT. He is absent.

Mr. ROOT. I see that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] is present, however.

Mr. STONE. I beg the Senator's pardon. My attention was called away.

Mr. ROOT. I have introduced a brief amendment to the tariff bill, which I shall ask to have referred to the Committee on Finance; but I wanted to call the Senator's attention to the precise point of the amendment. It is an amendment to the provision that the income tax shall be computed on incomes accruing from March 1 to December 31, 1913.

I think that provision will encounter very serious question. The change I propose is to have the income for the first year computed from the passage of the act, rather than from a fixed date—March 1, 1913.

The reason why I think it would be wise to make the change is that all direct taxes must be apportioned unless they come within the amendment relating to an income tax. We can impose a tax upon incomes without apportioning it because of the amendment, but we can not impose any other direct tax without apportionment. When income is received it immediately becomes principal. The income that was received on the 1st day of July of the present year, having been received, became principal, and no law hereafter can tax it without apportionment, any more than we can tax now the income that was received 10 years ago without apportionment. It is principal, and comes under the old provision of the Constitution requiring the apportionment of direct taxes, and not under the amendment which allows the taxing of income without apportionment.

So if the bill becomes a law with the provision in it that has been reported from the committee you will find yourselves endeavoring in one sentence to tax income that comes under the amendment, and to tax past income, income received, reduced to possession, and turned into principal before the passage of the act, and that you can not do without apportionment.

It is to avoid that difficulty, which I am sure is very serious, that I propose the amendment which I now ask to have referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that of course the Committee on Finance will be more than glad to have suggestions of an important character, such as have been made this morning by the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], referred to the committee, with the very clear and intelligent explanations of their views, which have been put in the RECORD, in order that they may be considered, and they will be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DEMOTION OF RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS.

On motion of Mr. BANKHEAD, it was

*Ordered*, That the papers relative to the demotion of clerks in the Railway Mail Service, which were sent to the Senate in response to Senate resolution No. 400, Sixty-second Congress, third session, and which have been mainly printed in two parts, as Senate Document No. 1130, Sixty-second Congress, third session, be returned to the Postmaster General in accordance with his request of July 15, 1913.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In accordance with the notice which I have heretofore given, I submit a resolution, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Rules.

The resolution (S. Res. 137) was read, as follows:

*Be it resolved, etc.*, That Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate shall be amended as follows:

(1) Change the paragraph which now reads "A Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor, to consist of five

Senators," so as to read "A Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce, to consist of five Senators."

(2) Insert after the paragraph which reads "A Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, to consist of five Senators," a new paragraph, to read as follows: "A Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor, to consist of five Senators."

(3) Insert after the paragraph which reads "A Committee on Revolutionary Claims, to consist of five Senators," a new paragraph, to read as follows: "A Committee on Roads, to consist of 17 Senators."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and printed.

WASHED PAPER MONEY.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I present matter which I ask may be printed in the RECORD. Acting upon the suggestion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], I have consolidated or boiled down my five hundred and seventy-odd letters to 12 or a few more, and I ask that I may be granted permission to print them in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANA.

FORT WAYNE.

DANGEROUS TO MAKE ANY CHANGES.

HAMILTON NATIONAL BANK,
*Fort Wayne, Ind., March 29, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I am very glad to receive the pamphlet entitled "Washed Money," and have read it with interest. When it was reported that the last administration proposed to change our currency in the manner described, and intended to reduce the size of the notes, I wondered what could be the reasons for so doing, by what authority, for I had never seen any act of Congress authorizing such changes.

I think our present currency is generally artistic, the engraving, I presume, up to the highest standard, and the manufacture of the paper under the sole control of the Government. The present size of notes are most conveniently handled by bank tellers and all others who distribute large sums.

What reason can there be for making any change, except, as is stated, a saving of a small amount in paper, and this saving would be absorbed for a long time by the cost of new plates. The profit that the Government makes by the destruction of notes in all manner of ways is certainly very much more than the cost of keeping bright new notes in circulation, for the washing business is, as you state, a strange economical proceeding for a great Government like ours. The Bank of England never pays out a note the second time; this proceeding may be extreme, but certainly the Government is rich enough and should have pride enough to keep in circulation fairly clean bills. I hope all the attempts of the last administration to change the style or size of our currency will be countermanded by Mr. McAdoo, and I think all such changes should be authorized by an act of Congress only when experts upon such matters can give good reasons for so doing.

FINE ENGRAVING AND PAPER BAFFLES COUNTERFEITERS.

Counterfeiters have found it impossible to do any work that has not been quickly detected. This is because such care has been exercised by the Government, both in engraving and paper. It is certainly dangerous to make any changes, particularly such as the last administration contemplated.

For many years in my younger days I was a bank teller (before the Civil War, when we had the greatest variety of bank notes and since the Government took charge); I paid considerable attention to the matter of engraving, and I believe the work now done in this line is beyond criticism in both mechanical work and design.

I am very glad that Senator MARTINE is giving this matter his personal attention, and hope he will prevent any changes. I look with confidence to the work of the new administration in all departments, from President Wilson down.

Respectfully, yours, CHARLES MCCULLOCH, *President.*

INDIANAPOLIS.

HISTORIC PICTURES SHOULD NOT BE ABANDONED.

THE UNION TRUST CO.,
*Indianapolis, Ind., March 21, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your favor of the 8th, inclosing the article on washed money. I do not know much about washed money, but the idea has never appealed to me as a good one. But I am in complete sympathy with the article in reference to the abandonment of historic pictures on bills and the reduction in size. Our money has seemed to me to be almost perfect, and some of the notes have far surpassed anything I have ever seen in artistic design and beauty of finish. The size, too, is just what it should be, and I think if the small bills are introduced they will not give anything like the satisfaction the others have done.

Yours, very truly, JOHN H. HOLLIDAY.

PENNSYLVANIA.

HARRISBURG.

AMOUNTS TO HINDRANCE TO BUSINESS.

HARRISBURG, PA., *March 21, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your favor inclosing Senate document entitled "Washed Money, the Counterfeiter's Delight" (and have read it with a great deal of interest), and asking me to furnish to you my views with respect to same.

The experiment of the United States Government of washing its paper money is probably a monetary saving, as far as the Government is concerned, inasmuch as it defers the issuance of new notes in lieu of the old ones turned in for redemption; but as far as the public is concerned it amounts to a hindrance to business, and it is to be hoped that the Government authorities will reconsider the step it has taken and abandon the project.

WASHED MONEY RELUCTANTLY ACCEPTED.

In the bank with which I am connected, in this city, I am advised by one of its employees that washed money is reluctantly accepted by those to whom it is tendered. Many who are accustomed to handling money—i. e., store clerks, shop dealers, etc.—are somewhat skeptical and dubious about it. The expert, however, does not hesitate, but the public in general does, and the public is depended upon for the circulation of the money.

A VERY INTERESTING AND SUGGESTIVE INCIDENT.

One of the bank's employees stated to the writer the following incident, which shows the inadequacy of the Government's new venture—that of washing money.

"A sum of money amounting to several hundred dollars—all in notes—was handed to the clerk, and in the center of the bundle was a washed note. The clerk hesitated a moment to examine the note. The depositor to whom the money belonged asked the clerk to return the note to him, and gave him another one in return. The clerk being somewhat surprised at the depositor's action asked him the reason, and he stated that one of his clerks had taken the note in payment of a purchase and doubted its genuineness, and he was afraid the bank clerk might mark the note 'counterfeit,' and he hastily withdrew it in order that he might make further investigation in regard to it."

I have no doubt that this incident is one of many that is happening every day, and it should discourage the Government to continue the washing of money for the reason that it is detrimental to the business welfare of the country.

Yours, very truly, C. H. BACKENSTOE.

NEW YORK.

BROOKLYN.

PROPHESIES RETURN TO HAND-PRINTED BILLS.

THE DIME SAVINGS BANK,
*Brooklyn, N. Y., March 31, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Beg to acknowledge receipt of yours recently received, inclosing article from The Plate Printer relative to washed money.

At your request I will briefly state in reference thereto that nearly a quarter of a century's experience in observing and handling of money, etc., leads me to believe that this action will work to a very great disadvantage with the money-handling public. It would appear to me that the small saving accomplished by this method of washing was as nothing compared with the risk involved. Nearly every counterfeit we meet with is the faded and worn kind. It is seldom that a counterfeit has a chance of passing when it is new and crisp. In fact, it would appear that counterfeiters give them the worn and faded appearance purposely before floating them.

SMALLER SIZED BILLS ALSO IN INTEREST OF COUNTERFEITERS.

As to machine printing, I prophesy that within a twelve month after the experiment is begun they will have to go back to hand-printed man's size bills. Here, too, it would seem that the small saving in paper is as nothing compared to the convenience of the present bill. Anyone familiar with the handling of money knows that half the surety in discovering counterfeit money is that indescribable "feel" when the bill is passed through the fingers. With the new bills, as proposed, I feel sure it will be impossible to slide them through the hand in the present manner; it will be necessary, I feel sure, to "thumb" them. In the "thumbing" method of counting there is absolutely no chance for the "feel" referred to above. I have tried pieces of paper cut to the size proposed, and it does not seem to me that it will be possible to handle the proposed bills in the old way.

And further, think of the chance during the years when the new size currency is being gradually worked into the system there will be for the new small bills to be slipped in between the larger bills through error.

MACHINE PRINTING SMUDGY, MISERABLE WORK.

As to machine printing, see what smudgy, miserable work is shown on beer and cigar stamps. Nothing, I believe, has ever been invented to take the place of the pad which nature has placed on the human hand for the wiping off of the plate after the ink has been applied. Thanking you for this chance to express myself, I am,

Yours, very truly,

C. M. LOWES, *Treasurer.*

WAVERLY.

WANT FIRST-CLASS CURRENCY.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK,
*Waverly, N. Y., February 3, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Your circular on washed money received and read with interest. A number of years ago I prepared an article on the subject of the different forms of currency we were issuing, believing that we had too many varieties, which gave the counterfeiters opportunities to ply their trade, and I think the point you raise in regard to washed money is very important.

I think I can give you another argument against this plan; that is, that up to 1908 the national banks had paid in to the Government $180,000,000 in taxes for various purposes, largely upon circulation, and the expenses of the department for the same term, chargeable to this fund, were only $23,000,000, leaving $157,000,000 which the Government has taken. Since 1908 I think the banks have paid something over $10,000,000 of the same kind of taxes, and the expenses have been very small in comparison.

BANKS PAY ALL EXPENSES.

In this you will note that the banks are paying all expenses, and there is no reason why the Government should come in and allow the issue of anything but a fine class of note issues, especially as to work.

Hoping that you will secure a change in this plan and that they will give us first-class currency hereafter, I am,

Very truly, yours, F. E. LYFORD.

NEW YORK CITY.

MAKES MORE DIFFICULT TO DETECT COUNTERFEITERS.

THE FIFTH AVENUE BANK,
*New York, April 11, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Your Senate Document No. 1020 is quite correct in so far as it relates to the washing of our paper currency.

Our teller says that it is much more difficult to detect a counterfeit now that washed bills are in circulation. Aside from the fact that a washed bill has lost in some slight degree the sharpness of the engraving, the paper has been changed in a way difficult to describe, so that it is very similar to the paper of most counterfeits, and therefore

the delicacy of touch by which a counterfeit is often detected is apt to be lost or greatly diminished.

TELLER'S WORK VERY TRYING.

I have had an experience of more than 50 years in banking, and in the early sixties was a teller in a bank in Poughkeepsie, N. Y. The difficulty of detecting counterfeits, and the vast number of them in circulation then made the teller's position very trying. The Government has changed all that by better engraving and by issuing new plates without stint whenever successful counterfeits appear, and by the unremitting pursuit of counterfeiters, as, for instance, in the celebrated Pennsylvania case in which Detective Burns was so successful.

It seems a pity to diminish the safeguards against counterfeits to save the cost of destroying old bills and issuing new ones in their place. The rule of the Bank of England never to reissue a note, but to redeem and destroy all notes they receive, even if fresh, is, in my opinion, a great hindrance to counterfeiting.

Thanking you for your interest in the subject, I am,

Yours, very truly,

A. S. FRISSELL.

MANAGER NEW YORK CLEARING HOUSE CONDEMNS WASHED MONEY.

NEW YORK CLEARING HOUSE,
*New York, March 25, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Complying with your favor asking for an expression of opinion on Document 1020, United States Senate, I have the honor to say that I consider it a very well-expressed argument against the washed-money scheme.

I can see no good reason for the adoption of that plan. As you truly say, it aids the counterfeiters' industry and will cause great loss to the people, larger, I believe, than will be saved by this mere experiment of washing.

SMALLER NOTES CONDEMNED.

In the important matter of the issuance of currency by the Government, I feel warranted, after a practical experience of 50 years in the handling of currency as a bank clerk, as a Treasury official, and manager of the New York Clearing House, in expressing warmly my objection to the plan to shorten and curtail the size of the currency notes of the Government, as I believe it will lead to confusion in the handling of money by the banks. The volume is exceedingly large, and if it is composed of mixed sizes of bills it will cause not only a loss of time but great risk of miscount and error.

Trusting that these experiments will not be tried, I am,

Very respectfully, yours,

WM. SHERER,
*Manager New York Clearing House Association.*

## OKLAHOMA.

MUSKOGEE.

DO AWAY WITH WASHING.

THE COMMERCIAL NATIONAL BANK,
*Muskogee, Okla., April 1, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: With reference to Senate Document No. 1020, "Washed Money," beg to advise that this bank would much prefer paying its proportionate part for the printing of new money and do away with washing the old money. In other words, we can see no particular benefit from it, and do not believe it is a good practice.

Yours, truly,

D. N. FINK, *President.*

ALVA.

PRESIDENT OF THREE BANKS OPPOSES.

THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF ALVA,
*Alva, Okla., March 31, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I have been opposed to the "penny wise and pound foolish" idea of washing currency from its inception on general principles, but after reading your Senate Document No. 1020, have concluded that the honorable Senators, with their usual good judgment, will abolish the idea entirely.

Yours, most respectfully,

J. A. STINE,
*President First National Bank, Alva, Okla.*
*President First National Bank, Woodward, Okla.*
*President First National Bank, Waynoka, Okla.*

## NEBRASKA.

SOUTH OMAHA.

SENATE DOCUMENT EXPRESSES HIS VIEWS.

LIVE STOCK NATIONAL BANK,
*South Omaha, Nebr., March 11, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

SIR: I am in receipt of a copy of your Senate document entitled "Washed Money," which I have read with much interest and great pleasure, and which expresses my views upon the questions involved better than I could have expressed them myself.

When the proposed change in the form of our currency was first advanced by Secretary MacVeagh, I filed strenuous objections, but they received scant courtesy. Have also written Secretary McAdoo repeating my objections, copy of letter being herewith inclosed.

A SHAME TO GO BACK TO "SHINPLASTERS."

It would seem a shame that our great Government should go back to the issuing of "shinplasters," and street-car transfers in the form of currency, simply for the purpose of saving a few dollars expense, the larger part of which has heretofore been borne by the national banks without complaint, so far as I know, upon their part. If a part of the expense which is devoted to the franking of congressional mail and advertisements for muckraking magazines were devoted to the sending of new currency to the banks throughout the country, it would seem to be better for all.

It is said that the Bank of England never reissues a note after it has once been returned to the bank, even though it has never left the banking room.

SECRETARY MACVEAGH'S INSPIRATION.

I think the late Secretary of the Treasury, in making the order to change the form of our currency, was actuated by the same motive as the ruler of a country who orders the profile changed on the coin that his reign may be remembered.

I sincerely trust that you may be able to bring enough pressure to bear upon Secretary McAdoo to prevent the proposed change in our form of currency, and also stop the laundering of our money, which is a disgrace to our Government.

Respectfully, yours,

C. F. MCGREW, *President.*

(Inclosure.)

## OHIO.

CANTON.

SINCERELY OPPOSED TO WASHED MONEY.

THE GEORGE D. HARTER BANK,
*Canton, Ohio, March 14, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. MARTINE: Your letter of March 8, inclosing printed matter on washed money, received. I read the contents of this folder some time ago and I heartily indorse all that was said in the subject matter, and I sincerely am opposed to washed money. Our tellers are having a great deal of difficulty examining these bills when presented for deposit. The currency after treatment is faded and presents anything but a perfect piece of work.

WILL BE COUNTERFEITER'S DELIGHT.

It certainly will be the counterfeiter's delight and probably be a great loss to the general public. I hope this practice will be eliminated immediately. Let us not lower the standard of our currency system.

Very truly, yours,

E. E. MACK, *Cashier.*

POMEROY.

WRONG KIND OF ECONOMY.

FIRST CITY BANK,
*Pomeroy, Ohio, March 19, 1913.*

Senator JAMES E. MARTINE,
*Washington, D. C.*

SIR: Your secretary has sent us the article you had printed on washed money, with the suggestion that our views would be welcome, and we are very glad to express them.

We are against the whole plan of washing money and we consider it a wrong kind of economy. We think it is wrong in principle and a step in the wrong direction. We rather favor an increased expenditure in the direction of putting new money in the people's hands. The money in circulation even this far West is far too dirty to be a credit to the Government, and in other sections we have heard it is even worse. And so far we have had no washed money to contend with—no doubt it will be even worse if the washed money reaches this locality. It will not reach us, however, through any of the local banks, I am sure, for none of them would receive any such bills from their city correspondents if they should attempt to force them on our community.

FAVORS A MORE LIBERAL POLICY.

Instead of trying to save money in this way, at the cost of untold annoyance and suspicion about every washed bill, we would favor a more liberal policy in the way of making it easier and cheaper for country banks to get new money from the Government—absolutely new money, no other.

Respectfully,

W. G. PLANTZ,
*Assistant Cashier.*

## MISSOURI.

KANSAS CITY.

HARD ENOUGH NOW TO DETECT COUNTERFEITS.

MISSOURI SAVINGS BANK,
*Kansas City, Mo., April 9, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: We have read with considerable interest the article on washed money, but even before reading this we were fully convinced that trouble must ensue because of the condition of the bill after washing.

It is hard enough now to distinguish good money from counterfeit, and we urge you to use all efforts possible to protect our money.

Yours, truly,

W. S. WEBB, *Cashier.*

ST. JOSEPH.

POOR ECONOMY AND EXTREMELY DANGEROUS.

THE GERMAN-AMERICAN NATIONAL BANK,
*St. Joseph, Mo., April 10, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I have read your pamphlet referring to washed money and wish to state that it is very poor economy for our Government to wash its currency, and it is extremely dangerous to have such washed currency in circulation, and I hope a united effort will be made to discontinue the washing of our currency and give us the highest product of new bills that the artist's skill can produce, as the public is entitled to this.

Thanking you for your efforts in this direction, and trusting that the Government will at an early date discontinue the washing of currency, I am,

Sincerely, yours,

HENRY KRUG, Jr.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE.

TILTON.

DULLS BILLS, BLURS THE INK, AND ENCOURAGES COUNTERFEITERS.

THE CITIZENS NATIONAL BANK,
*Tilton, N. H., March 27, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Having received a copy of Washed Money, published as Senate Document No. 1020, and an invitation being thereby extended to do so, I will briefly give you my opinion.

Our currency is, in my opinion, the finest product of the engraver's art in the world.

As such it is poor economy to undertake to spoil that effect by any washing process. My observation is that it dulls the bill, blurs some of the ink, and gives such an appearance as to encourage counterfeiters to imitate the same, which can be more readily done with washed currency than unwashed.

The Bank of England never pays out the same bill twice, but retires it when returned to the bank, even if it comes back the same day. This is an extreme treatment of the same, as, of course, new currency is still usable. On the other hand, we go to the other extreme, and currency is in use to-day that is positively filthy.

It is impossible to count up $2,000 of the average currency as it comes in over the counter without so soiling the hands that they need "washing."

DO NOT WASH, BUT DESTROY FILTHY BILLS.

If the Bank of England can afford to destroy over 90 tons of paper frequently, as it does, from the failure to reissue currency, I believe that the United States can afford to destroy filthy currency rather than to attempt to go into the laundry business.

From the standpoint of a banker of some years, having never known any other business, and with the memory of having been taught to sit on a high stool at 6 years and count money for my father, who died with an honorable record of 45 years of continuous service, I fully think that we would better study how to make our currency better by retiring the old, rather than to try to save a few dollars at the expense of public safety.

If a bank man can be deceived by the washing process, what about the rank and file of people who do not, and can not, tell a good counterfeit?

Enough said, perhaps.

I thank you for the opportunity.

Yours, very truly, ARTHUR N. CASS, *Cashier.*

—

MINNESOTA.

LITCHFIELD.

BLEACHED AND WASHED-OUT APPEARANCE.

THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK,
*Litchfield, March 24, 1913.*

Senator JAMES E. MARTINE,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Wish to acknowledge receipt of article on washed currency. In reply to same would say that we do not favor this washing process at all. In the first place, the bills present a bleached and washed-out appearance, and, in the second place, it is a matter of small expense to have fresh, new currency. We are far inland and a great number of the bills in circulation are torn, ragged, and dirty, and it would only be fair that whatever bills are put in circulation that they should be new, and, in the third place, we should guard, as well as possible, from counterfeiting, which would be comparatively easy with a large amount of washed bills in circulation.

Before closing, would like to urge the necessity of currency legislation as soon as possible. Every fall, in crop-moving time, we are taxed to our fullest capacity, and it seems absurd that business operations should be slowed down because we have not got the currency to transact the business of the country. The panic of 1907 was in the fall in the midst of crop-moving time, and with us was a currency panic and nothing more. The twin-city banks were shipping currency into the interior for crop-moving purposes until they had none left.

The trouble with the Vreeland law is that this is not put into operation until there is a panic. Can not some constructive legislation be enacted whereby the necessary currency is furnished to transact the commercial business of the country, and when the stress is over that it be retired from circulation? Whether this is accomplished by a central bank, clearing-house associations, or rediscount associations, with the privilege of issuing currency, is of little moment to the most of us as long as we get the results.

Yours, truly, A. W. KRON, *Cashier.*

—

KANSAS.

LEAVENWORTH.

DANGEROUS AND RISKY.

LAMBERT LUMBER CO.,
*Leavenworth, Kans., March 12, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: We have yours of the 28th ultimo in reference to the washing of currency proposition, and in our opinion it seems to be a dangerous and risky thing to do, considering the apparent ease with which these bills may be counterfeited, and, in our opinion, no question of economy or saving to the Government within any reasonable limit should be considered if by so doing it would in any way, to the slightest degree, render our circulating medium unsafe and easy to imitate.

Very respectfully,

LAMBERT LUMBER CO.,
By O. P. LAMBERT,
*Vice President.*

PITTSBURG.

IS POOR ECONOMY.

THE NATIONAL BANK OF COMMERCE,
*Pittsburg, Kans., March 13, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Answering your circular letter dated February 28, it impresses me that it is poor economy for the United States Government to attempt to save money by washing of currency; the saving is insignificant compared to the risk assumed by reason of the ease with which it may now be counterfeited.

Yours, truly, A. E. MAXWELL, *President.*

McPHERSON.

IS A DISGRACE TO THE COUNTRY.

THE PEOPLE'S STATE BANK,
*McPherson, Kans., March 18, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I have read with considerable interest your pamphlet on washed money. I am surprised that a Government like ours, with all the pride we have along other lines, should stoop to the practice of "washing money" for the purpose of saving a few dollars. It is a disgrace to the country, and will cheapen our money and help to bring our currency into disrepute. I am sure the people would not stand for it a minute if left to a vote. Do all you can to stop it. The efficiency of the engraving should never be less, either. Counterfeiting will be rampant when the washed money is in circulation.

Yours, truly, F. A. VANIMAN,
*President.*

—

SOUTH DAKOTA.

YANKTON.

APPRECIATE NEW CURRENCY.

THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK,
*Yankton, S. Dak., March 11, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Your letter of February 28 received relative to the document printed at the request of Senator JAMES E. MARTINE, of New Jersey, on January 20, 1913, entitled "Washed Money, the Counterfeiters' Delight," and in reply to same will state that we are strongly opposed to washing our currency, for the following reasons:

First. We live in the West and have very little new currency, and practically the only new currency we have is what we get from Washington on account of our $50,000 circulation, and the farmers being the people with whom we deal and depend upon mostly, appreciate what little new currency we have to give them, and we find that this washed currency does not take its place.

OPPOSED TO REDUCING HIGH STANDARD.

Second. We are opposed to the Government trying to reduce their expenses in the currency department, for the reason that our present currency has a high standard, and, in our opinion, it would be folly to run any risk of reducing this standard which our currency has attained by taking any risks by counterfeiters imitating these washed bills.

We have discovered no counterfeit bills and possibly would not know them if we had, but can see where it is logical that these washed bills would be easier to imitate than the new currency where the cuts are clear and distinct.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE SATISFIED WITH ENORMOUS PROFITS.

Third. The Government realizes enormous profits from the manufacture of paper currency, and our present currency system has paid the Government many dollars in profit, and from the action they have taken one would think they are not satisfied with the millions of dollars of profit or rather accumulations which they have made in the past. Why they should cut down the high standard of this department we can not understand, unless it is for the purpose of increasing the enormous profits which they now have.

Fourth. In closing I wish to state that we are in favor of a revision of our present currency system, although this does not come under the topic upon which you asked us to write. I take the liberty to give you our expression on the question.

Very truly, yours, E. R. HEATON,
*Assistant Cashier.*

—

CONNECTICUT

BRIDGEPORT.

CHEAPENS QUALITY OF OUR PAPER MONEY.

THE PEQUONNOCK NATIONAL BANK,
*Bridgeport, Conn., April 5, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: We have read Document No. 1020, entitled "Washed money," with much interest, and as a banking institution with 60 years' experience we are very much opposed to the scheme to use washed currency. It would be a crime to cheapen the quality of our paper money, and it would certainly be difficult to detect counterfeits if the idea were carried into effect.

UNWISE TO CHANGE THE SIZE.

We also think it unwise to change the size and design of United States bills and national-bank currency after our people have become accustomed to handling the present issues. We sincerely hope that the plans will not be carried out.

Very truly, yours, F. W. HALL, *Cashier.*

NEW HAVEN.

CONSIDERING DANGER, NOT GOOD BUSINESS.

THE W. T. FIELDS CO., INVESTMENT SECURITIES,
*New Haven, Conn., April 19, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: We think your remarks as given in Senate Document No. 1020 on washed money were to the point. The washing of paper money, in view of the danger incurred in its subsequent use, does not strike us as good business, and we hope that the practice will be abandoned. We believe that new money should be supplied to take the place of mutilated currency when forwarded for redemption.

Yours, very truly,

W. T. FIELDS, *Treasurer.*

—

MASSACHUSETTS.

SPENCER.

WASHING OF SERVICE TO COUNTERFEITERS.

SPENCER SAVINGS BANK,
*Spencer, Mass., March 28, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: It seems to me that the washing machine will simply result in being of service to the counterfeiter when a spurious note that has been so cleverly executed passes the official in the Treasury cash room in the belief that it was a washed note.

If this is done for the sake of economy, then why not establish along with it a bureau for renovating second-hand clothing for the use of the military branch of the Government?

Soapsuds cleaning and such a bureau might fairly represent a cheap, sickly republic, but not this Government, let us hope.

Respectfully, yours,

J. W. TEMPLE, *President.*

LOWELL.

UNQUALIFIEDLY PROTESTS AGAINST WASHED MONEY.

NORCROSS & LEIGHTON, INSURANCE,
*53 Central Street, Lowell, Mass., March 10, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Your favor of February 28, inclosing article on "Washed money," duly received. Replying to your request for my views, would say:

I would unqualifiedly register my protest against the use of washed money, believing that the paper currency of this country should be of the very best workmanship and never reissued after its once being paid back into the Treasury. The article referred to is well named "The counterfeiters' delight."

Thanking you for giving me this opportunity to express my views, I remain,

Yours, truly, NICHOLAS G. NORCROSS.

BROCKTON.

MAKES WORK OF COUNTERFEITER EASIER.

PEOPLE'S SAVINGS BANK,
*Brockton, Mass., March 21, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. MARTINE: I am glad of the opportunity to express to you my views on the money question. It only requires the application of a little gray matter for any intelligent man to see that by making the engravings coarser and cheaper and washing away the life of the bill it makes the work of the counterfeiter more easy. Changing the size of bills is another serious mistake, as they can not be put up in packages with the large bills and will cause all kinds of confusion and mistakes. The United States is able and should use the finest work of the engravers' art on its money. Educational pictures are especially desirable.

Yours, very truly,

C. S. LUDDEN, *Treasurer.*

NEW BEDFORD.

CONFIDENCE OF PEOPLE SHOULD NOT BE SHAKEN.

SANDFORD & KELLEY, BANKERS,
*New Bedford, Mass., April 2, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Yours at hand, and in reply we beg to state that we are not in favor of the reissuing of washed money, as we believe that the confidence of the people should in no way be shaken through the possibility of any measure that would make it easier for counterfeiters to ply their profession and circulate their counterfeits. In the rush of business as it is done these days people should not have to stop to examine washed bills; and, further, we are paying too much money to protect the country from the wiles of the counterfeiter to let down the bars at this time, or, in fact, at any time. The Government should go to the limit to protect the handlers of the money which they have issued and in which the people place confidence.

Yours, very truly,

SANDFORD & KELLEY.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, executive clerk, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 9, 1913:

S. 2272. An act providing for an increase in the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy after June 30, 1913.

On July 15, 1913:

S. 2517. An act providing for mediation, conciliation, and arbitration in controversies between certain employers and their employees.

SALARY OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

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

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution No. 132, relative to the salary of the Secretary of State.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that under the rules a motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not debatable.

Mr. BRISTOW. I demand the yeas and nays on the motion to lay the resolution on the table.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when Mr. BURLEIGH's name was called). The junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] is detained from the Senate on account of protracted illness. That Senator is not paired, and I am going to express the hope that a pair may be arranged so that he may be protected.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. In his absence, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. JACKSON]. I do not know how he would vote if present, and I therefore withhold my vote. I am in favor of the motion, however, and should vote "yea" if I were at liberty to do so.

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. CRAWFORD (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SHEPPARD (when Mr. CULBERSON's name was called). My colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT].

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. STONE (when Mr. REED's name was called). I desire to state that my colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], is absent from the Senate on official business in connection with what is known as the lobby committee. He is paired with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia (when Mr. SWANSON's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SWANSON] is unavoidably absent from the Senate. If present, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF]. I learn that he is not in the Chamber, and I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] are unavoidably absent from the city.

Mr. CHILTON. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. JACKSON] to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BACON (after having voted in the affirmative). The senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] is absent, being on duty with the investigating committee. During his absence I have undertaken to protect him. I rose to withdraw my vote and stand paired with him upon this question, but I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] to the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], and will permit my vote to stand as originally cast.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan] is absent on important business. He is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (after having voted in the affirmative). I voted in the affirmative, forgetting that I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON]. Therefore I must withdraw my vote; but if at liberty to vote I should vote in the affirmative.

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. MCCUMBER] is necessarily absent from the city. He is paired with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS].

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—41.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Johnson, Me. | Pittman | Smith, Md. |
| Bacon | Johnston, Ala. | Poindexter | Stone |
| Borah | Kern | Pomerene | Thomas |
| Bryan | Lane | Ransdell | Thompson |
| Chilton | Lewis | Robinson | Thornton |
| Clarke, Ark. | Martin, Va. | Saulsbury | Tillman |
| Fletcher | Martine, N. J. | Shafroth | Vardaman |
| Gore | Myers | Sheppard | Williams |
| Hollis | O'Gorman | Shields | |
| Hughes | Overman | Shively | |
| James | Owen | Smith, Ariz. | |

NAYS—29.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bradley | Cummins | Lodge | Sterling |
| Brady | Dillingham | McLean | Sutherland |
| Brandegee | Fall | Norris | Townsend |
| Bristow | Gallinger | Page | Warren |
| Burton | Gronna | Penrose | Weeks |
| Clark, Wyo. | Jones | Root | |
| Colt | Kenyon | Sherman | |
| Crawford | Lippitt | Smoot | |

NOT VOTING—26.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bankhead | Goff | Newlands | Smith, S. C. |
| Burleigh | Hitchcock | Oliver | Stephenson |
| Catron | Jackson | Perkins | Swanson |
| Chamberlain | La Follette | Reed | Walsh |
| Clapp | Lea | Simmons | Works |
| Culberson | McCumber | Smith, Ga. | |
| du Pont | Nelson | Smith, Mich. | |

So Mr. BRISTOW's resolution was laid on the table.

Mr. LODGE subsequently said: When the vote was taken on the motion to lay the resolution of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] upon the table, I was out of the Chamber, having been called into the reception room. I came in after the call had been finished and voted. I did so in entire forgetful-

ness of the fact that I had a general pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. I could have transferred my pair, I find, to the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH], and thus it could have been covered. I wish to make this explanation because it was my fault, and I very deeply regret it.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I desire to say that our Democratic friends may be able to stop the discussion in this Chamber of this resolution by the action just taken, but they can not convince the American people that a member of the Cabinet can neglect his official duties and go out over the country in other employment when his services are needed in his department in Washington.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. What does the gentleman discuss?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. LEWIS. I demand the regular order.

Mr. BRISTOW. May I inquire what is the point of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution has been laid on the table, and the Chair holds that its discussion is out of order.

Mr. BRISTOW. I will discuss something else, then.

Mr. LEWIS. I call for the regular order.

COTTON TIES AND COTTON BAGGING.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution 134, calling for an investigation by the Secretary of Commerce into the advance of the price of bagging.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, as I was saying, the Senate may dispose of one resolution, but other resolutions appear, and as long as there is freedom of discussion in the Senate a Senator may talk within the rules upon the resolution that is pending.

It would be just as consistent for the Attorney General to take two or three months of his time during the year and engage in the practice of law as for the Secretary of State to follow his private business to the neglect of his duty.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary question.

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

Mr. BRISTOW. For what purpose does the Senator from Montana rise?

Mr. MYERS. I rose to make a parliamentary inquiry. What is the regular order, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution now pending before the Senate.

Mr. MYERS. What resolution is it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has already been stated. It is Senate resolution 134.

Mr. MYERS. I ask for the reading of it, please.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. SMITH of South Carolina on the 15th instant, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Commerce be, and is hereby, directed to investigate the recent advance in price of bagging used in baling cotton, also the advance in price of ties used in banding or baling cotton, and to report to the Senate at the earliest possible time the cause or causes for said advances.

Mr. MYERS. I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BRISTOW. I have the floor.

Mr. MYERS. I object to the resolution. Let it go over one day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas has the floor.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss at length the resolution that is pending, but I think there is a condition before the country that should demand the attention of Congress and of the administration in power. Can the members of the Cabinet, with business of the highest public importance pending, commanding the most careful and industrious attention of the entire administration, absent themselves from their departments and go about the country in private business for profit and gain, because the salary paid of $12,000 a year is not enough to sustain them, and leave subordinates that draw from $5,000 to $7,000 a year to do the work that they are supposed to be doing?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BRISTOW. For what purpose does the Senator from Mississippi rise?

Mr. VARDAMAN. May I ask the Senator from Kansas a question?

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Are you really apprehensive that the business of the State Department will be neglected by the absence of the Secretary of State?

Mr. BRISTOW. Well, Mr. President, that is a pertinent question.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I hope the Senator will give me a very candid answer to it, because he is always candid.

Mr. BRISTOW. It has been said since this discussion came up that the department was better off with the present Secretary of State away than at home. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. VARDAMAN. What is your opinion about that?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will enforce order in the galleries or clear them.

Mr. VARDAMAN. What is your opinion?

Mr. BRISTOW. I believe that if the present Secretary of State would devote his time and bring to bear on the problems that confront his department his great intellect he could render substantial service to his country. Whether there are men more fitted to perform the duties of Secretary of State, who are holding subordinate positions upon whom the duties now rest, than the Secretary of State himself, is a question which I can not answer, because I am not acquainted with the subordinates. I have endeavored to answer the Senator's question as clearly as I can. I could consume hours of the time of the Senate in the discussion of this question, but I do not intend to do it.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. FALL. I should like to ask of the Senator who is now addressing the Senate, as throwing some light on the question asked by the Senator from Mississippi, if it is not possible that if the Secretary of State had remained in his office attending to his duties the Senate of the United States might not ere this have had an answer to a resolution adopted by this body on April 24, 1913, which so far has been treated with silent contempt?

I refer the Senator to the resolution offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], reported favorably from the Committee on Foreign Relations, unanimously adopted by this body, April 24, calling upon the President of the United States to furnish to this body information as follows:

Senate resolution 62.

*Resolved*, That the President is respectfully requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to cause to be transmitted to the Senate:

First. A full list of the names of claimants, if any, and the nature and amount of the claims for damages to person or property made by citizens of the United States of America against the Republic of Mexico and filed or deposited with the Department of State at Washington, D. C., since the beginning of the Madero revolution in Mexico to the present time, together with the statement of fact on which said claims are based.

Second. A full list of the names of all citizens of these United States, if any, who, while leading lawful and peaceful lives in Mexico, have been killed or wounded in Mexico or driven out of Mexico by Mexican soldiers or other armed bands on Mexican soil, together with the facts and circumstances attending such killing, wounding, or forceful deportation.

Third. A full list, if any, of such peaceful citizens of the United States of America as have been forcibly seized and held prisoners for ransom in the Republic of Mexico during the time first mentioned, and what sums of money, if any, have been paid by any person or persons to secure the release of anyone so imprisoned or held.

Fourth. What redress, if any, has been offered by Mexico in the premises, or demanded by the United States of America, and the result of such offer or demand, and what assurance of protection to the lives and property of our peaceful, law-abiding citizens in Mexico does that Republic offer.

Mr. President, I submit the question to the Senator from Kansas as to whether, in his opinion, if the Secretary of State, rather than delivering lectures upon the Chautauqua platform, were to remain in the city of Washington and to attend to his business, it might not have been possible for the Senate to receive ere this the information which it demanded from the department? I presume that when the Senate unanimously requested the information it was with the idea in view that it was of interest to the people of the United States and possibly necessary in the consideration of very grave and important subjects which may at a very early day come before Congress.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I think that if the department had been as industriously managed as it should have been we would have had that information ere this.

I want to say further that it has been the custom for years, when constituents of Members of the House and Senators are about to proceed abroad, to get letters of introduction, in order that our citizens when they are in foreign countries may call upon our consular agents for any information that they might desire. That is what we keep agents in foreign countries for. The American people pay our Consular Service to serve them

in various capacities. It has been the practice since I have been a Member of the Senate to have very prompt replies to such requests. In recent months, upon at least one occasion, I made such a request for a constituent and I did not get the reply until some weeks afterwards, when my constituent had sailed.

This is not a partisan discussion on my part. I desire to read an editorial from the New York World of July 17. Certainly the New York World can not be regarded as a paper that is unfriendly to this administration and that would pass an unjust criticism upon any of the President's Cabinet officers. The editorial reads as follows:

[From the New York World, July 17, 1913.]

A DEPLORABLE MISTAKE.

It is of course obvious that Mr. Bryan's explanation of his money-making lecture plans readily explains what can not be readily excused.

He says that he is going to limit his profits to his vacation. The last thing he should be thinking about at this time is a vacation.

The Mexican crisis alone makes any talk of a vacation little short of an insult to his office.

We earnestly believe that when the present administration reversed the former policy of dollar diplomacy and substituted the diplomacy of minding our own business in international affairs it was a splendid reform.

But this policy of hands off illegitimate diplomatic problems should make it all the more essential for the State Department to devote a full measure of time and attention to legitimate diplomatic problems. Otherwise there may arise grave doubts in the public mind as to where a policy of conviction ends and where a policy of convenience begins.

As for Mr. Bryan's financial sacrifices, they constitute a question which should have interested Mr. Bryan before he accepted the portfolio of State and which can not be expected to interest the public now.

That the public has a right to take the same view that Thomas Jefferson did in his letter to Richard Henry Lee, which Mr. Bryan possibly remembers, in which he said:

"In a virtuous government, and more especially in times like these, public offices are what they should be, burthens to those appointed to them, which it would be wrong to decline, though foreseen to bring with them intense labor and great private loss."

I do not want to give this discussion a partisan tinge, but I want to ask my Democratic friends if they do not think that the New York World, when it commended to Mr. Bryan the ideals of Jefferson, did a very fitting and proper thing in the interest of the administration now in power? Has the time come in American politics when the question of the profits of public office is the uppermost thing in the mind of high public officials?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. STONE. The Senator asked a question. I should like to ask him a question for my personal information. The Senator has been a very distinguished and influential Member of this body for five or six years. Has the Senator from Kansas during his service here delivered Chautauqua lectures or other speeches for pay?

Mr. BRISTOW. I have not delivered Chautauqua addresses or other speeches for pay at any time when the Senate was in session or my public duties required my attention.

Mr. STONE. The question I asked was whether during his service——

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to say further to the Senator from Missouri that the Senator from Kansas has been present in this Chamber every day that this body has been in session since it met last December, and has not absented himself for any personal or private reason or for any other cause.

Mr. STONE. The one question I asked the Senator has not been answered. I ask him if during his service here in the Senate he has delivered speeches for which he has received pay.

Mr. BRISTOW. I have delivered speeches during the vacations of the Senate occasionally for which I received pay.

Mr. STONE. Then the Senator belongs to the Chautauqua lecture class.

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not, Mr. President.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President——

Mr. BRISTOW. I will say that I have refused invitations this year and last year that would have aggregated at least half as much, I will say, as Mr. Bryan says he hopes to make. I refused them because I felt that I owed it to my country and my State to stay here and attend to my business while the Senate was in session.

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

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. ASHURST. Will my friend the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRISTOW. I certainly will.

Mr. ASHURST. Has the Senator from Kansas always entertained the views which he now urges?

Mr. BRISTOW. I have.

Mr. ASHURST. I have a letter, purporting to have been written by the Senator, containing the following words, addressed to Chester I. Long, then a Senator of the United States:

WASHINGTON, *May 27, 1906.*

DEAR SENATOR: I wrote you briefly last night. Received your letter to-day. If there was a vacancy in some desirable office, and you or Will White were here the day it was available, the President would appoint me to it, but otherwise no one knows what he might do.

He asked me what I wanted. I told him that I did not know what was available. He said he did not either, and for me to see Taft as soon as he returned. I think I would like to have one of those advisory places on the Canal Commission. They pay $7,500 and require a visit to the Isthmus once in three months. I could hold it and live in Kansas, being there at least half my time, and when the fight got hot, I could resign.

Did the Senator write that letter?

Mr. BRISTOW. I wrote that letter. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will preserve order in the galleries. This is the second notice, and the Chair instructs the Sergeant at Arms to see that this order is obeyed or clear the galleries.

Mr. BRISTOW. And it is not at all inconsistent, and nothing connected with that letter, directly or indirectly, is inconsistent with the position I take now. I will say to the Senator from Arizona, my friend, that that letter has been hawked about in every township in the State of Kansas for 10 years.

Mr. ASHURST. No; it was written in 1906.

Mr. BRISTOW. Well, since 1906. I think it is approximately 10 years; something less, probably.

Mr. LODGE. Eight years.

Mr. BRISTOW. It was circulated in every voting precinct in Kansas when I was a candidate for the United States Senate against the gentleman to whom it was written, and as a result I came to this body by the vote of the majority of the people in the primaries and of the majority of the people in the State. I stand here now and proclaim that, in my judgment, it is the business of a public official, when he is paid from the Public Treasury to transact public business, to be at his post of duty and to attend to the business for the transaction of which he is paid.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BRISTOW. And I want to say to the Senator from Arizona, since he has been so kind as to bring up some old political campaign letters——

Mr. ASHURST. I merely wanted to see if the Senator had changed his views.

Mr. BRISTOW. I have the floor. I want to say to the Senator from Arizona, who has been so kind as to bring up some of the old political campaign documents that were circulated in Kansas years ago, that since I have been a Member of this body I have not expended a hundred dollars a day of the funds of the United States to carry private telegrams to my State on personal political business.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator from Kansas has not been in touch with his constituents as much as his duty would require.

Mr. BRISTOW. Not by carrying on private correspondence by telegraph when it should have been by letter and carried at his own expense.

Mr. ASHURST. I fail to catch the Senator's statement.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator from Arizona doubts my statement, I refer him to the records of the Secretary of the Senate relating to the Senator from Arizona and his own private account with the Western Union Telegraph Co.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

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

Mr. BRISTOW. I very gladly yield.

Mr. ASHURST. It does not require any abstruse lines of reasoning to ascertain that my friend, in a moment of heat, seems to be obsessed with the idea that I have been too much in communication with my constituents by means of the telegraph; but if the Senator from Kansas means to insinuate that I have used the telegraph, or aught else, sir, other than in a public way and in a proper way—if the Senator from Kansas dares to assert here or elsewhere that I have ever used the mails of this country or the telegraph of this country other than in a proper way, the Senator insinuates something that is wholly baseless, false, and without foundation. It is true that I write 200 letters a day during certain times. I recall at one time that I sent over 700 letters and over 100 telegrams in one day. Does the Senator from Kansas object to that? I remember one day I telegraphed every newspaper in Arizona—about 55 in all—asking their assistance in trying to bring about an

advisory election to ascertain just whom the people's choice was for United States judge for Arizona. There was no necessity for my friend to lose his head.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator from Kansas has not lost his head, and if the Senator from Arizona is through, I will answer the question which he asked me a few moments ago.

Mr. ASHURST. There was no occasion for my friend——

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator from Kansas has not lost his head at all. He knows just what he is saying.

Mr. ASHURST. I trust the Senator does, but there was no occasion for his losing his head and his heart over this matter. I simply desired to know whether the Senator had changed the position which he occupied in 1906, when he said that he would draw the salary and live in Kansas, being there at least half the time, and when the fight got hot he could resign. The Senator does not usually resign when the fight gets hot. He fights instead of resigning. What I wanted to know was had the Senator changed his position, and I do not think I have violated the proprieties of debate or of the occasion in asking the Senator that question.

Mr. BRISTOW. In regard to the first part of the Senator's remarks I desire to say that in my judgment the Senator from Arizona has misused the privilege of charging official telegrams to the Government. He has carried on private correspondence at public expense. He has charged to the United States Government telegrams that should have been paid for by himself, and the telegraph companies have presented their bills to the Sergeant at Arms for payment of such messages.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator from Kansas has a reputation for combining the ability of a Sherlock Holmes with that of other famous characters, and if he has such evidence it is his duty to make a charge to that effect. It is his duty to see that the money improperly expended, if any, should be restored. That I have misused any privilege I deny.

Mr. BRISTOW. Well, the information has not been in my possession for a long time, but it came to me through official channels, and it has had my attention, as can be verified by other Members of the Senate who are entirely familiar with the attitude that I have taken upon such unwarranted expenditures of the public money to conduct private correspondence.

Mr. ASHURST. I deny with all the vehemence at my command that I have ever used any publicly paid telegram or letter to conduct private business. I make this assertion here in the Senate of the United States. I will say that I have no private business. I am probably financially the poorest man in the Senate. I have no private income whatever. I declined to practice law when I entered the Senate. I have used the telegraph in the conduct of the public business, and the Senator's rather bad temper this morning has caused him to make a charge that is without foundation. That I have telegraphed to my constituents very much I admit. I purpose continuing to do so. I think one of the chief faults with us is that we do not keep sufficiently in touch with our constituents, and I purpose, to the best of my ability, to inform my constituents as to what we are doing and how the public business is conducted. I am of opinion that keeping constantly in touch with my constituents by telegrams and letters gives me more accurate and reliable information than in listening to a speech—say, from the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. The records of the Senate will determine whether the Senator from Arizona or myself is right. It is a question that can be verified. Copies of the telegrams are on file which have been charged to the Government, signed by the Senator from Arizona, and the nature of them will show in the telegrams themselves. So there need be no question of veracity between him and me. I am willing to leave the matter to the documentary evidence.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, of course so am I.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator from Kansas has not neglected his duty in this respect so far as his duty goes, as the Senator from Arizona can learn if he will make proper inquiry of the chairman of the committee who is in charge of that part of the Senate's business.

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; and if the Senator finds a violation of the law in that respect in reference to myself he will lay it before the Senate, will he?

Mr. BRISTOW. Well——

Mr. ASHURST. I ask you will you do it?

Mr. BRISTOW. I have made the statement as broadly as I know how to make it. I was under the impression that it was before the Senate now.

Mr. ASHURST. This is the first I have heard of it; and I should like to have the specific facts and dates set down.

Mr. BRISTOW. I will be very glad to furnish the Senator and the Senate, if he desires, the specific facts and dates. I think we can call upon the Sergeant at Arms to do it. It will not be a very great task.

Mr. ASHURST. I will be very pleased to have the Senator do so.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. OWEN. Would the Senator from Kansas object to having the resolution read again upon which he is proceeding?

Mr. BRISTOW. Well, it has been read twice, and I think the Senate is interested in the discussion far more than it usually is in the discussions of the body, at least the attendance seems so to indicate.

Mr. OWEN. I merely wished to call attention, Mr. President, if the Senator from Kansas will permit me, to the irrelevant character of this debate.

Mr. BRISTOW. I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma. It is entirely irrelevant, but since the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] saw fit to drag into it an old political circular that was used and discredited in the Kansas campaigns years ago as a defense of the Secretary of State in his violating his public duty and neglecting the affairs of his office in order that he might accumulate a larger fortune than he now has, I think the remarks of the Senator from Arizona were not exactly pertinent to this question under consideration, and I am free to say that my retort did not have a direct bearing upon the resolution that is now before the Senate, but it probably contained some information that may result, especially on the part of some Senators, in economies in the future in the use of the telegraph for private business at public expense.

As I was proceeding to say—and I am not going to weary the Senate with this discussion—I think if the time has come when the consideration for public office is private gain, when we are to neglect our public duties in order to increase our bank accounts, and the American people will justify that kind of an administration of its public affairs, then we have approached a serious period in the history of our country.

It is with regret, I desire to say, that I felt compelled to introduce a resolution of this kind. I have been during recent years at least an admirer of Mr. Bryan. I have shown my admiration of his capacity as a political leader upon more than one occasion, as Senators here will remember, but because I may have admired him, because I have a friendly feeling for this administration, and will be very glad to see it succeed, is no reason why I should withhold a criticism which four-fifths of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber know ought to be made.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Kansas allow me to interrupt him by a question?

Mr. BRISTOW. I will.

Mr. LEWIS. Was the Senator from Kansas a Member of this Chamber during the last term of the Secretary of State under President Taft?

Mr. BRISTOW. I was.

Mr. LEWIS. Did the Senator from Kansas have his attention attracted to the general charge published throughout the country that the then Secretary of State was so constantly absent from his official duties at important times as to have to be brought back from his stock farm at Valley Forge?

Mr. BRISTOW. I am not aware of that. That may have happened, but it was not called to my attention.

Mr. LEWIS. Did the Senator from Kansas address himself to those conditions by introducing a resolution making inquiry?

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator will permit me, how could I introduce such a resolution when I was not advised that such was the fact?

Mr. LEWIS. Did not the Senator have the same opportunity of public information then as he has now?

Mr. BRISTOW. If there ever has been such another demonstration of the neglect of public duty in order to acquire private fortune, it has not been brought to my attention; but I will say further that if the last Secretary of State sacrificed the public business for his private gain he should be now condemned and should have been then condemned; and any Senator who was cognizant of those facts, if they were brought to his attention, as they might have been, and failed to present them to the Senate, fell short of his duty.

Mr. LEWIS. Then, as I understand the distinguished Senator from Kansas, his criticisms are not directed against the present Secretary of State because he is a Democrat?

Mr. BRISTOW. Not at all.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. ROOT. I rise for the purpose of preventing something which I am sure both the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] would regret, that there should be left on the records any apparent finding or concession that the Secretary of State under the administration of President Taft did neglect his duties, whether for gain or for any other reason. I dispute any such proposition, and I am sure that no one will undertake to establish it here.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to say——

Mr. LEWIS. If the Senator from Kansas will allow me to address myself to the observation of the Senator from New York, may I ask the Senator from New York, will he show to the Senate that during the term of the service of Secretary Knox as Secretary of State under President Taft he was not absent from his official duties time and time again, and much of the time at his stock farm at Valley Forge, and that there was complaint of his absence, without any regard to whether his absence was for gain or not?

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I am not aware that Secretary Knox was absent from the city of Washington any more frequently or for any longer periods than was entirely within the proper limits of the discretion of the head of a department.

Mr. LEWIS. Ah, Mr. President, that begs the question and apologizes for the situation. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROOT. I am quite certain that if he visited his stock farm, if he has a stock farm, it could not have been for the purposes of gain.

Mr. LEWIS. Probably it had the object of getting accomplished some fast movement at that particular time in order that the running might be better in the administration of the Senator's party. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I desire to say that, so far as I know, Secretary Knox never neglected the duties of his office. I am not informed if he did; it was never called to my attention, and did not come to my attention through the public press. I want to say that if he had neglected the duties of his office in the same way I should certainly have criticized him with equal severity that I have criticized the present occupant of that high office.

I have not been slow to criticize members of the political party with which I have been affiliated when I thought they were doing the wrong thing. I have not hesitated to vote against this side of the Chamber when I believed it was standing for things that were not best for the country. I have tried to follow what I believed to be right and obeyed the dictates of my judgment and my conscience since I have been a Member of this body; and I do not want the criticism which I make upon the Secretary of State to be regarded as a partisan criticism, because I know that I am reflecting the opinion of the majority of the Democrats of the country in the remarks that I am making here to-day, as well as the opinion of a majority of Republicans; indeed a majority of the entire people; and without prolonging the debate—there are many things that I should like to incorporate in the RECORD, but I will not take time to do so——

Mr. LEWIS. May I be permitted to interrupt the distinguished Senator from Kansas for one other inquiry?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. Was the Senator a Member of this body when the former President of the United States, President Taft, made his general circuit for political campaign purposes throughout the States while he was President of the United States?

Mr. BRISTOW. I was.

Mr. LEWIS. Did the Senator offer a resolution under those circumstances either to investigate such conduct or to condemn such a course?

Mr. BRISTOW. I did not.

Mr. LEWIS. The President was a Republican. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. BRISTOW. But I desire to say here that I did not approve the absence from his office of the last President of the United States in the political campaign that he waged. I did not think it comported with the dignity of the high office he held. But while in my opinion he did neglect the duties of his office in pursuing a political campaign, he did not do so for gain.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. KERN. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BRISTOW. In a moment.

It has been too frequently the habit of men holding high official positions to absent themselves from their official trusts in order to carry on political campaigns. That has been done too much in the past. I hope it will be done less in the future. It has been one of the evils of our political life, and has been growing, I regret to say, during recent years. But that can not be offered as a justification for the course that is now being pursued by the Secretary of State.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

Mr. BRISTOW. I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. KERN. I wish to ask the Senator from Kansas whether the President of the United States, when on that more or less celebrated tour of the country, was not operating for political gain, and whether he was not operating at public expense, and whether there is any real difference between a man leaving his post that he may gain in politics and a man leaving his post that he may gain in purse? On the other hand, is there not all the difference in the world between a man going out on business, paying his expenses out of his own pocket, and a public official going out to wage a political campaign at the expense of the taxpayers of the country?

Mr. BRISTOW. My friend from Indiana has too discriminating a mind not to realize the difference. It has been the habit of men holding positions in American politics to go upon the stump and defend the policies of the administration in power. It has been a political habit to have a campaign carried on by those responsible for the policies that have been adopted by the administration in power. I see a vast difference, and I think my friend from Indiana will also, between the head of a party or the head of the Government, or a subordinate who is responsible for a policy in the Government, on the one hand, going before the American people and presenting the arguments for such policies and discussing the political views on questions involved, defending the policies for which the administration stands and meeting the criticisms that have been made, and, on the other hand, abandoning the duties of the office and going out to make money, hawking about for purposes of profit—receiving so much of the gate receipts, if you please—the high honors that have been bestowed upon him by the American people. I see a very, very wide difference between the two situations.

I was going to close a few minutes ago with an observation, but I was interrupted. I desire to say, with all seriousness and earnestness, that I should at least like to see the heads of our great departments of government hold up to the American people the high ideals that came down to us from the founders of the Republic in regard to the public service.

The public service is a great honor in a free country like this, and men seek that honor. It is of the highest importance to our country that men should regard it as a high distinction to serve their country in these positions of great responsibility. While there may be rare exceptions, as a rule in the fierce political controversies which rage in this country of ours no man has attained high distinction except at personal sacrifice and financial loss.

The very genius of our political institutions is such that it can not be done otherwise by men who are patriotic and honest.

I want to protest here against the man who sits at the right hand of the President of the United States declaring, not only to his own country but to the nations of the earth, that he can not afford to sacrifice any of his profits in private business in order that he may hold the highest position within the gift of the President. I say, if public opinion in the United States will justify such a course of conduct, the days of free government in this country of ours are nearing their end.

Mr. STONE and Mr. TOWNSEND addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, if other Senators desire to discuss the matter which has been discussed by the Senator from Kansas, I shall not stand in their way very long. In my opinion this whole thing is a very small affair, too small in all its aspects to engage the serious attention of the Senate. In fact, I can not escape the impression that it has been injected here in a narrow, partisan spirit that does no credit to its originator.

The Senator from Kansas has been a Member of this body for nearly one full senatorial term. During that period two Republican Presidents, Roosevelt and Taft, have toured the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Canadian boundary to the Gulf, being absent from their offices for weeks, engaged in political propaganda. They were seeking in these

repeated tours to promote the political policies for which they stood, and to promote their personal political interests.

The Senator from Kansas was here at that time and not a word of complaint, protest, or criticism fell from his lips. He says now that there is a difference between a President absenting himself from office and scouring the country for weeks at a time in advocacy of party policies and in the promotion of individual ambitions and a Cabinet officer going out on rare occasions to lecture in response to urgent invitations sent to him by communities desiring him to address them. The Senator is too hypercritical for most men to follow him; he is too hairsplitting for the ordinary man to understand him. While criticizing, strange to say, the Senator himself admits that he, while holding his position here in the Senate, with important and multiplied duties resting upon him, has gone out on the Chautauqua circuit to deliver addresses for which he received compensation.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

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

Mr. STONE. To be sure.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire that the Senator's language may not be misconstrued. The way he put it would lead to the inference that while the Senate was in session, and I was occupied here with my duties, I had gone out for the purpose he mentions. The Senator from Kansas has done nothing of the kind, as he very clearly stated.

Mr. STONE. The Senator endeavors to escape by saying that he was in his seat when the Senate was in session, but in vacation he went out and delivered lectures or speeches, for which he received a compensation. He justifies himself in this behalf because he did this when the Senate was not in session.

Mr. President, the executive departments of the Government are supposed to be always in session, theoretically; but the President goes every year for rest to his summer home. The President has done this from time whereof the memory of man hardly runs to the contrary. Executive officers—that is, the heads of departments and the heads of bureaus—go to the seaports or to mountain resorts, on well-earned vacations, that they may have rest and recreation, but always within easy reach of their offices and in close touch with their duties, ready on the shortest notice to return; aye more, they are usually well prepared to keep close track of and to conduct the official business of their offices while on their vacations.

The Senator from Kansas has business to do, as all of us have as Senators, even when the Senate is not in session. He has complained about having to wait for an undue length of time for a letter for some constituent of his who wished to go abroad, and who wanted a letter of introduction to our foreign representatives. I suppose if the Senator from Kansas had been in California or Maine during the vacation of the Senate, lecturing for pay, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, for this anxious constituent to have reached him in order that the Senator might have made this important application to which he calls such particular attention. Mr. President, all of us here know that applications for letters of the kind referred to by the Senator are matters of routine departmental business, and that they can be and are just as well done when the Secretary is absent from his office as when he is present. Such a letter signed by one of the Assistant Secretaries is just as potent as if signed by the Secretary himself. This shows how puerile the criticisms of the Senator from Kansas are. While dilating on what the Secretary might do in matters of small detail I admonish the Senator not to forget that there is a multitude of things a Senator has to do and can do in vacation as well as during the sessions of the Senate, just as there is a multitude of things Cabinet officials might personally do if they were present instead of being away on a vacation or on official business. Mr. President, the Senator in making this childish criticism shows conclusively that he is just groping in a vain search for something on which to hedge a denunciation of an honorable public official.

Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas has himself done substantially the very thing he is now, in a narrow partisan spirit, which does him no credit, for the doing of which he attacks the Secretary of State. The honorable Senator and his partisan colleagues have long been in the habit of assailing with unwonted energy and bitterness the distinguished Secretary of State; and now the honorable Senator thinks he finds a new opportunity on this slight pretext, of which he seeks to take advantage, to make this attack.

The Senator from Kansas is playing his game on dangerous ground—in fact, a sort of quicksand as to him. The Senator from Kansas should remember that he has himself gone upon the lecture platform and received pay for speeches he made—receiving, no doubt, much less than his speeches were worth—while he was a Senator of the United States. But in this respect he is not exceptional, for other distinguished and able men, whose names add luster to our public life, members of both political parties, have done the same thing, and have done so for years and years in the past.

While sitting here at my desk I have made a list of some able Republicans who have engaged in this business of lecturing for pay. I give you a brief list of eminent Republicans who have done this character of work, and I could also give you a list of eminent Democrats who have done the same thing. For the present, however, I confine myself to the Republicans, for Democrats are not complaining.

Of course, at the top of the list I place the Senator from Kansas. But the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] has also been one of the most eloquent and attractive lecturers on the public stage. I make no criticism of him; I congratulate him.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has gone over the country from one ocean to the other during recent years delivering lectures, and has exercised a tremendous influence on public opinion.

Mr. KENYON. Does not the Senator from Missouri believe that the work of the Senator from Wisconsin on the Chautauqua platform has been of more good than anything he could have done in this body?

Mr. STONE. I would not like to say that. I think the work of the Senator from Wisconsin has been of great potentiality both in this body and out of it.

Mr. KENYON. I did not mean to say that his work was not of great value in this body, but the Senator from Wisconsin has been the forerunner in this country of the great movement for popular government, and he has done it on the Chautauqua platform. He had audiences there that he could not get in any other place.

Mr. STONE. I think that is true.

Mr. KENYON. And Mr. Bryan likewise.

Mr. STONE. I think that is true. But I do not care to be diverted into a discussion of this phase of the subject.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator said that this is a partisan attack. I think it is not a partisan attack. There are many on this side who——

Mr. STONE. Judging by the vote here this afternoon, it would seem that the Republican side of the Chamber had lined up with the Senator from Kansas to make this a partisan question. We regret that, but we stand ready to meet it.

All of us remember Senator Dolliver, dear to our hearts and memory, a magnificent man, a great Senator, the immediate predecessor, I think, of the Senator who just interrupted me. I am glad that Dolliver has been so well succeeded. Senator Dolliver delivered hundreds of Chautauqua lectures throughout the country, not only during the vacations of Congress, but also while Congress was in session. I never heard any criticism of him, and far be it from me to criticize him. I merely refer to the matter by way of giving answer to the unwarranted assault upon the Secretary of State by the Senator from Kansas.

The able and eloquent Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is accredited with delighting and instructing audiences on the Chautauqua platform.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator from Missouri refer to the senior Senator from Idaho?

Mr. STONE. I had reference to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to say to the Senator from Missouri that I never delivered a Chautauqua address in my life. I have never at any time before or since entering public life delivered a speech under the employ of a Chautauqua bureau. I am not criticizing those who do or eulogizing those who do not. I am simply stating a fact.

Mr. STONE. Then I withdraw all I have said as to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The soft impeachment.

Mr. STONE. I withdraw the "soft impeachment," as my friend from Mississippi says.

Mr. BACON. The Senator will permit the compliment to stand, however.

Mr. STONE. Yes; the compliment stands; but I venture another assertion on perhaps less information, for I have not any information about it, that the Senator from Idaho has been often solicited to speak on the Chautauqua platform; and I say this because a man of his fine ability and superior eloquence could not well have escaped such importunity.

Mr. President, among those in this very limited and imperfect list I have is the name of former Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, a progressive of progressives, a leader of the most advanced thought of this day and generation.

Mr. CLAPP. Will the Senator pardon an interruption?

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. Of course, I am only speaking by hearsay, but Senator Beveridge has often told me that he never lectured for compensation. It is not that I am attempting to excuse a man who does that, but simply in justice to a Senator who is no longer here. He has often made that statement to me.

Mr. STONE. In what I said I never dreamed that I was doing Senator Beveridge an injustice.

Mr. CLAPP. No; but the Senator was implying that he had lectured for pay.

Mr. STONE. I did assume, if the Senator please, that when Senator Beveridge had gone over the country to address great assemblages, at Chautauquas and elsewhere, he went under the terms and conditions ordinarily obtaining in such cases.

Mr. CLAPP. What I am saying is not in any sense intended as a criticism of those who do it; but it is a singular fact, I think, in connection with Senator Beveridge's career that, while he writes, he never lectures for pay. At least, he has often told me that he never lectured for pay.

Mr. STONE. Of course I know nothing of that.

But now as to writing, it seems to be admitted that Senator Beveridge at least wrote articles for newspapers and magazines for which he received pay, and that work required investigation and time, time which I suppose the Senator from Kansas thinks Senator Beveridge should have been devoting assiduously and exclusively to his public duties.

By the way, it has just been whispered to me that even the Senator from Kansas, who is so uncompromisingly opposed to a public servant devoting any of his time to other than his public duties, has himself done some writing for magazines or newspapers in the way of reporting the proceedings of the last Republican and Democratic national conventions for pay. I will ask the Senator if that is true?

Mr. BRISTOW. Since the Senator addresses the inquiry, I will say that I have upon different occasions written articles for which I have received compensation, and I had the pleasure of writing a number of articles in regard to the Baltimore convention for which I received compensation.

I desire to say further that I offer no criticism on a man following the lecture business. It is an honorable occupation. I offer no criticism on a Senator or anyone else delivering lectures before colleges or Chautauquas or writing magazine articles presenting his views, or even writing occasionally for newspapers, provided that he does not sacrifice the public business in so doing.

Mr. STONE. Let me ask my distinguished friend this question: Did he attend the Baltimore convention of last year?

Mr. BRISTOW. I did.

Mr. STONE. Did the Senator undertake to report for some newspaper or magazine the proceedings of that convention?

Mr. BRISTOW. No.

Mr. STONE. Or to write his impressions of it?

Mr. BRISTOW. I wrote my impressions of the convention.

Mr. STONE. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that at that time the Senate of the United States was in session, and will ask if he did not desert his post here and go to Baltimore to write articles for pay. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. BRISTOW. I call the attention——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms has now been given two notices, and there will not be another one from the presiding officer to the Sergeant at Arms about the conduct of the occupants of the galleries.

Mr. BRISTOW. I call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact that the Senate was not in session during that period.

Mr. JAMES. I desire to say, Mr. President, that the Senate was in session during the Baltimore convention. The Senator from Kansas is entirely mistaken in saying that the Senate was not in session during that convention.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator from Kentucky should be more frank. If the defense of the Secretary of State depends upon such flimsy argument as that presented now by the Senator from Kentucky, it will have very little effect upon the public mind. If the Senator from Kentucky is informed, he knows that the Congress of the United States took a recess pending the two conventions and was not in session.

Mr. JAMES. I do not hardly believe that it lies in the mouth——

Mr. BRISTOW. There was an agreement that no business should be done. Two or three Members may have sat here to comply with the Constitution, but the Senate was not in session, and the Senator from Kentucky knows it.

Mr. JAMES. I do not believe it lies in the mouth of the Senator from Kansas, who has introduced the most buncombe of all buncombe resolutions I have ever heard of being introduced in this Chamber, to charge the Senator from Kentucky with using a flimsy argument when he merely presents the fact, which is that the Senate was in session; and perhaps there would have been enough Senators present to do business if all of them had not been away, as the Senator from Kansas was.

Mr. SMOOT. In justice to the Senator from Kansas I wish to state that I remember there was a virtual agreement among Senators that no business should be done during the time of the Republican convention at Chicago and the Democratic convention at Baltimore.

Mr. BRISTOW. Of course, as every Senator knows, that is the fact. There was a unanimous-consent agreement that no business should be done. The Senate was in recess.

Mr. STONE. I was personally so much occupied with the business of the Baltimore convention that I confess I was not only not in the Senate at that time but I do not know even what was done in the Senate; but the Senate could not have adjourned more than three days at a time, and the Baltimore convention lasted a week or more. In the interval there must have been one or two sessions of the Senate.

I should like to ask if the Senator from Kansas consented that the Senate of the United States might abandon its functions for days and days that he might attend a Democratic national convention and have an opportunity to write articles about it, for which he was to receive a liberal compensation? If he objected, let us have the page of the RECORD.

Mr. BRISTOW. Being a Member of the Senate and there having been unanimous consent, with almost every Member of the Senate consenting, that the Congress should stand in recess, I should think I was a party to the agreement with the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. Yes; the Senator was here. I was not here, and I have no apology to make for it.

Mr. BRISTOW. I have none either.

Mr. STONE. In view of the resolution and speech of the Senator, I think it is high time he should apologize.

Proceeding, I next recall that a Republican Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Shaw—another Iowa man—went all over the country delivering speeches, whether for pay I am not prepared to say.

Mr. SMOOT. Not on the Chautauqua.

Mr. STONE. The Senator says he was not on the Chautauqua, but this——

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was oratorical.

Mr. STONE. Yes; an oratorical mission. These rounders-up and stem-winders usually get pay for making speeches whether they are on the Chautauqua or not. I do not know whether Mr. Shaw was paid, but I know while Secretary he went all over the country and made speeches, elaborating his views on financial affairs and on fiscal systems. I did not hear any criticism of that, although he was a member of the Cabinet and in a position fully as important as that of the Secretary of State.

Again, Mr. President, Members of the House have done the same thing. I recall to the attention of Senators one very distinguished Member of the House among many I might recall, Gen. Grosvenor, of Ohio, a very able man, a very distinguished man, who spent a great deal of his time in lecturing over the country.

Mr. GALLINGER. I believe it is an historical fact that Gen. Grosvenor collaborated with a gentleman by the name of CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri?

Mr. STONE. He did.

Mr. GALLINGER. They went together.

Mr. STONE. They went together, and Speaker CLARK and Senator Dolliver went together and "collaborated," as the Senator says. Certainly that was done. Who objected? I am not saying that Democrats have not done as Republicans did. Many Democrats have been on the lecture platform, probably more Democrats than Republicans, and this for reasons I fear I could not state without offense to some of my friends. There was a greater demand for them.

I see that my good friend the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] is absent. He stayed here a moment to refute some observations of the Senator from Illinois with reference to former Secretary Knox and then disappeared.

It is said that Mr. Bryan has been absent a great deal from his office. I have seen criticisms of him in the opposition press about the number of days he has been away from his office. A day or two ago I read a statement of his absences, among others that he had been quite a long time in California about the Japanese trouble out there, and it counted up something like two weeks that he lost from his office.

And then they told about him going down the Chesapeake Bay to meet Dr. Müller, the special ambassador sent here from

Brazil to return the visit made to that country by Secretary ROOT. He went down as the head of the State Department to welcome this special ambassador of a great neighboring state, and he is criticized for doing that. What would you say if he had not done it?

Secretary ROOT made a trip, and he did right in making it, on an American war vessel, to Central and South America. He visited those countries. He came in contact with the governmental representatives of those people, talked with them, and I am sure accomplished a good work; but he was absent from his office for many weeks.

Secretary KNOX made a trip to Central America also, taking him from his office for a long time. In addition to that, he was commissioned by President Taft to go on a special mission to Japan. He boarded a war vessel in the harbor of San Francisco and was conveyed with due dignity as our special ambassador to Tokyo, the capital of Japan. His high mission was to deliver personally the condolences of our Government to the new Mikado, because of the death of his father, and to express to His Majesty the deep grief of the American people over the loss sustained by the Empire, and at the same time to give renewed assurances of our high esteem, and so forth. He was gone on this important diplomatic mission—a grave and most delicate diplomatic mission—for more than a month. I have never heard any criticism of that. I have never criticized it; I do not criticize it now. I do not know what the Senator from Kansas thinks about it. His voice even unto this day has been silent.

Now, Mr. President, dealing in common honesty with each other, am I not justified in saying that all this outburst is the merest partisan tommyrot injected here for purely partisan purposes, and in no sense worthy of a dignified consideration before this body? The motion to lay it on the table was agreed to, as it should have been; yet the Senator from Kansas has insisted upon speaking on another and wholly irrelevant resolution that he might give voice to his partisan spleen and exploit a bad spirit of partisan vindictiveness. I do not know how many of his compatriots on the other side are in sympathy with him or will join in supporting his most unhappy contention.

That is all I care to say.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I regret the circumstances which impel me to raise my voice in criticism of any officer of this Government. To my mind it is of vital importance that the people have confidence in their public servants, for lack of such confidence is, in effect, lack of confidence in government itself. I have felt, however, that the events upon which I am about to comment are of such a nature as to result in the establishment of bad precedents unless public protest is uttered.

I allude, Mr. President, to the publicly announced intention of the present distinguished Secretary of State to engage his time and energies and talents not only for his own pecuniary profit but for the profit of private individuals or organizations and at the expense of large numbers of American citizens who are to be charged a fee for the privilege of listening to an address by one to whom the people as a whole are paying a salary by no means small. I deem it the more important that notice be taken here of the adoption of this policy because of the public career of the man who is sponsor for it.

For more than 15 years Mr. Bryan has posed as a public censor of men and measures. He has preached the duties of citizenship and assumed to establish standards of public service. His public acts, therefore, more than those of any other man except the President, are of influence in the fixing of standards of public service and public policy. If the American people remain silent at this time, and by their silence give their inferential approval or assent to the policy Mr. Bryan has announced, that attitude of an official toward his duties must be assumed to be a permanent feature of our governmental institutions.

For my part I feel impelled to voice a protest. I am no respecter of persons. I see no reason why the head of a department should be permitted to make private gain by methods that are forbidden to his subordinates. I see nothing in his announced policy that is not equally available to any man or woman in the Government employ, and certainly no one will question the assertion that the general application of that policy would mean the absolute ruin of public service.

It has been ordered by another member of the Cabinet that postmasters shall not engage in any other business than that relating to their offices as postmasters. The same rule is applied to other subordinate Federal officeholders. Why this discrimination in favor of a high-salaried officer against the low-salaried one?

Mr. Bryan says he is selling his time, energies, and talents to private individuals or organizations because his official salary is not enough for him to live upon. He is receiving $12,000 a year. In the Government service there are thousands of employees who receive less than one-tenth of that sum, and who, in these days of high cost of living, find it difficult to live within their income. Not one of these thousands, however, is permitted to abandon his post of duty and sell his time and energies and talents to others for the reason that Mr. Bryan has given for his action. If Mr. Bryan's example shall be followed by public employees generally, who can see the extent of injury to the public service?

If it be said in further defense of Mr. Bryan that the work of his office proceeds just the same in his absence, let answer be given to the question why the same defense can not be made by each and every chief of a division or head of a bureau who can find opportunity to resell a portion of the time he has already sold to the Government.

It is true that the clerks, division chiefs, and bureau heads accepted their positions knowing what their salaries were and the time required of them; if they did not deem the salaries sufficient, they were not required to enter the Government employ; but I fail to see wherein this obvious truth applies to a $1,200 man with more force than to a $12,000 man. If we are to adopt the policy of placing the dollar above public duty, then the door of opportunity should not be opened to one citizen and closed to another. If there is to be discrimination, it should be in favor of the poorly paid man, but I can see no reason why a distinction should be made.

At a time when most unusual foreign complications confront us, when the perplexing Japanese question is up, when our relations with the disturbed Republic to the South of us are most grave and fraught with mighty responsibilities, when treaties affecting our relations with various nations of Europe are pending and awaiting the action of this Nation, when the question of Panama Canal tolls is pressing hard upon us, when the alleged claims of Colombia are being urged, when the Congress is dealing with the tariff containing provisions which may affect our diplomatic relations with other countries, indeed, at this time, above all other times, the statement of Mr. Bryan that he proposed to desert his office for the purpose of personal financial gain comes as a shock to all thoughtful people. This action is even more inexcusable when it is known that the Secretary has been in office but a few months and from the nature of things he can not have become familiar with all of the responsibilities of his great position. The Secretary of State is regarded as the most important executive officer of the Government below the President. He is premier of the Cabinet. He should be the first example of faithful, intelligent devotion to duty.

I know of nothing more unfortunate to the cause of public virtue and singleness of purpose for high ideals than this expressed determination of Mr. Bryan, upheld by the reasons which he gives. When he entered into the implied contract with the Government to serve as Secretary of State he knew what the salary of that position was. He had for years proclaimed the doctrine of the simple life of pure democracy. He knew that $1,000 per month was the compensation he would receive from the Government. To a majority of people in public and private life that compensation seems most adequate, and yet now he declares to the country that it is insufficient to meet his expenses as Secretary of State. His salary is the same as that received by other Cabinet officers, and no one of them has complained that it is inadequate. How now are the virtues of economy and simplicity to be impressed upon the people when their great advocate states that it is necessary for him to capitalize for financial gain his great ability as a Chautauqua lecturer because he can not support himself and family upon $12,000 a year? If he had resigned as Secretary, giving as his reason the one he did give, viz, that he could not live on his salary and by inference that he owed a higher duty to his desire for wealth than he did to public service, there would have been less reason for public complaint, but to hold his office and draw the full salary for only a part of the time he renders service, the balance of his time having been sold to individuals, is, in my judgment, improper and inexcusable.

I hold, Mr. President, that the public official must perform the full duties of his office to the best of his ability (and undivided service is of the very essence of his contract) and the higher the position the more imperative becomes that demand.

Mr. Bryan was one of the highest-priced lecturers in the country before he became Secretary of State. His superior ability as an orator plus the notoriety he secured as a several-times candidate for President gave him great drawing powers as lecturer at Chautauquas, and he had a right to improve the opportunities thus opened to him, but no man has a right to exploit the public office which he is holding for private financial gain,

especially not when such exploitation must of necessity interfere with the performance of the duties which he voluntarily assumes.

And so, Mr. President, it seems to me that aside from the technical and legal question of the right of a public servant to sell his services twice, the public announcement by Mr. Bryan that a man of his well-advertised democratic tastes can not live upon an income of $12,000 a year presents a moral question for the consideration of the American people. The question is simply this: Whether, under such circumstances, it is the duty of the citizen and the public servant to modify his style of living to bring it within his legitimate income or whether it is his privilege to resell his services in order to cover the cost of the style of living he has adopted.

Mr. President, I am sorry that an occasion has arisen which, from my viewpoint of public service, compels me to voice my protest, although my action may be misconstrued as an attack upon a coordinate branch of the Government. The President is responsible for the public service of the members of his Cabinet, and, to my mind, Mr. Bryan's action, whether with the President's consent or assent, must be considered as an approved policy unless publicly renounced.

Whatever I have had to say regarding the matter is not based upon innuendo nor presented in the form of generalities, but it is a criticism of a concrete example, which, unrebuked, might be assumed to be inferentially approved, and which, if generally followed, would certainly be greatly detrimental to good government by placing individual selfish interest above the general welfare.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President——

Mr. SHAFROTH rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I had sincerely hoped that there would arise no occasion for any Senator on this side of the Chamber [Democratic side] to treat with dignity, much less responsibility, the resolution presented by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW], which, though laid on the table, is discussed through the privileges available under our rules. The Latins have an expression reading "Parturiunt montes; nascetur ridiculus mus," or, liberally translated, "the mountains labored and brought forth a mouse." I would not have my observation construed that these mountains which have thundered and parted have only brought forth mice. I recognize the leonine strength of these lions of debate and their assumption that legislative veracity and political integrity only abound on the other side of the Chamber; but I am instantly attracted by the evidence of the constant absence of any effort on the part of those distinguished gentlemen to have urged their exalted standards at the time when they could have been applied appropriately to those of their own party affiliations.

I am particularly attracted to my distinguished, able, and learned friend from Michigan, Senator TOWNSEND, who has addressed himself to a splendidly prepared oration, reading it with deliberation. It was accurate in construction, attractive in diction, perfectly poised, and eloquently phrased. For that the commendation of a fellow Senator and a friend goes ungrudgingly to the Senator, but as to its propriety, its statesmanship, or weight I reserve the right to pass judgment and now to express it. May I not inquire when have these distinguished gentlemen—the honorable Senators on the other side of the Chamber—been so suddenly inoculated with this great danger to the institutions of the Republic from the fact that now and then some official takes an excursion into some literary undertaking before the public? Or presents some public policy or proposed legislation in which the public have great interest and ought to be instructed from every source? Did the distinguished Senator from Michigan during his renowned service in this Chamber or when a Member of the House find it agreeable to voice these expressions of hostility to vacations when the President of the United States, a Republican, made it convenient to circumnavigate this country in a private car—coupled with other conveyances—for political purposes, and charged the expenses to taxpayers of the Republic? This while he was drawing the munificent salary of $75,000 a year and surely able to pay his expenses. I ask my friend from Michigan why should there be a rule, to quote and paraphrase his expression, for the high official different from that for the lowly? Why should the humble voter from Michigan working here in Washington be compelled to return to Michigan—as he was—to vote for Representative TOWNSEND in his contest for Senator and to pay his expenses for transportation, while the President of the United States, the highest official of the same party, can make his political expenses payable out of the Public Treasury?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to my friend, anticipating a query that I trust may be pertinent at this moment.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to say, in answer to the Senator, that I never did approve of the policy of the President in going out in the campaign. I think it was not only unwise but fateful. The Senator from Illinois should remember, however, that the Congress of the United States took deliberate action and expressed not only impliedly but directly its desire to have the President travel over the country, and appropriated $25,000 in express language for the purpose of having him go out to the people, believing that it was a good thing for them to meet their President. So Congress itself provided that the President should travel at the expense of an appropriation which it had allowed.

Mr. LEWIS. Does the Senator from Michigan say, upon the responsibility of his station, that the Congress of the United States passed a measure allowing President Taft to go to Massachusetts and Ohio and other States to make his political campaign at the expense of the taxpayers, and that he as a Senator or Representative voted for such a measure of imposition upon his countrymen?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am not saying that Congress made any such express allowance, but they made no restriction. They simply allowed the President so much money for traveling expenses.

Mr. LEWIS. Then I ask, did the Senator from Michigan apply his present morals of condemnation to the President when he was apparently and publicly expending that sum in his political campaign, using the fund to the extent that even his cook and his bath attendant were likewise paid from the funds of the Federal Government?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will say, in answer to the Senator, that I do not know for what the President expended this money. I am not able to say whether he used any portion of the money for doing that or not. I am satisfied that the President of the United States—and I am not making any excuses for some of the trips which he made—I am positive that the President never proposed to leave his office for six weeks in charge of somebody else with the idea of going out and receiving compensation because he could not live on $50,000 a year.

Mr. LEWIS. I will ask the distinguished Senator if while he has been a Member of Congress—and distinguished he was as such—and drawing his salary, did he not practice his profession of the law—legitimately, and draw compensation from clients?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I did not.

Mr. LEWIS. What was the reason your clients lost such confidence in you during that time? [Laughter.]

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to state—perhaps I ought to modify that—when I was elected to Congress I had a number of lawsuits pending. Those that I could turn over—and most of them were transferred, because they could be turned over to better hands—were transferred. There were, however, a few which were not turned over, to which I attended, not when Congress was in session, but the courts kindly postponed them until Congress adjourned, and I then went home and tried them. I have not taken any cases since the end of my first term in the House.

Mr. LEWIS. Then, I will ask the Senator, during the time which he calls "vacation," was he not both drawing his salary from the Government and likewise charging legitimate or proper compensation to his clients for his valuable services?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I was.

Mr. LEWIS. Of course. There is such a difference when it is a Democrat. [Laughter.] So legitimate for a Republican Senator—so criminal when done by a Democratic Secretary of State.

Now, Mr. President, we are particularly interested, and, I am sure, to a degree amused by this illuminating spectacle of virtue on the part of our distinguished friends—for all of whom we entertain deep affection; but where was this voice of protest that has been calcium lighted upon this particular stage when a high official of the Post Office Department deliberately deserted his official duties and turned himself into a political machinist to nominate a distinguished friend—Secretary of War Taft—for political office, abandoning all his duties and under circumstances publicly shaming this country? Where was the protest when an officer of the Army, Maj. Ray, was deliberately ordered to abandon a purely nonpartisan employment, that should have been fraught only with unquestioned patriotism and nonpartyism, and turn himself to the partisan employment by being a special political emissary located in the city of Chicago

for the Middle West to secure converts for a political aspirant for the Presidency? Now, before the eyes of the country this officer seeks reward of promotion for that questionable service. Did then from my distinguished friend from Michigan arise a protest, or any from the honorable Senator from Kansas?

The records are waiting for them to speak and are heavy with silence. Will they contend to the contrary? Is it because the gentleman against whom they now inveigh is a Democrat, an officer of the Wilson administration, and opposed to their political predilections that a lawmaker would engage himself in this undertaking of discrimination? Mr. President, it is not through patriotism that these distinguished Senators protest, but out of a narrow, small partyism; and it is apparent that it does not do credit to their intelligence, while it renders the dignity of their splendid position contemptible.

What is the claim the distinguished Senator from Michigan makes? Not, sir, that anything has happened to the hurt of public service; not, sir, that any wrong has been inflicted upon the Republic; not, sir, that any public duty has been neglected by the Secretary of State; nor, sir, that any particular omission in any form of performance can be sustained. No. Yet he prepares a lecture upon good behavior of Democratic officials, and in the agony of anticipation that permeates his throbbing body screams his quivering fear that the precedent might lead to others doing the things which he contends the Secretary of State threatens—to the great undoing of the Nation.

What is that threat? It is that he, the Secretary of State, will in the time of vacation go to the country and deliver addresses upon subjects of public importance. From this avowal it is claimed by the Senator from Michigan that the Secretary is to receive some form of remuneration; but in the meantime does the Senator from Michigan, from his very high and exalted station, upon his unimpeached honor, intimate to the Republic that this official is neglecting any duty; that he is not keeping in touch with his department; that he is not to be ever present at any hour that his presence is required, as much so as if the Senator returned to his home in splendid Michigan on private business subject to the call of the Senate in the performance of his official duties in this Chamber? Where is the difference?

Why all this cant? Why all this ridiculous performance? Now, Mr. President, let us be frank. There may be, on the part of some gentlemen with tender sensibilities lately aroused and newly announced, some objection to an important official adding to his income by a form of undertaking such as assumed by the distinguished Secretary of State, and who, without blush and without disguise, frankly concedes such as his object. The distinguished Senator from Kansas and likewise the Senator from Michigan delight to indulge in the retrospection that such practice has not been in the character and life of those named in the resolution of the Senator from Kansas (commented upon by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] in his able utterance). Sir, the hour has struck when common, plain truth in this elevated station is to be approved.

It may be admitted that a form of obnoxious and objectionable poverty afflicts many Members of the heretofore minority—the Democracy—fighting and struggling in behalf of the masses of America day by day and disdaining a form of employment that corrupted the souls and defiled the bodies of honorable men. They would not accept tendered opportunity of compensation of a nature and quantity that would enable them to hold with ease office in the great Capital City. They have not been, as other officials of another party, favored with the gift of splendid homes adorned with silken tapestries brought from the Orient, floored with burnished carpetings from Syria, walls refined with furnishings in Carrara marble, gilded and inlaid with onyx and precious stones, favors from certain admirers who could make the presentations to which I have alluded and which incidents are now familiar to the minds of the listening Senators. Our Democrats probably were compelled to resort to the honorable method of working for a living, and this by visible means of support. Ah, different, indeed, from that other era just passing, when commonly, notoriously, when obnoxious to decency, contemptuous of citizenship, certain officials under another political régime did not hesitate to use their office for the recoupment of their coffers by open speculation in the stock market, and basing these upon the tariff bills of the Government while they made profitable the gambling practices upon the legislative undertakings of the Government, by shaping their own official course along the line of recommendation of public measures on the one hand or the support of them on the other as would enrich their private fortunes and give to them the luxuries of coarse vulgarities. Sir, the true Democrat who, never having engaged in such undertakings, could never hope for the profit from such nor sought he to avoid labor to make good his needs caused by his honorable avoidance of such detestable business.

Oh, there is a difference, there is a change. We delight to know that patriotic men on both sides of the Chamber dream that the difference now intrenched shall always exist. Mr. President, when the hour really comes for examination by the American public as to what all this false tempest is about, they will waste no time in a petty analysis of these reverberating anathemas of the gentlemen who, spending days and nights devising sentences and meaningless utterances that are "sound and fury," hoping that the geniuses who preside over the press gallery may advertise them to their constituents as worthy of notice and possible of praise—fatuous allurement—no; the people are just.

When all of these pretenders have been excluded by the sincere, abandoned by the prudent, smiled at by the dignified and thoughtful; there will arise the query from the great heart of America, which knows this Bryan, asking, What wrong has this man, the Secretary of State, committed? What duty has he violated? What obligation has he avoided? What offense has he committed that distinguished Senators, under their solemn oaths to maintain the dignity of a great and exalted assemblage of their country, should be content to drag it along the lower plane to insignificance and contempt, while they humiliate an exalted officer, a Christian gentleman, merely to gratify some spleen of party on the one hand or to obtain political publicity to themselves on the other?

For myself I trust that no such scene may be duplicated in the time that I am permitted to honor myself by association with these distinguished gentlemen, and if it should arise again to their thoughts to repeat the comedy let them reflect that there is a sentiment of honor in their States and a manhood of citizenship in their homes. That from these already, in humiliation, breaks a protest, voicing of each of them the condemning execration—

> I had rather be a dog, and bay the moon,
> Than such a Roman.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there has been such a heated discussion over this question, in which personalities have been hurled from one side to the other of this Chamber, it might be well for us now to look at what the resolution introduced by the Senator from Kansas is and what its purpose and motive were. When we consider this resolution and read the clause contained in it with relation to Mr. Bryan we find that this is the language used:

> Whereas the "Great Commoner" now holding that high office, Hon. W. J. Bryan, has stated in the public press that the salary of $1,000 per month is not sufficient to enable him to live with comfort, and that because of the meagerness of the salary of $12,000 per annum he is compelled to neglect the duties of his office and go upon the lecture platform in order to earn a living.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> *Resolved*, That the President be requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to advise the Senate what would be a proper salary to enable the present Secretary of State to live with comfort and to enable him to give his time to the discharge of his public duties, for which he is now being paid the sum of $1,000 per month.

In that language the position of Mr. Bryan is not only exaggerated but misrepresented. Since there has been a statement made by Mr. Bryan that he is not in favor of an increase of salary for any of the Cabinet officers, the object of the resolution has been met, and the Senator from Kansas should withdraw it instead of discussing the subject.

Last night Mr. Bryan delivered a lecture at Mountain Lake Park, Md., a few miles from Washington, and in the course of the discussion, as reported by the Washington Post of this morning, he made an explanation contained in the following report of the meeting:

> Subsequent to his lecture, however, when asked if $12,000 was not sufficient to maintain him and his family, would he advocate an increase, Mr. Bryan replied that he would not. The salary, he said, was sufficient to meet all expenses when these are confined to the home and official life. This, however, was not true in his case, for the reason that there were certain fixed charges that must be met.
>
> "These charges," he said, "with my living expenses and expenses incident to my position, exceed my salary." He added that the public would not suffer by his absence from Washington.

Mr. President, in all fairness the governmental question that would naturally be presented by this resolution is as to the policy of the Government concerning the salaries of Cabinet officers. When that is settled and determined by the man whom this resolution seeks to attack, it seems to me that it ought to close the discussion upon the subject; but we find contained in this resolution quotations that were never uttered by Mr. Bryan. For example, I quote the following:

> Whereas the "Great Commoner" now holding that high office, Hon. W. J. Bryan, has stated in the public press that the salary of $1,000 per month is not sufficient to enable him to live with comfort.

That declaration is absolutely negatived and denied in the statement which Mr. Bryan made. Before the Senator from Kansas introduced his resolution, in a conversation which I had with Mr. Bryan he stated to me that he was absolutely opposed to an increase in the salary of Cabinet officers. It seems to me, then, that this resolution is aiming at an object that is not a proper senatorial inquiry, whether the Government should pay its officers better salaries or not, but goes beyond that and criticizes unjustly and improperly a member of the Cabinet.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no intention of participating in this debate, but I have been listening to it with great care. I observe that in the speech made last evening by the distinguished Secretary of State he alludes to certain "fixed charges." In business matters we know what that means. Will the Senator, if he has the information, advise the Senate as to precisely what the term "fixed charges" in connection with a public official mean?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, I do not know. I have never talked with Mr. Bryan relative to that; but nearly every public official has some expenditures which he is compelled to make every year which probably can not be counted as part of his household or official expenses. Why, in this very interview some one asked him about his farm near Lincoln, Nebr., and in reply thereto he said it was a liability instead of an asset. I have not any doubt that item constitutes part of the fixed liability which he feels under obligation to meet. He farms there, I presume, by hiring labor; and every man who ever attempts to do that finds there is no profit, but usually a liability, in such an undertaking.

But I want to go further with relation to this unfair recital. The resolution proceeds:

And that because of the meagerness of the salary of $12,000 per annum he is compelled to neglect the duties of his office.

Where is there any statement of his that he is going to neglect the duties of his office? Who has any right to assume that he is going to neglect his duties.

Everybody who is well acquainted with Mr. Bryan knows that he is one of the hardest-working men that ever lived, not merely during the paltry hours that he is compelled to spend in the office of the Secretary of State, but during the time after office hours and into the late hours of the night.

Where is there any statement of his, or any implication which can be drawn from Mr. Bryan's interview, that he is going to neglect his official duties? He has stated in this very interview that he expects to cancel whatever lecture engagements he may have if he finds that his presence is needed at the State Department. At all times he would be in telegraphic and telephonic connection with his office.

Senators are endeavoring to make it appear that the State Department is now handling a great crisis. I do not see that the present conditions are different from those that usually exist.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator says Mr. Bryan is opposed to any increase of salary?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. NORRIS. I presume the Senator also takes as true Mr. Bryan's other statement, that the salary of the office is not sufficient for him to live on and pay the fixed charges, whatever those may be?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; I suppose so.

Mr. NORRIS. Then does it not follow that men who are very wealthy, or who, like Mr. Bryan, can make something outside of the office, are the only ones who can be appointed to the office of Secretary of State?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, not necessarily; no.

Mr. NORRIS. If those fixed charges are necessary, how could a man who did not have the eloquence or the ability of Mr. Bryan, or of men like him, or a man who had not sufficient wealth outside of his salary, afford to accept the place?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Bryan has always felt, no doubt, that he had a right to use in any manner he might wish the time which men ordinarily spend as their vacation.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not finding fault with that; but I call the Senator's attention to the fact that he has not yet answered my question. If it be true that the Secretary of State can not live and perform the duties of his office on a salary of $12,000, and that the salary should not be increased, does it not follow that only wealthy men can be appointed to the office, or men who can make some money outside of the salary of the office?

Mr. SHAFROTH. But Mr. Bryan has expressly stated that the compensation is amply sufficient to meet the ordinary expenses of living and the ordinary duties of his office, but that he himself——

Mr. NORRIS. What are the other charges?

Mr. SHAFROTH (continuing). That he himself has some fixed charges to pay; and that is a matter with himself, as to whether or not he would under those circumstances accept the office.

Mr. NORRIS. Do I understand, then, that the fixed charges of which the Senator is speaking are not charges pertaining to the office of Secretary of State, but something connected with Mr. Bryan's private affairs?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, I suppose so.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not get that idea from what the Senator said.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, yes; as I understand, they are connected with his own private affairs.

I am one who also believes that Cabinet officers, Senators, Representatives, and other officers of the Government are getting a fair compensation for their services. It may be that some are in the habit of making more money. I do not believe in great salaries. I do not believe men should get rich in public office out of the money which they get from the Government. I believe there should be some element of patriotism—some sacrifice, even, if necessary—in order that men should hold these high offices. For that reason it seems to me that our salary roll is sufficiently high, and should not be increased.

But Senators have said that if this rule prevails of a Cabinet officer going out and lecturing, it should also prevail as to subordinates; and it does. One month's annual leave is given to each of the employees in each of the departments of the Government. I apprehend that in that time if they want to lecture, or if they want to work on the farm, or if they want to do anything else, they have a perfect right to do it without criticism from anybody. So the privilege Mr. Bryan is exercising is not anything more than the privilege which is given to the very lowest of the Government employees.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado whether it is customary for these other employees to take their vacations at the end of the year or when they have been only three months in office?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know about the time. I think those in authority generally accommodate employees to their convenience, and let them select the time whenever they wish.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator is going to make a comparison, and to put the case under discussion on all fours with the illustration he makes, it really seems to me that at least the distinguished Secretary of State might have spent a few months in office without finding it necessary to go for a vacation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, well, the summer months are usually the months of vacation. Consequently I do not see that there is anything out of the ordinary in his choosing that time. In fact, there is usually less going on, and the presence of the head of the department is of less moment to the Government during the hot season.

Mr. LIPPITT. Certainly the Senator from Colorado does not mean to say that there is less than usual going on at this moment in the office of the Secretary of State. Unless all the signs of activity are false, I should suppose that at this very moment some of the most important questions that are apt to come before the department are on its files.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know of anything except the Mexican matter that is being discussed to any extent. That is something which, in my judgment, should not be rushed, because of the fact that we know that the money brokers of Europe have been lending money to the Republic of Mexico, and now are exerting their influence upon the United States to induce it to recognize that Republic, not for any good to our Government, but in order that there may be more stability and more security to the loans which they have made to the Mexican Republic.

Mr. LIPPITT. It is reported that some foreign nations have made certain representations to this country on that subject. Of course, I am not informed upon that matter any further than I see in the public prints. But the statement and insinuation of the distinguished Senator would seem to imply that these foreign nations are being controlled in their action by foreign money lenders or somebody else. It seems to me that is going a long way beyond the facts in order to try to make it appear that this is a time when the Secretary of State can be most

particularly spared from his duties, whereas all the ordinary signs seem to show that it is a time when he should be particularly attentive to his duties.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not apprehend that there is anything of special moment pending. The policy which has been pursued up to this time, according to newspapers, has been that of nonrecognition of the Republic of Mexico. It has been announced, though I have no knowledge concerning the matter either from the Secretary of State or from anyone connected with the administration, that recognition of the Republic of Mexico will be made whenever there is an election in that country, and a duly elected and qualified president is chosen by the people. It seems to me that is a wise policy. The election does not occur until the 26th day of October. Consequently I can not see what rush there is in relation to the matter. This is the season when many of the foreign ambassadors are away from Washington and hence the most appropriate time for a vacation for the Secretary of State. But, anyway, whether it is or not, Mr. Bryan has announced that every single lecture engagement he may have will be canceled if his presence is necessary at the Capital. I have no doubt that he will keep in close touch with every movement that is made in the State Department.

It seems to me this is a tempest in a teapot. Hundreds of cases have existed where men in public office have left Washington during the vacation season for the purpose of lecturing and for the purpose of attending to some of their own private business. To single out for criticism one man because he has been our leader in three successive campaigns is unworthy of the Senator who introduced the resolution and unworthy of the consideration of the Senate.

The discussion has deviated from the resolution. The resolution was with respect to compensation to public officers; but instead of that the discussion has taken the turn as to whether any man should be permitted to earn a dollar aside from his salary while he is holding a public office. It seems to me that as Mr. Bryan has stated clearly that he does not want his salary increased that ought to foreclose discussion with relation to the resolution, and it should be withdrawn.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I got into a colloquy a while ago with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW], in which I stated that the Senate was in session during the Baltimore convention which nominated Woodrow Wilson for President. The Senator from Kansas stated that that was a flimsy argument; that the Senator from Kentucky well knew that the Senate had an agreement that they were not to transact any business; that two or three only met and adjourned. He was particularly emphatic in his declaration. He had just before that stated that he was reporting the proceedings of that convention, or giving his observations of that convention, for some newspaper or magazine for money.

If I were as unkindly disposed to the Senator from Kansas as he has been to the Secretary of State, I might have applied a great many of these "whereases" to him, because the Senate of the United States was in session and did transact business. It did not, as the Senator from Kansas states, meet and adjourn. It transacted considerable business, and I intend to insert it in the RECORD.

On July 1, when that convention was in session, the Senate passed a bill appropriating $10,000,000 of the people's money. The Senate was in session to that extent.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Kentucky if that was not after the unanimous-consent agreement had expired?

Mr. JAMES. Ah! No matter when the unanimous-consent agreement expired; I know nothing of that. Senators who themselves are critical of other people can not excuse themselves to the people who send them here by saying that all the Senate agreed with them not to do work while they did other work at a national convention.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator from Kansas is not excusing himself for anything.

Mr. JAMES. I understand that.

Mr. BRISTOW. He takes the responsibility for everything that he has said and every act that he has done, and asks no excuse or apology from the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. JAMES. The Senate met on Monday, July 1, 1912. This convention was then in session. The RECORD shows that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], who had previously given notice that upon this day he would call up the Indian appropriation bill, rose and said:

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 20728, being the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 20728) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments.

Then follows the consideration of that bill, covering many pages of the RECORD.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

Mr. JAMES. So, Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas was mistaken when he stated there was an agreement that the Senate was to meet and adjourn and that there were not enough Senators here to do business during the Baltimore convention. The RECORD shows that they did do business, and on one bill to the extent of ten or twelve millions of dollars.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

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

Mr. JAMES. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator from Kentucky were frank, he would state that that business was transacted after the unanimous-consent agreement had expired, when everybody supposed the Democratic convention would have adjourned; and the reason it had not adjourned was because it was prolonged beyond anyone's expectations.

Mr. JAMES. Let me ask the Senator whether he did not stay in the convention at Baltimore and report its proceedings during this time?

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to say that I did not; that I returned when the Senate resumed its sessions, and wrote the article which was last printed from Washington.

Mr. JAMES. Was the Senator present in the Senate when this bill was under consideration?

Mr. BRISTOW. I was.

Mr. JAMES. Then why did the Senator state that when the convention was in session at Baltimore there were not enough Senators here to transact business?

Mr. BRISTOW. There were not until the unanimous-consent agreement had expired; and I want to repeat that if the Senator were frank he would admit that he seeks to impute a misstatement to me. But I am not on trial here, and if I were I would not be tried by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. JAMES. Oh, I am not seeking to put the Senator upon trial. I am seeking to sustain the statement I made.

Mr. BRISTOW. I am correct in the statement I made, and I repeat it now.

Mr. BRISTOW subsequently said: I should like to have incorporated in my remarks in the colloquy I had with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] the following order of the Senate. I should like to read it and have it made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. And the date of it, please.

Mr. BRISTOW. June 12. 1912.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT.

Mr. LODGE. I call up the unanimous-consent agreement which I offered last evening. I have changed it so as to make it more explicit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts asks that the following unanimous-consent agreement be entered into.

The Secretary read as follows:

"It is agreed by unanimous consent that on Monday, June 17, 1912, immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business, the Senate will adjourn to Thursday, June 20, 1912; that upon the last-named day, immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business, the Senate will adjourn to Monday, June 24, 1912; that upon the last-named day, and immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business, the Senate will adjourn to Thursday, June 27, 1912; that upon the last-named day, and immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business, the Senate will adjourn to Monday, July 1, 1912; and that during the period from June 17 to July 1, 1912, no business, other than routine morning business, will be transacted, and that no bills shall be passed."

It is on page 7981 of the RECORD, volume 48.

Mr. JAMES. The Senator is no more correct in that statement than in the other one, because the Senate on Thursday, June 27, did transact business. Motions were made, petitions were presented, messages from the President were presented to the Senate, and bills were passed. If that does not constitute a session of the Senate, what does constitute it?

Mr. BRISTOW. Will the Senator please state what bills were passed?

Mr. JAMES. I have not had time to look over the particular bills. There are many pages of the RECORD here. I will put into the RECORD the whole proceedings, so that there may be no dispute about it. It shall all be before the Senate. But, Mr. President, this only goes to show that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones. [Laughter in the galleries.] So far as I am individually concerned, I find no fault with the distinguished Senator from Kansas because he went to the Democratic convention. I wish to God he would go to more of them. [Laughter in the galleries.] But I do insist, Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will preserve order in the galleries. He has had four notices.

Mr. JAMES. But I do insist, Mr. President, that the Senator would be subject to the same criticism by those who are disposed to be critical to which he undertakes to subject the Secretary of State.

The Senator stated in his argument this morning that he called for a passport for some friend, and he did not get it for two or three weeks. Surely the Senator does not mean to insinuate that the illustrious Secretary of State was responsible for some failure in the routine business of the State Department. Is that the character of statesmanship that is to be shown upon this floor for the purpose of securing some petty party advantage, by attacking small things? It is really gratifying, Mr. President, to see our Republican friends unable to criticize the great policies of our party, unable to criticize the tariff bill we present, unable to criticize the currency bill we have under consideration, but that they resort to small things——

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

Mr. JAMES (continuing). For the purpose of making criticisms, and consuming the time of the Senate, and keeping back the passage of these great and important bills of relief to the people, while they discuss the question of the absence of the Secretary of State from the department for a few days to deliver lectures upon religious subjects.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. LIPPITT. I just rose for the purpose of venturing to assure the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that Senators on this side of the Chamber have no intention of not criticizing the "great policies," as he calls them, of his party.

Mr. JAMES. Oh, the Senator from Rhode Island is always ready and always ludicrous.

Mr. LIPPITT. If he for a moment thinks the bill is going to be passed through this Chamber without there being called to the attention of the people a great many points that we think are thoroughly justified by way of criticism, he is proceeding under a very mistaken idea.

Mr. JAMES. I venture to say that, even as courageous as the distinguished Senator is, he would not undertake to say now that he would vote for the repassage of the bill that bears the name of one of the distinguished citizens of the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky that before I would put my vote at the back of the tariff bill that has been brought in here, and which even at this moment is stopping the industries of my State and stopping the industries of neighboring States, I would vote for the bill that is now on the books ten times over.

Mr. JAMES. Let me say to the Senator, in relation to his remark about stopping industries, that that is an old gag. You played that off the boards long ago.

Mr. LIPPITT. Yes; that was an "old gag." It occurred in 1892 and 1893, and for months and months the employees of the mills in my State were walking the streets and going to the soup kitchens to get relief.

Mr. JAMES. Oh, that is an old, worn-out argument. I have heard that before.

Mr. LIPPITT. It is not worn out. It fits the present situation like a garment.

Mr. JAMES. But we will see the Senator when he comes in action upon the present tariff bill. That is the best answer to it all. But I think if there is one Senator above another upon that side that would stand for tariff duties so high that they would keep out competition of all sorts, I should most respectfully bow to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I simply rise to call the Senator's attention to a statement he made. I know the Senator wants to be accurate.

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator stated a moment ago that Senators on this side of the Chamber are delaying the consideration of the tariff bill by the discussion that is now under way. I will say for myself that I came into the Senate Chamber this morning expecting that the distinguished Senator who is at the head of the Finance Committee [Mr. SIMMONS] would make his opening argument, and we would proceed with a good deal of haste to consider this important measure. We understand why the Senator from North Carolina has not spoken; and we all trust, on this side of the Chamber, that he will be able to open the discussion to-morrow. I want to say to the Senator, and I speak from knowledge, that Republican Senators have no disposition whatever to delay the consideration of the tariff bill after they have had fair time to discuss it and consider its various provisions.

Mr. JAMES. I am very glad to hear the Senator from New Hampshire make that statement. It must be known, however, because it is of record, that practically all of the members of the Republican Party—all except two, I believe—voted against the motion to lay this resolution upon the table this morning.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that would be justified upon the ground that there was no other business before the Senate, and that we might as well have this interesting discussion as anything else.

Mr. JAMES. But the Senator is mistaken about that. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], the second in command upon the Committee on Finance, is here ready, and has been, to make the report of the Finance Committee upon the tariff bill. It would have been reported immediately but for this matter that has been precipitated here.

Mr. GALLINGER. That would take just two minutes. If the Senator from Missouri were prepared to make a report, unquestionably the Senate would agree that the Senator should make that report—by unanimous consent, if necessary.

Mr. JAMES. I merely rose, Mr. President, not to engage in any controversial discussion with my friends upon the other side but merely to present this record as it is.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. One remark made by the Senator struck me as justifying a little statement on my part. That was his apparent challenge everywhere of the fact that there was no disposition to discuss or take issue with the propositions made on that side of the Chamber with relation to the tariff and, he also added, in relation to the currency.

Mr. President, I fully realize that the sentiment of the people of the country will not countenance a discussion of the proposed currency legislation as a matter of partisan politics. I do not believe thoughtful gentlemen on that side of the Chamber want to have a great question of that kind, far-reaching as it is and affecting as it does men in every walk and in every station of life, discussed and considered and determined from the standpoint of the kind of political discussion we have heard here to-day on both sides of the Chamber. I want to say to the Senator from Kentucky——

Mr. JAMES. I do not mean to interrupt the Senator, but I was trying to follow the line of his question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the question of currency legislation is to be put forward to the people of the country as a matter of the sort of partisan politics that is being discussed here this afternoon, God save the people of the United States.

Mr. JAMES. He will. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am sure He will; but I will add to that remark of the Senator that if the Democratic Party is going to approach the currency question in that spirit the Democratic Party will not save the people of the United States.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, what God Almighty intends to do with the people of the United States is a question about which I am not entirely informed. I think we are a good people and He will take care of us. I think we will do well now, however, to discuss the questions we have before us here, questions of great moment—the tariff bill, involving our consuming public and thousands of industries; the currency question, and other great problems—without halting this great work to play petty politics.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am perfectly willing that that shall be done; but the distinguished Senator from Kentucky threw out a very broad statement with reference to currency legislation.

Mr. JAMES. I think the Senator will be prepared to vote for the currency bill when it comes from the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to reply to that suggestion. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I propose, so far as it is possible for me to do so, to act in sympathy and in a spirit of cooperation with all the members of that committee and to help, so far as I can consistently with my convictions, the distinguished chairman of that committee, who has brought a currency bill into the Senate. But I wish to say that when we come to discuss the details and propositions entering into the bill as it is presented here now I shall, as the bill is proposed at the present time, be compelled to differ in a decided manner from those who contend that the bill is all-sufficient in its present form, not as a partisan, but as one who wishes to get the best possible legislation for the country upon the subject. I do not care to discuss it in advance

of a full consideration by the committee of which I happen to be a member, but I suggest that the Senator should not make his charge too sweeping with reference to there not being sufficient conviction upon the subject to challenge discussion upon a great many features that are in the bill in its present form.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, so far as Mr. Bryan is concerned, no assault made here, no assault, in my judgment, made in the newspapers, no assault that may be fomented by political foes, can affect him. He is secure in the confidence and affection of his countrymen. No resolutions that you may pass, no partisan speeches that you may make, will ever convince the American people that William J. Bryan would desert his post of duty when there was the slightest necessity for his presence.

That has not been his record in times of defeat. It will not be his record in times of triumph. Our Republican friends used to tell us that if Bryan ever got into office he would ruin the country, and now the Senator from Kansas is telling us that if he leaves office he will ruin the country. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, many distinguished men, as the Senator from Missouri said, have gone upon the Chautauqua platform; and let me say, of all the forces of uplift, of all the powers that have made for our progressive life, of all the influences that have battled to relieve the people from the clutches of greed, I most respectfully point you to the Chautauqua platform. Free from the rancor and malice of partisanship, they gather to hear when they are cool and unprejudiced. They listen to these arguments, and the forces and the power of not only many distinguished men in this country, but more especially of Mr. Bryan, are responsible for the great uplift in this country and the trend toward better and higher ideals and purposes.

Mr. President, so far as criticism of Mr. Bryan is concerned, Senators upon the other side remained silent and free from criticism of the President of the United States, Mr. Taft, when he went, at Government expense, for the purpose of making political speeches, yet they freely and violently criticize Mr. Bryan when the speeches that he is making are those of a religious character, and I do not believe that even the Republican Party has much to fear from that.

And you may rest assured of just one thing, that Mr. Bryan will be in touch with his office at all times, and that at the slightest show of the necessity for his presence at the Capital he will be here to perform his duty.

In connection with my remarks, Mr. President, I ask that the entire proceedings of the Senate of June 27 and July 1, 1912, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The proceedings of the Senate referred to are as follows:

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *June 27, 1912.*

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
*Washington, D. C., June 27, 1912.*

*To the Senate:*

In the absence of the Vice President and of the President pro tempore of the Senate, by authority of Rule I, I hereby name DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair to-day.

AUGUSTUS O. BACON,
*President of the Senate pro tempore.*

Mr. FLETCHER thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer, and directed that the Journal of the last legislative day's proceedings be read.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to have the Journal read this morning. A number of us have been absent.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Monday last.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. HEYBURN. I have asked that the Journal be read this morning. Some of us who were not here desire to know what the Journal contains. We can spend that much time in hearing it read.

Mr. NELSON. Very well; I withdraw the request.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal, and it was approved.

THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. HEYBURN. I notice in the Journal of the last legislative day that a communication from the Secretary of War, Senate Document No. 856, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. That was in response to a resolution which I offered, and I desire that it shall lie on the table so that I may call it up in the morning hour. I was not able to be here at the time it was referred, but I do not desire that it be referred to a committee, because I wish to address the Senate upon it at an early day. For that reason I ask that the communication be withdrawn from the committee and that it may lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho asks that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the communication and that it may lie on the table. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION AT GHENT, BELGIUM (S. DOC. NO. 863).

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of State, submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of $25,000 to enable the Government to participate in a universal and international exposition to be held at Ghent, Belgium, from April, 1913, to the end of October, 1913, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate communications from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions of law filed by the court in the following causes:

Edgar L. Swaine, administrator of the estate of Peter T. Swaine, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 859);

Lucy May Castor, administratrix of the estate of Thomas Foster Castor, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 861);

Diantha G. Littlejohn, administratrix of the estate of John Egan, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 860); and

Washington Loan & Trust Co., administrator of the estate of James W. Cuyler, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 864).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER presented resolutions adopted by the Swedish Evangelical Mission Covenant, in annual convention at Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of an interestate liquor law to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution adopted by District Council, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen Society of North America, American Federation of Labor, of New York, remonstrating against the adoption of the so-called illiteracy-test amendment to the immigration law, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Woman's Auxiliary to the Board of Missions of the Diocese of New Hampshire, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide medical and sanitary relief for the natives of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of the Connecticut Avenue Citizens' Association, of the District of Columbia, and a petition of sundry citizens of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to maintain the present water rates in the District, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WORKS presented a memorial of members of the National League for Medical Freedom, of Los Gatos, Cal., remonstrating against the establishment of a department of public health, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pacific Beach, Cal., praying for the establishment of a governmental system of postal express, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a board of river regulation and to provide a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the People's Church, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation granting the right of suffrage to the citizens of the Philippine Islands and the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Eureka, Cal., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. JONES presented a petition of sundry citizens of La Crosse, Wash., praying for the establishment of a governmental system of postal express, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. ASHURST. I present a petition signed by a large number of stockmen of Mohave and Yavapai Counties, Ariz., with reference to the so-called leasing and grazing bill. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

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

SELIGMAN, ARIZ., *June 22, 1912.*

Hon. HENRY ASHURST,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

We, the undersigned stockmen of Yavapai and Mohave Counties, Ariz., do respectfully ask you to do everything in your power and influence to assist in having the present leasing grazing bill passed.

This bill, known as the La Follette bill, proposes to lease the Government grazing lands of the western part of the United States or the public domain. The bill is now pending before the Senate of the United States Congress, and we earnestly request you to present this petition to the committee in charge of the bill and use your utmost efforts to have this bill passed before the present session of Congress adjourns.

Sincerely, your petitioners,

J. W. Sullivan, E. L. Paterson, D. L. Williams, Thos. King, Chas. King, Arthur King, M. A. Perkins, N. Perkins, S. Perkins, N. Penteny, Chas. Penteny, Joe Mathie, Albert Mathie, M. L. Boner, J. W. Knootz, John Duke, J. W. Stewart, Clarence Stewart, Rall Stewart, Geo. Carter, J. H. Stevens, Ed. Stevens, Chas. Ridgen, John Hurley, Joseph Campbell, Abe Caufman, Al Sanford, A. L. Nelson, Ed Carrow, John Lawler, Joe Tribble, Robt. Tribble, Lee Cockrell, Ed Haskins, Walter Brown, Le Van Evens, John Markham, Jas. Johnson, Carl Davis, Ray Carr, Dee Nelson, John Neil, W. B. Stevens, M. L. Boner, Henry Bacon, Jones Bishop, Sam Sloan, Geo. Miller, Wm. Epperson, William Ellison, John Simpaon, Geo. Daniels, Dave Kaiser.

Mr. CURTIS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Kans., praying for the establishment of a department of public health, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a memorial signed by 459 members of the Florida Branch of the League for Medical Freedom, remonstrating

against the establishment of a department of public health, which was ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7197) for the relief of the heirs of L. A. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 7198) granting a pension to Ida A. Mitchell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7199) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Murphy (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7200) granting an increase of pension to Rosa L. Couch (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 7201) granting a pension to Fannie M. Carey; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 7202) fixing the date of reenlistment of Gustav Hertfelder, first-class fireman, United States Navy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 7203) to provide for homestead entries in national forests; to the Committee on Public Lands.

DRY-FARMING PROCESS.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I desire to introduce a bill to exempt from cancellation and provide for patenting by dry-farming process desert-land entries. It is a very short bill, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD. With the permission of the Senate, if it be in order, I should like to give notice that immediately after the morning business on Tuesday, the 9th of July, if such be the pleasure of the Senate, I shall submit a few remarks with reference to the bill.

Mr. HEYBURN. I did not catch the suggestion of the Senator, and I ask what the request was?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request, as the Chair understands, is to introduce a bill and to have the bill printed in the RECORD and lie on the table.

Mr. HEYBURN. I thought I heard something about the bill being printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ASHURST. I should like to have the bill printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HEYBURN. I think there is no rule permitting that.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator from Arizona is entitled to have the bill read, and in that way it will go into the RECORD. Let the Senator request that the bill be read.

Mr. HEYBURN. It is not in order to print the bill in the RECORD without having it read.

Mr. ASHURST. Then I most respectfully ask to have the bill read. It is very short.

The bill (S. 7204) to exempt from cancellation and provide for patenting of desert-land entries reclaimed by dry-farming process was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That no desert-land entry heretofore made under the public-land laws for lands shall be canceled or in any wise impaired because of any failure on the part of the entryman to make any annual or final proof falling due upon any such entry prior to December 31, 1913: *Provided, however*, That patent shall be permitted to issue to any desert-land entry when the proofs disclose that the land embraced within such entry has fairly and in good faith been reclaimed to agricultural or horticultural crops by the dry-farming process."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona gives notice that he will address the Senate on this bill on the 9th of July, and it will lie on the table.

Mr. ASHURST. With the kind permission of the Senate, I will change the notice to Tuesday, the 16th day of July. I feel it is due to the Senate that I should state that my remarks will be very brief, and it is simply because of what I deem to be the great public importance of the bill that I will take the time of the Senate to discuss it. My remarks, as I have said, will be brief, but I do feel that I should say something in support of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will lie on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $100,000 to investigate the treatment of ores and other mineral substances with special reference to the prevention of waste in the mining and the utilization of important mineral resources, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WORKS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $1,250,000 for necessary improvements in the Colorado River to protect the land and property of Imperial Valley, Cal., from overflow, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMOOT submitted an amendment providing that hereafter the proviso to the act of July 1, 1898, directing that all bonds, notes, and checks be printed on hand-roller presses, shall not apply to checks, the backs and tints of all United States bonds, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $30,000 to pay the city of Salt Lake, Utah, to assist in defraying the expenses of the International Irrigation Congress to be held in that city September 30, 1912, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PERKINS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $28,000 to enable the Commissioner of the General Land Office to make field examinations of selected lieu lands in California, and to adjudicate the same in the General Land Office, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $41,615 for the protection and improvement of the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, executive clerk, announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolutions:

On June 25, 1912:

S. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution authorizing and directing Charles F. Riddell, cashier in the office of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to draw checks, requisitions, and execute all papers necessary to obtain from the United States Treasury the money appropriated for salaries and mileage of Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

On June 26, 1912:

S. J. Res. 101. Joint resolution authorizing the appointment of Andrew D. White a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

S. 6479. An act authorizing the St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co. to repair, alter, or rebuild certain bridges in the State of Arkansas.

THE ORGANIZED MILITIA (H. DOC. NO. 852).

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

Very complete arrangements have been tentatively prepared for the participation in camps and maneuvers of a large portion of the Organized Militia of the United States. Preparation has been made for this most important military instruction both by the United States and by the various States whose Organized Militia will participate. The magnitude of the maneuver plans can be seen when it is estimated that 70,000 officers and enlisted men of the Organized Militia will take part in them during the coming year. Should it be impossible to carry out the contemplated maneuvers it will be at a very great loss of efficiency to the troops concerned and will entail a great disappointment to the thousands of men who, with the maneuvers in view, have been preparing themselves therefor.

In contemplation of the maneuvers it has been necessary already to expend the sum of $80,000 from the unexpended balance of last year's appropriation for maneuver purposes for the Organized Militia, which sum will be lost should the project of maneuvers not be consummated. In addition to this, the various States have made arrangements to expend large amounts from their apportionment from the funds appropriated by Congress under section 1661, Revised Statutes, or from funds appropriated by the State. Without an appropriation by Congress the maneuvers may not be held. I have the honor, therefore, strongly to recommend and urge that the following item, taken from House bill No. 18956 (Army appropriation bill), be enacted separately and specially:

"One million three hundred and fifty thousand dollars 'Encampment and maneuvers, Organized Militia, 1912–1914.'"

In addition to the appropriation for the Organized Militia for maneuver purposes it would be necessary that certain amounts be appropriated and made immediately available for the Regular Army to participate with the Organized Militia and aid the latter in the purpose of the maneuvers. This appropriation would total $367,500, and is made up of the following items:

| | |
|---|---|
| Regular supplies | $160,000 |
| Incidental expenses | 4,500 |
| Barracks and quarters | 33,000 |
| Army transportation | 75,000 |
| Roads and walks, etc | 4,000 |
| Water and sewers | 57,000 |
| Clothing and equipage | 34,000 |
| Total | 367,500 |

The immense importance of the training of the militia leads me again to urge most strongly that the two appropriations mentioned be made available on or before the 2d day of July, 1912, since, unless the maneuvers can be definitely determined upon by that date, the plans for the encampments and maneuvers of a great portion of the Organized Militia of the United States will have to be abandoned.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 24, 1912.*

LIEUT. COL. J. F. REYNOLDS LANDIS (S. DOC. NO. 862).

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and the House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, concerning a silver medal and a diploma awarded by the Italian Government to Lieut. Col. J. F. Reynolds Landis, United States Army, in recognition of services rendered by him at the time of the Messina earthquake.

In accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State, these papers are submitted to Congress with a view to its decision whether the Secretary of State may be authorized to deliver the medal and diploma to Lieut. Col. Landis.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 27, 1912.*

CAPT. FRANK PARKER (S. DOC. NO. 858).

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Cuban Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and the House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, concerning a decoration of the Order of Military Merit of the Third Class which has been conferred upon Capt. Frank Parker, United States Army, by the President of Cuba in recognition of services rendered by Capt. Parker as military instructor of the rural guard of Cuba.

In accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State, these papers are submitted to Congress with a view to its decision whether the Secretary of State may be authorized to deliver the decoration to Capt. Parker.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 27, 1912.*

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 24023) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and that the request of the House for a conference be granted, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. WETMORE, and Mr. FOSTER conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANNIE R. SCHLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4568) granting an increase of pension to Annie R. Schley, which was, on page 1, line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one hundred and fifty" and insert "seventy-five."

Mr. MCCUMBER. In the absence of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], I ask that the bill and amendment of the House of Representatives lie on the table until his return.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5623) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors which was, on page 4, to strike out lines 9 to 12, inclusive.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I inquire what are the lines stricken out?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the paragraph of the bill stricken out by the House.

The Secretary read as follows:

"The name of Anne Jones Banks, widow of William Banks, late of Capt. William M. Allred's company, Nauvoo Legion, Utah Volunteers, Utah Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of $8 per month."

Mr. MCCUMBER. I move that——

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I desire to make the point of order that under the unanimous-consent agreement a motion to concur can not be made. That would be to pass the bill, and would be legislative business.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I think the Senator is correct in regard to that; but I was not going to move to concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the point of order well taken.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I was not going to move to concur, but simply that conferees be appointed. Probably, however, even that motion would not be in order, although I observe that in the case of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill conferees were appointed. I think, Mr. President, that all the pension bills amended by the House had better lie on the table until next Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will lie on the table.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I should like to make a suggestion. I was in some doubt when the conferees were appointed on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill as to whether that was not in violation of the unanimous-consent agreement. That period of the consideration of a bill often provokes considerable discussion. I do not raise any point against it, but it is no part of the morning business and I merely make that suggestion.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I desire to say a word with regard to the appointment of the conferees in the case of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. It was not the intention in moving that conferees be appointed to perfect or present any conference report until next week. Debate and action usually take place in connection with the presentation of the conference report, but I should presume, unless I am reminded otherwise by something not now evident, that morning business would carry with it the receipt of messages from the House and the reference of a bill to a conference committee, the same as if a bill were introduced and referred to one of the regular committees of the Senate. Of course the appointment of the conferees is not a matter of voting, but the custom is to take the senior Senators who have served on the subcommittee and appoint them conferees. I only wanted, of course, to carry out what I thought was the morning business of the Senate.

Mr. HEYBURN. I did not intend to raise any objection that would embarrass the Senate at all; but I was of the opinion at the time the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into that it should have been better protected. Of course the conferees should be appointed, but clearly their appointment was not in accord with the unanimous-consent agreement.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Monday next, at the close of the routine morning business, I will ask the Senate to consider the Indian appropriation bill, being House bill 20728. I observe that notice has been given for the same time for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, and I desire to say that the giving of the notice of the intention to ask for the consideration of the two bills on that day is not to be taken as suggesting any differences whatever between those who have them in charge.

Mr. HEYBURN. The original notice, as appears from the calendar, for the consideration of that bill was June 27. I understand the Senator has already given notice to that effect. Is this intended to be an original notice in lieu of any notice heretofore given?

Mr. CLAPP. Oh, I do not know whether it is or not. There are several objections going to be made to the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill, and, in order that Senators may know when the bill will come up, I give this notice.

THE CHEMICAL SCHEDULE.

Mr. HEYBURN. Now, I, too, desire to give a notice. It is that on next Monday, when the Senate resumes business, I shall endeavor to have the Senate proceed immediately to the consideration of the chemical schedule bill. In the absence of Senators a unanimous-consent agreement, or what appears to be one, was obtained which undertook to confine the consideration of the chemical tariff bill to one calendar day. I think there will be some difficulty in enforcing that agreement, because it is my intention to discuss that measure when the order of the unfinished business is reached on that day, and if the unfinished business is laid aside it will be by a vote and not by unanimous consent. I merely give that notice.

Mr. CLAPP. Some time ago—in fact, very soon after the Indian appropriation bill was reported—I gave notice that I would ask for its consideration, and continued the notice from day to day. It is an appropriation bill, and I think Senators are desirous of getting the appropriation bills through the Senate and into conference. So I give this notice this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning business is closed.

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

Mr. MCCUMBER. It seems to me that that is not morning business. I understood that nothing but morning business would be considered.

Mr. GALLINGER. I withdraw the motion, although I think it is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate adjourn, to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. HEYBURN. Why make it 11? I should like to inquire why the Senate——

Mr. GALLINGER. I have made my motion.

Mr. HEYBURN. I move to amend by making the hour of meeting 12 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has moved that the Senate adjourn to meet on Monday next at 11 o'clock. The Senator from Idaho moves to amend by making the hour 12 o'clock. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

The motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the original motion made by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The motion was agreed to: and (at 10 o'clock and 42 minutes a. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 1, 1912, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, *July 1, 1912.*

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

Mr. BACON took the chair as President pro tempore under the order of the Senate of June 12, 1912.

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

THE LAWRENCE (MASS.) STRIKE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting, in response to a resolution of May 7, 1912, a report of the investigation of the recent strike at Lawrence, Mass., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

CHARLES H. QUACKENBUSH (S. DOC. 866).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of May 13, 1912, the correspondence in the possession of the Post Office Department relating to the discharge of Charles H. Quackenbush from the Railway Mail Service and his reinstatement, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

THE YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of April 2, 1912, an estimate prepared by Capt. C. H. Knight, Corps of Engineers, relative to the cost of new roads in Yellowstone National Park.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to have the communication printed with the illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it will be printed with the illustrations. To what committee is it desired that it should be referred?

Mr. HEYBURN. It should not go to any committee. It is in response to a resolution which I offered calling for information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Such communications are usually referred to some committee.

Mr. HEYBURN. Let it lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communication will lie on the table, without objection.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 6847) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was, on page 2, line 15, to strike out "Stotler" and insert "Statler."

Mr. MCCUMBER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5623) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House and ask a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MCCUMBER, Mr. Burnham, and Mr. GORE conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 6084) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendments, ask a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MCCUMBER, Mr. Burnham, and Mr. GORE conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 6340) granting pensions

and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendments and ask a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. Burnham, and Mr. GORE conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 6384) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and to certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers or sailors.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House and ask a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. Burnham, and Mr. GORE conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 6851) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House and that a conference be requested on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. Burnham, and Mr. GORE conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANNIE R. SCHLEY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4568) granting an increase of pension to Annie R. Schley, which was, on page 1, line 8, to strike out "one hundred and fifty" and insert "seventy-five."

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. Rayner] evidenced some interest in this bill. I will ask that the bill and amendment of the House may lie on the table until his return.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be so ordered without objection.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 6925) to authorize the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River near the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri which were, on page 1, line 6, after "a," to strike out "railroad," and on page 1, line 7, after "point," to insert "on the west side of said river."

Mr. NELSON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

PROPERTY IN SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 6252) to relinquish the title of the United States to certain property in the city ond county of San Francisco, Cal., which was, on page 2, strike out lines 4 to 17, inclusive, and insert: "to be used by the city and county of San Francisco for such charitable purposes as may be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That if the same shall at any time be used for any other than such charitable purposes, all right and title thereby relinquished shall revert back to and again vest in the United States," so that the act will read as follows:

"That all the right and title of the United States to the following-described property is hereby relinquished to the city and county of San Francisco, the same being the two 50 vara lots on which the old marine-hospital building now stands, fronting 275 feet on the north side of Harrison Street between Spear and Main Streets, with a uniform depth of 137 feet and 6 inches, as laid down on the official map of the said city, to be used by the city and county of San Francisco for such charitable purposes as may be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That if the same shall at any time be used for any other than such charitable purposes all right and title hereby relinquished shall revert back to and again vest in the United States.

"SEC. 2. That Congress reserves the right at any time to amend, alter, or repeal this act."

Mr. PERKINS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

S. 458. An act for the relief of Turner Hardware Co.;
S. 897. An act for the relief of Alfred L. Dutton;
S. 1293. An act for the relief of Herbert Thompson;
S. 4180. An act for the relief of Alessandro Comba; and
S. 5287. An act for the relief of Kate Ferrell.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1754) to correct the military record of William F. McKim, with an amendment to the title, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 6978) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4113. An act for the relief of Robert E. Burke;
H. R. 4512. An act for the relief of Mary Beal;
H. R. 18425. An act to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Simon Nager;
H. R. 19190. An act for the relief of John P. Risley; and
H. R. 25060. An act for the relief of Joe Cook.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

S. 462. An act for the relief of Salvo Ramadanovitch, of Cettinge, a Montenegrin subject, heir and administrator of Marcus Ramadanovitch, alias Radich, deceased;
S. 547. An act for the relief of Sarah A. White;
S. 837. An act to reimburse the officers and crew of the lighthouse tender *Manzanita* for personal-property losses sustained by them on the foundering of that tender October 6, 1905;
S. 1337. An act authorizing the President to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint Lloyd L. R. Krebs, late captain in the Medical Corps of the United States Army, a major in the Medical Corps on the retired list, and increasing the retired list by one for the purposes of this act;
S. 2127. An act for the relief of the heirs of Robert S. Gill;
S. 2427. An act for the relief of the legal heirs of A. G. Strain;
S. 2601. An act for the relief of Douglas B. Thompson;
S. 3469. An act for the relief of the American Surety Co. of New York;
S. 4751. An act for the relief of Albert S. Henderer;
S. 5046. An act to authorize the appointment of Shepler Ward Fitz-Gerald and of Alden George Strong to the grade of second lieutenant in the Army;
S. 5141. An act to correct an error in the record of the supplemental treaty of September 28, 1830, made with the Choctaw Indians, and for other purposes;
S. 5176. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Preston;
S. 5198. An act to authorize the issuance of patent to James W. Chrisman for the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter, the southeast quarter, and the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 13, and the north half of the northeast quarter of section 24, township 29 north, range 113 west of the sixth principal meridian;
S. 5776. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to adjust and settle the claims of the attorney of record involving certain Indian allotments, and for other purposes;
S. 6009. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Huron, S. Dak.;
S. 6153. An act for the relief of Charley Clark, a homestead settler on certain lands therein described;
S. 6636. An act to authorize the President of the United States to appoint Robert H. Peck a captain in the Army;
S. 6646. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;
S. 6977. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;
S. 7018. An act to authorize the appointment of Harold Hancock Taintor to the grade of second lieutenant in the Army;
H. R. 20628. An act for the transfer of the so-called Olmstead lands in the State of North Carolina from the Solicitor of the Treasury to the Secretary of Agriculture;
H. R. 20738. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;
H. R. 23515. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and
S. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution authorizing the licensing and employment of Otto Neumann Sverdrup as master of vessels of the United States.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a resolution adopted by the American Seed Trade Association, in convention at Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to regulate foreign commerce by prohibiting the admission into the United States of certain adulterated seeds, etc., which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the general mission board of the Church of the Brethren of Elgin, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize the reading of the Bible in the public schools, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the use of trading coupons, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of sundry citizens of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to maintain the present water rates in the District, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CULLOM presented resolutions adopted by the Illinois Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, in convention at Chicago, Ill., and a memorial of the Merchants' Association of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the repeal of legislation providing for competition among architects for all Federal buildings, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 6, Metal Polishers, Buffers, and Platers' Union; of Local Union No. 130, Journeymen Plumbers' Protective and Benevolent Association; and of Local Union No. 62, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, all of Chicago; and of Local Union No. 2, International Brick, Tile, and Terra Cotta Workers' Alliance, of Bernice, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the better protection of American seamen, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wenona, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the use of insignia or garb of any denomination in the Indian public schools, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 250, of Belleville, Ill., and a petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 305, of Monmouth, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation requiring manufacturers to place their own names upon manufactured articles, which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 250, of Belleville, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the use of trading coupons, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 765, United Mine Workers of America, of Breese; of Local Union No. 194, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, of Chicago; of

the Trades and Labor Assembly of Breese; of Typographical Union No. 213, of Rockford; of Local Union No. 15, Coopers' International Union, of Chicago; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 20, of Decatur; of Local Union No. 41, Coopers' International Union, of Alton; and of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Decatur, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the passage of the so-called injunction limitation bill, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Branch, United Order of the Golden Cross, of Providence, R. I., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill relative to the transportation through the mails of publications issued by benevolent or fraternal societies, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented the petition of J. F. Taake, executive committeeman of the Associated Fraternities of America, of Des Moines, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation granting to the publications of fraternal associations the privileges of second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of Bartenders' Local Union No. 285, of Providence, R. I., praying for the passage of the so-called anti-injunction bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. OLIVER presented a memorial of the Lutheran Ministerial Association, of Pittsburgh, Pa., remonstrating against the use of insignia or garb of any denomination in the Indian public schools, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of members of the Pastors' Association of Easton, Pa., and a petition of sundry citizens of Kittanning, Pa., praying for the establishment of a department of public health, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Division No. 528, Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees of America, of Tarentum, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called anti-injunction bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation prohibiting the use of the Panama Canal by any steamship company in which any railroad has an interest, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Ministers' Association of Oil City, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transportation of moving pictures of prize fights, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Auxiliary of the Church of the Messiah, of Gwynedd, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide medical and sanitary relief for the natives of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, McKeesport, and Luzerne County, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against an appropriation being made to be used for the purpose of celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of peace with England, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Pittsburgh Chapter, American Institute of Architects, of Pennsylvania, and a memorial of the Pennsylvania State Association of the American Institute of Architects, remonstrating against the repeal of the act providing for competition among architects for all Federal buildings, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented resolutions adopted by the Merchants' Association and the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, Hawaii, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation prohibiting the use of the Panama Canal by any steamship company in which any railroad has an interest, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Conn., remonstrating against an appropriation being made to be used for the purpose of celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of peace with England, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Molders' Local Union No. 71, of Ansonia, Conn., praying for the passage of the so-called Clayton injunction-limitation bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Gales Ferry, Conn., remonstrating against the repeal of the anticanteen law, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of the congregation of the First Christian Church of Sheridan, Wyo., praying for the enactment of an interstate liquor law to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BROWN presented a petition of members of the Central Labor Union of Lincoln, Nebr., praying for the passage of the so-called Clayton injunction-limitation bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of members of the Commercial Club of Kansas City, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the sale of convict-made goods, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the retirement of officers of the Civil War Volunteer force upon a fair and equitable basis, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the San Francisco Chapter, American Institute of Architects, of California, remonstrating against the repeal of the act providing for competition among architects for all Federal buildings, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented telegrams in the nature of memorials from Frank B. Anderson and members of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., and of members of the Northern California Hotel Association, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation prohibiting the use of the Panama Canal by any steamship company in which any railroad has an interest, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. BRADLEY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Fayette County, Ky., praying for the enactment of an interstate liquor law to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROOT presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Kingston, N. Y., remonstrating against the establishment of a department of public health, which was ordered to lie on the table.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. MCCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 24016) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 898) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 7205) granting jurisdiction to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia to quiet title to lands in certain cases; and

A bill (S. 7206) restricting the method of disposition of public land in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 7207) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus N. Lyons (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 7208) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to navigation and vessels, bills of lading, and to certain obligations, duties, and rights in connection with the carriage of property," approved February 13, 1893; and

A bill (S. 7209) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at the town of Sartell, Minn.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 7210) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the sales of public lands to the endowment of schools or departments of mines and mining and to regulate the expenditure thereof; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. MCCUMBER:

A bill (S. 7211) to correct the military record of Samuel Barry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7212) granting an increase of pension to Lucius E. Fletcher; and

A bill (S. 7213) granting an increase of pension to Myra Von Winkle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURNHAM:

A bill (S. 7214) granting an increase of pension to John Cook, alias Joseph Moore;

A bill (S. 7215) granting a pension to Amanda Barrett; and

A bill (S. 7216) granting an increase of pension to Alvah S. Howes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN:

A bill (S. 7217) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," to place additional taxes on tobacco, snuff, cigars, or cigarettes when sold with coupons; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 7218) providing for the disposition of town sites in connection with reclamation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. CRANE:

A bill (S. 7219) granting an increase of pension to George C. Rider; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 7220) to provide for the sale of 39.69 acres of the surface of the segregated coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations to the Pittsburg County Fair (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 7221) granting a pension to William H. H. Chestnut; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 7222) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Lay (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARREN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 121) authorizing the use of certain unexpended balances to defray expenses incident to parting and refining bullion; to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENTS TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CRAWFORD submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $75,000 to reimburse the Government of the Philippine Islands for expenses relative to the disinterment, shipment, and transportation of the remains of the late Ormon K. Osbon, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment providing that no allowance or disallowance heretofore made shall preclude an officer or enlisted man of the United States or Volunteer Army or his next of kin or personal representative from applying for and receiving any pay and allowance which may be due him under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment proposing to increase the number of topographic and hydrographic draftsmen in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OLIVER submitted an amendment relative to the donation of any land or building or the use of any land or building in or near the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., suitable for experimental work of the Bureau of Mines, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMOOT submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $100,000 for inquiries and investigations into the methods of mining and treatment of ores and other mineral substances, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OWEN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $100,000 for inquiries and investigations into the mining and treatment of ores and other mineral substances, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADLEY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $250,000 for expenses of the semicentennial exposition for the celebration of the semicentennial anniversary of the act of emancipation, etc.,

intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $25,656.88 for the purchase of additional land in Cave Hill Cemetery, at Louisville, Ky., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $25,000 to enable the Census Department to collect statistics concerning the quantity of leaf tobacco in all forms in the United States, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the punishment for violations of internal-revenue laws, etc., from $140,000 to $150,000, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. CULLOM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 19115) making appropriation for payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS.

Mr. WETMORE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 22126) relating to the compensation of clerks of the United States district courts, etc., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

IMPERIAL VALLEY, CAL. (S. DOC. NO. 867).

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, a few days ago I offered an amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill for the improvement of the Colorado River to prevent the overflow of land in the Imperial Valley. This is a matter of urgency. The appropriation has been urged by the Secretary of the Interior and has been recommended by a special message of the President.

I have here a statement showing the necessity for the improvement that is sought to be made. I move that the statement be printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, to accompany the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

EXPENSES IN PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS.

Mr. WORKS. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask that it be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 350), as follows:

"Whereas it is asserted and has been charged on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere that large sums of money have been furnished to and used by candidates for the office of President of the United States by the various candidates for that office to control the presidential primary elections in the different States, and otherwise, to secure the election of delegates to the national conventions of the Republican and Democratic Parties; and

"Whereas it is well known that many persons drawing salaries or other compensation from the Government for services as public officials or employees, from the President, Cabinet officers, and United States Senators down, have been using the time for which they have been paid by the Government in campaigning for themselves and others and aiding as campaign managers and otherwise during this session of Congress, and in the endeavor to influence and control the primary elections in the various States for the election of delegates and the nomination of candidates for President of the United States: Now therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That a committee of seven Senators, four Republicans and three Democrats, be appointed by the Vice President a special committee to investigate, inquire into, and report to the Senate the following facts:

"1. What amount of money has been subscribed, paid, or furnished to or for the use of each and every candidate for the nomination as a candidate for President of the United States, both Republican and Democratic, or to their and each of their managers, treasurers, auditors, committees, agents, or friends, or paid out or subscribed in aid or support of his candidacy, directly or indirectly, and the amount paid out by such candidate himself for such purpose, giving the name of each such candidate, the amount subscribed, paid, and used for or in aid of his candidacy, by whom paid, subscribed, or furnished, directly or indirectly, the name of each person or corporation by whom subscribed, furnished, or paid, and in behalf of which candidate; the amount paid by each person; the total amount subscribed, paid, and furnished to or in aid of the candidacy of each of such candidates; the amount of money paid out by or in aid of the candidacy of each such candidates and for what purpose, in detail, and the total amount subscribed, paid, or furnished to or for and paid out by all such candidates.

"2. What persons engaged in the campaign by and for each of such candidates or in aid thereof, in whatever mode or form, were under salary or other pay of the Government, in what capacity, the amount of compensation paid each of them, the amount of time devoted by each of them, including the candidates themselves, and the total amount of money paid by the Government to such persons and the aggregate amount paid to all of them for the time consumed by them all in conducting, carrying on, or in any way aiding in the conduct of such political campaign, giving the amount so paid for workers of all kinds for all of said candidates, giving them separately.

"3. The proportion or percentage of the registered and qualified voters voting at the presidential primary elections in each of the States, giving the Republican and Democratic percentage of votes cast separately, and the total vote cast at such election in each of the States, giving the Republican and Democratic votes separately.

"4. The amount of money paid to newspapers and other publications and periodicals and newspaper and other writers for services of any and every kind rendered by said newspapers and other publications and periodicals and writers in aid or support of each and every candidate for such office; the names of such newspapers and other publications and writers and the amount paid to each, directly or indirectly, whether for additional subscriptions or otherwise; the amount paid by, for, or on account of any such candidate in the aggregate, and the whole amount so paid by all of such candidates to all of such newspapers, publications, or periodicals.

"5. The cost to the candidates and each of them, and of the delegates attending the same, of the national convention for the nomination of candidates for President of the United States, and each of them, and for what purpose moneys were paid and used at each such convention, and particularly whether the expenses of any delegate to such convention, or either of them, were paid, either in whole or in part, by anyone other than themselves, and if so, by whom and in what amounts and on what terms and conditions, if any.

"6. In what States corrupt-practice acts have been enacted applicable to primary elections and, in general terms, the provisions of each of said acts and the penalties imposed for the violation thereof.

"That said committee be authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate and during any recess of the Senate or of Congress; to hold sessions at such place or places as it shall deem most convenient for the purposes of the investigation; to employ stenographers; to send for persons and papers; to administer oaths; and to report the results of its investigations, including all testimony taken by it, and that the expenses of the inquiry shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee."

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I have been an earnest advocate of the direct and presidential primaries. I believe they are necessary to the preservation of the rights of the people and the prevention of fraud and corruption in elections. I believe they will have that effect if rightly and honestly conducted. They have been on trial for the past few months. I think it is time to take account of stock and see what they have profited us.

We have just passed through a campaign in both of the great parties for the nomination of candidates for President of the United States. No American citizen can look back upon it without the blush of shame. Candidates for that great office have gone on the stump and canvassed for their own election. That was shame enough. But one of them was President of the United States and another an ex-President, pitted against each other. Their campaign was undignified, malicious, and disgraceful. It was not a discussion of principles or an effort to inform or instruct the people, but consisted of personal attacks and counter-attacks, criminations and recriminations. If half the things they said of each other were true, neither of them was fit to be nominated. The whole country was shocked at this unexampled spectacle. The people were humiliated and indignant. It was openly charged on the stump and on the floor of the Senate that enormous sums of money were being used to carry the election. The people have a right to know whether this charge is true or not. They have a right to know whether the direct primaries can be controlled by the use of money, as we all know the caucus and convention can be controlled and corrupted. If they can, if the masses of the people can not be trusted and their votes can be had for money, the last hope of maintaining the institutions of the country free and uncorrupted has vanished. The hope of the country rests upon the integrity and patriotism of the people.

We all know that public officials, paid by the Government, from the President down, have given their time, that the people are paying for, in carrying on the campaigns of the various candidates. The people have a right to know how much of the time paid for by them has been used in conducting, managing, and manipulating politics in the interest of candidates. They have a right to know, too, how much it cost to hold the nominating conventions and who put up the money for these expenses. The enormous sums of money expended in political contests has become one of the crying evils of the time. This country has every right to be informed on these subjects. In other words, the people have a right to know how much it costs them, in money and time, to nominate a candidate for President, and how much the candidates and their supporters have paid in the attempt to secure the nominations. It is information that touches the very vitals of our systems, new and old, of nominating candidates for President.

We have tried both the direct primaries and conventions in this campaign. The national convention at Chicago was a fitting sequel to the campaign that preceded it. It was full of malice and hatred. Charges of fraud and corruption were openly and loudly made. The nomination made is tainted with the belief of thousands of people that it was procured by unjust, fraudulent, and illegal means. And now we have a torn and dismembered party and the prospect of a new one. The movement for a new party is founded upon hatred, revenge, and ambition. The Democratic Party is torn with the same dissensions, the result of like causes.

What is the duty before us in this condition of discord and unrest? The people are going to rule this country. Of that we may be assured. If they can not do it through the instrumentalities of the old parties, they will have a new one. They will no longer be ruled by political bosses and privilege-seeking corporations. But we do not need a new party in California. The Republican Party in my State is decent and respectable. Five years ago California was one of the worst boss-ridden States in the Union. It was owned and controlled by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co. and its hired bosses and corruptionists.

The question confronted us there, as it is confronting Republicans of the whole Nation to-day, Shall we form a new party to meet this consuming evil, or shall we undertake to free and redeem the old one? We chose the latter course. We succeeded beyond our fondest hopes. The good people of the State, Democrats and Republicans alike, came to the rescue. It was not a question of party, but of political freedom and civic righteousness. As a result the people and not the bosses have control of the party and the State government. They have complete control of the party organization. The Southern Pacific machine has retired from business. The State has the best and purest government in its history. We are not ready yet to surrender this redeemed and purified party to the old machine and embark in the perilous venture of a new party. When we do we want it to be a party founded on principle and the best interests of the public welfare. We want no political bosses or privilege seekers, who are looking for the loaves and fishes, to govern or control it, but men of courage and patriotism who are willing to sacrifice their standing and interest in the old party to the public good. But are we ready now for such a party? Is it necessary? Are we willing to surrender and give over the old party, with all its achievements and traditions, to the men who have brought it to the brink of ruin? Are we ready to give up the fight the Progressives have been making for a free and untrammeled party? Not yet. The fight has just begun, and the people have been winning battle after battle against the interests. Many of the States have already shaken off the shackles of boss rule and become free. So may all the others, and so they will if their leaders are faithful and vigilant.

I can remember when a mere boy shouting for Abraham Lincoln in his first campaign. Later, when still a boy, I took my place with thousand of others in the ranks of the Army formed to maintain the principles of freedom upon which the Republican Party was founded. I cast

my first vote for Ulysses S. Grant, who led that Army to ultimate victory. I have cast my vote with that party in national affairs until now. Now I am called upon to make my choice between the old party and a new one to be formed. The temptation is great. The provocation is almost overwhelming. This is a time when men should search their own consciences and their motives unmoved by anger or passion and do what seems to each of them to be his patriotic duty to the whole people. I shall not shirk my own individual responsibility or question the motives of others who may take a different course. As conditions now present themselves to my mind, I can not join a new party movement. But, Mr. President, I do not want to be misunderstood by the Senate or by the country. It does not follow, from what I have said, that I shall support the alleged nominee of the Republican convention. I believe he secured his nomination by unjust and illegal means. I do not believe that he is the nominee of the party in any just or proper sense. I hope he does not realize, in accepting such a nomination, what thousands and thousands of his party believe to be the fact—that it was procured for him by compromising with fraud and corruption and the violation of an express statute of a State. But its alleged nominee is not the Republican Party. He does not represent its principles or its sentiments. His title to the nomination is tainted and questioned by the great mass of the party. Neither I nor any other Republican who views the situation and believes as I do owe him, personally, any political allegiance or support. If any good Republican representing the real sentiments of the party were to become an independent candidate, running on a progressive platform that he could conscientiously stand upon, the voters of the party would sustain him; but in my judgment the man who attempts to form a new party, as conditions now are, will not be serving the interests of the people. Better far to see the great Republican Party go down to temporary defeat now for the sins its leaders have committed, and redeem it four years hence, than attempt the uncertain and dangerous remedy of forming a new party. Better, for the time being, to "bear the ills we have than fly to others that we know not of." The party had already been purged in many of the States of its worst and most dangerous elements. Many of the members of the national committee who made possible the nomination that was brought about had been repudiated in advance by the voters of their States. This victory was thrown away by the delegates chosen to represent the progressive element of the party in the convention, a victory that would in all probability have taken the control of that committee out of the hands of the powers that manipulated it at the convention. Four years from now, if we stand to our guns and do not follow after false gods, the people will have complete control over the Republican Party in the Nation, as it now has in many of the States.

Mr. President, this struggle for political freedom and civic righteousness is not confined to the Republican Party. Its great rival, the Democratic Party, has the same fight with the powers of evil; and one man, with a courage and patriotism that challenges my admiration and respect and should incite the gratitude of the American people, is bravely fighting for the integrity and righteousness of his party and fighting practically single handed and alone. He is making the fight that every good and loyal citizen should be making, not outside but inside of his party. If that effort, rightly made, fails, it will be time enough to form a new party. If it does fail, no one will be more ready than I to form that new party, founded on principles of justice, liberty, purity, and honesty in politics.

Mr. President, I have offered these resolutions so that the people may, so far as it can be ascertained by such an inquiry as they call for, be informed as to what has brought us to this present pass, so far as the campaign just closed is concerned.

I understand the Vice President is not likely to be present for some time to come. I desire, therefore, to amend my resolution, where it authorizes the appointment by the Vice President, so as to read "by the President pro tempore of the Senate."

I desire further to say that in view of the limited attendance this morning I shall not insist upon pressing the resolution at the present time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be modified as suggested by the Senator from California.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest that under the law the resolution will necessarily go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. WORKS. I was about to suggest that it take its regular course and go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is necessary that that be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution necessarily will be so referred.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, before the close of morning business, if I may be indulged, in order briefly and imperfectly to do what should be done with care and elaboration, I will interpose a demurrer to the statement read by the Senator from California. I do not desire that it should be taken as accepted by Republicans.

I shall not occupy any considerable time. Not having the resolution of the Senator from California in print, and not having known that such a motion would be made, it will, of course, be somewhat difficult to cover the subject. I shall not undertake to do that.

An attack has been made in this resolution upon the integrity of the President of the United States as an incumbent and as a candidate for reelection. Concurrently an attack has been made upon those who are responsible for his nomination. Still further, an attack has been made upon the integrity of the Republicans of this Nation.

Mr. GALLINGER. And upon Members of this body who are upon the national committee.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; and as suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire who sits on my left, upon Members of this body who chance to be members of the national committee. More than that, with an ever-widening circle of slander, an attack has been made upon the citizenship of the country at large.

It is charged, in effect, that the standard of the citizenship of this country is so low and so venal that it may be bought and sold like chattels in the markets; that it may be controlled by corrupt men. This resolution undertakes to stamp a character of degradation, inefficiency, and corruption upon the citizenship of this country to the extent that it controls the Government. The man who can be corrupted is as bad a citizen as the man who corrupts him or attempts to do so. There is no difference under any rule of morals or of law.

So this resolution charges that these people constituting the citizenship have been subject, for a period not named, to the dominion and control and manipulation of corruption and corrupt men. I deny it. I challenge any man, responsible for this resolution or otherwise, to hand in to the Secretary of the Senate and have read from the desk the names of five men that within his knowledge come within the class of debauched citizenship.

No man should be allowed to slander another, even in political excitement or campaigns, without being held responsible. The offense of slandering the American citizenship, singly or in the aggregate, is as heinous a crime as that of attempting to bribe them. It is usually indulged in for the purpose of compelling some one to do or not to do something—heaping opprobrium and epithets upon your fellow citizen in order to deter him or to influence him one way or the other.

The statement in the resolution that an unhappy condition of affairs has existed in the country is true in a very large measure. It did not emanate from the rank and file or the leadership of either party, singly and alone. Whatever of the unhappy conditions pictured in this resolution have existed are the result of an attempt—an irresponsible and unwise attempt—to change overnight the form of this Government and the manner of the performance of the political duties of citizenship. Where there is no meeting or coming together of men there can be no riot. Where the opportunity is not given or accorded them to violate long-established principles the principles are safe.

It is not necessary to take up the resolution in detail and analyze it, because it is all based upon one wrong, vicious proposition. To stand in the Senate of the United States and charge that Members of this body, in the performance of their individual citizenship, have participated in disreputable and dishonest procedure in a national convention is intolerable, and if such a charge is made it should be accompanied by the names of those charged.

We have a rule in this body which precludes any Member from speaking disrespectfully of another. We have a rule in this body which precludes any Member from charging another with improper motives. It may be said that that applies only to his actions in the body. I hold that it applies to the action of the Senator, because he is a Senator of the United States wherever he is during the tenure of his office.

What a document that would be to read in the public schools of the United States! As well take in the infected flag of smallpox or cholera. It is a more serious offense to poison the minds of the children and the students of the country than it is to infect them with a disease. The mind, once tainted, never is restored to perfect health. A suggestion of dishonor made against the representative bodies of the people of the country is never eradicated from the mind of the child.

If it is said that the charges are true, why investigate them? No man should say that these charges are true unless he can stand in his place and show that they are true by giving the day, date, data, and names. The things charged in that document are crimes. They are crimes against the law of citizenship; they are crimes against the law of the land. There should be no necessity for an investigation of such a charge by a committee.

What would be the result? Send out a committee of this body to travel up and down the land for months and months, sitting in various places, with its daily proceedings made the subject matter of newspaper quibble and comment, charge and vituperation, and you had as well send the trailing bag of infectious disease from one end of the country to the other to poison the air. There is nothing more important than that the minds of the people of the country, especially of the youth and those whose minds are in process of formation, should remain untainted by a charge coming from a responsible body.

It is bad enough to be confronted with irresponsible slander, but it is infinitely worse to be confronted by a charge coming with the sanction of the Senate of the United States for investigation in the local communities of the United States. The committee would succeed in procuring conjecture, uncertainty, but would any man come before the committee and make a definite charge? If he would, he is accessible now without this public exhibition of irresponsible charges.

The thing to be desired is that whatever has occurred during these political contests shall be buried in oblivion as soon as possible, that most of the men shall be forgotten at the earliest possible moment. The names of men who engage in disgraceful conduct in the performance of public duty ought not to be remembered overnight. No man is entitled to fame because of his misbehavior.

This, if it is calculated for anything more than another, is calculated to perpetuate the consideration of the evil deeds of evil men. We do not want that kind of history written. We want to write only the history of the good deeds of good men, and how much of it would be found in the report of this committee? It does not ask that the committee shall investigate lawful deeds of men engaged in lawful proceedings. It is a little on the order of the journalism of the day. I have not seen in any paper any statement as to the good deeds of a man in display type at the head of a column. I have not noticed any reference to the class of men who do good deeds except, perhaps, in obituary. Would this committee sit under the resolution to hear the facts in regard to really great and pure statesmen actuated by high motives of statesmanship? It does not ask that they shall do it, and they have no jurisdiction. It is simply a dragnet in search of crime, in search of the disreputable, in search of that which should be forever hid.

Now, Mr. President, it is not a subject to elaborate on very much, in my judgment. It contains suggestions and innuendoes enough to wipe out every good and patriotic impulse in the mind and breast of every child in the land. A suggestion that those things are true to those who are studying the institutions and learning the lesson of citiship is a blot upon their life. I care not what are the politics of the officials who are charged irresponsibly, against whom a suggestion is made that if you will enter into this investigation you will probably find that they are disreputable. I would like the man to stand up before us and make the charge. I like the habit when a man commences to tell you in confidence something to the detriment of another to say, "Wait; I will call him up on the phone that I may have him here and listen to the conversation." I have stopped a good many confidences of that kind in that way.

Let any man making those charges give the names, and in the presence of those whose names he gives take the chances. If he will not, the charge ought not to be made. Let us elevate the standard of citizenship so that there will be no possibility of such a condition as is presented here this morning.

I am not going to consider the question whether or not there will be two parties or three parties or many parties in the coming campaign. The man whose mind is bent on considering that question as paramount loses sight of the principles for which parties stand. The Republican Party at Chicago has redeemed itself in its tariff declaration. We do not find within that platform the old saw about the difference between the cost of production abroad and at home. That absurdity is eliminated. It is a perfect tariff plank, except for one little joke in it, which suggests that some duties are too high. I think so. I think myself the duty on beeswax and curled feathers might be reduced. I am not afraid to meet a platform anywhere in considering the question of adjusting business relations between the American people and the

people of other countries. I do not know what kind of a plank will come over from Baltimore. I do not know that I am very much interested in it, because a man can not ride in two cars at the same time, and he can not vote two tickets at the same election—that is, I do not think he can.

This resolution leaves the people up in the air, with nothing beneath their feet. It does not advise supporting either party. It rather intimates that there may come a deliverer out of Israel.

Now, Mr. President, I have said more than I intended to say, but I feel that a resolution like that should not go through in a perfunctory manner, be referred to a committee as though it were something serious, reported by a committee as though it were worthy of consideration, and considered in the Senate as though we were here to spend our time in the consideration of such a matter. I hope that the committee will be supplied with a proper undertaker for burial services.

M. WORKS. Mr. President, this resolution has been regularly referred, and I am not going to take up the time of the Senate now in discussing the merits of it.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] has made a resolution of his own and discussed it quite elaborately, not the resolution offered by me. Evidently he did not pay attention to the reading and has not read the resolution itself. The resolution does not charge anybody with anything. It is purely and simply a resolution calling for inquiry as to the truth of the charges that have been made by somebody else, and made on the floor of the Senate, not by me, not by the resolution. It calls for an inquiry into the truth of the facts that have been spread all over the country, not only as emanating from the floor of the Senate of the United States, but charges that were made in the political campaign over and over again affecting the integrity of the Republican Party and those who are connected with it.

Now, who should object to the truth being known about it? The best way to overcome the evil is to disclose it and then handle it. That is just what we have to do with the affairs of the Government and in politics to-day if we are going to accomplish anything.

It was charged, Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate within a very short time, that millions of dollars had been expended to control this campaign. It was said upon the floor of the Senate that a Member of this body had made that same charge on the stump throughout the country. All sorts of charges were made during the continuance of the Republican convention. How much of them were true, how much of them were false, none of us know. But I say, Mr. President—and I say it in all sincerity—that the people of this country have a right to know whether these charges are true or false and the Senate of the United States, standing as a representative of the people, have a right to ask that this kind of an investigation may be had in order to determine whether the charges are true or not.

These resolutions do not charge corruption upon the part of the citizens of this country, as the Senator from Idaho assumes. I sincerely hope that the investigation made under the resolution will disclose the fact that they are not subject to corruption, because it would be a sorry day for this country if it should ever come when the masses of the people of the country could be influenced and corrupted with money.

There are some things recited in the resolution that every Senator on this floor knows to be true. As the Senator from Idaho says, that does not need any investigation. Members of this body and other public officials have been giving their time day after day to carry on the political campaigns of the different candidates. We know it. A good many of the people of the country do not know it, and they have a perfect right to know if it be true that men sent here as their representatives, men employed in the departments of the Government, and paid by them, are using the time for which they are paid by the Government to carry on the campaign of any candidate for President or any other office within the gift of the people.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WORKS. I do.

Mr. NELSON. I want to ask the Senator, in all candor, if those remarks would not apply to some of the Members of this body?

Mr. WORKS. I think they are applied to Members of this body, as the Senator would have known if he had listened to the resolution. I think, if an investigation of this kind is made, that it will be found to be true with respect to Members of this body the same as other public officials.

As I said in the beginning, I am not disposed to discuss the merits of this resolution. I am perfectly willing to take such responsibility as may flow from its introduction. It is for the proper committee and the Senate to determine whether this investigation shall be made or not. I have submitted the resolution in good faith. I think it calls for an investigation, which should be made and made thoroughly, but that, as I have said, is a matter for the Senate to determine.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Mr. President, personally I have no objection whatever to the resolution introduced by the Senator from California. I, however, do have objection and I wish to protest as a Republican against the argument that was used to bolster up the resolution. We have heard the cry of fraud throughout the country in reference to the presidential primaries from the very beginning, and there is not a man in the Senate of the United States who did not thoroughly understand why that cry of fraud went out months before an election was had in a single State. It is the practice of the incendiary who purposes to destroy by fire to cry fire in some other quarter of the city and thereby divert attention from his own work. We have heard the cry of fraud and what was going to happen and the contests that were going to be initiated from one end of the country to the other. We knew when that cry went forth that there was a purpose, a clear purpose, to create fake contests all over the country, and as those fake contests would necessarily be dismissed there would be seemingly some ground for suspicion and enable the cries of fraud to gain some attention when they were dismissed.

I think it most unjust at this time, in support of a resolution of this character, to declare that the President of the United States received his nomination through fraud and corrupt practices. I do not believe it, Mr. President, myself, and I do not believe that there will be any evidence forthcoming to sustain a charge of that kind.

I am perfectly willing to investigate the question of the amount of money that is necessary in these primary contests. I am willing to investigate and ascertain how many dollars it takes to bring out one-quarter, one-fifth, or one-tenth of the party vote in any one of the States.

There are some justifiable provisions included in the resolution of the Senator from California. I agree with him that a contest has been carried on that has been a disgrace to the American people, and the very system that the Senator supports so strongly and so earnestly has been the system that has invited the kind of personalities against which he complains.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

Mr. MCCUMBER. In just a moment.

Personalities and personal abuse that never would be made before a convention of intelligent men, that never would be made before a legislature in any State in the Union, have been indulged in as fit arguments by those who think they can mislead the people by making charges of a criminal character, charges that would not be made before any convention or any gathering of men organized to make nominations. I agree with the Senator on many of those things contained in his resolution, but I do not agree with him that there has been any fraud or injustice whatever in the matter of dismissing any of those fake contests. There may have been some few contests in which there were close questions, but I believe as a whole the members of the national committee acted honestly and conscientiously in their decisions, and to charge that they have acted dishonestly and corruptly is not only uncalled for but is untrue.

Why, Mr. President, the greatest——

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

Mr. MCCUMBER. One moment. The greatest amount of money that was ever raised in any political campaign was raised in 1896 during the McKinley campaign, and not a dollar of the millions of dollars that were raised was used to buy votes; it was used for literature; it was used to pay the expenses of the speakers; it was used to cover the thousands of expenses that are necessary to carry on a great campaign of education. I do not condemn the using of a great amount of money, whether it comes from the Standard Oil Co., whether it comes from Mr. Perkins in support of his candidate, or whether it comes in support of the present President of the United States, if it is used honestly and fairly for the purpose of getting out literature, for the purpose of presenting facts to the people and not sensational falsehoods. I think the greater force we can have to disseminate true political knowledge over the country the better it will be for the country.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota may be perfectly right that the presidential primary has resulted in such a campaign as we have just witnessed. If that be the case it has a great deal to answer for, and if it is going to have such an effect in this country I want to know it. I am not so wedded to any kind of machinery for conducting the elections of this country as to insist upon that or any other machinery that is going to result in such consequences.

With respect to the question of the expenditure of money, certainly there may be legitimate expenditures of money in a political campaign whether for President of the United States or anybody else. The object and purpose of the resolution is to ascertain whether the large sums of money alleged to have been used have been used properly or not. To that I should think the Senator from North Dakota would not object.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I do not object to that, Mr. President.

The closing remarks of the Senator from California in his first address on this subject were not surprising to me. It is a part of what has seemed to me for the last 8 or 10 years to be a consistent policy—a policy of rule or ruin. "If we can not rule the party, if we can not secure the success of our nominee this year, we will turn against the candidate who is nominated." Then they use that as a reason why some other person, representing a different view, should be selected next time. I have heard in a number of the States in the past few years, where we have conducted such elections, the claim made: "We have put up our candidate"—I will say "our progressive candidate"—"for a number of years in the primary; he has not been chosen; so we will elect a Democrat to that position. That will furnish evidence to you, the people of the country, that you had better nominate our candidate." It is simply a hold-up system. "Support our views; support our candidate; or we will destroy the party." That is the proposition in a nutshell that is presented to the Senate of the United States in the argument that has just been made. "If we can not secure the defeat of your candidate in the primary, then the next step is to defeat him in the election. We will try once more; we will defeat him, if it is possible; if we should not succeed in defeating him, it will be time enough then to consider whether it is necessary to create a third party in order to win."

Mr. President, I believe in fighting out our difficulties within the party itself. I do not believe that the public is so corrupt, I do not believe that the average people who go as delegates to conventions are so corrupt, as the Senator would have us believe. I do not believe that those who support one party are criminals and those who support the other party are saints. I believe that we should and can fight out these questions in our conventions, or fight them out in our primaries if we have the primary system, and then let us as good partisans stand by the party of our choice. If there is a plank in our platform that is not just according to our idea, let us try to better fit it to the necessities of the country. If we think our tendency is in the wrong direction, let us work together to guide the party in the right direction. We gain nothing by uniting a number of people who have been defeated in their purposes and attempting to destroy the old organization by creating a new one.

Mr. President, I only rose primarily to dissent most earnestly from this continuous cry of fraud by those who were defeated, and while I might have, with the majority, differed as to some of the contests that were decided I certainly believe that the men who decided them were honest in their convictions in every decision. The majority of the elected delegates favored the renomination of President Taft. As a Republican he is my nominee. Had either of his opponents been nominated I should have supported that nominee.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 331) extending appropriations for the necessary operations of the Government under certain contingencies, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask that House joint resolution No. 331 be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution from the House of Representatives.

Mr. WARREN. I think the joint resolution should be read for information, and then referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I will say

that the committee have already had the subject under consideration and will probably be prepared to report at once; but I wish that the joint resolution may be read so as to go into the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 331) extending appropriations for the necessary operations of the Government under certain contingencies was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

"*Resolved, etc.*, That all appropriations for the necessary operations of the Government, and for the payment of pensions under existing laws, which shall remain unprovided for on the 30th day of June, 1912, be, and they are hereby, continued and made available for and during the month of July, 1912, unless the regular appropriations provided therefor in bills now pending in Congress shall have been previously made for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913; and a sufficient amount is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry on the same: *Provided*, That no greater amount shall be expended for such operations than as the sum of one-twelfth of the appropriations made for the fiscal year 1912 bears to the whole of the appropriations of said fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the total expenditures for the whole of the fiscal year 1913 under the several appropriations hereby continued, and under the several appropriation bills now pending, shall not exceed in the aggregate the amounts finally appropriated therefor in the several bills now pending, except in cases where a change is made in the annual, monthly, or per diem compensation or in the numbers of officers, clerks, or other persons authorized to be employed by the several appropriations hereby continued, in which cases the amounts authorized to be expended shall equal one-twelfth of the appropriations for the fiscal year 1912, and eleven-twelfths of the appropriations contained in the several bills now pending when the same shall have been finally passed, unless the salary or compensation of any office shall be increased or diminished without changing the grade or the duties thereof, in which case such salary or compensation shall relate to the entire fiscal year and run from the beginning thereof: *And provided further*, That the session employees of the Senate and House of Representatives now authorized by law shall be continued upon the rolls until the end of the present session of Congress and paid at the rate per diem or month at which they are now paid; and a sufficient amount is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to pay the same.

"This joint resolution shall be construed as authorizing the continuance of the salaries and other expenses under the organization of the Bureau of the Census of the Department of Commerce and Labor as the latter existed June 30, 1912, for the period of time and under the conditions provided herein for all other branches of the public service."

Mr. WARREN subsequently said: The Committee on Appropriations, having considered House joint resolution 331, I report it back favorably without amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

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

ADDRESS OF HON. N. C. YOUNG (S. DOC. NO. 865).

Mr. MCCUMBER. Mr. President, I have here a very short address delivered by Hon. N. C. Young, late a member of the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota, on the subject, "Shall we change our plan of government?" I consider it a very worthy article, and ask that it be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MANEUVERS OF REGULAR ARMY AND MILITIA.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. Mr. President, I desire to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if any immediate action is being taken in regard to the appropriation for maneuver camps?

Mr. WARREN. We will await the action of the other House upon that matter. Of course we have been unable to act until to-day, but I assume that the other House will take care of it, and that we shall hear from them soon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. Very well.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT EXPENSES (H. DOC. NO. 854).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I send herewith the report of the Commission on Economy and Efficiency on "The need for a national budget." The recommendations contained therein are approved by me. I recommend to the Congress the enactment of the legislation necessary to put them into effect.

The subject is one of fundamental importance to the Executive as well as to the Congress. Notwithstanding the magnitude and complexity of the business which is each year conducted by the executive branch and financed by the Congress, and the vital relation which each governmental activity bears to the welfare of the people, there is at present no provision for reporting revenues, expenditures, and estimates for appropriations in such manner that the Executive, before submitting estimates, and each Member of Congress, and the people, after estimates have been submitted, may know what has been done by the Government or what the Government proposes to do.

Briefly stated, the situation is this: Under the Constitution (and subject to its limitations) Congress is made responsible for determining the following questions of policy: What business or work the Government shall undertake; what shall be the organization under the Executive which is charged with executing its policies; what amount of funds and by what means funds shall be provided for each activity or class of work; what shall be the character of expenditures authorized for carrying on each class of work—i. e., how much for expenses, how much for capital outlays, etc.

As a means of definitely locating this responsibility Congress was given the sole power to levy taxes; to borrow money on the credit of the United States; to authorize money to be drawn from the Treasury. To the President also has been given very definite responsibility. To the end that Congress may effectively discharge its duties the article of the Constitution dealing with legislative power provided that "a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures of all public moneys shall be published," and the article dealing with the Executive power requires the President "from time to time to give to the Congress information on the state of the Union and to recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall deem necessary and expedient."

Notwithstanding these specific constitutional requirements there has been relatively little attention given to the working out of an adequate and systematic plan for considering expenditures and estimates for appropriations, for regularly stating these in such form that they may be considered in relation to questions of public policy, and for presenting to Congress for their consideration each year, when requests are made for funds, any definite plan or proposal for which the administration may be held responsible.

Regular committees on expenditure have been established by the Congress for the purpose of obtaining knowledge of conditions through special investigations. During the last century over 100 special congressional investigations have been authorized to obtain information which should have been regularly submitted, and much money as well as much time has been spent by the Congress in its effort to obtain information about matters that should be laid before them as an open book; many statutes have been passed governing the manner in which reports of expenditures shall be made; specific rules have been laid down giving the manner in which estimates shall be submitted to Congress and considered by it. From time to time special investigations have been made by heads of executive departments. During the last century many such investigations have been carried on and much money has been spent in the conduct of these, as well as by Congress, for the purpose of obtaining facts as a basis for intelligent consideration of methods and procedure of doing business with a view to increasing economy and efficiency. From time to time Executive orders have been issued and reorganizations have taken place.

Generally speaking, however, the only conclusions which may be reached from all of this are that—

No regular or systematic means has been provided for the consideration of the detail and concrete problems of the Government.

A well-defined business or work program for the Government has not been evolved.

The reports of expenditures required by law are unsystematic, lack uniformity of classification, and are incapable of being summarized so as to give to Congress, to the President, or to the people a picture of what has been done and of cost in terms either of economy of purchase or efficiency of organization in obtaining results.

The summaries of expenditures required by law to be submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury, with estimates, not only do not provide the data necessary to the consideration of questions of policy, but they are not summarized and classified on the same basis as the estimates.

The report on revenues is not in any direct way related to the expenditures, except as the Secretary of the Treasury estimates a surplus or deficiency, and this estimate is based on accounts which do not accurately show expenditures or outstanding liabilities to be met.

Instead of the President being made responsible for estimates of expenditures, the heads of departments and establishments are made the ministerial agents of Congress, the President being called on only to advise Congress how, in his opinion, expenditures may be reduced or revenues may be increased in case estimated expenditures exceed estimated revenues.

The estimates do not raise for consideration questions which should be decided before appropriations are granted, nor does the form in which estimates are required to be presented by the Congress lay the foundation for the consideration of subjects of work to be done, the character of organization best adapted to performing work, the character of expenditures to be made, the best method of financing expenditures.

The present law governing the preparation and submission of estimates, requiring them to be submitted each year in the same form as the year before, was passed without due consideration as to what information should be had before Congress as a basis for action, the result being that the unsystematic and confused method before in use was made continuous.

The rules of the Congress do not provide for the consideration of estimates in such manner that any Member of Congress, any committee, or either House of Congress as a whole may have before it at any one time the information needed for the effective consideration of a program of work done or to be done.

The committee organization is largely the result of historical development rather than of the consideration of present needs.

Inadequate provision is made for getting before each committee to which appropriations are referred all of the data necessary for the consideration of work to be done, organization provided for doing work, character of expenditures, or method of financing.

Following the method at present prescribed, the estimates submitted by each organization unit may have to be split up for consideration by appropriation committees of the Congress and be made the subject of several different bills; in few places are all of the estimates or appropriations asked for by a single organization unit brought together.

The estimates for appropriations requested for a single class of work are similarly divided, no provision being made for considering the amount asked for, the amount appropriated, or the amount spent for a single general class of governmental activity.

Generally speaking, the estimates for expenses (or cost of each definite class of services to be rendered) are not separately shown from estimates for capital outlays (or cost of land, buildings, equipment, and other properties acquired).

While the classification and summaries of estimates do indicate a proposed method of financing, these summaries do not show classes of work or the character of expenditures provided for, and therefore can not lay the foundation for the consideration of methods of financing as a matter of governmental policy as is contemplated under the Constitution.

The appropriations are just as unsystematic and incapable of classification and summary as the estimates; in fact, follow the same general form, making it difficult and in many cases impossible to determine what class of work has been authorized, how much may be spent for each class, or the character of expenditures to be made; nor does any one bill cover the total authorizations for any particular general class of work.

Bills for appropriations (the authorizations to incur liabilities and to spend) are not considered by the committee to which measures for raising revenues and borrowing money are referred, nor are revenues and borrowings considered by committees on appropriations in relation to the funds which will be available.

So long as the method at present prescribed obtains, neither the Congress nor the country can have laid before it a definite understandable program of business or of governmental work to be financed; nor can it have a well-defined, clearly expressed financial program to be followed; nor can either the Congress or the Executive get before the country the proposals of each in such manner as to locate responsibility for plans submitted or for results.

Although the President has the power to install new and improved systems of accounts and to require that information be presented to him each year in such form that he and his Cabinet may intelligently consider proposals or estimates, although the President, under the Constitution, may submit to the Congress each year a definite well-considered budget, with a message calling attention to subjects of immediate importance, to do this without the cooperation of the Congress in the repeal of laws which would be conflicting, and in the enactment of other laws which would place upon the heads of departments duties to be performed that would be in harmony with such procedure would entail a large expenditure of public money in duplication of work.

The purpose of the report which is submitted is to suggest a method whereby the President, as the constitutional head of the administration, may lay before the Congress and the Congress may consider and act on a definite business and financial program; to have the expenditures, appropriations, and estimates so classified and summarized that their broad significance may be readily understood; to provide each Member of Congress, as well as each citizen who is interested, with such data pertaining to each subject of interest that it may be considered in relation to each question of policy which should be gone into before an appropriation for expenditures is made; to have these general summaries supported by such detail information as is necessary to consider the economy and efficiency with which business has been transacted; in short, to suggest a plan whereby the President and Congress may cooperate—the one in laying before the Congress and the country a clearly expressed administrative program to be acted on, the other in laying before the President a definite enactment to be acted on by him. Included in this report are summaries of expenditures for the year 1911, summaries of appropriations for the fiscal year 1912, and summaries of estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1913. To these summaries your special attention is invited. Attached is also an appendix containing a digest of laws pertaining to appropriations and allotments, to the preparation of estimates, and to forms of reporting expenditures; also the suggested pro forma draft of budget, which has been prepared by the commission and is submitted for your consideration as a matter bearing very directly on the economy and efficiency with which Government business is carried on.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 27, 1912.*

[NOTE.—Report accompanied similar message to the House of Representatives.]

WILLIAM F. M'KIM.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representative to the bill (S. 1754) to correct the military record of William F. McKim, which was to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of William F. McKim."

Mr. JONES. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 6978) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MCCUMBER, Mr. BURNHAM, and Mr. GORE conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 4113. An act for the relief of Robert E. Burke;
H. R. 4512. An act for the relief of Mary Beal; and
H. R. 25060. An act for the relief of Joe Cook.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs;

H. R. 18425. An act to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Simon Nager; and
H. R. 19190. An act for the relief of John F. Risley.

UNEXPENDED BALANCE FOR PARTING AND REFINING BULLION.

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Appropriations, I report back favorably without amendment Senate joint resolution No. 121, authorizing the use of certain unexpended balances to defray expenses incident to parting and refining bullion, and I submit a report (No. 899) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the joint resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, as follows:

*"Resolved, etc.*, That the unexpended balance of the permanent indefinite appropriation for parting and refining bullion remaining on the books of the Treasury June 30, 1912, may be drawn upon to defray in full the expenses incidental to refining and parting bullion in the mints at Denver and San Francisco and the assay office at New York, including labor, material, wastage, and loss on sale of sweeps, until the regular appropriations for the mint service for the fiscal year 1913 are available, and that the amount expended under this provision shall be deducted from the annual appropriation for this service."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

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

Mr. WARREN. I ask that the report accompanying the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD. It is short and carries with it a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury in explanation of the necessity for the passage of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator desire that it be printed in the RECORD without being read?

Mr. WARREN. Without being read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is so ordered, in the absence of objection.

The report submitted this day by Mr. WARREN is as follows:

"Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following report, to accompany Senate joint resolution 121:

"The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 121) authorizing the use of the unexpended balance of the permanent indefinite appropriation for parting and refining bullion remaining on the books of the Treasury June 30, 1912, for said purpose for the fiscal year 1913 until the annual appropriation therefor is available, reports the same to the Senate with the recommendation that it pass without amendment, and in explanation of the action of the committee respectfully submits the following letter from the Secretary of the Treasury:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*"Washington, June 29, 1912.*

"Hon. FRANCIS E. WARREN,
*"Chairman Committee on Appropriations,*
*"United States Senate.*

"SIR: In connection with the consideration of a joint resolution to provide temporarily for the expenses of the Government after June 30, 1912, pending final action upon the regular appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1913, I beg to invite your particular attention to the situation relative to parting and refining operations in the mints and the assay office at New York.

"The provision under which all expenditures incident to parting and refining bullion have been met for years past is to be found in the deficiency act of July 7, 1898 (see ch. 571, 30 Stat. L., 657), and reads as follows:

"'Chapter 571. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

"'PAR. 4a. And refining and parting of bullion shall be carried on at the coinage mints of the United States and at the assay office at New York, and it shall be lawful to apply the moneys arising from charges collected from depositors for these operations, and also the proceeds of sale of by-products (spent acids arising from any surplus bullion recovered in parting and refining processes), pursuant to law, so far as may be necessary, to defraying in full the expenses thereof, including labor, material, wastage, and loss on sale of sweeps.

"'But no part of the moneys appropriated for the support of the coinage mints and assay office at New York shall be used to defray the expenses of parting and refining bullion.'

"The policy of using the proceeds of charges imposed upon bullion to meet the cost of operating the refineries was changed by a provision of the deficiency act of March 4, 1911 (see ch. 240, Public, 480), the repealing clause reading as follows:

"'All laws and parts of laws, to the extent that they make a permanent indefinite appropriation for the expenses of parting and refining bullion, are repealed to take effect from and after June 30, 1912; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall, for the fiscal year 1913, and annually thereafter, submit to Congress, in the regular Book of Estimates, detailed estimates for the expenses of this service.

"'The unexpended balance, after meeting all obligations, of the permanent indefinite appropriation for parting and refining bullion remaining on the books of the Treasury two years after the close of the fiscal year 1912 shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.'

"It is a grave question whether a resolution so worded as to extend the 1912 appropriations will have the effect of reviving a statute which is definitely repealed. Estimates for the cost of maintaining this service in the fiscal year 1913 in the Denver and San Francisco Mints and the assay office at New York were submitted to Congress, and provisions for the same appear in the bill making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses. It is highly important that provision be made for continuing these refinery operations at the three institutions without a break. The wages of 90 people are involved. At the New York assay office the larger part of all expenditures have been met from the charges imposed upon bullion and the institution can not be kept open for the transaction of business unless provision is made for meeting these expenses after June 30, 1912.

"I therefore suggest that the proposed resolution contain the following specific provision, or one similar that meets your judgment, to cover the situation above pointed out:

"'That the unexpended balance of the permanent indefinite appropriation for parting and refining bullion remaining on the books of the Treasury June 30, 1912, may be drawn upon to defray in full the expenses incidental to refining and parting bullion in the mints at Denver and San Francisco and the assay office at New York, including labor, material, wastage, and loss on sale of sweeps, until the regular appropriations for the mint service for the fiscal year 1913 are available, and that the amount expended under this provision shall be deducted from the annual appropriation for this service.'

"Respectfully,

"FRANKLIN MACVEAGH, *Secretary.*"

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there are no further concurrent or other resolutions, the morning business is closed.

Mr. CLAPP. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 20728, being the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 20728) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments.

Mr. CLAPP. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and that order is made.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, before the Secretary proceeds to read the bill, I desire to make a very brief statement.

This bill, as reported from the Senate committee, very largely increases the House appropriations. The increases come from three sources: First, many of the appropriations are appropriations of Indian funds and not of Government funds. Second, many of the increases are simply cases where the House failed to grant the amount estimated for, and the Senate committee has increased the appropriation to the

estimate. Third, there are items affecting the conduct of irrigation and other projects where the Indian Office felt that it was wiser to have the larger sum appropriated.

The bill contains a great deal of general legislation, which it seems difficult to get in any other form. I am not so sensitive on that subject as heretofore, in view of the uniform custom at this session of putting much general legislation on the appropriation bills.

I call attention to these matters before the Senate proceeds to consider the bill. Of course it is for the Senate to determine what it will do with them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 2, line 16, before the word "thousand," to strike out "two hundred and fifteen" and insert "three hundred and thirty-five"; in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "$35,000 of which to be immediately available"; and in line 20, after the word "expended," to insert: "*Provided*, That the unexpended balances of all continuing appropriations heretofore made for survey, allotment, classification, or appraisement work, general or specific, are hereby made available for the purposes enumerated herein. Surveys provided for by appropriations for surveying and allotting Indian reservations shall be made in accordance with the provisions for surveys and resurveys of public lands, including traveling expenses and allowance in lieu of subsistence, to surveyors and clerks detailed as surveyors employed thereunder," so as to make the clause read:

"For the survey, resurvey, classification, and appraisement of lands to be allotted in severalty under the provisions of the act of February 8, 1887, entitled 'An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians,' and under any other act or acts providing for the survey and allotment of lands in severalty to Indians, including the necessary clerical work incident thereto and to the issuance of all patents in the field and in the Office of Indian Affairs, and to the delivery of trust patents for allotments under said act or any such act or acts; and for the survey and subdivision of Indian reservations and lands to be allotted to Indians under authority of law, $335,000, $35,000 of which to be immediately available, to be repaid proportionately out of any Indian moneys held in trust or otherwise by the United States and available by law for such reimbursable purpose and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of all continuing appropriations heretofore made for survey, allotment, classification, or appraisement work, general or specific, are hereby made available for the purposes enumerated herein. Surveys provided for by appropriations for surveying and allotting Indian reservations shall be made in accordance with the provisions for surveys and resurveys of public lands, including traveling expenses and allowance in lieu of subsistence, to surveyors and clerks detailed as surveyors employed thereunder."

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I would suggest to the Senator, inasmuch as we have commenced on another fiscal year, that the words "to be immediately available" should be stricken from the bill wherever they occur.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, that occurred to me while the joint resolution we have passed was being read. It strikes me that while the joint resolution answers the purpose for the present, some provision must be made in all these appropriation bills to meet that proposition. In these bills there are certain appropriations with reference to a fixed day. That day has already passed; yet the joint resolution of the two Houses does not cover an appropriation made under those circumstances. I thought that, if necessary, when we get through with all of them, the Committee on Appropriations can meet that difficulty by some general provision.

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall not insist upon my suggestion, Mr. President. It does no harm to leave in the clause; but it seems to me it is unnecessary, for the reason that when the bill becomes a law all these appropriations will be immediately available.

Mr. CLAPP. Will they?

Mr. GALLINGER. Absolutely.

Mr. WARREN. The 1st of July will have passed before the bill becomes a law, but it will do no harm to leave in the language.

Mr. CLAPP. Some of them would be immediately available and some, in the very nature of things, would not be.

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall not insist upon it.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 3, line 10, before the word "thousand," to strike out "three hundred" and insert "three hundred and forty-five," so as to read:

"For the construction, repair, and maintenance of ditches, reservoirs, and dams, purchase and use of irrigation tools and appliances, water rights, ditches, lands necessary for canals, pipe lines, and reservoirs for Indian reservations and allotments, and for drainage and protection of irrigable lands from damage by floods, $345,000, to remain available until expended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for the construction, repair, and maintenance of ditches, reservoirs, and dams, etc.; on page 4, line 14, before the word "thousand," to strike out "ten" and insert "fifty-five," so as to make the clause read:

"For traveling expenses of two inspectors of irrigation, at $3 per diem when actually employed on duty in the field, exclusive of transportation and sleeping-car fare, in lieu of all other expenses authorized by law, and for incidental expenses of negotiation, inspection, and investigation, including telegraphing and expense of going to and from the seat of government and while remaining there under orders, $4,200; in all, $355,700: *Provided also*, That not to exceed seven superintendents of irrigation, who shall be skilled irrigation engineers, may be employed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, in line 17, after the word "employed," to insert:

"*Provided also*, That there shall be covered into each fund, from whatsoever source derived, for construction or maintenance and operation of any irrigation project or system within the jurisdiction of the Indian service or preliminary surveys and investigations for determining the feasibility or cost of new projects in the Indian service, the proceeds of the sales of material utilized for temporary work and structures, as well as of the sales of any other property which had been purchased from such fund, and also any moneys refunded in connection with operations necessary for and incidental to such work; and for lands under any such project the Secretary of the Interior may fix annual maintenance charges, which shall be paid as he may direct, such charges, when collected, not to be covered into the Treasury but to be immediately available for use for the maintenance and operation of the project or system for which collected."

Mr. CURTIS. I make the point of order against that amendment. I think the acting chairman will concede that it is general legislation, in violation of Rule XVI.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will be glad if the acting chairman of the committee will indicate whether or not there is an issue upon that point.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I do not see how there can be any issue. The Senator makes the point of order. It is a provision that the Indian Office is very anxious to have. That is the only thing I can urge in its behalf.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will sustain the point of order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I suggest that we go on to-day on these matters as in Committee of the Whole, and when we get into the Senate, if any Senator wishes to offer an amendment to strike out anything that has been agreed to—I do not know that such will be the case—he can do so. I do not suppose the Senator desires to have the bill passed to-day.

Mr. CLAPP. Of course I should like to have the bill passed to-day if it can be passed without pressing the matter against the convenience of Senators. It is an appropriation bill, and we want to get the appropriation bills out of the way.

Mr. OVERMAN. I realize that fact, but I think probably the Senator can not get it passed to-day. I simply make the suggestion so that we may reserve any amendments that any Senator desires to reserve. I have no amendments to offer myself and no fight to make on the bill. But there are only a few Democratic Senators here, and there may be some who will desire to have the course I suggest taken.

Mr. CLAPP. There is no objection to agreeing to that.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator, Mr. President, if he objects to a point of order being made and ruled upon by the Chair?

Mr. OVERMAN. Not at all. I only want, when the bill gets into the Senate, to reserve the right to submit any amendment that any Senator wants to submit. I am doing it only as a matter of caution.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have no fight to make on the bill myself and no amendments to offer.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 5, line 10, after the word "Indians," to insert "including the illegal introduction of intoxicating liquors into the State of Oklahoma," so as to make the clause read:

"For the supression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors among Indians, including the illegal introduction of intoxicating liquors into the State of Oklahoma, $75,000."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in view of the decision of the Supreme Court that the law does apply to Oklahoma, I think that amendment is unnecessary, and I will ask that the Senate disagree to it.

Mr. CLAPP. I think so, too.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the suggestion of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. CURTIS. That we disagree to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is properly put in the affirmative, and those who wish to disagree will vote against the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I have talked with some members of the committee, and I wish to offer an amendment at this point. In the conduct of this matter of suppressing the traffic in intoxicating liquors among Indians it has been found that a strict interpretation of the law would prohibit the introduction of wines into Indian country to be used for sacramental purposes. The undesirability of such a restriction is so manifest that I am going, at this time and in connection with this item, to offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will report the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 12, after the word "dollars," it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That hereafter it shall not be unlawful to introduce and use wines solely for sacramental purposes, under church authority, at any place within the Indian country or any Indian reservation, including the Pueblo Reservations in New Mexico."

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question for information. Can it be possible that the Indians may not make wine from the grapes grown in that part of the country? They grow plenty of grapes there.

Mr. CLAPP. There are some sections of the country where grapes could be grown and homemade wine made for sacramental purposes. There are other sections of the country where it is very doubtful whether that could be done. A strict construction of the liquor law, at least the construction placed upon it by the authorities, prohibits the having of wine within the Indian country even for sacramental purposes, and to set the matter at rest and avoid any further question in regard to it I have offered this amendment.

Mr. HEYBURN. I did not rise to object to the amendment, but my attention was attracted by the suggestion that any legislation is necessary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will suspend for one moment. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 20182) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask if the Senator from Idaho desires to speak upon the unfinished business. If not, I shall ask unanimous consent that it be laid aside temporarily.

Mr. HEYBURN. I had intended at this time to make some remarks, but in view of the fact that the Indian appropriation bill is before the Senate I will defer any remarks. Of course it is not to be laid aside for the day, but only to be laid aside temporarily.

Mr. SMOOT. Temporarily. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HEYBURN. I do want to get at an intelligent idea of this matter. Can it be possible that one in authority has held that Indians may not make wine out of the grapes at their door? Everyone who knows this country knows that grapes are one of the plentiful fruits, and that it

should require legislation in order that they might have wine for church purposes seems to me to imply that they may not make wine out of their own grapes.

Mr. CLAPP. I will ask the Senator if it is his understanding that under the law of this country an Indian within the prohibited classes has the right to manufacture liquor on a reservation?

Mr. HEYBURN. I should dislike to think that we had ever been so unwise in legislation as to make it impossible for Indians to make wine of their own grapes for such a purpose. If we have, then it is another of the curiosities that should be taken into consideration in legislation.

I was impelled to make the suggestion because of the fact that if any person should be permitted to do it they should be permitted to make out of their production whatever a white man might make out of his. Those Indians there are probably quite up to the standard of average American citizenship.

Mr. CLAPP. That is all true, but the fact remains that those in authority maintain that wine for sacramental purposes comes within the general provision of the statute.

Mr. HEYBURN. Then my criticism would be shifted to those in authority.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, in line 12, after the words "dollars" to insert the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That the powers conferred by section 788 of the Revised Statutes upon marshals and their deputies are hereby conferred upon the chief special officer for the suppression of the liquor traffic among Indians and duly authorized officers working under his supervision whose appointments are made or affirmed by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs or the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest to the Senator that as he has already inserted a proviso, that this proviso should read "*Provided also*," and I would further suggest that it be made one paragraph instead of two.

Mr. CLAPP. That can be done now or in the final preparation of the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. The clerks can make it a single paragraph.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 13, after the word "*Provided*," insert "*also*."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CLAPP. Let it appear in the RECORD that the part beginning in line 9 down to the end of line 19 shall be treated as one paragraph.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That will be done.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 24, before the word "thousand," to strike out "sixty" and insert "two hundred and fifty," so as to make the clause read:

"To relieve distress among Indians and to provide for their care and for the prevention and treatment of tuberculosis, trachoma, smallpox, and other contagious and infectious diseases, including the purchase of vaccine and expense of vaccination, $250,000."

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to know something of the necessity for making so radical a change as to strike out $60,000 and insert $250,000 for purchase of vaccine and expense of vaccination.

Mr. CURTIS. It was my purpose to oppose this amendment, and if the Senator will——

Mr. HEYBURN. I will leave it to the Senator, who is much more familiar with the subject; but I was naturally put upon inquiry by the vast raise in the appropriation.

Mr. CURTIS. I dislike very much to oppose an amendment of this kind, but it seems to me that the report of the commissioner justifies me in taking that course. I hope the Senate will disagree to the amendment.

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs estimated for only $75,000. The House gave them only $60,000. Last year there was appropriated for this purpose $60,000, and only $53,000 of it was used. Twenty thousand dollars of that was used in the building of a hospital and only $10,000 was used for medicine; $1,000 was used to buy material for taking photographs, and all the balance was paid in salaries. The year before they had $40,000 and used only $29,000.

It seems to me that there is no justification for so large an increase in view of what has been expended and in view of the further fact that there are now 100 regular physicians, 64 contract physicians, 54 matrons, and 88 field matrons to look after matters of this kind and attend the Indians who need care and attention.

I hope the amendment will be voted down, and then I should like to have the Senate give the commissioner what he asked—$75,000.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to inquire if the Senator has information as to how much of this sum is expended for physicians and how much for vaccine matter.

Mr. CURTIS. Less than $10,000 was paid out for medicines of all kinds.

Mr. HEYBURN. That would include vaccine matter?

Mr. CURTIS. I will read the items that were paid out last year:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relieving distress among destitute Indians | $3,000 |
| Purchase of vaccine and antitoxin and the vaccination of Indians | 3,000 |
| Employment of special physicians and purchase of medicines | 3,000 |
| Equipment and maintenance of sanatoria in the North and Northwest | 20,000 |
| 3 physicians at large, at $1,400 per annum each | 4,200 |
| Expenses of 3 physicians, at $1,200 each | 3,600 |
| 1 nurse, field service | 1,000 |
| Expenses of nurse, field service | 1,200 |
| Traveling expenses and subsistence of physician detailed to Trachoma Hospital at Phoenix | 1,200 |
| 1 nurse, field service | 720 |
| Expenses of nurse, field service | 1,200 |
| 2 contract physicians, 1 at $480 and 1 at $720 | 1,200 |
| 2 nurses, at $720 | 1,400 |
| 2 assistant nurses, at $300 | 600 |
| Incidental expenses, such as extra drugs, supplies, etc., in open market | 500 |
| 1 nurse | 720 |
| 1 cook | 600 |
| Incidental expenses at tuberculosis sanatorium, such as fresh fruit, extra food, and supplies in open market | 500 |
| Salary | 2,000 |
| Traveling and incidental expenses | 2,095 |
| Transportation for box of books and instruments | 150 |
| Motion-picture accessories, etc | 204 |



Mr. HEYBURN. What is that item?

Mr. CURTIS (reading)—

| | |
|---|---|
| Motion-picture accessories, chemicals, 2 boxes Ozone, 8 cans lime, and 100 barrels sulphuric ether | $204.00 |
| 6 cases photographic plates | 100.00 |
| 3 cases lantern slides | 50.00 |
| 6 gross developing paper | 50.00 |
| Photographic accessories, chemicals | 100.00 |
| 5,000 feet positive film | 212.50 |
| 7,000 feet negative film | 262.50 |

Making a total of $58,104 expended last year.

Mr. HEYBURN. There is nothing in the report showing extraordinary conditions under which there should be an increase?

Mr. CURTIS. Nothing at all.

Mr. HEYBURN. Can the chairman of the committee advise us as to why the increase was made?

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, this item was increased from the amount allowed by the House over the estimate of the bureau on the request of the Indian Office. I will read a statement which appears in the report and which is brief:

"The records of the Indian Bureau show that a large per cent of the Indians are afflicted with tuberculosis as well as trachoma. The conditions of health among the Indians, as has been revealed by a careful study of conditions, especially as relates to trachoma, is very startling, indeed, as it is shown by carefully prepared statistics that anywhere from 15 to 80 per cent of the Indians in different parts of the country are suffering from trachoma, and if this terrible disease is not checked a large number of Indians will eventually become totally blind."

Then here comes another feature of it:

"It should be remembered that this disease not only endangers the sight of a large per cent of the Indians, but it endangers the health of millions of white people living in the immediate vicinity of the Indian reservations and who come in contact with the Indians."

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not these Indians are living in their homes—on their farms. They are not in a reservation?

Mr. CLAPP. Some are on reservations; some are on farms and in their homes. There is an indiscriminate condition of the Indian situation with reference to residence from those who are still practically blanket Indians to those who now own and cultivate farms.

Mr. HEYBURN. Are the blanket Indians remaining within the purview of this bill?

Mr. CLAPP. There are yet a great many Indians who might properly be called blanket Indians.

Mr. HEYBURN. These are in Oklahoma?

Mr. CLAPP. No; this would apply to the whole country.

Mr. HEYBURN. I was just looking at the end to see whether it is so extensive.

Mr. CLAPP. If the Senator is correct, then the committee was laboring under a very serious misapprehension.

Mr. HEYBURN. The clause beginning in line 9 reads:

"For the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors among Indians, including the illegal introduction of intoxicating liquors into the State of Oklahoma, $75,000."

I find no qualifying provision between that language and the language under consideration. I suppose the committee intended this to be of general application to all Indians.

Mr. CURTIS. A general provision, to apply to all Indians throughout the country.

Mr. CLAPP. Certainly. That criticism would apply to the provision for the day Indian schools.

Mr. HEYBURN. I had that in mind. I have it before me. I merely wanted information in regard to it. I have no sympathy with the vaccination proposition whatever, and to see a sum, including that kind of services, raised nearly $200,000 rather provoked inquiry.

Mr. CLAPP. Of course, vaccination is a very small item. It is included with the others. I will say that there was a time when smallpox was a very destructive disease, but to-day tuberculosis and trachoma are the two diseases that menace the Indians.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am going to ask a question that will reveal ignorance on my part, although I think probably I understand it. This bill does not apply to Indians in Alaska, I assume.

Mr. CLAPP. No; it does not, except in one or two schools that are specially mentioned.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have in mind a very eloquent and pathetic appeal of the Bishop of Alaska for Indians in that Territory, or whatever we may call it, and if I get an opportunity I should like very much to vote for a liberal appropriation to relieve the suffering of the people there. But I assume that this is not of general application.

Mr. CLAPP. Only where it is specified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Georgia in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before the vote is taken I will ask the Senator from Kansas if I understod him correctly to say that the estimate of the department was $75,000?

Mr. CURTIS. Seventy-five thousand dollars.

Mr. GALLINGER. The House reduced it to $60,000.

Mr. CURTIS. Because last year only $53,000 was expended, and the year before, I think, $29,000 was expended.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall support a motion of the committee to insert $75,000 in lieu of $60,000.

Mr. CLAPP. I shall move now, on behalf of the committee, to insert $75,000 in lieu of $60,000, if there be no objection to that.

Mr. CURTIS. I think that ought to be done.

Mr. CLAPP. The motion now is to amend, on line 24, by striking out "sixty" before "thousand" and inserting "seventy-five" in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 24, after the word "vacination," strike out "sixty" and insert "seventy-five," so as to read "seventy-five thousand dollars."

Mr. MCCUMBER. I understand that the amendment proposing to appropriate $250,000 has been stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was disagreed to.

Mr. CLAPP. I propose to insert $75,000 in lieu of $60,000, conforming to the estimates of the Indian Office.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I wish to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if, in his opinion, $75,000 is sufficient for the purposes enumerated?

Mr. CLAPP. Personally, I do not feel that it is. I think the increase, especially of trachoma among the Indians during the last two or three years, warrants us in making a larger appropriation, and I not only moved the amendment at the request of the office but I very cheerfully supported it.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I think we ought to stop a moment to consider this matter before we hurriedly strike out a provision that has been adopted by the committee after a very full hearing. We are appropriating, Mr. President, some $10,000,000, I think, in the bill for the benefit of the Indians of the country. Large sums are being expended for instruction. I do not know what particular good we will obtain by instructing and educating Indians this year, when what knowledge they may have obtained could not be exercised, as they would be in the grave. I can not see the necessity of spending millions of dollars for the comfort of the Indians in certain lines while we neglect to appropriate a few thousand dollars necessary for the purpose of saving lives. It seems to me that the life of the Indian is about the first thing to take into consideration; that first we ought to look after their health. An Indian diseased with tuberculosis or smallpox is not going to be a very useful Indian, and the money expended will not be very beneficially expended in his behalf if we do not first adopt some means to stop the spread of this fatal disease among the Indians.

The evidence, as I now remember, that was taken before the committee showed that 30, 40, 60, or 70 per cent of the Indians in some sections were affected by tuberculosis. If we want to settle the Indian question in a very short time, we might withdraw all aid in this direction, and in a very few years it would not be necessary for us to pay out expenses for schools, and so forth.

I again appeal to the Senate to appropriate what ought to be appropriated to eradicate the disease. The commissioner says that it is necessary. Those who were present and testified as to the condition of the Indians in the several sections of the country showed, to my mind, most conclusively that $250,000 ought to be expended for their protection and in the attempt to wipe out this dread disease. Therefore, Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota by inserting $150,000 in lieu of $75,000.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from North Dakota that sufficient appropriation should be made to take care of the health of the Indians, but the Senator will remember that a gentleman who appeared before the committee stated that in one case where the Indians had been under the care of the Government they had been bothered with trachoma, and after they were left alone and went to themselves trachoma had entirely disappeared. There was no evidence given before the committee that justified such a large appropriation or such a large increase as was made by the committee. There was nothing in the previous expenditures of the department to show that that amount of money was necessary.

I agree with the Senator from North Dakota that every precaution should be taken. So far as I am concerned, I shall vote for his amendment making the amount $150,000. If any facts had been given to the committee, if any cases had been cited, or if the report had shown that the money was expended for medicine or something for the use of the Indians instead of for photographs and things of that kind, and only $10,000 of it for medicine, I would have voted for the appropriation of $250,000.

I believe that before the department get at the hands of Congress large sums they should give an itemized statement to the Senate or to the House showing what they need the appropriation for. I shall support the amendment.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I agree with the Senator that probably there may have been some wastefulness in previous appropriations, but this paragraph is clear in reference to the purpose for which the money is to be used. If the department will use the money for the purposes indicated and not for films for kodaks, I have no doubt but that a great deal of benefit can be obtained. I believe that the whole amount should have been appropriated and most of it used, not so much for trachoma and for minor diseases as for the eradication of tuberculosis. I am glad that the Senator agrees at least that we should have $150,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I rise to ask the Senator from North Dakota if the hearings to which he alludes have been printed?

Mr. MCCUMBER. I am not certain.

Mr. CLAPP. They are in print.

Mr. MCCUMBER. We had a witness before us, a special examiner, who had been out in Montana and Washington, and his evidence was very strong on the subject.

Mr. GALLINGER. The proposition of the committee, Mr. President, was to increase the appropriation $163,000, which would necessarily have gone to physicians and for medicines. I think it is an extravagant suggestion. Trachoma undoubtedly exists among those people. It will not require a great deal of either medical treatment or medicine to care for that disease if it is properly handled. So far as tuberculosis is concerned, these Indians have to-day at their own command, without physicians and without medicine, all that advanced medical science says can do them any good; they are out in the open. The system now is to establish open-air camps for tuberculosis patients, and the physician who would use medicine to any very considerable extent in the treatment of that disease at the present time would be laughed at by the advanced members of the profession.

So, I see no reason why in this case a very large amount of money should be appropriated for physicians and medicines for these two particular diseases, and yet that is the proposition involved in this amendment. If the Senators who know more about the matter than I do think that the amount ought to be increased to $150,000, I certainly would not oppose it, although it occurs to me that as $62,000 was used last year and some of it was used for moving-picture films and all sorts of things that may have amused those people, $75,000 will be adequate for this year. But at best the matter is going to conference and it will be adjusted there. In that view, while I think it is not a necessary increase, I shall not vote against it.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I hope that the motion to make the amount $150,000 will prevail. The ills of the Indians are not confined entirely to the diseases named here. The employment of physicians is very largely used for other diseases.

Mr. GALLINGER. One suggestion made by the Senator from North Dakota attracted my attention. It is that the testimony showed that in many instances 75 per cent——

Mr. MCCUMBER. I would not say 75 per cent. I suggest in some cases I think 70 per cent.

Mr. GALLINGER. That as high as 70 per cent were afflicted with tuberculosis. The Senator has in his own State a good many Indians, and we are making appropriations for the Indians in the State of North Dakota. I will ask the Senator if he has discovered any such percentage among the Indians in North Dakota as that even 50 per cent or 40 per cent of them are suffering from tuberculosis.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I do not know the exact per cent. I know that the percentage is very great, even among those in North Dakota. It is demonstrated, I think, that the disease is to some extent, at least, infectious, and while the Senator's remedy may be the proper remedy for the treatment of tuberculosis, and if it could be cured in a single summer by keeping the Indians out of doors, that might be quite a proper remedy, and would require but little expenditure; these Indians, especially in the northern regions, can hardly camp out when the thermometer registers 30 or 40 or 50 below zero. They are compelled to live in houses during at least six or seven months of the year, and possibly eight months in some sections of the country. Their houses are not sanitary. They need more or less instruction in the matter of their own treatment of themselves, and they need constant assistance. The Indian does not follow advice very readily. He is somewhat indigent and somewhat careless as to his personal habits. The buildings in which they live are often very insanitary and conducive to increasing the extent of tuberculosis. So there is something besides medicine that must be considered in the matter of treatment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will not raise any issue on this point. I do not set myself up as an authority at all, but I have sometimes thought that we were pampering the Indian a little too much; that it is about time, after the centuries have come and gone, for the Indian to be taught some degree, at least, of self-reliance and some degree of self-support. But that probably is not the popular idea, and I have no disposition to deny to these poor people any governmental aid that they can reasonably ask, except I do feel that if this appropriation is to be largely used for physicians and medicines, while it is a good thing for the profession, with which I greatly sympathize, it is rather a profligate expense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 6, to insert:

"To enable the Secretary of the Interior to investigate, audit, and adjust, under such terms, conditions, and regulations as he may prescribe, the claims of licensed traders and other bona fide claimants who have claims against individual Indians under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, $75,000: *Provided*, That $10,000 of this amount may be used for clerk hire in the Indian Bureau."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I make the point of order against that amendment on two grounds: First, the appropriation was not estimated for; and, second, it is general legislation and in violation of Rule XVI.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, the committee will have to accept as sound the objection made by the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 6, line 12, before the word "hundred," to strike out "four" and insert "five," and in the same line, before the word "thousand," to strike out "and fifty," so as to read:

"For support of Indian day and industrial schools, not otherwise provided for, and for other educational and industrial purposes in connection therewith, $1,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 7, before the word "thousand," to strike out "four hundred and twenty-five" and insert "six hundred and fifty," so as to make the clause read:

"For construction, lease, purchase, repairs, and improvements of school and agency buildings, and for sewerage, water supply, and lighting plants, and for purchase of school sites, $650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to expend $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, in the prevention and control of forest fires on Indian reservations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, all sums expended hereunder to be reimbursed from the tribal funds of the Indians on the reservations where the sums are expended."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I make the point of order against that amendment that it is general legislation.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Kansas will not press the point of order. There is a great deal of destruction of timber belonging to these Indians. This is a reimbursable appropriation. I doubt very much whether technically it is subject to a point of order. The Senate held some years ago that even in the case of a claim against an Indian tribe the item was not subect to a point of order. I certainly hope the point will not be pressed.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator from Minnesota say that this provision is wholly for the protection of timber from fire?

Mr. CLAPP. It reads:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to expend $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, in the prevention and control of forest fires on Indian reservations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, all sums expended hereunder to be reimbursed from the tribal funds of the Indians on the reservations where the sums are expended."

Mr. CURTIS. I will withdraw the point of order on that amendment, Mr President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 9, after line 4, to insert:

"There is hereby appropriated the sum of $250,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available, for the purpose of encouraging industry among Indians and to aid them to engage in the culture of fruits, grains, and other crops. The said sum may be used for the purchase of animals, machinery, tools, implements, and other equipment necessary to enable Indians to become self-supporting: *Provided*, That the sum hereby appropriated shall be expended subject to the conditions to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior for its repayment to the United States on or before June 30, 1925, and all repayments to this fund made on or before June 30, 1924, are hereby appropriated for the same purpose as the original fund, and the entire fund, including such repayments, shall remain available until June 30, 1924; and all repayments to the fund hereby created which shall be made subsequent to June 30, 1924, shall be covered into the Treasury and shall not be withdrawn or applied except in consequence of a subsequent appropriation made by law: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to Congress annually on the first Monday in December a detailed report of the use of this fund."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I make the point of order against that amendment on two grounds: First, the amount named was not estimated for; and, second, the amendment proposes general legislation, in violation of Rule XVI.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, the committee will have to concede the correctness of the point of order, though I regret it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 10, line 20, before the word "thousand," to strike out "four" and insert "five," and in line 21, after the word "rent," to insert: *"Provided,* That hereafter the Board of Indian Commissioners is authorized to employ a secretary, not a member of said board, and pay his salary out of the appropriation herein made or which shall hereafter be made for said board: *Provided further,* That the proper accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby directed to pay the salary of H. C. Phillips for services heretofore rendered said board as secretary out of the appropriation provided for the expenses of said Board of Indian Commissioners in the Indian appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912," so as to make the clause read:

"For expenses of the Board of Indian Commissioners, $5,000, including not to exceed $300 for office rent: *Provided,* That hereafter the Board of Indian Commissioners is authorized to employ a secretary, not a member of said board, and pay his salary out of the appropriation herein made or which shall hereafter be made for said board: *Provided further,* That the proper accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby directed to pay the salary of H. C. Phillips for services heretofore rendered said board as secretary out of the appropriation provided for the expenses of said Board of Indian Commissioners in the Indian appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912."

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from Minnesota if it is possible that the money shall be paid out of the appropriation of the last fiscal year?

Mr. CLAPP. I suppose it was upon the theory that there was money left over.

Mr. GALLINGER. At the end of the fiscal year, it strikes me, the money must be turned back into the Treasury, and that this would not be approved. We would have to reappropriate it.

Mr. CLAPP. That is true, but does not this amount to a reappropriation? That was the design.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am afraid not. I think the Senator had better let that amendment be passed over for the present, and look into it.

Mr. WARREN. I think, if that is the idea, it will have to be expressed as a reappropriation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Unquestionably so. Let it go over.

Mr. CLAPP. Let the amendment be passed over. I will change the language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 11, line 24, before the word "thousand," to strike out "eighty-five" and insert "one hundred and twenty-five," so as to make the clause read:

"For pay of special agents at $2,000 per annum; for traveling and incidental expenses of such special agents, including sleeping-car fare, and a per diem of $3 in lieu of subsistence when actually employed on duty in the field or ordered to the seat of government; for transportation and incidental expenses of officers and clerks of the Office of Indian Affairs when traveling on official duty; for pay of employees not otherwise provided for; and for other necessary expenses of the Indian service for which no other appropriation is available, $125,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 12, to insert:

"*Provided,* That the Commissioner of Indian Affairs may expend not to exceed $1,000 of this appropriation in purchasing law books for official use in the Indian Bureau."

Mr. CURTIS. I want to ask the acting chairman of the committee why that amount of law books provided for can not be purchased out of the contingent fund of the Interior Department?

Mr. CLAPP. The Indian Commissioner advised the committee that the comptroller declined or objected—I do not know that he put it quite so strong as refused—at least he objected to paying this item out of the contingent fund. That was the reason why the amendment was put in the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. I would suggest that the proviso should become a part of the text of the bill on the preceding page, and not be made a separate paragraph. The Senator, if he examines it, will see the point of that suggestion.

Mr. CLAPP. I think that ought to be done, Mr. President. Let the proper record be made for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 12, after line 4, to insert:

"For continuing the work of classifying and indexing the files of the Indian Office and preparing historical data from records therein, including the pay of employees, $5,000, to be immediately available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 8, to insert:

"For the purpose of conducting hearings and taking evidence to determine the heirs of deceased Indian allottees, pursuant to the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., 855 to 866), and the regulations thereunder prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, $100,000."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish the chairman of the committee would explain the necessity for that item, if he can.

Mr. CLAPP. Just a moment before I take the matter up. Acting on the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] I think the bill will read much better when concluded if the words "to be immediately available" are eliminated in all cases where they occur.

Mr. GALLINGER. That ought to be done.

Mr. CLAPP. I desire it understood that it shall be done.

Mr. WARREN. Why not ask that the Secretary may do that in this place the same as in the others?

Mr. CLAPP. It amounts to the same thing.

Mr. GALLINGER. That should be done in all cases.

Mr. WARREN. In all cases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made.

Mr. CLAPP. Now, Mr. President, in answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], I will say that the Indian Office asks for this upon the ground that—

"The regular administrative work of the various Indian agencies taxes the efforts of those officials to the limit. There have been about 200,000 allotments to Indians on 52 reservations, of which number it is believed that about 40,000 allottees have died, leaving undetermined heirs. In order to clear up the tangled condition of the estates of deceased Indians so that the inherited lands may be disposed of to white settlers and so that the money may be available to provide the Indian heirs with funds with which to begin the farming of their own allotments and the building of sanitary homes, it is desirable that this item should be retained in the bill."

Mr. CURTIS. I have no objection to the amendment. I merely wanted to get into the RECORD the information which the Senator from Minnesota has furnished.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indians Affairs was, on page 12, after line 15, to insert:

"That so much of the provision of the Indian appropriation act of June 7, 1897 (30 Stat. L., pp. 62–90), as limits the amount that may be paid for salaries or compensation to employees regularly employed at any one agency to $10,000 and at a consolidated agency to $15,000 is hereby amended by increasing the amounts to $20,000 and $25,000, respectively."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Arizona and New Mexico," on page 13, line 15, before the word "thousand," to strike out "eight" and insert "eleven"; and in line 16, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty-seven" and insert "thirty," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 700 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Phoenix, Ariz., and for pay of superintendent, $119,400; for general repairs and improvements, $11,000; in all, $130,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 20, before the word "thousand," to strike out "three" and insert "five"; and in line 21, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty-one" and insert "twenty-three," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 100 pupils at the Indian school at Truxton Canyon, Ariz., and for pay of superintendent, $18,200; for general repairs and improvements, $5,000; in all, $23,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 3, after the word "dollars," to insert:

"*Provided,* That the proportion of the cost of the irrigation project on the Gila River Indian Reservation heretofore and herein authorized to be paid from the public funds shall be repaid into the Treasury of the United States as and when funds may be available therefor: *Provided further,* That in the event any allottee shall receive a patent in fee to an allotment of land irrigated under this project before the United States shall have been wholly reimbursed as herein provided, then the proportionate cost of the project, to be apportioned equitably by the Secretary of the Interior, shall become a first lien on such allotment, and the fact of such lien shall be recited on the face of each patent in fee issued and the amount of the lien set forth therein, which said lien, however, shall not be enforced so long as the original allottee or his heirs shall own the allotment; and the receipt of the Secretary of the Interior, or of the officer, agent, or employee duly authorized by him for that purpose, for the payment of the amount assessed against any allotment as herein provided shall, when duly recorded by the recorder of deeds in the county wherein the land is located, operate as a satisfaction of such lien."

So as to read:

"For maintenance, including purchase of electricity for irrigation wells already completed, and the completion of the lateral irrigating ditches thereunder in connection with the irrigation of the lands of the Pima Indians in the vicinity of Sacaton, in the Gila River Indian Reservation, $15,000: *Provided,* That the proportion of the cost of the irrigation project on the Gila River Indian Reservation heretofore and herein authorized to be paid from the public funds shall be repaid into the Treasury of the United States as and when funds may be available therefor: *Provided further,* That in the event any allottee shall receive a patent in fee to an allotment of land irrigated under this project before the United States shall have been wholly reimbursed as herein provided, then the proportionate cost of the project, to be apportioned equitably by the Secretary of the Interior, shall become a first lien on such allotment, and the fact of such lien shall be recited on the face of each patent in fee issued and the amount of the lien set forth therein, which said lien, however, shall not be enforced so long as the original allottee or his heirs shall own the allotment; and the receipt of the Secretary of the Interior, or of the officer, agent, or employee duly authorized by him for that purpose, for the payment of the amount assessed against any allotment as herein provided shall, when duly recorded by the recorder of deeds in the county wherein the land is located, operate as a satisfaction of such lien."

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether or not it is proposed in allotting irrigated lands to the Indians to make the cost of construction a lien upon the lands that may be foreclosed.

Mr. CLAPP. Not so long as they retain the land, but in case they dispose of the land, then it is a lien.

Mr. HEYBURN. Then it is a charge against the value of their lands.

Mr. CLAPP. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. And a limitation on the right of sale.

Mr. CLAPP. Undoubtedly; it does amount, in effect, to a certain limitation.

Mr. HEYBURN. That would seem to me to be a very harsh way of dealing with the Indians. You take their lands, irrigate them, and say to them—and they are citizens of the United States—"you will stay right here, and if you sell these lands or do anything to better your condition in life then we will foreclose to the extent of the cost of putting water on them." The Indian would rather have the land without the water than to have it subject to so harsh a condition as that. No white man would submit to it for a moment.

I do not know where the idea originated, but, of course, I assume that it did not originate with the acting chairman of the committee. It is probable that a departmental clerk somewhere conceived the idea of making the burden of these Indians more onerous than it is. I would rather see the whole amendment go out of the bill than to see so harsh a burden as that placed upon the Indians. Two years ago and four years ago we had that same question here of seizing a man's land and, as Lord Eldon said, "improving him out of his title." That is what it amounts to. The Indian does not depend upon the market; he depends upon his own necessities for the value of the land, while

the white man depends upon the market where he can sell the proceeds of the land.

I do not like to raise a point of order against these matter, but I think if the Senator in charge of the bill will allow the amendment to go over and give it a little more thought he will find some way of eliminating that harsh feature from it.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, this plan has been adopted quite generally with reference to Indian reservations, but it has not yet been applied to the Pima Reservation.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, it has not always been successfully adopted. In the case of the California Indians, some six years ago now, the Senate refused to accede to any such plan. Again, two years ago, when the question was before the Senate, the Senate again refused to recognize it. Now it is brought up again. If they are not doing one thing, they are doing another; if they are not cutting the units down so that the Indian can not possibly sustain himself and those dependent upon him, then they are putting a burden upon the Indian in the way of payment, and they say now, "So long as you and your family and your descendants live here we will not foreclose, but it will be a charge against you and a burden on your property, and if you undertake to exercise the right that ought to belong to you if you are citizens of the United States then we will foreclose." We have to keep our eyes on the departments; we have to keep our eyes on that department particularly.

Mr. CLAPP. I suggest that the matter go over for the present.

Mr. HEYBURN. A word before it goes over. These are Indians with whom we have treaty relations. We have entirely lost sight of those relations, and we seem to have reached a point where we think we can be forgetful of the relations that ordinarily exist and take their lands and, as I have said, improve them out of their title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the Senator from Minnesota asks that the amendment be passed over.

Mr. CLAPP. I suggest that it go over for the present.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President——

Mr. CLAPP. I understand the Senator from Arizona desires to say a word on the matter before it is passed over.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, just a word. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] has just said. I have the honor to be a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs, and I desire at this time publicly to make expression of my appreciation as a Senator of the faithfulness of that committee in the performance of its duty. That committee labored for nearly three months on this bill. This item was carefully considered, and the reason—if I remember aright—why it was inserted in this way was the committee felt that it would be for the benefit of the Indian. If he had land at that particular place allotted to him and he were permitted to alienate it, speculators could come along and buy his land, he would possibly squander the money received for the sale of the land and again soon become a charge upon the Government, whereas if allowed to retain the title and cultivate his land, the Government for all practical purposes has furnished him with an irrigation project without any charge to him——

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, of course Indians differ in different sections. Now, we are not under the necessity of considering——

Mr. ASHURST. Just permit me a moment, and I will close. I wish, of course, this money could be appropriated without the reimbursement feature. I now yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. HEYBURN. We are not under the necessity of considering the Indian as incompetent to take care of his money. A tribe of Indians in the adjoining county to that in which I live is, if not the first, the second wealthiest organization or body of citizens of the United States. They know how to keep their money in bank; they know how to invest it; and they know how to do business with it probably as well as any body of white men.

Mr. ASHURST. That may be true as to some tribes of Indians.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is true generally of our northern Indians.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, in the item of appropriation for the maintenance of the Gila Indian Reservation, on page 15, line 12, before the word "thousand," to strike out "ten" and insert "twenty-five," so as to make the proviso read:

"*Provided*, That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, directed to convene a board of not less than three engineers of the Army of wide reputation and large experience to make the necessary examinations, borings, and surveys for the purpose of determining the reasonability and practicability of constructing a dam and reservoir at or in the vicinity of the Box Canyon, on the San Carlos Indian Reservation, known as the site of the proposed San Carlos reservoir on the Gila River, Ariz., and the necessary irrigation works in connection therewith to provide for the irrigation of Indian, private, and public lands in the Gila River Valley. Said board of engineers to submit to Congress the results of their examinations and surveys, together with an estimate of cost, with their recommendations thereon at the earliest practicable date. The sum of $25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of conducting said investigations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 15, to strike out:

"For the development of a water supply for domestic and stock purposes and for irrigation for nomadic Papago Indians in Pima County, Ariz., to be immediately available, $5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 19, to insert:

"To enable the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the possibility of enlarging the irrigation system for the protection and irrigation of the Indian lands on the Papago Indian Reservation, Ariz., and report thereon to Congress at the beginning of its next session, $5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 8, to insert:

"For the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Interior to carry into effect the provisions of the sixth article of the treaty of June 8, 1868, between the United States and the Navajo Nation or Tribe of Indians, proclaimed August 12, 1868, whereby the United States agrees to provide school facilities for the children of the Navajo Tribe of Indians, the sum of $250,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. In carrying out the authority hereby conferred the said Secretary may expend said funds, in his discretion, in establishing day schools or other industrial schools, tribal habits and climatic conditions being considered, suitable for the education of said Indians."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 23, to insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to make an investigation of the conditions on the White Mountain, or San Carlos, Indian Reservation, in the State of Arizona, with respect to the necessity of constructing suitable steel and concrete wagon bridges, with approaches thereto, across the San Carlos Creek and the Gila River, in the vicinity of San Carlos, on said reservation, and also to cause surveys, plans, and reports to be made, together with an estimated limit of the cost for the construction of said bridges, at such sites as he may select, and submit his report thereon to Congress on the first Monday in December, 1912; and the sum of $2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purposes herein authorized."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that that amendment proposes general legislation and that the amount proposed to be appropriated is not estimated for.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I realize that the point of order made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] may be dangerous to this appropriation of $2,000. Far be it from me to seek, for any purpose whatever, any strained ruling or strained construction of any rule which would give to Arizona or to any other State money to be expended within a State contrary to our rules. My remarks, therefore, will be directed more to the Senator from Kansas than to the Senate, if I may be permitted to so address him, in order to induce him to withdraw the point of order.

Mr. President, the necessity for this bridge at the point described in the amendment offered by the Senate committee is so great that my duty requires I should say a word here in its behalf.

The first main tributary of the Gila River is the San Francisco River, which comes into the Gila at or near Clifton. At the town of Duncan, about 20 miles above Clifton, in Arizona, the river begins to assume considerable proportions. The next important tributary is the San Carlos, which flows into the Gila River on the San Carlos Indian Reservation. These streams—that is, the Gila River and the San Carlos—are torrential rather than perennial. At times the Gila River would float a battleship, and during such periods of high water all traffic is suspended, farming lands are destroyed, and the commerce of that part of the country is wholly and completely suspended by reason of the raging and turbulent waters.

It was my intention, when I came to this distinguished body, to ask for a direct appropriation of $100,000 for the purpose of constructing a bridge there. After serving here for a few weeks I learned that it would be impossible to secure such appropriation just now. Therefore this amendment has been reported by the committee. It simply authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the situation, and if, in his opinion, when he makes his report to the next Congress, the bridge should be built there an appropriation may be secured.

I earnestly hope the Senator will withdraw his point of order. I desire at this time to say that this proposed bridge is favored by the department, and I request to have read at the desk the letter in which the department states that this bridge should be built. The department has no objection to it.

With the permission of the Senate, I will ask that that letter be read now.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

[Land contracts, 36118, 1911; 13579, 1912. R. J. H. Proposed bridges.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
*Washington, April 2, 1912.*

Mr. ABRAHAM L. LAWSHE,
*Superintendent San Carlos School.*

SIR: Referring to your letter of February 6, 1912, regarding proposed bridges across the Gila and San Carlos Rivers, there is inclosed for your information a copy of departmental report of March 25, 1912, to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, on the subject.

Respectfully,
H. ABBOTT,
*Assistant Commissioner.*

[I-21497. Land contracts, 16794, 1911; 13579, 1912. R. J. H. H. R. 1682.]

MARCH 25, 1912.

Hon. W. C. ADAMSON,
*Chairman Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,*
*House of Representatives.*

SIR: I have the honor to invite your attention to departmental letter of May 12, 1911, reporting on H. R. 1682, the purpose of which is "to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct bridges across the San Carlos and Gila Rivers on the White Mountain or San Carlos Indian Reservation, in the Territory of Arizona, and for other purposes."

Section 2 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to select the most available sites for such purpose at points on said rivers "not to exceed 3 miles above the confluence."

In its letter of May 12, the department referred to the fact that there were pending certain applications involving the San Carlos reservoir site, and that if application to construct a dam were granted, the banks of both the Gila and San Carlos Rivers would be submerged to points in excess of 3 miles above the confluence.

In connection with this case there is inclosed a copy of a report dated February 6, 1912, from the superintendent in charge of the San Carlos Reservation, who thinks it would be entirely feasible to construct bridges within 3 miles of the confluence of the two rivers, as the shallowness of the water would make such construction easily possible. The department would be much pleased to see the proposed legislation enacted into law and an appropriation made available for constructing the bridges, which would be an important factor in the development of that section of the country. It seems that the citizens of Arizona are making special efforts to construct good roads and to open up a transcontinental highway of which the proposed bridges would be a part.

While the superintendent's letter of February 6 indicates that in all probability bridges could easily be constructed within the 3 miles of the confluence of the rivers, yet to obviate the contingency of having the proposed improvements defeated by reason of circumstances which would make it impossible to construct at sites within the limit named in the bill, the department respectfully suggests that the bill be

amended by striking out, in lines 12 and 13 of page 1, the words "not to exceed 3 miles above the confluence of said rivers."

If the bill be so amended, the department respectfully suggests that it be favorably considered and reported.

Respectfully,

SAMUEL ADAMS,
*First Assistant Secretary.*

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, it is true that not all of the letter is pertinent to this particular amendment, but I had it all read in order that it might not go in the RECORD in a fragmentary or broken condition.

That is all I wish to say at this time.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator to designate the lines where this amendment is found.

Mr. ASHURST. The amendment commences on page 16, line 24, and extends down to and includes line 13, on page 17. The amendment offered by the committee simply calls for an appropriation of $2,000 in order that the Secretary of the Interior may make an estimate as to the necessity for a bridge there.

Mr. HEYBURN. This is on an Indian reservation?

Mr. ASHURST. It is, sir.

Mr. HEYBURN. And on a navigable river?

Mr. ASHURST. At times the river assumes the proportions of a navigable river.

Mr. HEYBURN. Not practically navigable?

Mr. ASHURST. No.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. ASHURST. Most certainly I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The letter that has been read, of course, is not an estimate, and can not be so construed. There are quite a number of bridge items in the bill. If this one is agreed to, all the others should be agreed to. I judge from the letter that the bridge is needed, and, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to building bridges where they are needed. I think, however, the Government is going too extensively into the building of bridges on reservations that are likely to be soon opened to settlement; but I withdraw the point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn, and, without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 17, after line 13, to insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to make an investigation of the conditions on the Yuma Indian Reservation, in the State of California, with respect to the necessity of constructing a suitable thoroughfare bridge of sufficient strength and capacity to safely carry street cars, in addition to foot and wagon traffic, over and across the Colorado River, connecting Fort Yuma, on the Yuma Indian Reservation, Imperial County, State of California, with the town of Yuma, State of Arizona, and also to cause surveys, plans, and reports to be made, together with an estimated limit of the cost for the construction of said bridge, at such a site as he may select, and submit his report thereon to Congress on the first Monday in December, 1912; and the sum of $1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose herein authorized.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I make the point of order against that amendment. I should like to ask the Senator, if the Chair will permit the inquiry before ruling upon the point of order, whether that bridge, if constructed, will be wholly within an Indian reservation?

Mr. ASHURST. A frank reply, which of course is always given by a Senator, requires me to say that it will not be wholly within an Indian reservation.

Mr. CURTIS. Then, Mr. President, I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. ASHURST. Before the ruling I should like to say a few words, if, under the rule, I may be permitted to do so. Appreciating very much the withdrawal of the other point of order, I insist most strenuously—respectfully, of course—that the point of order against this amendment also be withheld, for the following reasons: The great Colorado River is anomalous in America. It has no parallel on this hemisphere; it has a parallel only in one place, and that is in Africa—the Nile. The Colorado River is very long; it flows some 1,700 miles without being spanned by a wagon bridge. Like the Nile, it flows a thousand miles without a tributary. Like the Nile, it rises in June and spreads out for a number of miles on either side of its banks and irrigates alluvial soil which is so rich that it could be transported to Canada and used for fertilizing purposes if it were not for the prohibitive freight rates. At high water means of communication between the two banks are almost completely shut off.

It has been determined by the unanimous voice of the great Southwest, which includes southern California and the States of Arizona and New Mexico, that at this advanced stage of civilization, in this morning of the twentieth century, at this time when the ingenuity of man is making such progress in means and ways which make for the facility of transportation, it is almost a reproach to civilization that there is no wagon or automobile bridge across that great river.

Not long since the President of the United States sent a message to Congress asking an appropriation of a million or more dollars in order that the banks on either side of the river might be revetted and riprapping built to protect the farms on both sides of the river from the raging overflow. The Colorado River almost defies, if a river could defy, the very law of nature. At one time of the year it chooses a particular course or channel; and at another time of the year, or possibly another year, it chooses another place whither it shall go. On the Arizona side of the river, which would be the eastern abutment of the proposed bridge, is the prosperous city of Yuma, a marvel of industry and progress. Directly across the river, on the California side, is the Indian reservation. Many Indians—and they are strong swimmers—have been drowned there even when the river was at low water, for the reason that it is very heavily charged and impregnated with silt, and even the strongest swimmer is in danger. But consider that river in a raging, turbulent condition, such as the press dispatches announce it has been in for the last few weeks, and the necessity for a wagon bridge across it becomes apparent.

It may be, and it doubtless is, that this amendment proposed by the committee is obnoxious to the rule of the Senate. If it be obnoxious, I most respectfully insist, with all the earnestness at my command, that such a rule ought to be abrogated, because we ought not to have a rule which will stand in the way of the requirements of advancing civilization. I am very sorry if the rule does prevent the appropriation of a thousand dollars in order that an investigation may be made by the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain the suitability or the necessity of a bridge at that point.

Mr. CURTIS. I insist on the point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On what ground does the Senator raise the objection?

Mr. CURTIS. It is general legislation, and the item was not estimated for by the department.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order made by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, of course I accept the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state to the Senator that he did not understand the Senator to contest the ruling. The Chair was ready to give full weight to any suggestion the Senator might make on the other side of the matter.

Mr. ASHURST. The Chair ruled correctly.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 18, after line 6, to insert:

"For salary due Clarence I. Stacy, supervisor of ditches, Pima Indian Reservation, Ariz., from April 8, 1911, to October 25, 1911, at $1,200 per annum, $660."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I make the point of order against that item, because it was not estimated for. But surely there must be some reason for the committee having put it in, and I will ask the acting chairman of the committee if he will explain why that and the next item were put in this bill?

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, these items were inserted for the reason that some time ago there was trouble down there—I do not know the details of it nor would they be material—and these two employees were suspended pending an investigation or examination. The result of the investigation was that they were reinstated, but the comptroller held that he could not allow their pay for this time in view of the fact that they had been formally suspended. Consequently there is no way in which they can get their pay except by a direct appropriation. I trust the Senator will withhold his point of order.

Mr. CURTIS. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. President.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 18, after line 11, to insert:

"For salary due N. D. Brayton as physician on the Pima Indian Reservation, Ariz., from April 7, 1911, to November 14, 1911, inclusive, at the rate of $1,200 a year, $726.67."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 17, to insert:

"For constructing dike to protect allotments on the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation, $33,000."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I desire to make the point of order that that was not estimated for, and to ask the acting chairman of the committee whether that item was inserted at the request of the department?

Mr. ASHURST. It was estimated for.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes, sir; it was estimated for, as the record shows.

Mr. CURTIS. Then I withdraw my point of order.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 18, after line 19, to insert:

"For continuing the construction of necessary channels and laterals for the utilization of water in connection with the pumping plant for irrigation purposes on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., as provided in the act of April 4, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 273), for the purpose of securing an appropriation of water for the irrigation of approximately 150,000 acres of land and for maintaining and operating the pumping plant, $35,000, reimbursable as provided in said act." (Act of Apr. 4, 1910, vol. 36, p. 273, sec. 3.)

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "California," on page 19, line 19, before the word "thousand," to strike out "ten" and insert "twenty-three," and in line 20, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred and four" and insert "one hundred and seventeen," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 550 Indian pupils at the Sherman Institute, Riverside, Cal., and for pay of superintendent, $94,350; for general repairs and improvements, $23,000; in all, $117,350."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 25, before the word "thousand," to strike out "eighteen" and insert "one hundred," so as to make the clause read:

"For the balance of the first annual reclamation and maintenance charge on Yuma allotments and for the second and third annual charge and maintenance $100,000, or so much thereof as may be required, to be reimbursed from the sale of surplus lands or from other funds that may be available, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1911."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Idaho," on page 21, after line 4, to insert:

"To reimburse Peter Moctelmy, a member of the Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Indians, for damages sustained by him because of the sale by the United States to the State of Idaho of land for a State park on a portion of which the said Peter Moctelmy made his home, $500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Kansas," on page 21, line 21, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred twenty-seven" and insert "one hundred and twenty-nine"; in line 22, before the word "thousand," to strike out "ten" and insert "eleven"; and in line 23, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred thirty-seven" and insert "one hundred and forty," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 750 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kans., and for pay of superintendent, $129,750; for general repairs and improvements, $11,000; in all, $140,750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 5, before the word "dollars," to strike out "three thousand" and insert "five thousand five hundred," and in line 7, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seventeen thousand eight hundred and sixty" and insert "twenty thousand three hundred and sixty," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 80 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Kickapoo Reservation, Kans., and for pay of superintendent, $14,860; for general repairs and improvements, $5,500; in all, $20,360."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Michigan," on page 22, after line 22, to insert:

"That the sum of $116.37 be, and the same is hereby, reappropriated for the purpose of paying the claim of John E. Meyer, of Shepherd, Mich., for the balance due him on construction of certain wells at the Mount Pleasant Indian School, located at Mount Pleasant, Mich., in the years 1901 and 1902, the appropriation out of which such balance should have been paid having heretofore lapsed."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I do not like to make a point of order against that item, but it sounds to me like a claim. I wish the acting chairman of the committee would explain why the item was put in here without an estimate.

Mr. CLAPP. In one sense, of course, it is a claim, although not in the ordinary sense of the word. This man entered into a contract to sink a well. He made three attempts, and the third attempt was successful. The department, after reviewing the case, recommends, in view of all the circumstances, that this amount be paid him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in the chair). The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, under the head of "Minnesota," on page 23, line 12, before the word "thousand," to strike out "four" and insert "five"; in line 16, after the word "sheds," to insert "for the construction of a drain from the head of Pipestone Falls east in the bed of the creek to a point where it turns south, from thence east to the section line, $1,500"; and, in line 20, before the word "hundred," to strike out "forty-three thousand six" and insert "forty-six thousand one," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 225 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Pipestone, Minn., and for pay of superintendent, $39,175; for general repairs and improvements, $5,500, $1,500 of which shall be used for the installation of an electric-lighting system and $500 of which shall be used for the construction of coal sheds; for the construction of a drain from the head of Pipestone Falls east in the bed of the creek to a point where it turns south, from thence east to the section line, $1,500; in all, $46,175."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 19, to insert:

"That there is hereby appropriated the sum of $700 in addition to the $1,000 heretofore appropriated for the construction of a bridge across Clearwater River, on the Red Lake Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I make the point of order on that amendment, but I would like to ask if the bridge is wholly within an Indian reservation. If so, I shall withdraw the point.

Mr. CLAPP. It is on the reservation. The appropriation of $1,000 was made a year ago, and it was found that it was not sufficient, so that the committee inserted an item carrying the additional $700.

Mr. CURTIS. I withdraw the point of order.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, at the top of page 25, to insert:

"That there is hereby appropriated, out of any funds in the possession of the United States and belonging to the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000, of which $85,000 shall be used to procure a site or sites and thereon to construct, furnish, and equip a building or buildings to be used as a hospital or hospitals as hereinafter directed; and of which $15,000 shall be used for the operation and maintenance of the said hospital during the 12 months next after its completion."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, to save the time of reading, I should like to make a point of order against the amendments commencing at the top of page 25 and ending on page 28, line 9.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I must concede that the point is well taken. In view of that, I do not see any necessity of taking the time of the Senate with the full reading. Of course, I should like to have the items in the bill, but they are undoubtedly subject to the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

The remaining amendments ruled out on the point of order were, on page 25, after line 10, to insert:

"That the said hospital or hospitals shall be called the Minnesota Chippewa Hospital and shall be open to all Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota who can qualify for admission as hereinafter provided. It shall be under the control and government of a board of directors, who shall be called the board of governors of the Minnesota Chippewa Hospital. Said board shall consist of three members, one of whom shall be the secretary of the State board of health of Minnesota, who shall be ex officio chairman of said board of governors, and two of whom shall serve for a term of five years, one to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and one to be chosen by the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota.

"The representative of the Indians on said board shall be selected by a council of the Indians, to meet at White Earth, Minn., consisting of delegates from the several bands of Chippewa Indians in Minnesota, each band being entitled to 1 delegate for each 100 members or major fraction thereof. The said board of governors shall meet at the hospital as occasion requires, and at least once every two months. As compensation the said governors shall receive $3 per day while attending meetings of the board and their actual and necessary traveling expenses within the State of Minnesota.

"That immediately upon the approval of this act and the selection of the board of governors, or a majority thereof, the said board shall proceed to acquire a suitable site in the State of Minnesota and thereon construct, furnish, and equip the said hospital. The title of the said site or sites shall be taken in the name of the board of governors of the Minnesota Chippewa Hospital as trustees for the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota. One part or building of said hospital shall be adapted for and devoted to the care of patients afflicted with tuberculosis; one part or building shall be adapted for and devoted to the care of patients afflicted with contagious or infectious diseases; one part or building shall be adapted for and devoted to the care of patients suffering from old age, debility, or other bodily infirmities. Said board of governors shall also immediately appoint one physician, without regard to civil-service rules or requirements, who shall be regularly qualified to practice in the State of Minnesota, who shall receive a salary not exceeding $3,500 per annum, and who shall be selected without regard to civil-service rules. The said physician shall give his entire time, from the date of appointment, to the said hospital, first in its construction and later in its operation. He shall be the attending physician and known as the superintendent.

"That admission to the said hospital shall be upon the order of a majority of the board of governors, save in emergency cases admission may be on the order of the superintendent, subject to approval by the board at its next meeting. Only the following, who are also Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota, shall be entitled to admission for care and treatment.

"Indians afflicted with tuberculosis or some contagious, infectious, or fatal diseases.

"Indians who by reason of age or bodily infirmities are unable to earn a livelihood and who have not means with which to procure necessaries.

"Applications may be made by anyone in person or by others on behalf of such person, which application shall set forth the facts of the case, and be accompanied by a certificate setting forth the merits of the case signed by a physician. Discharge from the hospital shall be by order of the board of governors."

That the said board of governors shall appoint such hospital attendants as may be needed in the operation of said hospital and make such rules and regulations and perform such other acts as may be appropriate or necessary in said operation and not inconsistent with the provisions of this act.

"This appropriation shall be immediately available and all moneys drawn hereunder shall be drawn from the Treasury of the United States upon vouchers signed by the chairman of said board of governors."

The next amendment was, under the head of "Montana," on page 28, line 13, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifteen" and insert "twenty-five," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and civilization of the Indians at Fort Belknap Agency, Mont., including pay of employees, $25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 5, before the word "hundred," to strike out "two" and insert "four," so as to read:

"For continuing the construction of irrigation systems to irrigate the allotted lands of the Indians of the Flathead Reservation, in Montana, and the unallotted irrigable lands to be disposed of under authority of law, including the necessary surveys, plans, and estimates, $400,000."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I hope that amendment will not be agreed to. The estimate was only $250,000. It seems to me that without an estimate or a statement from the department, that that amount of money is needed, it is too large an increase to make to go from $200,000 to $400,000. I, for one, would have no objection to the department being given what they estimated—$250,000—but I hope the amendment making the amount $400,000 will be disagreed to.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Mr. President, before that is disagreed to I should like to have the report read in reference to that particular section. I am assuming that there is a report on it, and that the reason is given for the additional amount.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator from North Dakota desires, I will read the paragraph of the report relating to this item:

"The amendment on page 28, line 10, increasing the appropriation for the construction of the irrigation system on the Flathead Indian Reservation from $200,000 to $400,000, $50,000 to be made available, and striking out lines 13 to 16 of said item, was reported on favorably by the department under date of April 4, 1912. The department is of the opinion that it is more economical to expend larger sums during shorter periods so as to complete the project at the earliest date practicable. Overhead charges on large projects remain about the same, whether the amount expended be large or small. The department is also of the opinion that the work should not be limited to any particular unit, as that would cause discontent among Indians on other units within the reservation."

Mr. MCCUMBER. I think there was some testimony before the committee on that particular question.

Mr. CLAPP. There was.

Mr. MCCUMBER. If I remember rightly, the purport of the testimony was in effect that it would be a considerable saving to the Government to appropriate the necessary amount now and to continue and complete the work as soon as possible; and it was necessary to appropriate the full amount in order that we might have a completion and save the work that had already been done on the project. I confess that I am not entirely clear as to what the testimony was on that line, but I think it justified the committee in asking that the sum be added at the present time as proposed.

Mr. CLAPP. The statement of the Senator from North Dakota is practically the evidence we had before the committee, and the same consideration applies to some other items. The Indian Office was of the opinion that it would result in an economy in the end to have the appropriation made now instead of stringing it out at later periods.

Mr. CURTIS. In view of the fact that the Montana Senators are absent, I suggest that we pass over the Montana amendments and take them all up at one time. I understand there are other amendments in the bill to be passed over, and I presume there will be no objection to this course.

Mr. CLAPP. There is no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the amendments under the heading "Montana" will be passed over for the present.

The next amendment, after those passed over, was, under the head of "Nebraska," on page 34, line 5, before the word "thousand," to strike out "three" and insert "six," and in line 10, before the word "thousand," to strike out "sixty-five" and insert "sixty-eight," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 300 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Genoa, Nebr., and for pay of superintendent, $52,100; for general repairs and improvements, $6,000; to complete the construction of two dormitories provided for in the Indian appropriation act of March 3, 1911, $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available; in all, $68,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 10, to insert:

"For construction of septic tank on sewer main at the Indian school at Genoa, Nebr., $1,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 13, to insert:

"For cottage for superintendent of Indian school at Genoa, Nebr., $4,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 15, to insert:

"For additions to hospital and office at the Genoa Indian School, Genoa, Nebr., $3,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 18, to insert:

"That jurisdiction be, and hereby is, conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render final judgment for any balance found due the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Bands of Sioux Indians, otherwise known as Santee Sioux Indians, with right of appeal as in other cases, for any annuities which may be due to said bands of Indians under and by virtue of the treaties between said bands of Indians and the United States, dated September 29, 1837 (7 Stat. L., 538), and August 5, 1851 (10 Stat. L., 954), as if the act of forfeiture of the annuities of said bands, approved February 16, 1863, had not been passed: *Provided*, That the court, in rendering judgment, shall ascertain and include therein the amount of accrued annuities under the treaty of September 29, 1837, up to the date of the passage of this act and shall determine and include the present value of the same, not including interest, and the capital sum of said annuity, which shall be in lieu of said perpetual annuity granted in said treaty; and to ascertain and set off against any amount found due under said treaties all moneys paid to said Indians or expended for their benefit by the Government of the United States since the treaties were abrogated by the act of 1863, except such amounts as have been paid them under the treaty of 1868 or for an otherwise adequate consideration.

"That upon the rendition of such judgment, and in conformity therewith, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to determine which of said Indians now living took part in said outbreak, and to prepare a roll of the persons entitled to share in said judgment by placing on said roll the names of all living members of the said bands residing in the United States at the time of the passage of this act, excluding therefrom the names of those found to have participated in the outbreak; and he is directed to distribute the proceeds of such judgment, except as hereinafter provided, per capita, to the persons borne on the said roll.

"Proceedings shall be commenced by petition verified by one of the attorneys who have been heretofore or may be hereafter employed by said bands of Indians to prosecute their claims under this act under a contract which has been approved or which shall hereafter be approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior as provided by law, upon information and belief as to the existence of the facts stated in said petition, and no other verification shall be necessary. Upon final determination of the cause the Court of Claims shall decree such fees as the court shall find to be reasonable upon a quantum meruit for services performed or to be performed to be paid to the attorney or attorneys so employed by the said bands of Indians and their associates, and the same shall be paid out of the balance found to be due said bands of Indians when an appropriation therefor shall have been made by Congress: *Provided*, That in no case shall the fees decreed by the court amount in the aggregate to more than 10 per cent of the amount of the judgment recovered, and in no event shall the aggregate amount exceed $25,000: *Provided further*, That the court shall by its decree distribute such fees equitably between the attorneys who have been or may hereafter be employed by said bands of Indians in said cause."

Mr. CURTIS. I make the point of order against the amendment beginning on line 17, page 34, and ending line 5, page 37. It is general legislation and subject to a point of order under Rule XVI.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I wish to suggest that this is a provision, as I understand it, to carry out a treaty stipulation, and if it is to carry out a treaty stipulation it removes it from the operation of the rule relating to general legislation.

Mr. CURTIS. This identical question has been raised upon two different occasions on amendments similar to this, and each time the point of order was sustained on the ground that it was general legislation. If the Senator desires, I can get those authorities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is inclined to believe that if it is to carry out a treaty stipulation, as suggested by the Senator from North Dakota, the point of order is not well taken under Rule XVI.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this is simply a claim against the Government. It repeals a law which was passed, as I recollect it, in 1863, which repealed the treaty and took away from these Indians their rights to annuities and other rights under the treaty. That treaty was done away with in 1863; the right was taken away; and now by this bill it is proposed to give these Indians an opportunity to go into court to have their rights reestablished. It virtually repeals the act of 1863.

Furthermore, on page 36, line 8, it provides for the employment of attorneys which is not provided for in any treaty with any Indians, and it provides for fixing the fees of the attorneys, which are not provided for in any treaty with the Indians. As I said before, this same question was raised on an identical claim upon two former occasions in the Senate, and the point of order was sustained.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I think the Senator is a little in error about the amendment repealing any other law. This case grew out of the Indian massacre in Minnesota in 1862. Prior to that time a treaty had been entered into between the United States and the Wahpeton and Sisseton Bands of Sioux Indians. Under that agreement, as I now recall it, certain annuities were to be paid to those Indians. A provision was contained in the treaty requiring the Indians as a nation to keep peace with the United States, and, I think, with a provision in it for the abrogation of the annuity in case the tribe as a nation did not maintain peace with the United States.

In 1862, while the Civil War was in progress, a certain number of the Wahpeton and Sisseton Bands of Indians and of the bands mentioned here committed heinous depredations upon white settlers. The President of the United States then, as I remember, by an order, abrogated the treaty, and it was not done by a legislative act. I stand ready to be corrected in that respect if I am in error.

Mr. CURTIS. The amendment itself says:

"With right of appeal as in other cases, for any annuities which may be due to said bands of Indians under and by virtue of the treaties between said bands of Indians and the United States, dated September 29, 1837 (7 Stat. L., 538), and August 5, 1851 (10 Stat. L., 954), as if the act of forfeiture of the annuities of said bands approved February 16, 1863, had not been passed."

In other words, this act repeals the act of 1863.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Let us suppose that that is all true and that an act was passed repealing another act. The original act was a treaty. The treaty was a contract between the Government of the United States and the Sioux Nation of Indians. The treaty took certain lands of the Indians and in consideration agreed to pay them certain annuities for a given number of years. There was a contract fully executed upon the part of the Sioux Nation and the United States. The Sioux Nation relinquished its claim to a very large section of the country. The annuities fell due. The annuities were paid for a given number of years. They were paid until this uprising by a number of the bands Then the question arose, and it was the only question, whether or not the act of the depredators was an act by the nation. Congress, acting rather hurriedly, and influenced undoubtedly by the atrocities of the Indians in that massacre, passed the act referred to, which abrogated the treaty.

Now, Mr. President, after these many years and the blood of the nation is allowed to cool, I think the country generally concedes that we were hasty and unjust in punishing the entire Sioux Nation for the acts of some of their followers who could not be controlled by the old leaders of the nation.

Therefore, the treaty itself in all moral law still exists, and the question before us is whether we shall, notwithstanding this abrogation, fulfill the treaty stipulation. It is based upon a treaty; it is to carry out the terms of a treaty; and the fact that we may have been hasty in passing a law abrogating that treaty would not take it without the rule.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the point that was raised in the Fifty-fourth Congress, second session:

"On motion by Mr. Allen to further amend the same bill by inserting, after line 6, page 34"—

And if the Chair will read the amendment he will see that the amendments are almost identical—

"That the Santee Sioux Indians of Nebraska and the Flandreau Sioux of South Dakota, formerly known as and being a confederacy of the Medawakanton and Wapakoota Sioux Indians, be, and they are hereby, restored to all rights, privileges, and benefits they and their ancestors had and enjoyed under the treaty entered into September 29, 1837, at the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, between Joel R. Poinsett, on behalf of the Government of the United States, and the Medawakanton Sioux Indians, by certain of their chief men, proclaimed June 15, 1838, and the treaty entered into between the United States, through Luke Lea and Alexander Ramsey, as commissioners, and the Medawakanton and Wapakoota Sioux Indians, by certain of their chief men and proclaimed by Millard Fillmore as President of the United States, August 5, 1851, and all treaties and acts of Congress supplementary thereto and amending thereto, etc.

"Mr. Allison raised a question or order, viz: That the amendment proposed general legislation to a general appropriation bill and was not in order under clause 3, Rule XVI.

"The Presiding Officer (Mr. Faulkner in the chair) sustained the point of order."

In another Congress the same amendment was offered and the point of order was again sustained, because it repealed the act of 1863, which took away from the Indians all their right under former treaties. The courts have held that a treaty with the Indians is nothing more than an act of Congress, and it may be repealed, and it was repealed by the act of 1863.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, it is true that the decisions referred to have been made, but the more one studies these acts the more he is inclined to think, with due deference to the presiding officers at the time, that the decisions were not correct. It is also true that Congress arbitrarily, in 1863, did pass an act purporting to forfeit the rights under a treaty between the Government and the Indians. The courts have gone a long ways toward holding that the United States Government can contract with an Indian, the Indian in the Constitution of the United States being recognized as competent to make contracts, because it is one of the functions of Congress to deal with foreign nations and Indian tribes; but the fact remains that without any act on the part of the Indians as a tribe consenting to the act of Congress of 1863 Congress passed that act.

Now, the outbreak of 1862 was perhaps one of the most atrocious in the history of this country, but the evidence was so overwhelming and the sense of gratitude to a part of those Indians who, against the rashness of the younger members of the band, protested and opposed the massacre, and the outbreak of the Indians was so recognized that almost 20 years ago an illustrious predecessor of mine, Senator Davis, on the floor of the Senate demonstrated the injustice of the act of 1863. That act was born of the passions that were engendered by that outbreak.

This measure is not in the nature of creating a claim. It is simply for the purpose of ascertaining what the value of those annuities thus sought to be forfeited by the act of 1863 amounted to. Those annuities were due and they are due to-day under the trems of that treaty.

The only difference between this amendment and an amendment appropriating the money for the annuities is that instead of Congress seeking without any further instrumentalities than they had an ascertainment of the value of the annuities it is proposed to send the matter to the court that the court may investigae the value of the annuities. The fact that it provides for procedure in court is none the less carrying out the terms of the agreement, because we ourselves have abandoned the other process of carrying out the terms of those treaties, which would be for Congress to directly appropriate the money.

That is all I care to say upon the subject. As I said, it engendered a great deal of passion at the time. The outbreak was one of the most diabolical ever known. Yet the people who had been part and parcel of those who suffered so recognized the debt that they owed some of these Indians who opposed the outbreak that 20 years ago, when the feeling had far less died out than it is to-day—and it took time for it to die out—the then senior Senator from that State not only urged this provision, but demonstrated the justice of settling the matter in some way, and surely no more just way can be found than to let the Court of Claims ascertain the value of the annuities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It seems to the Chair that the amendment simply proposes to transfer to the courts the right to determine whether or not there are any annuities due under the treaty. The court can in that same proceeding determine whether the treaty provision has been repealed, as insisted by the Senator from Kansas. If it sustains the repeal there can be no claim and there would be no adjudication or determination.

Mr. CURTIS. But, Mr. President, the provision of the bill provides in so many words that that decision shall be made regardless of the act of Congress repealing the former treaty.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes; that is true, Mr. President. I would not have the occupant of the chair labor under a false impression as to the terms of the amendment. It provides that the court shall entertain the case and act upon it "as if the act of forfeiture of the annuities of said bands, approved February 16, 1863, had not been passed."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In other words, does the Senator think the amendment reinstates the act that was repealed?

Mr. CLAPP. It would amount to a legislative declaration that that act ought not to stand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In view of that situation, the Chair thinks the point of order is well taken. The Chair had not an opportunity to read the amendment, and supposed that it adjudicated the rights of the parties under the treaty if valid, and not to reinstate a treaty that had been repealed. Then it is not an appropriation made in pursuance of any treaty. The point of order is therefore sustained.

The next amendment was, under the head of "New Mexico," on page 37, line 20, before the word "thousand," to strike out "five" and insert "six"; in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "for addition to girls' dormitory, including heating plant, $10,000"; and in line 22, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifty-six" and insert "sixty-seven," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 300 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Albuquerque, N. Mex., and for pay of superintendent, $51,900; for general repairs and improvements, $6,000; for addition to girls' dormitory, including heating plant, $10,000; in all, $67,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 1, before the word "thousand," to strike out "three" and insert "six," and in line 3, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifty-six" and insert "fifty-nine," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 300 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Santa Fe, N. Mex., and for pay of superintendent, $51,900; for general repairs and improvements, $6,000; for water supply, $1,600; in all, $59,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 4, to strike out:

"The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make an investigation of the conditions on the Navajo Indian Reservation at Shiprock, N. Mex., with respect to the necessity of constructing a bridge across the San Juan River at Shiprock on said reservation, and also to cause surveys, plans, and reports to be made, together with an estimated limit cost for the construction of a suitable bridge at that place, and submit his report thereon to Congress on the first Monday in December, 1912, and the sum of $1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated for the purpose herein authorized."

And insert:

"For the construction of a bridge across the San Juan River at Shiprock, N. Mex., on the Navajo Indian Reservation, to be immediately available, $16,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 20, to insert:

"For the pay of one special attorney for the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, and for necessary traveling expenses of said attorney, $4,000, or so much thereof as the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "New York," on page 39, after line 9, to strike out:

"For pay of one special agent, at $1,050; one physician, at $600; and one financial clerk, at $600 per annum, in addition to employees otherwise provided for at the New York Agency; in all, $2,250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "North Carolina," on page 39, line 20, after the word "dollars," to insert "for rebuilding employees' quarters destroyed by fire, $6,000," and in line 22, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty-eight" and insert "thirty-four," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 180 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Cherokee, N. C., and for pay of superintendent, $26,650; for general repairs and improvements, $2,000; for rebuilding employees' quarters destroyed by fire, $6,000; in all, $34,650."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 23, to insert:

"For the purchase of a site at or near the town of Pembroke, Robeson County, N. C., and the erection thereon of a suitable building for a school for the Indians of Robeson County, N. C., the sum of $25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "North Dakota," on page 40, after line 11, to insert:

"To assist members of Turtle Mountain Tribe of Indians in making settlement upon their nonreservation allotments, $100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 18, after the word "dollars," to insert "for the purchase of water and irrigation for the growing of trees, shrubs, and garden truck, $2,500"; and in line 22, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty thousand two hundred" and insert "twenty-two thousand seven hundred," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 100 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Bismarck, N. Dak., and for pay of superintendent, $18,200; for general repairs and improvements, $2,000; for the purchase of water and irrigation for the growing of trees, shrubs, and garden truck, $2,500; in all, $22,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 2, before the word "thousand," to strike out "four" and insert "six"; in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "$2,000 of which shall be immediately available"; and in line 4, before the word "thousand," to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "seventy-four," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 400 Indian pupils at Fort Totten Indian School, Fort Totten, N. Dak., and for pay of superintendent, $68,500; for general repairs and improvements, $6,000; in all, $74,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 5, after the word "hundred," to insert "and fifty"; in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "eighteen thousand two hundred" and insert "twenty-eight thousand five hundred"; in line 9, after the word "improvements," to insert "including fencing of building grounds"; in line 10, before the word "thousand," to strike out "two" and insert "three"; in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "for erection of silo and purchase of ensilage cutter and other farm machinery, $2,000; for purchase of milch cows and other live stock and poultry, $2,000; for erection of hospital building and equipment of same, $25,000"; and in line 16, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty thousand two hundred" and insert "sixty thousand five hundred," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 150 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Wahpeton, N. Dak., and pay of superintendent, $28,500; for general repairs and improvements, including fencing of building grounds, $3,000; for erection of silo and purchase of ensilage cutter and other farm machinery, $2,000; for purchase of milch cows and other live stock and poultry, $2,000; for erection of hospital building and equipment of same, $25,000; in all, $60,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 16, to insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the Indians of the Standing Rock Indian Reservation in the States of North Dakota and South Dakota, immediately after the passage and approval of this act, out of moneys derived from the sale of certain of their lands under the act of May 29, 1908, and now in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of said Indians, a $40 per capita cash payment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Oklahoma," on page 42, line 12, after the word "benefit," to strike out: "and he is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury the further sum of $40,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the funds on deposit to the credit of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, for the construction and equipment of an Indian hospital upon the Fort Sill Indian School Reservation in Oklahoma, to be used only for the benefit of Indians belonging to said tribes; in all, $65,000," so as to make the clause read:

"The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States, at his discretion, the sum of $25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the funds on deposit to the credit of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, for the support of the agency and pay of employees maintained for their benefit."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 20, to insert:

"For the purpose of fitting up the old agency and other buildings of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Agency for hospital purposes and the construction of other hospitals, $20,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 43, to insert:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the administrator of the estate of John W. West, deceased, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States, standing to the credit of the Cherokee Nation of Indians, the sum of $5,000 and interest thereon at the rate of 5 per cent per annum from September 16, 1884, in full payment of the award made by the commission appointed pursuant to the authority contained in the seventh article of the treaty with the Cherokees promulgated August 17, 1846, and which award was approved by the Secretary September 16, 1884, and his action reaffirmed April 26, 1886."

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] asked a question about that item a few moments ago. I suggest that it be passed over until his return.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRANDEGEE in the chair). Is there objection to that request?

Mr. CLAPP. There is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 11, before the word "thousand," to strike out "eight" and insert "nine," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and civilization of the Ponca Indians in Oklahoma, including pay of employees, $9,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 16, before the word "thousand," to strike out "six" and insert "seven," and in line 17, before the word "thousand," to strike out "ninety" and insert "ninety-one," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 500 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Chilocco, Okla., and for pay of superintendent, $83,500; for general repairs and improvements, $7,500; in all, $91,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 17, after the word "Shawnee," to strike out "Agency" and insert "Superintendency," so as to make the clause read:

"For pay of 1 stenographer and typewriter, $900 per annum, in addition to employees otherwise provided for at the Shawnee Superintendency."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 2, to insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to extend for a period of one year the time for the payment of the several annual installments due or hereafter to become due on the purchase price for lands sold under the act of Congress approved June 17, 1910, 'to open to settlement and entry under the general provisions of the homestead laws of the United States certain lands in the State of Oklahoma, and for other purposes': *Provided*, That purchasers shall pay interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum on the deferred payments for the time of the extension herein granted."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Five Civilized Tribes," on page 46, after line 13, to strike out:

"SEC. 18. For expense of administration of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, and the compensation of employees, $150,000: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, no money shall be expended from the tribal funds belonging to the Five Civilized Tribes, except for schools, without specific appropriation by Congress."

And insert:

"SEC. 18. For expenses of administration of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, and the compensation of employees, $174,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 47, to insert:

"For salaries and expenses of district agents for the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma and other employees connected with the work of such agents, $100,000: *Provided*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, no moneys shall be expended from the tribal funds belonging to the Five Civilized Tribes except for schools for the ensuing year and for the equalization of allotments, per capita or other payments authorized by law to individual members of the respective tribes, and the salaries and contingent expenses of the governors, chiefs, assistant chiefs, secretaries, interpreters, and mining trustees of the Five Civilized Tribes, and attorneys of said tribes employed under contract approved by the President, without specific appropriation by Congress, except as hereinafter provided: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to continue the tribal schools of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, and to use funds arising from royalties on coal and asphalt for their maintenance."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 19, to insert:

"For payment of salaries of employees and other expenses of advertisement and sale in connection with the disposition of the unallotted lands and other tribal property belonging to any of the Five Civilized Tribes, to be paid from the proceeds of such sales when authorized by the Secretary of the Interior, as provided by the act approved March 3, 1911, not exceeding $25,000, reimbursable from proceeds of sale."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 2, to insert:

"For expenses incident to and in connection with collection of tribal revenues, including rent of unallotted lands, such amount as may be necessary: *Provided, however,* That such expenditures shall not exceed in the aggregate 20 per cent of the amount collected."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 7, to insert:

"For traveling expenses of appraisers of the surface of the Choctaw and Chickasaw coal and asphalt segregated lands, $5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided,* That the houses and other valuable and permanent improvements placed upon the segregated coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, in the State of Oklahoma, by private individuals and not purchased by the Indian nations shall be scheduled to the present owners thereof, and shall be appraised independently of the surface of the land on which they are located; and if the owners of such improvements fail to buy the surface of the lands on which their improvements are located at the highest bid, said improvements shall be sold with the lands at the appraised value with the surface of the land, and the owners of such improvements shall receive out of such purchase money the appraised value of said improvements."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 23, to insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to accept payment to the full amount of the purchase money due, including interest to date of payment, on any town lots originally sold as provided in agreements with any of the Five Civilized Tribes and declared forfeited by reason of nonpayment of amount due and not resold."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 16, after the date "1910," to strike out "to March 1, 1912," so as to make the clause read:

"The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to pay, out of the funds of the Chickasaw Indians now on deposit in the Treasury of the United States, to Douglas H. Johnston, governor of said nation, the sum of $3,000 per annum from March 1, 1910."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, after line 17, to insert:

"For the construction of a sanitary sewer system in Platt National Park, Okla., to be immediately available and expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, $35,000."

Mr. CLAPP. On page 50, line 19, in the amendment of the committee, I move to strike out the words "immediately available and."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 50, line 19, after the words "to be," in the amendment of the committee, it is proposed to strike out the words "immediately available and," so as to read:

"To be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. I simply want to call the attention of the acting chairman of the committee to the fact that while that item was estimated for in the sundry civil appropriation bill, I have no objection to it going into this bill; but I think that fact ought to be noted in the RECORD, so that it will be left out of the sundry civil bill.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes; that is true. The item ought not to go into the sundry civil bill.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 50, after line 21, to insert:

"The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to the heirs or legal representatives of John W. Noble and R. V. Belt the sum of $3,569.95, for legal services rendered to and expenses incurred on behalf of members of the Lyman family, Osage allottees, under contract made pursuant to section 2103 and the following of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and duly approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, said sum to be paid as provided for in the contract out of individual funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the members of said Lyman family."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, after line 9, to insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to satisfy of record the judgments rendered in the district court of Oklahoma, for the eighth judicial district, on December 15, 1911, in favor of Albert J. Lee and against Jack Postoak, in the sum of $1,448, by the payment thereof out of any funds that may now or hereafter be to the credit of the heirs of Bessie Postoak; against King Isaacs and others, in the sume of $1,449, by the payment thereof out of any funds that may now or hereafter be to the credit of the heirs of Roger Isaacs; against Thompson Peters, in the sum of $1,476, by the payment thereof out of any funds that may now or hereafter be to the credit of the heirs of Sookie Peters; and against Zeno Huff, in the sum of $732, by the payment thereof out of any funds that may now or hereafter be to the credit of said Zeno Huff."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, after line 2, to insert:

"The fund of $390,257.92, placed to the credit of the Choctaw Indians by act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. L., 1027), shall draw interest at 5 per cent per annum, and the accrued interest at this rate shall be placed to the credit of the Choctaw Nation."

Mr. CURTIS. I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it proposes general legislation; but I should like to ask the acting chairman why the item was inserted? The existing agreements and treaties do not fix the rate of interest to be paid to these Indians.

Mr. CLAPP. In answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Kansas I will say that the Office of Indian Affairs has asked for this appropriation on the following ground:

"The amendment on page 50, lines 4 to 10, inclusive, providing that the fund of $390,257.92 placed to the credit of the Choctaw Indians by the act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. L., 1037), shall draw interest at 5 per cent per annum and the accrued interest at this rate shall be placed to the credit of the Choctaw Nation, was reported on favorably to the chairman of the Senate committee in letter of April 23, 1912, on H. R. 20728."

Mr. CURTIS. I withdraw the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is withdrawn. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 52, after line 9, to insert:

"For incidental and necessary expenses of any suit heretofore brought at the request of the Secretary of the Interior and now pending on behalf of any of the Five Civilized Tribes, the sum of $10,000 is hereby appropriated to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, reimbursable from funds belonging to the tribe in whose interest such suit was brought, or now pending."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, after line 16, to insert:

"That to carry into effect the agreement between the United States and the Muskogee (Creek) Nation of Indians ratified by act of Congress approved March 1, 1901 (31 Stats., p. 861), and the subsequent agreement of June 30, 1902 (32 Stats., p. 500), and laws providing for a minimum allotment to each Creek citizen whose name has been placed on the rolls by the Government of the United States under the authority of said agreements and laws, of the standard value of $1,040, the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, directed to pay, out of the funds of the said nation now in the Treasury or that may hereafter come into the Treasury to their credit, to each of said Creek citizens placed on the rolls under said agreement and subsequent agreements, a sum sufficient to bring the allotment of land and money to each up to $800 as a part payment on the standard allotment of $1,040; and that jurisdiction be, and is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims, with right of appeal as in other cases, to hear, determine, and render final judgment in the matter of the claim of all citizens of said nation who have received allotments of less than the standard value of $1,040, and to render judgment for a sum of money sufficient to equalize the allotments of each citizen who shall be found to be so entitled up to the standard amount of $1,040; and that the action herein authorized shall be brought in the name of the Muskogee (Creek) Nation against the United States by petition to be filed within six months after the passage of this act, which petition shall be verified by the national attorney of said nation or by the attorney or attorneys employed by said nation to conduct said suit, whose employment is approved by the Department of the Interior in accordance with section 2103 of the Revised Statutes, and the Attorney General shall appear and defend said action; and in rendering judgment in said cause the court shall fix the compensation to be paid to the attorneys upon a quantum meruit for all services rendered in behalf of said Indians in the matter of the claim of all of said citizens for the equalization of their allotments, including services rendered before the departments of the Government, the committees of Congress, and the courts, in and for their interest in this matter in any way rendered, said compensation to be based on a per cent of the amount of said judgment, less any money in the Treasury to the credit of the Creek Nation, not to exceed 10 per cent, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay said sum out of the amount of said judgment or out of any funds of the said nation in the Treasury, and all the remaining funds of said nation not appropriated by the council and approved by the President of the United States (except the sum of $50,000) shall be utilized and applied in any judgment that may be rendered under this act; and the said cause shall be advanced in hearing by the Court of Claims, and by the Supreme Court of the United States if the same shall be appealed."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is clearly legislation, in violation of Rule XVI. A point of order was sustained against the same provision a few years ago when it was offered as an amendment to the then pending Indian appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Upon what ground is the point of order based?

Mr. CURTIS. On the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, it is a fact that the point of order has been heretofore sustained, and in view of the scant attendance this afternoon I shall not take the time of the Senate to discuss it or suggest an appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair the point of order is well taken, and it is sustained.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 54, after line 21, to insert:

"The sum of $300,000, to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him, in aid of the common schools in the Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Seminole Nations in Oklahoma during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Oregon," in section 19, page 55, line 13, after the word "thousand," to insert "six hundred," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and civilization of the Wallawalla, Cayuse, and Umatilla Tribes, Oregon, including pay of employees, $3,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, after line 13, to insert:

"To enable the Secretary of the Interior to construct a bridge and the necessary approaches thereto across the Deschutes River, abutting on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon, at a point to be agreed upon between him and the county court of Crook County, Oreg., the sum of $15,000."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I want to make a point of order against that amendment; but I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], the acting chairman of the committee, or the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], if the bridge is on a river that runs through an Indian reservation, and is it within the reservation?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. A part of it runs through the reservation; but where the bridge is it abuts on the reservation. At the place where the bridge is to be built the bluffs are very precipitous, and the Indians, as they now travel from the reservation, have to go down with their teams to the stream and up these precipitous bluffs.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it to accommodate the Indians on the reservation?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir; almost altogether. A recommendation was made by the department, and the estimates have also been made.

Mr. CURTIS. Then I withdraw the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 56, after line 22, to insert:

"That there be paid to the Tillamook Tribe of Indians of Oregon the sum of $10,500, to be apportioned among those now living and the lineal descendants of those who may be dead, by the Secretary of the Interior, as their respective rights may appear; that there be paid to the Clatsop Tribe of Indians of Oregon the sum of $15,000, to be apportioned among those now living and the lineal descendants of those who may be dead, by the Secretary of the Interior, as their respective rights may appear; that there be paid to the Nuc-quee-clah-we-muck Tribe of Indians of Oregon the sum of $1,500, to be apportioned among those now living and the lineal descendants of those who may be dead, by the Secretary of the Interior, as their respective rights may appear; that there be paid to the Kathlamet Band of Chinook Indians of Oregon the sum of $7,000, to be apportioned among those now living and the lineal descendants of those who may be dead, by the Secretary of the Interior, as their respective rights may appear; that there be paid to the Waukikum Band of Chinook Indians of Washington the sum of $7,000, to be apportioned among those now living and the lineal descendants of those who may be dead, by the Secretary of the Interior, as their respective rights may appear; that there be paid to the Wheelappa Band of Chinook Indians of Washington the sum of $5,000, to be apportioned among those now living and the lineal descendants of those who may be dead, by the Secretary of the Interior, as their respective rights may appear; and that there be paid to the Lower Band of Chinook Indians of Washington the sum of $20,000, to be apportioned among those now living and the lineal descendants of those who may be dead, by the Secretary of the Interior, as their respective rights may appear, and for this purpose there be, and is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $66,000: *Provided*, That said Indians shall accept said sum, or their respective portions thereof, in full satisfaction of all demands or claims against the United States for the lands described in the agreements or unratified treaties between the United States and said Indians dated, respectively, August 7, 1851; August 5, 1851; August 7, 1851; August 9, 1851; August 8, 1851; August 9, 1851; and August 9, 1851: *Provided further*, That if, after investigation by the Secretary, he shall find that all of the Indians of either of said tribes or bands and their lineal descendants are dead, then none of the money hereby appropriated for such tribe or band shall be paid to any person for any purpose: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall find and investigate what attorney or attorneys, if any, have rendered services for or on behalf of said Indians, and shall fix a reasonable compensation to be paid said attorney or attorneys for their services in prosecuting the claims of said Indians hereunder, which compensation, if any, shall be paid out of the sum hereby appropriated, in full payment of services rendered; and the decision of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the attorneys and their compensation shall be final and conclusive: *Provided further*, That before any money is paid to any attorney hereunder, he shall first execute and deliver to the Secretary of the Interior a satisfaction and discharge of all claims and demands for services rendered such Indians in the matter of their claims."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I desire to make a point of order against that amendment, but during the pendency of it I should like to have the Senator from Oregon explain that claim, for the purpose of getting the facts regarding it in the RECORD. As I understand, it is a claim to carry out the provisions of certain unratified treaties. Treaties made and sent to Congress were not ratified, but the Government proceeded to take possession of the lands without paying the Indians.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, that is practically a statement of the facts with reference to the matter as briefly as it can be made. These cases are like numerous other cases of sharp practice that was indulged in against the Indians in the early days on the frontier. It is rather amusing to look back at some of the treaties that were attempted to be entered into. I was just reading one to my colleague on my left [Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama], where, instead of paying the Indians money, it was agreed to give them a silk dress or a calico dress or other such things in consideration for valuable tracts of land.

These particular unratified treaties were negotiated pursuant to the acts of 1850 and 1851, which authorized commissioners to treat with the Indians and to make treaties with them for the cession of valuable tracts of land in Oregon. It had been the purpose and desire of the Government for a great many years to try to get these nomadic tribes of Indians together on one reservation, and in pursuance of that policy these treaties were made with them.

Some of the treaties were ratified, but a great many of them were not ratified by the Senate, because it is supposed, although there is no record to show that fact, that the Indians refused to go on the reservations which had been designated by the Government. They did not care to go long distances from the places where they had been accustomed to live and where they had been accustomed to fish and hunt in times gone by.

To show you how the Government treated these people, Mr. President, I might say here that the claims under those treaties which were ratified by the Senate were paid a long while ago, and these are the only ones not paid. The Indians do not even ask interest on the amount of these claims, which I think are just. For instance, the Clatsop Indians ceded to the United States about 500,000 acres of land for a consideration of $15,000, and reserved to themselves only about 4,000 acres. The Government of the United States took that 500,000 acres of land and treated it exactly as they have treated other parts of the public domain. They have sold it, and have received the money for it; but, notwithstanding that fact, these claims have not been paid, because the Government says the Senate never ratified the treaties. That land is amongst the most valuable land in the State of Oregon; it is along the timber ridges of the Coast Range of mountains, and now, in private hands, is worth all the way from $50 to $500 an acre.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That same statement might be made with reference to all these claims. Mr. President, I am truly glad that the Senator has withdrawn the point of order, because these claims have been hung up here in the Senate for years, and ought to have been paid a long time ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas withdraws the point of order, and, without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, under the head of "Pennsylvania," in section 20, on page 59, line 18, before the word "thousand," to strike out "nine" and insert "twenty"; and in line 22, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one hundred and forty-eight thousand five hundred" and insert "one hundred and fifty-nine thousand five hundred," so as to make the clause read:

"SEC. 20. For support and education of Indian pupils at the Indian school at Carlisle, Pa., and for pay of superintendent, $132,000; for general repairs and improvements, $20,000; for completing steam-heating plant, $7,500, to be immediately available; in all, $159,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "South Dakota," in section 21, on page 60, line 2, after the word "dollars," to insert "for the construction and equipment of a gymnasium building, $8,000"; and in line 5, before the word "thousand," to strike out "sixty-six" and insert "seventy-four," so as to make the clause read:

"SEC. 21. For support and education of 365 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Flandreau, S. Dak., and for pay of superintendent, $61,500; for the construction and equipment of a gymnasium building, $8,000; for general repairs and improvements, $5,000; in all, $74,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 10, before the word "thousand" where it occurs the first time, to strike out "six" and insert "seven"; and in the same line, before the word "thousand" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "thirty-eight" and insert "thirty-nine," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 175 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Pierre, S. Dak., and for pay of superintendent, $32,000; for general repairs and improvements, $7,000; in all, $39,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 16, before the word "thousand," to strike out "eight" and insert "nine"; in line 17, after the word "dollars," to insert "for a new school building, $35,000; for remodeling boys' building, $5,000"; and in line 21, before the word "dollars," to strike out "sixty-one thousand five hundred" and insert "one hundred and two thousand five hundred," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 250 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Rapid City, S. Dak., and for pay of superintendent, $48,500; for general repairs and improvements, $9,000; for completion and extension of heating plant, $5,000; for a new school building, $35,000; for remodeling boys' building, $5,000; in all, $102,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 9, after the word "dollars," to insert "for general repairs and improvements of agency buildings, $10,000; in all, $24,000," so as to make the clause read:

"For subsistence and civilization of the Yankton Sioux, South Dakota, $14,000; for general repairs and improvements of agency buildings, $10,000; in all, $24,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendmen was, at the top of page 64, to insert:

"To complete the work of straightening the Duchesne River within the limits of the town site of Duchesne, in the State of Utah, $2,000, to be immediately available and to be reimbursed to the United States out of the proceeds of the sale of lands within the ceded Uinta Indian Reservation opened to entry under the act of May 27, 1902, including the sales of lots within the said town site of Duchesne."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if the town of Duchesne, referred to in the amendment, is an Indian town or embraces Indian lands?

Mr. CLAPP. I understand it is within the reservation.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the land being sold for the benefit of the Indians?

Mr. CLAPP. Well, some of the lands are being sold. They were taken by allotment. The item is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior as necessary in order to serve the interests of the Indians on that reservation.

Mr. CURTIS. I will not make a point of order, then, against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 64, after line 8, to insert:

"VIRGINIA.

"SEC. 23. For support and education of 120 Indian pupils at the school at Hampton, Va., $20,040."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Washington," on page 64, line 21, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one thousand" and insert "one thousand five hundred," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and civilization of the Qui-nai-elts and Quil-leh-utes, including pay of employees, $1,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 5, before the word "thousand," to strike out "thirteen" and insert "eighteen," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and civilization of Indians at Colville and Puyallup Agencies, Wash., for pay of employees, and for purchase of agricultural implements, and support and civilization of Joseph's Band of Nez Perce Indians in Washington, $18,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 13, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifteen" and insert "seventy-five," so as to make the clause read:

"For extension and maintenance of the irrigation system on lands allotted to Yakima Indians in Washington, $75,000, reimbursable in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 1, 1907."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, after line 15, to insert:

"For support and education of 300 Indian pupils at the Cushman Indian School, Tacoma, Wash., including repairs and improvements, and for pay of superintendent, $50,000, said appropriation being made to supplement the Puyallup School funds used for said school."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, after line 21, to insert:

"That for the purpose of constructing storage reservoirs to impound flood waters of the Yakima River to provide 1,500 cubic feet of water per second of time at the reservation gates for the irrigation of 120,000 acres, more or less, on the Yakima Indian Reservation, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $1,600,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended in said works by the Reclamation Service."

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, on page 65, line 23, in the committee amendment just stated, I offer an amendment which has been suggested

by the department. I will say that the chairman of the committee requested me to look after the matter.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. We might as well close the matter up now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 65, line 23, after the word "provide," it is proposed to strike out "1,500 cubic feet of water per second of time" and insert "for the total diversion of 516,000 acre-feet of stored water and natural flow during each irrigation season"; and on page 66, line 4, before the word "thousand," to strike out "six" and insert "eight," so as to make the clause read:

"That for the purpose of constructing storage reservoirs to impound flood waters of the Yakima River to provide for the total diversion of 516,000 acre-feet of stored water and natural flow during each irrigation season at the reservation gates for the irrigation of 120,000 acres, more or less, on the Yakima Indian Reservation, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $1,800,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended in said works by the Reclamation Service."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 66, after line 6, to insert:

"That the lands within the project on the Yakima Indian Reservation owned by Indians in fee or otherwise to the extent of 32,000 acres, estimated to be necessary for the support of Indians allotted within the project, for which a water supply of 400 cubic feet per second of time is required, shall receive water free of any and all cost or charge on account of said storage works."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, after line 13, to insert:

"That other lands under Indian ownership to the extent of 70,000 acres additional, more or less, shall bear the proportionate acreage cost for providing said storage waters in the river, except that provided for in the preceding paragraph, which cost shall be a charge against said lands to be paid on such terms and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, after line 2, to insert:

"That the claims for water of the owners of the remaining area of 18,000 acres, more or less, of irrigable Indian land, the Indian title to which has been extinguished, shall be equitably adjusted by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That any payments by owners of said lands on account of said storage works shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, after line 2, to insert:

"That the owners of irrigable lands within the project shall pay the proportionate cost of the distribution and drainage systems upon such terms as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That no water shall be furnished as herein provided for until the owners of deeded or sold lands and Indians holding lands in fee benefited thereby shall have agreed to pay such proportionate share, such payments when received to be a part of the tribal funds of the Yakima Indians."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Wisconsin," on page 67, line 17, before the word "thousand," to strike out "two," and insert "three"; in the same line, after the word "building," to strike out "an addition" and insert "additions"; in line 18, after the word "to," to strike out "dormitory" and insert "dormitories"; in line 19, before the word "dollars," to strike out "sixteen," and insert "twenty"; and in line 19, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifty-four" and insert "fifty-nine," so as to make the clause read:

"SEC. 25. For the support and education of 210 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Hayward, Wis., and pay of superintendent, $36,670; for general repairs and improvements, $3,000; for building additions to dormitories, $20,000; in all, $59,670."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 1, before the word "thousand," to strike out "three" and insert "seven"; and in line 2, before the word "thousand," to strike out "forty-eight" and insert "fifty-two," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 250 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Tomah, Wis., and for pay of superintendent, $43,450; for repairing and rebuilding barn, $2,500; for general repairs and improvements, $7,000; in all, $52,950."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, after line 4, to insert:

"For support, education, and civilization of the Pottawatomie Indians who reside in the State of Wisconsin, $9,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, after line 7, to insert:

"The time provided for bringing suits under the fifth paragraph of section 26 of the act approved April 4, 1910, entitled 'An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911 (36 Stat. L., p. 287),' be, and the same is hereby, extended to the 30th day of June, 1913."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, after line 17, to insert:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of the sum of $1,500,000 set aside and held in the Treasury of the United States for the use and benefit of the Colville Indians under the provisions of an act approved June 21, 1906 (34 Stat. L., p. 337), the sum of $45,000 to Hugh H. Gordon for his individual services in behalf of said Indians, which sum of $45,000 is hereby appropriated for said Gordon's exclusive use and benefit out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the same shall be charged against the funds set aside for the benefit of said Indians."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I make the point of order against that amendment, as being in violation of paragraph 3 of Rule XVI. It is general legislation on an Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I will ask the Presiding Officer to withhold his ruling in deference to the absence of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON]. With that understanding let the amendment be passed over for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the point of order made by the Senator from Kansas will be entered and further action on the matter deferred until the Senator from Georgia is present.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, under the head of "Wyoming," on page 69, line 12, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty-one thousand and twenty-five" and insert "thirty-two thousand five hundred"; in line 13, before the word "thousand," to strike out "three" and insert "four"; and in line 15, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty-four thousand and twenty-five" and insert "thirty-six thousand five hundred," so as to make the clause read:

"For support and education of 175 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Shoshone Reservation, Wyo., and for pay of superintendent, $32,500; for general repairs and improvements, $4,000; in all, $36,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, after line 21, to insert:

"For continuing the work of road and bridge construction on the Shoshone Reservation, Wyo., $20,000, reimbursable in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1905."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I desire, if I may be permitted to do so, to recur to page 17 of the bill where, commencing with line 14, there is an amendment reported by the committee which was discussed a few moments ago, and against which a point of order, made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], was sustained.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. If it can be done, I desire to withdraw the point of order and let the question come upon the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Arizona to ask unanimous consent to recur to the amendment on page 17, beginning with line 14. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent to withdraw the point of order which he made against the amendment and which was sustained. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The point of order is withdrawn, and, without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, under the heading "Utah," and after the items now in the bill under that heading, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To come after all the provisions in regard to Utah?

Mr. CLAPP. Yes, sir. In support of the amendment I desire to make a short statement.

This matter was referred to the Court of Claims. The court entered a judgment. Prior to the matter going to the court the amount due the Indians was drawing interest payable annually and was paid annually, but when it was merged into a judgment the comptroller held that he could not any longer pay interest except by direct authority of the Congress. This amendment is in part to cover that.

In connection with that it appears that a great many of these Indians have allotments upon which irrigation rights attach, subject to forfeiture if the improvements are not carried on. In addition to that it appears that many Indians require help in the matter of making improvements, getting stock, and so forth. So the department recommended an appropriation to cover this whole matter, to be used in the judgment and discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota.

The SECRETARY. On page 64, after line 8, it is proposed to insert:

"That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,305,257.19, being the net amount of a judgment rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, dated February 13, 1911, exclusive of the amount awarded for attorney's fee, pursuant to the provisions of the jurisdictional act approved March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. L., p. 788), the same to bear interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum from and after the date of said judgment, the amount thereof and the interest accruing thereon to be available for cash payments to the Indians or for expenditures for their benefit, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior (Mar. 3, 1909)."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, under the heading "Oklahoma," at the end of the provisions already in the bill under that heading, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Under the head of "Oklahoma," subhead "Five Civilized Tribes," on page 55, after line 3, it is proposed to insert:

"For the purpose of reimbursing the trust funds of the Kickapoo Community in Mexico, said fund having been created under the provisions of the act of Congress of April 30, 1908 (35 Stat. L., 89), for legal expenses necessarily incurred in defending said community, its funds, lands, and members from fraud, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Okemah, who is now trustee of said community, the sum of $41,000, the same to be immediately available."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to hear that amendment explained. It is a private claim.

Mr. CLAPP. The explanation of the amendment is this: Some years ago these people had lands in Oklahoma. While it would take some time to go through the details of the litigation, these Indians were subjected to a great deal of expense that was unfair and unjust. They are now in Mexico, and in need not only of this item but the item of their lease money, which has not been paid them and which is due them. In order to clean up both matters, I have offered this amendment to reimburse them; and I desire to offer one directing the Indian Office to pay their lease money over to them.

Mr. LODGE. Does this money go to the Indians?

Mr. CLAPP. It goes to the Indians; yes, sir. I want to say that from all the information I have been able to get, those Indians, after they went down to Mexico, became a contented, satisfied band of Indians and, in the main, are doing well. I have made inquiries from time to time about them—of course, the evidence which I have is all hearsay—and I believe it was a blessing to those Indians that we allowed them to go down there. They have these two items left; and the purpose of this amendment is to clean up the matter, so that we may be through with it.

Mr. LODGE. I made the inquiry because of the statement I saw in one of the hearings—that of the $2,000 heretofore appropriated for the

Kickapoos, I think, only $45 reached the Indians. The rest went in salaries.

Mr. CLAPP. That is too true with reference to their agency in Oklahoma. I have no hesitation in saying, from the evidence I have obtained in these matters, that those Indians are infinitely better off in Mexico and come much nearer getting a fair return for what is theirs and due them than they ever did while they were under the jurisdiction of our own Government.

Mr. LODGE. If this money goes to them, Mr. President, I have no objection to the appropriation; but I do think, in view of the appropriation of $2,000 for the benefit of the Kickapoo Indians, of which all but $45 was spent in the expense of distribution, that we ought to be careful to see that this money goes to the Indians.

Mr. CLAPP. So far as the law can safeguard it, this amendment provides that the money shall be paid over to them.

Mr. LODGE. I do not want it all absorbed in the salaries of agents.

Mr. CLAPP. No, sir; I am as anxious to avoid that as is the Senator.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLAPP. In addition to that, I am going to ask for the adoption of an amendment to pay over their lease money to them. I send the proposed amendment to the Secretary's desk.

The SECRETARY. After the amendment just agreed to it is proposed to insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to immediately cause to be deposited to the credit of the Indian owner in the First National Bank of Douglas, Ariz., all money known as lease money now on deposit with or in any manner under the control of the agents and officers of the Interior Department and all like money due or becoming due or collectible by them prior to the 1st day of January, 1914, and belonging to any of the Mexican Kickapoo Indians now resident in the Republic of Mexico. The receipt by such bank for any such money shall operate as the receipt of the Indian owner and as a complete release of all liability on the part of the officer paying the said money as herein directed."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLAPP. Now, Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. I regret I have no statement concerning it. It was handed me by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN]. Perhaps it may be well to offer it and let it lie on the table until he returns.

The SECRETARY. On page 21, after line 9, it is proposed to insert the following:

"For the construction of buildings for agency headquarters on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation in Idaho, $30,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota asks that the amendment lie upon the table. Without objection, it will lie upon the table.

Mr. CLAPP. I now offer the amendment I send to the desk, and ask for the reading of the letter from the Interior Department in regard to it.

The SECRETARY. Under the head of "South Dakota," on page 62, after line 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

"The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to A. C. Brink, of Pierre, S. Dak., the sum of $128.68 on account of repairs to a gas engine made while said engine was rented by him to the superintendent of the Pierre Indian School, and being used during September and October, 1911, in digging a test well for the purpose of securing a water supply for that school, and to charge said amount to the appropriation for Indian school, Pierre, S. Dak., water supply."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In that connection, the Secretary will read the letter from the Secretary of the Interior in relation thereto.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
*Washington, June 24, 1912.*

Hon. CHARLES H. BURKE,
*House of Representatives.*

SIR: Answering your letter of June 17, 1912, relative to claim in favor of A. C. Brink, I have the honor to advise you that the bill originally consisted of a charge of $50 for 10 days' rental of a gas engine, which amount was allowed by the Auditor for the Interior Department, and of $128.68 for repairs on the engine while it was being used by the Government. As the agreement for the rental of the engine did not expressly specify that the repairs should be made at the expense of the Government and as their necessity appears to have been due, in part, to the negligence of the Government employees, the auditor held, following the decision of the comptroller dated March 26, 1912, in case of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co., that the damages were unliquidated and, therefore, were not of such a nature as the executive departments are authorized to settle. The amount of $128.68 was, therefore, disallowed by him.

Mr. Brink, the claimant, has a legal right to appeal to the Comptroller of the Treasury at any time within one year from the date of settlement, which was April 24, 1912.

However, as the statutory authorization suggested by you would probably be more effective in the settlement of his claim, an item has been prepared as requested and is transmitted herewith so that you may take such action as you consider proper in the matter. The office deems the charge a just one and recommends its payment.

Respectfully,

F. H. ABBOTT,
*Acting Commissioner.*

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLAPP. On page 43, at the suggestion of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], we passed the item proposing to pay $5,000 to the estate of John W. West, beginning with line 1, going down to and including line 15. I desire to call up that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota moves to recur to page 43, lines 1 to 15, inclusive, the amendment which was temporarily passed over during the absence of the Senator from North Dakota. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The amendment is before the Senate. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. I simply asked that it be passed over because the Senator from North Dakota was not here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has now been recurred to. Does the Senator still ask that it be passed over?

Mr. CLAPP. No; I move the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, owing to the absence of some Senators there was an understanding that the bill would not be reported out of the committee to-day. Unless some Senator has an amendment he desires to offer I ask that the bill be laid aside until to-morrow.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, requested the Senate to return to the House of Representatives the bill (H. R. 25069) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes.

The message also informed the Senate that the House of Representatives had elected JOSHUA W. ALEXANDER, a Representative from the State of Missouri, Speaker pro tempore during the temporary absence of the Speaker.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 331) extending appropriations for the necessary operations of the Government under certain contingencies, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRANDEGEE) laid before the Senate the request of the House of Representatives for the return of the bill (H. R. 25069) making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I understand that is a request for the recall of the sundry civil appropriation bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. LODGE. That bill has been referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and it is now under consideration by that committee. I should think the chairman of the committee should be consulted before any action is taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by one of the clerks at the desk that word was sent to the Senator from Wyoming, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and he said he had no objection to the granting of the request of the House.

Mr. LODGE. Then that is sufficient.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the House is complied with.

REGENT OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, which was, on page 1, line 6, after "Fairbanks," to insert "a citizen."

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. 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 five minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. HEYBURN. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, July 2, 1912, at 11 o'clock a. m.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. STONE. I desire to ask that House bill 3321 be now laid before the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. There is still pending before the Senate the resolution all this argument has hinged upon, and under the rules it is still before the Senate. I desire that there shall be some facts given to the Senate in reference to it, and as it is now in order, if the Chair will recognize me, I will present those facts.

Mr. STONE. If the Senator from South Carolina will pardon me, all I desire to do now is to submit the report of the Finance Committee and to ask for an order, and then to lay the matter temporarily aside. The consideration of the resolution of the Senator from South Carolina can be resumed.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. With that understanding, I will yield to the Senator from Missouri, but I should like to have it clearly understood that it is done by unanimous consent in order that the resolution may be disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that as soon as this matter is passed upon, then the resolution of the Senator from South Carolina is to be taken up. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. STONE. Then I will move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. That will make it the unfinished business, which ought to be done.

Mr. STONE. I understand that automatically it makes it the unfinished business.

Mr. GALLINGER. It does.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, it was the intention of the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], to lay before the Senate to-day the

report of the committee to accompany this bill, which was reported several days ago. I regret to say that an unexpected death in the family of the Senator from North Carolina has made his absence from the Senate to-day imperative. At his request I present now the report of the committee (No. 80), stating that I am advised there will be a minority report. I send the report to the desk. The report is somewhat lengthy, and I do not know but that every end will be served if it should be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to ask that the report be printed in the RECORD, because of the fact that it may take some time to have it printed in document form, and Senators will then have it before them to-morrow morning in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and the report will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. STONE. And the formal reading of it will be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be dispensed with.

The report is as follows:

[Senate Report No. 80, Sixty-third Congress, first session.]

TO REDUCE TARIFF DUTIES AND TO PROVIDE REVENUE FOR THE GOVERNMENT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

Mr. STONE (for Mr. SIMMONS), from the Committee on Finance, submitted the following report, to accompany H. R. 3321:

On May 8, 1913, the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue passed the House of Representatives, and on May 12, 1913, it was referred to the Finance Committee. Since that date and up to the time it was reported to the Senate your committee has had this measure under careful scrutiny and analysis.

As a result of this examination and study your committee wishes to give its assent to the soundness of the general principles upon which this measure was originally constructed, as well as the theory upon which the revision of the tariff has proceeded. But while the principles of the proposed revision are conceded and while the general line of their application is believed to be beyond controversy, there have been other phases of the situation which in the judgment of the committee called for further analysis. On certain of these points the inquiries of the committee have confirmed the position taken by the Ways and Means Committee of the House, while on certain others it has been necessary on further inquiry to make additional modifications.

Following the lead of the House, your committee has sought in the amendments it now proposes to the House bill to further carry out and perfect the theory of establishing a revenue-producing tariff upon the basis of competitive rates as a just and fair interpretation in the light of existing conditions of the latest authoritative utterances of the party in power upon that subject, and now submits the result of its labors with the confident belief that the enactment into law of the House bill as amended will result in a more equitable distribution of the burdens and incidental benefits of our system of customs taxation; that it will tend to disintegrate the monopolies built up under the present system; that it will enlarge opportunity to individual effort, reduce the cost of living, and relieve the people from the burdens of the protective system strikingly exemplified in the so-called Payne-Aldrich bill, which this measure is intended to supersede. As reported to the Senate, the bill reflects the collective opinion of the Democratic Senators representing the party responsible for the proposed legislation.

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF HOUSE AND SENATE RATES.

Before beginning a discussion of the changes made by the proposed Senate amendments to the House bill, a summary table showing the changes proposed by the Finance Committee in the dutiable and free lists of the House bill will be helpful.

Table I gives the House rates of the dutiable list and the proposed Senate rates.

Table II gives the House rates on items transferred to the free list by the proposed Senate amendments.

TABLE I.—*Comparisons of rates of H. R. 3321 as passed by the House and as amended by the Committee on Finance.*

SCHEDULE A.—CHEMICALS, OILS, AND PAINTS.

| Paragraph. | Article. | House rate. | Senate rate. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Gallic acid | 4 cents per pound. | 7 cents per pound. |
| | Oxalic acid | 2 cents per pound. | 1½ cents per pound |
| | Pyrogallic acid | 10 cents per pound. | 15 cents per pound. |
| | Tannic acid | 4 cents per pound. | 5 cents per pound. |
| 6 | Alizarin | 10 per cent | Free. |
| 14 | Compounds of caffein | 15 per cent | 25 per cent. |
| 15 | Calomel, etc | do | 20 per cent. |
| 19 | Glycerophosphoric acid | do | 25 per cent. |
| 21 | Colors obtained from alizarin, anthracene, indigo, and carbazol. | 30 per cent | Free. |
| 23 | Creosote oil | 5 per cent | Do. |
| | Anthracene | do | Do. |
| 26 | Celluloid, crude | 15 per cent | 25 per cent. |
| | Manufactures of celluloid | 35 per cent | 40 per cent. |
| 30 | Ethers with 5 per cent or less of alcohol. | 10 per cent and 20 per cent. | 20 per cent. |
| 31 | Extract of nutgalls, Persian berries, and sumac. | Free | ¾ cent per pound. |
| 37 | Chicle, crude | 20 cents per pound. | 15 cents per pound. |
| | Amber chips | $1 per pound | Free. |
| | Potato dextrine | ¾ cent per pound | 1½ cents per pound. |
| 46 | Alizarin assistants | 15 per cent | 25 per cent. |
| | Linseed oil | 12 cents per gallon. | 10 cents per gallon. |
| | Olive oil, n. s. p. f. | 20 per cent | 20 cents per gallon. |
| 53 | Ultramarine blue, valued at less than 7 cents per pound. | 15 per cent | 1 cent per pound. |
| 62 | Lithopone | 10 per cent | 15 per cent. |
| | Zinc pigments mixed with oil | do | Do. |
| 65 | Potash cyanide | 1½ cents per pound. | Free. |
| 68 | Soda cyanide | do | Do. |

TABLE I.—*Comparisons of rates of H. R. 3321 as passed by the House and as amended by the Committee on Finance*—Continued.

SCHEDULE B.—EARTH, EARTHENWARE, AND GLASSWARE.

| Paragraph. | Article. | House rate. | Senate rate. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 74 | Cement | 5 per cent | Free. |
| 78 | Rock asphalt | 25 cents per ton | Do. |
| | Asphalt and bitumen | 50 cents per ton | Do. |
| 79 | Mica: | | |
| | Valued not above 15 cents per pound. | 30 per cent | 4 cents per pound. |
| | Valued above 75 cents per pound. | do | 20 per cent. |
| | 75 cents per pound | do | 25 per cent. |
| 80 | Stoneware and earthenware crucibles. | 15 per cent | 20 per cent. |
| 94 | Lenses | 30 per cent | 25 per cent. |
| | Gauging glasses and glass slides | 20 per cent | Do. |
| 95 | Opera glasses and optical instruments. | 30 per cent | 35 per cent. |
| | Photographic cameras | do | 15 per cent. |
| 96 | Surveying instruments, telescopes and microscopes, photographic and projection lenses. | 35 per cent | 25 per cent. |
| 98 | Glass enamel | Free | 20 per cent. |

SCHEDULE C.—METALS, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

| Paragraph. | Article. | House rate. | Senate rate. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 104 | Iron in pigs, iron kentledge, spiegeleisen, cast iron, iron and steel scrap. | 8 per cent | Free. |
| 104 | Ferromanganese | 15 per cent | Do. |
| 105 | Iron in slabs, blooms, loops, etc. | 8 per cent | Do. |
| | Muck bars, bar iron, rolled or hammered iron, etc. | do | 5 per cent. |
| 106 | Beams and other structural iron and steel. | 12 per cent | 10 per cent. |
| 107 | Iron or steel plates, strips, sheets, etc. | 15 per cent | 12 per cent. |
| 108 | Iron and steel anchors, forgings, etc. | do | Do. |
| 109 | Hoop, band, or scroll iron or steel, n. s. p. f. | 12 per cent | 10 per cent. |
| 111 | Iron or steel sheets, etc., galvanized or otherwise cut, polished, or finished, including tin plates. | 20 per cent | 15 per cent. |
| 112 | Steel ingots, blooms, slabs, die blocks or blanks, and billets, crude. | 10 per cent | Free. |
| | The same, if tapered or beveled | 15 per cent | 12 per cent. |
| | Steel products not containing alloys. | 10 per cent | 8 per cent. |
| | Containing alloys | 15 per cent | 12 per cent. |
| 113 | Steel wool and shavings | 20 per cent | 15 per cent. |
| 114 | Grit, shot, etc | 30 per cent | 25 per cent. |
| 116 | Iron or steel wire, covered or uncovered. | 20 per cent | 15 per cent. |
| | Wire rope | 30 per cent | 25 per cent. |
| 121 | Automobiles: | | |
| | Valued at $1,000 or less | 45 per cent | 15 per cent. |
| | Valued between $1,000 and $1,500. | do | 30 per cent. |
| | Finished parts of automobiles | 20 per cent | Do. |
| 122 | Motor cycles, and finished parts thereof. | 40 per cent | 25 per cent. |
| 125 | Nuts, nut blanks, and washers | 15 per cent | 5 per cent. |
| | Bolts and hinges | do | 10 per cent. |
| | Spiral nut locks and lock washers. | 35 per cent | 25 per cent. |
| 126 | Card clothing, not permanently fitted. | 40 per cent | 10 per cent. |
| | When plated or faced | do | 30 per cent. |
| 127 | Cast-iron pipes | 12 per cent | Free. |
| 128 | Sprocket and machine chains | 20 per cent | 25 per cent. |
| 133 | Files, etc., machine cut | 25 per cent | 20 per cent. |
| | Hand-cut and precision files | do | 35 per cent. |
| 137 | Needles, needle cases, and bodkins of metal. | do | 20 per cent. |
| | Needles for shoe machinery | do | Free. |
| 144 | Railway wheels and tires | do | 15 per cent. |
| 145 | Aluminum and alloys in crude form. | do | 2 cents per pound. |
| | Aluminum, rolled | do | 3½ cents per pound. |
| 146 | Antimony ores | 10 per cent | Free. |
| 148 | Bronze powders, etc | 25 per cent | 8 cents per pound. |
| | Aluminum in leaves | do | 4 cents per 100 leaves. |
| 152 | Metal threads of tinsel wire | 30 per cent | 25 per cent. |
| 154 | Lead ores | ½ cent per pound | ¾ cent per pound. |
| 164 | Zinc ores | 10 per cent | 12½ per cent. |
| 165 | Metallic zinc | do | 15 per cent. |
| 169 | Iron and steel products n. s. p. f. | 25 per cent | 20 per cent. |
| | Sugar machinery, sand-blasting and sludge machinery. | do | Free. |

SCHEDULE D.—WOOD, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

Only a few changes of technical nature.

SCHEDULE E.—SUGAR, MOLASSES, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

Paragraph 179. Duties of existing law extended to March 1, 1914.

Paragraph 182. Chewing gum: House rate, 15 per cent; Senate rate, 25 per cent.

SCHEDULE F.—TOBACCO, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

No change.

TABLE I.—*Comparisons of rates of H. R. 3321 as passed by the House and as amended by the Committee on Finance*—Continued.

SCHEDULE G.—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS.

| Paragraph. | Article. | House rate. | Senate rate. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 188 | Cattle | 10 per cent | Free. |
| 189 | Horses and mules, valued at $200 or less per head. | $15 per head | 10 per cent. |
| 190 | Sheep | 10 per cent | Free. |
| 196 | Oats | 10 cents per bushel. | 6 cents per bushel. |
| | Oatmeal and rolled oats | Free | 33 cents per hundredweight. |
| | Oat feed | 15 per cent | 9 cents per hundredweight. |
| 197 | Rice for fermentation purposes | ⅛ cent | ¼ cent. |
| 198 | Wheat | 10 cents per bushel. | Free — subject to countervailing duty. |
| 200 | Butter and butter substitutes | 3 cents per pound. | 2½ cents per pound. |
| 201 | Cheese and cheese substitutes | 20 per cent | Do. |
| 203 | Beets | 10 per cent | 5 per cent. |
| 208 | Eggs | 2 cents per dozen | Free. |
| | Frozen eggs | 2½ cents per pound. | 2 cents per pound. |
| | Liquid egg albumen | 3 cents per pound. | 1 cent per pound. |
| 209 | Blood, dried, soluble | 1½ cents per pound. | Free. |
| 214 | Peas | 15 cents per bushel. | 10 cents per bushel. |
| | Split peas | 25 cents per bushel. | 20 cents per bushel. |
| | Peas in small packages | ⅛ cent per pound | ⅛ cent per pound. |
| 215 | Greenhouse plants | 25 per cent | Free. |
| 217 | Linseed | 20 cents per bushel. | 15 cents per bushel. |
| | Seed, n. s. p. f. | 10 per cent | 5 cents per pound. |
| 223 | Currants | 2 cents per pound. | 1 cent per pound. |
| 227 | Bananas | Free | 1/10 cent per pound. |
| 233 | Meat extracts, n. s. p. f. | 15 cents per pound. | 10 cents per pound. |
| | Fluid extracts of meat | 7 cents per pound. | 5 cents per pound. |
| 236 | Cocoa, manufactured and sweetened chocolate valued between 15 and 20 cents per pound. | 25 per cent | 2 cents per pound. |
| 240 | Wild mace | 8 cents per pound. | 18 cents per pound. |
| | Ground spices—only in the Senate amendment, 20 per cent additional to the House rates. | | |

SCHEDULE H.—SPIRITS, WINES, ETC.

Paragraph 254. Mineral waters imported in packages of less than 1 quart: House rates, rates provided for plus additional duty on packages; Senate rates, House rates, but no additional duty on packages.

Paragraph 254½. Restoring the internal tax on wine spirits or grape brandy used for fortification of sweet wines.

Paragraph 254½. Placing a tax on all spurious wines of 25 cents per gallon.

SCHEDULE I.—COTTON AND MANUFACTURES.

| Paragraph. | Article. | House rate. | Senate rate. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 255 | Cotton thread, yarns, etc., not bleached, mercerized, etc. (between Nos. 80 and 99). | 20 per cent | 22½ per cent. |
| | Yarns, bleached, mercerized, etc. | Same as unbleached. | 2½ per cent above rates on unbleached. |
| | 200 and over, bleached or unbleached, etc. | 25 per cent | 20 per cent. |
| | Cotton sliver | 10 per cent | 5 per cent. |
| 257 | Cotton cloth, unbleached and not mercerized (between 80 and 99). | 22½ per cent | 25 per cent. |
| 260 | Handkerchiefs, unhemmed | 30 per cent | Do. |
| 261 | Cotton collars and cuffs | 25 per cent | 30 per cent. |
| 265 | Stockings, etc., valued up to 70 cents per dozen pairs. | 40 per cent | Do. |
| | Valued between 70 cents and $1.20. | 50 per cent | Do. |
| | Cotton gloves | 35 per cent | 45 per cent. |
| 267 | Bandings, beltings, bindings, etc. | 25 per cent | 30 per cent. |

SCHEDULE J.—FLAX, HEMP, AND JUTE, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

| Paragraph. | Article. | House rate. | Senate rate. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 272 | Flax, undressed | ½ cent per pound | Free. |
| 273 | Flax, dressed | 1½ cents per pound. | Do. |
| 274 | Tow of flax | ½ cent per pound | Do. |
| 275 | Hemp, and tow of hemp | 1½ cents per pound. | Do. |
| | Hackled hemp | ½ cent per pound | Do. |
| 276 | Single jute yarns not finer than 5 numbers. | 15 per cent | 20 per cent. |
| | Over 5 numbers | 25 per cent | Do. |
| 278 | Threads of flax, hemp, or ramie, from yarn of 5 numbers or less. | do | Do. |
| | Finer than 5 numbers | 30 per cent | 25 per cent. |
| 279 | Single yarns of flax, hemp, or ramie, not less than 8 numbers. | 15 per cent | 12 per cent. |
| | Between 8 and 80 numbers | 25 per cent | 20 per cent. |
| 280 | Gill nets, webs, etc., of flax, hemp, or ramie. | 30 per cent | 25 per cent. |
| 281 | Straw mattings and rugs | 2½ cents per square yard. | 2 cents per square yard. |
| 282 | Carpets, mats, and rugs of vegetable fiber except cotton. | 35 per cent | 30 per cent. |
| 284 | Flax tapes | 25 per cent | 20 per cent. |
| 287 | Wearing apparel of flax, hemp, or ramie. | 50 per cent | 40 per cent. |
| 288 | Single jute fabrics for bags | 20 per cent | Free. |
| 289 | Pile fabrics of flax, hemp, or ramie | 45 per cent | 40 per cent. |
| 290 | Bags of single jute yarns | 25 per cent | 10 per cent. |
| 292 | Woven fabrics of flax, hemp, or ramie. | 35 per cent | 30 per cent. |

TABLE I.—*Comparisons of rates of H. R. 3321 as passed by the House and as amended by the Committee on Finance*—Continued.

SCHEDULE K.—WOOL, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

| Paragraph. | Article. | House rate. | Senate rate. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 295 | Woolen or camel's-hair tops | 15 per cent | 5 per cent. |
| 296 | Wool yarns | 20 per cent | 15 per cent. |
| 297 | Wool stockings, hose, and half hose. | 35 per cent | 20 per cent. |
| | If finished or shaped, valued not more than $1.20 per dozen pairs. | | |
| | Valued above $1.20 per dozen pairs. | do | 50 per cent. |
| | Camel's-hair press cloth | Free | 10 per cent. |
| 298 | Wool flannels and blankets above 50 cents per pound. | 35 per cent | 25 per cent. |
| 298 | Wool blankets, valued less than 40 cents per pound. | 25 per cent | Free. |
| 314 | Angora-goat hair, alpaca and | 20 per cent | Do. |
| 315 | Angora-hair tops | 25 per cent | 5 per cent. |
| 316 | Angora-hair yarns | 30 per cent | 15 per cent. |
| 317 | Manufactures of angora hair | 40 per cent | 35 per cent. |
| 318 | Plushes, velvets, and pile fabrics | 50 per cent | 40 per cent. |

Duties on wool extended to Dec. 1, 1913.
Duties on woolens extended to Jan. 1, 1914.

SCHEDULE L.—SILKS AND SILK GOODS.

| Paragraph. | Article. | House rate. | Senate rate. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 319 | Carded and combed silk and silk noils. | 15 per cent | 30 cents per pound. |
| 320 | Silk, spun or in yarn | 35 per cent | 30 cents per pound up, according to weight and finish. |
| 321 | Thrown silk, floss, etc | 15 per cent | 35 cents per pound up, according to weight and finish. |
| 322 | Silk velvets, chenilles, etc | 50 per cent | $1.25 per pound up, according to weight and finish. |
| 323 | Silk handkerchiefs or mufflers | 40 per cent | 45 per cent. |
| 324 | Ribbons, hat bands, etc., of silk | do | Do. |
| 327 | Artificial silk yarns | 35 per cent | 25 per cent. |

SCHEDULE M.—PAPERS AND BOOKS.

| Paragraph. | Article. | House rate. | Senate rate. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 332 | Surface-coated papers | 35 per cent | 25 per cent. |
| | Embossed or printed papers | do | 50 per cent. |
| | Sensitized paper | do | 25 per cent. |
| | Plain paper for sensitizing | 25 per cent | 15 per cent. |
| 333 | Picture calendars, labels, etc | 12 per cent | 15 cents per pound. |
| | Decalcomanias | 20 per cent | 15, 20, and 60 cents, according to dimensions and weight of sheets. |
| | Textbooks | 15 per cent | Free. |
| 337 | Landscape views | 45 per cent | 25 cents per pound. |

SCHEDULE N.—SUNDRIES.

| Paragraph. | Article. | House rate. | Senate rate. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 342 | Ramie hat braids | 15 per cent | 40 per cent. |
| | Manufactures of ramie hat braids. | 25 and 40 per cent. | 50 per cent. |
| 347 | Ivory buttons, over 36 lines | 40 per cent | 35 per cent. |
| | 36 and less lines | do | 50 per cent. |
| | Shell and pearl buttons, over 26 lines. | do | 25 per cent. |
| | 26 and less | do | 50 per cent. |
| | Agate buttons | do | 15 per cent. |
| 351 | Crude artificial abrasives | 10 per cent | Free. |
| 353 | Fulminates | 5 per cent | Do. |
| 354 | Gunpowder, etc | 1½ and 1 cent per pound. | Do. |
| 356 | Blasting caps | 75 cents per M | $1 per M. |
| 358 | Raw furs | 10 per cent | Free. |
| | Furs, dressed or dyed | 40 per cent | 35 per cent. |
| | Fur, wearing apparel of domestic animals. | 50 per cent | 15 per cent. |
| | Fur, wearing apparel of other than domestic animals. | do | 45 per cent. |
| 364 | Hats, bonnets, etc | 40 per cent | Do. |
| 367 | Glaziers' and miners' diamonds | 10 per cent | Free. |
| | Marine coral, crude | Free | 10 per cent. |
| 370 | Leather toilet sets and similar articles. | 30 per cent | 40 per cent. |
| 373 | Women's leather gloves | $2 per dozen pairs. | $2.50 per dozen pairs. |
| | Men's leather gloves | do | $3 per dozen pairs. |
| 376 | Harness and saddlery, n. s. p. f. | 20 per cent | Free. |
| [1] 376 | Manufactures of amber and gut | 10 per cent | 20 per cent. |
| | Surgical catgut | do | Free. |
| 378 | India rubber druggists' sundries | do | 15 per cent. |
| 379 | Manufactures of mother-of-pearl, shell, hard rubber, etc. | 25 per cent | Do. |
| 380 | Masks | 20 per cent | 25 per cent. |
| 383 | Catgut strings | 35 per cent | 20 per cent. |
| 386 | Paintings and sculptures | 15 per cent | 25 per cent. |
| 388 | Pencils valued less than $1.44 per gross. | 25 per cent | 36 cents per gross. |
| 390 | Photographic cameras | 30 per cent | 15 per cent. |
| | Photographic films, sensitized but not exposed. | 15 per cent | Free. |
| | Films for moving-picture exhibits. | 20 per cent | Changed to specific rates equivalent to approximately 20 per cent. |
| 391 | Crude meerschaum | Free | 20 per cent. |

[1] New paragraph.

TABLE II.—*Free list.*

| Paragraph. | Article. | House rate. | Senate rate. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 403½ | Alizarin | 10 per cent | Free. |
| | Colors obtained from alizarin, anthracene, and carbazol. | 30 per cent | Do. |
| 404 | Ammonia perchlorate | 15 per cent | Do. |
| 404½ | Antimony ore, stibnite, and antimony matte. | 10 per cent | Do. |
| 416 | Fabrics of single jute yarns for grain, wool, and other sacks. | 20 per cent | Do. |
| 427½ | Wool blankets valued at less than 40 cents per pound. | 25 per cent | Do. |
| 428 | Blood, dried | 1½ cents per pound | Do. |
| 434 | Textbooks | 15 per cent | Do. |
| | Braille tablets, objects and apparatus, types, etc., used for the benefit of the blind exclusively. | 15 and 25 per cent. | Do. |
| 450 | Sand-blast machines, sludge machines, and sugar machinery. | 25 per cent | Do. |
| 450½ | Cast-iron pipe | 12 per cent | Do. |
| 452 | Surgical catgut | do | Do. |
| 452½ | Cement, Roman, Portland, and other hydraulic. | 5 per cent | Do. |
| 460 | Creosote, oil, anthracene, and anthracene oil. | do | Do. |
| 471 | Crude marine corals | Free | 10 per cent. |
| 481½ | Glaziers' and engravers' diamonds, miners' diamonds, and diamond dust. | 10 per cent | Free. |
| 485 | Eggs | 2 cents per dozen | Do. |
| 486 | Crude artificial abrasives | 10 per cent | Do. |
| 492 | Flax and hemp, not hackled or dressed. | ½ cent per pound | Do. |
| | Flax, hackled | 1½ cents per pound | Do. |
| | Flax and hemp tow | ½ cent per pound | Do. |
| 496½ | Fulminates | 5 per cent | Do. |
| 496¾ | Furs and fur skins | 10 per cent | Do. |
| 498 | Glass enamel | Free | 20 per cent. |
| 505 | Amber in chips | $1 per pound | Free. |
| 505½ | Gunpowder and explosives | ½ cent per pound and 1 cent per pound. | Do. |
| 518 | Colors obtained from indigo | 30 per cent | Do. |
| 522 | Pig iron, iron kentledge, spiegeleisen, wrought iron, steel scrap, ferromanganese, iron in slabs and blooms. | 15 and 8 per cent | Do. |
| 532 | Lard compounds and lard substitutes. | 15 per cent | Do. |
| 537½ | Limestone-rock asphalt | 25 cents per ton | Do. |
| 537½ | Asphaltum and bitumen | 50 cents per ton | Do. |
| 550 | Meerschaum, crude | Free | 20 per cent. |
| 559 | Needles for shoe machines | 25 per cent | Free. |
| 564 | Oatmeal and rolled oats | Free | 33 cents per hundredweight. |
| 571 | Hemp and flax waste | 10 per cent | Free. |
| 580½ | Photographic moving-picture films, not exposed. | 15 per cent | Do. |
| 584 | Potash cyanide | 1½ cents per pound. | Do. |
| 585 | Potatoes | Free | Free; subject to countervailing duty. |
| 609 | Soda cyanide | 1½ cents per pound. | Free. |
| 615½ | Steel ingots, blooms and slabs, die blocks or blanks, billets, not containing alloys. | 10 per cent | Do. |
| 621 | Cattle, sheep, domestic live animals, for food purposes. | do | Do. |
| 626 | Extracts of nutgalls, Persian berries, and sumac. | Free | ⅜ cent per pound. |
| 646 | Wheat | 10 cents per bushel. | Free; subject to countervailing duty. |
| 650 | Sawed cedar | 10 per cent | Free. |
| 652 | Wool of the angora goat, alpaca | 20 per cent | Do. |
| 652 | Paper twine for binding wool | 25 per cent | Do. |

DETAILED DISCUSSION OF CHANGES BY SCHEDULE.

While the preceding tables give in parallel columns a synoptic view of all the changes in rates made by the Committee on Finance in the House bill, a brief discussion of the reasons for the more significant alterations made in each schedule will perhaps contribute to a clearer understanding of those changes.

SCHEDULE A.—CHEMICALS, OILS, AND PAINTS.

It will be observed that the most important changes made by the Senate amendments in Schedule A are found in paragraph 1, dealing with acids; paragraph 6, dealing with alizarin; paragraph 25, dealing with celluloid; paragraph 31, dealing with vegetable dyes; paragraph 37, dealing with gums; paragraph 46, dealing with oils; and paragraph 62, dealing with zinc pigments.

Under the present law, alizarin and colors obtained from alizarin and anthracene are on the free list. The House bill placed a duty of 10 per cent on alizarin and 30 per cent on colors obtained from alizarin and anthracene. Under the present law colors obtained from carbazol and indigo pay a duty of 30 per cent and the House bill made no change.

The textile industries, the manufacture of leather, of pulp and paper, and of glass are among the heaviest consumers of chemicals and other products dealt with in Schedule A. In its glossary on the status of the chemical industry in this country, reprinted in House Report No. 326, Sixty-second Congress, second session, page 317, the Tariff Board gives the following table showing the value of chemicals and related products consumed in the industries mentioned, as ascertained by the census of 1905:

| | |
|---|---|
| Textiles | $30,971,685 |
| Leather | 25,038,936 |
| Pulp and paper | 10,203,304 |
| Glass | 6,311,783 |

H. R. 3321 has made heavy reductions from the existing law in the rates on products of the industries enumerated above, and in a number of instances the Senate amendments have increased these reductions still further. On account of the extensive use of these colors in the textile industries and in the manufacture of leather and on account of the heavy reductions made in the bill in the duties on the products of these industries the committee thought it but just and fair that these dyeing materials should all be transferred to the free list, as provided in the Senate amendments.

The Committee on Finance has transferred creosote oil to the free list. Creosote oil is used on a very large scale for saturating wood for the purpose of its preservation. In the interest of conservation of our rapidly decreasing resources of woods the committee has deemed it advisable to place this preservative on the free list, the end in view being of more importance than the revenue which would be derived from the small House rate.

The Committee on Finance has transferred cyanide of potash and cyanide of soda to the free list. These products are dutiable respectively under the present law at 12½ per cent and 25 per cent ad valorem. The House rate is specific and equivalent in both cases to less than 10 per cent ad valorem. In the interest of the mining industry the commitee decided to recommend their free admission.

A reduction was made by the committee in the rate on linseed oil. The present rate is 15 cents per gallon; the rate prescribed in the House bill is 12 cents per gallon, and the committee recommends a further reduction to 10 cents per gallon. Linseed oil is made from flaxseed. In the present law flaxseed is dutiable at 25 cents per bushel, H. R. 3321 reduces this duty to 20 cents per bushel, and the Committee on Finance has reduced it still further in the agricultural schedule to 15 cents per bushel to make the rate harmonize with the proposed reduction on linseed oil. Linseed oil is used in enormous quantities in making paints and varnishes, certain soaps used in the textile industries, for making linoleum, and in numberless other ways justifying the reduction proposed by the Senate committee.

A considerable reduction was made by the Committee on Finance in the rate on oxalic acid, viz. from 2 cents per pound to 1½ cents per pound. H. R. 3321 made no change in the rate on this acid from the existing law on account of the heavy revenue involved. Oxalic acid is used heavily in the textiles, the leather industries, laundries, and in households, and for this reason the committee deemed a reduction in rate of one-half cent per pound advisable.

In a number of instances the Senate committee has raised the rates in Schedule A of H. R. 3321; noticeably so in the rates on celluloid, calomel, alizarin assistants, lithopone, and zinc pigments. The reasons for recommending higher rates are partly to compensate for the losses in revenue to be expected owing to the changes made elsewhere, and partly because the rates established in H. R. 3321 seemed inconsistent with the rates on the raw materials entering into the manufacture of the products so affected.

The Committee on Finance recommends a rate of three-eighths of a cent per pound on extracts of nutgalls, Persian berries, and sumac. These articles are dutiable under the present law and were transferred to the free list in the House bill under the misapprehension that they are used in tanning leathers. They are used so only to a minimum extent, their principal consumption being in the textile industries. They belong logically with other dyewood extracts in paragraph 31, and for this reason the Senate committee placed them there.

SCHEDULE B.—EARTHS, EARTHENWARE, AND GLASSWARE.

A survey of the amendments made by the Committee on Finance to Schedule B shows that they relate principally to the following items:

(1) Cement, which is transferred to the free list.
(2) Asphalt, rock asphalt, and bitumen, which are made free.
(3) Mica, on which a new classification is introduced.
(4) Photographic cameras, upon which the duty has been reduced 50 per cent.

There were a number of minor changes made in this schedule, of which the reclassification of window glass is the most important.

Cement: The transfer of cement to the free list needs no justification. The cement industry has had in this country a phenomenal development, owing to the extensive and ever-increasing use of this material for building purposes and for paving. Applied originally only in connection with large building operations, cement is now rapidly becoming the foremost building material and an indispensable necessity on practically every farm. With the ever-widening demand for cement, the domestic supply has well kept step, and the production for 1912 is estimated to have exceeded in value the sum of $80,000,000. The law at present levies a duty on cement, equivalent to over 21 per cent ad valorem, on the basis of 1912, which rate was reduced in H. R. 3321 to 5 per cent ad valorem. The imports in 1912 were valued at less than $170,000, and under the radically reduced rates of the House bill imports are estimated to be $220,000. The exports of cement in 1912 were valued at over $5,000,000. Cement is manufactured in this country and at a cost no higher than anywhere else on this continent. It is characteristic of the competitive status of the cement industry of this country that, when some time ago the Panama Canal Commission asked for bids on 4,500,000 barrels of cement, with 12 foreign corporations bidding for the contract, the lowest bid submitted was that of a domestic corporation, whose bid was accepted. This, in connection with the heavy export, indicates that the cement industry of this country, when put on a free basis, need fear no serious competition from foreign imports as long as the domestic producers remain in competition and content themselves with reasonable profits, when it is considered that the bulky nature of the material entails heavy freight expenses, which in themselves act as a deterrent against too active foreign competition.

Asphalt: Asphalt, rock asphalt, and bitumen were put on the free list by the Committee on Finance largely on account of their heavy use in road building and for street paving. There are two classes of asphalt, namely, the natural asphalt found in lakes and imported mostly from Trinidad. Of this grade of asphalt practically none is produced in this country. The other kind of asphalt is of inferior quality and is obtained as a residual product from distillation of crude petroleum, the supply of which is chiefly controlled by the Standard Oil Co. and the manufacture of which is wholly above any competition from abroad. Petroleum products are on the free list, and asphalt obtained from petroleum logically belongs on the free list. To put a duty on asphalt is equivalent to placing a direct tax on communities desiring to improve the conditions of their roads and streets.

Mica: The Committee on Finance has reclassified the paragraph dealing with mica. Mica valued not above 15 cents per pound was put at a specific rate of 4 cents per pound, which rate will have the effect of raising slightly the House rate of 30 per cent on the low-grade product where the value does not exceed 13 cents per pound. The rates on mica of higher unit value have been reduced, and on mica valued above 75 cents per pound the reduction is one-third of the rate

established by the House bill, namely, from 30 per cent to 20 per cent ad valorem. A straight 30 per cent rate on mica of all grades, as fixed in the House bill, would discriminate against the low-priced article.

Photographic cameras: The Committee on Finance has eliminated from this schedule photographic cameras, at present dutiable under this schedule in paragraph 95, and has transferred them to Schedule N. The rate on photographic cameras under the present law is 45 per cent ad valorem. In the House bill the rate is fixed at 30 per cent ad valorem, and the committee has made an additional radical cut to 15 per cent ad valorem, reducing the rate to one-third of the Payne bill.

Photographic cameras are produced in this country as cheaply as anywhere in the world, and their manufacture, as well as their distribution, is closely controlled. Photographic cameras are finding a steadily increasing use among the masses, and since this use affords one of the most legitimate and most educational means of recreation, it ought to be encouraged as far as possible.

SCHEDULE C.—METALS, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

The bill as amended by the Senate committee made extensive changes in Schedule C in addition to alterations already made by the House committee in this schedule.

The principal alterations made consist in placing pig iron, iron kentledge, spiegeleisen, iron and steel scrap, ferromanganese, iron in blooms, loops, and slabs, steel ingots, blanks, and billets, cast-iron pipes, and antimony ore on the free list, and in materially reducing the rates upon many of the heavy products of iron and steel as a result of transferring the foregoing basic materials to the free list.

All of the enumerated products thus transferred to the free list, with the exception of ferromanganese, are produced in large quantities here at a cost which does not exceed that in other countries. They are all articles of prime importance in the industries generally, and, owing to their heavy and bulky nature, the relatively high cost of transportation in itself constitutes an impediment to excessive importations. In addition to this, the industry is largely controlled by a few great corporations.

"Judged by all available tests, the American iron and steel industry is fully able to sustain itself without Government aid. It has unrivaled supplies of raw material well situated with reference to one another. It has the use of abundant capital and the best of business organization, as shown by the large profits earned and the large reinvestments made in the industry. It is able to export in competition with foreign countries, as is freely admitted by its chief officials and as is shown by the figures of the Government. Were the domestic demand not so extensive as it has been, exports might be increased, and the testimony of the officers of the United States Steel Corporation shows that the prices abroad are about as satisfactory as they are at home. The industry has the advantage of low costs and when estimated from a rigid accounting standpoint. For all these reasons it may be regarded as well fitted from every point of view in which to establish rates of duty upon a strictly revenue-producing basis."

The House bill places iron ore upon the free list mainly because it was found that the domestic supply of iron ore was largely controlled by the United States Steel Corporation and for the purpose of aiding the independent iron and steel manufacturers in their competition with this monopoly.

For similar reasons the Committee on Finance thought that ferromanganese should also be placed upon the free list. The United States Steel Corporation largely controls the domestic ore out of which ferromanganese, which is a necessary material in the manufacture of steel, is produced. This corporation is the only producer of ferromanganese in this country, but produces it only for its own use and consumption. It was thought under these conditions just that the independent competitors of this monopoly should be permitted to import this high-priced alloy free of duty, and that with iron ore and ferromanganese on the free list domestic competition would be strengthened and the price of the finished products of iron and steel would be eventually lowered.

The changes otherwise recommended by the Finance Committee in Schedule C are practically all in the direction of reductions from the House rate.

Having placed pig iron and allied products upon the free list, your committee felt justified in reducing the House rates upon many of the products of these raw and semi-raw materials, such as beams, girders, joints, car trucks, anchors, tin plate, etc. For this reason, as well as because the House rates were thought not sufficiently low to be competitive, further reductions were made in some of the more highly organized products of this industry.

The committee amendment as to automobiles provides for reclassification of that paragraph and reduces the rates on low-priced automobiles 33 per cent and 66 per cent, respectively, from the House rate, according to the value of the automobiles. The duty is likewise reduced on motor cycles, rail wheels and tires, and a number of other products used heavily in the industries.

The duty on aluminum is changed from an ad valorem to a specific rate and the House rate reduced about 1 cent per pound. It was thought by your committee that the circumstances justified a further reduction than that made by the House, and that owing to the great variation in the price of this product and the close alliance between the domestic and the foreign manufacturers, justified the substitution of a specific for an ad valorem rate.

Of the very few cases where the Senate committee has raised the rates on the items carried in the steel schedule, those of lead ores, zinc ores, and zinc may be mentioned. In the House bill the rate upon lead ore is fixed at one-half cent per pound, which is a reduction of 66⅔ per cent from the rate of the Payne-Aldrich bill.

The reductions made in the House bill on lead ore, zinc ore, and zinc appealed to the Finance Committee as too radical and below the point of competition. In the interest of the industry, a continuation of which is absolutely essential for the welfare of the mining interests, the Senate committee raised the duty from one-half cent per pound to three-fourths of 1 cent per pound on lead ores, which was also the rate of the Wilson law.

Zinc ores were first made dutiable under the present law, the rate being one-fourth of a cent per pound on ores carrying zinc in excess of 10 per cent and less than 20 per cent, one-half cent per pound in excess of 20 per cent and less than 25 per cent, and 1 cent per pound on all ores in excess of 25 per cent. Duties paid on importations of zinc-bearing ores for 1910 show an equivalent ad valorem rate of 55.64 per cent and for 1912 of 44.64 per cent.

The House fixed a common duty of 10 per cent ad valorem upon zinc ore and zinc in bars. The rates appear to be somewhat lower than those upon lead ore or lead in bars. The metals are frequently found in association with each other and are extracted by similar processes. The committee has therefore reported the duty on zinc in ores at 12½ per cent ad valorem and upon zinc in bars at 15 per cent ad valorem, which, though lower than the rate on lead, compares more favorably with it and will increase the revenue derived from importations.

Antimony ores, which were placed on the free list by the Committee on Finance, are produced in this country only to a very limited extent. A duty on this article is exclusively for revenue purposes, but considering the extended consumption of antimony for manufacturing purposes in many lines of industrial activities the revenue from imports of antimony ore are dispensed with.

The rate for the so-called basket paragraph of this schedule, imports under which are very heavy, is under the present law 45 per cent ad valorem; in the House bill it is reduced to 25 per cent, and in the bill as amended by the Senate committee a further reduction of 20 per cent is made, or below one-half of the present rate.

To sum up, the changes made by the Committee on Finance in Schedule C may be classified under two general heads—those relating to iron and steel and those relating to other metals.

(a) In general, the committee was of the opinion that the rates fixed by the House on iron and steel were too high. The evidence produced in recent investigations of the steel industry has conclusively shown that that branch of manufacture is making large returns and is amply able to hold its own in the world market, as well as against foreigners in the domestic trade. Iron and steel products are essentially necessaries, and a reduction of rates on them to the lowest possible point is in line with the principles laid down by the party in past years. Not only, therefore, has the committee thought best to carry the heavier products to the free list, but it has made a general cut upon all of the more immediate derivatives of these products.

(b) On the other metals, lead, zinc, etc., it has been thought that the rates established by the House were too low, and consequently moderate advances were made over the House bill.

SCHEDULE D.—WOOD, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

The Committee on Finance recommends no change in this schedule, except such as are of technical nature, involving merely a change in verbiage in paragraph 171, in order to bring out fully the intentions of the bill and to avoid possible litigation.

In paragraph 174 the provision giving certain concessions to box wood of American production reimported into the United States in the form of boxes filled with oranges and lemons has been enlarged, so that the concession will now apply to boxes made of American wood filled with all kinds of fruit.

SCHEDULE E.—SUGAR, MOLASSES, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

The Committee on Finance, after a careful study of the manufacturing and marketing conditions of sugar, deemed it advisable to recommend that the sugar duties now in force shall be extended up to and including the 28th day of February, 1914, after which date the provisions regulating such duties as established in H. R. 3321 shall become operative. The purpose of this extension was to permit the sugar already contracted for under the custom prevailing in this trade, and which contracts were made under tariff conditions now in existence, to be disposed of at the prevailing rates. In paragraph 182 the committee eliminated the House provisions with reference to sugars tinctured, colored, or adulterated after being refined. This provision was taken over from the law now in force and is appropriate there on account of the rates provided in the Payne-Aldrich bill for sugar. The changed status of dutiability of sugar under H. R. 3321 would seem to make such a provision superfluous and might lead to unnecessary litigation.

In this paragraph chewing gum was made dutiable at 25 per cent ad valorem. Under the law now in force chewing gum, if imported, is classified as a manufactured product, not elsewhere enumerated, and dutiable at 20 per cent ad valorem, and if this classification were to continue under H. R. 3321 the rate would be 15 per cent. In view of the fact, however, that the rate on gum chicle, which is the principal ingredient of chewing gum, has been doubled under the proposed law, such a rate seems insufficient. A rate of 25 per cent on an article of this character is legitimate and in harmony with the plan of H. R. 3321.

SCHEDULE F.—TOBACCO, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

No change whatever is recommended by the Committee on Finance in this section.

SCHEDULE G.—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS.

In an effort to mitigate the high and rising cost of living, the House bill placed on the free list a number of agricultural commodities, many of which are not the direct product of farm labor but are the products of great industrial establishments carrying on their manufacture with the most improved methods known to modern industry. For the same reasons the rates on other items of this schedule have been reduced. The Committee on Finance has placed on the free list additionally live animals used for food purposes, wheat, eggs, lard compounds, and lard substitutes. In a number of instances it has recommended further reductions in the House rates, such as on butter, cheese, peas, meat extracts, cocoa, currants, and other articles of minor importance. It has made in this schedule only two important changes in rates in the other direction. It has restored a duty on oatmeal and rolled oats, making it 33 cents per hundredweight, or one-third of the existing rate, and has increased the duty on rice used for fermentation purposes from one-eighth of a cent, as provided in the House bill, to one-fourth of a cent per pound.

The Senate committee has placed for revenue purposes a duty of one-tenth of a cent per pound on bananas. Bananas are admitted free under the existing law, and were left on the free list in the House bill. A small revenue tax on this article was deemed justifiable, in view of the fact that the importation of bananas to this country is a practical monopoly of the United Fruit Co. On account of the perishable nature of bananas and the smallness of the tax, it is not believed it can be readily shifted to the ultimate consumer.

The House bill and amendments made by the Committee on Finance fully recognized the paramount interests of our agricultural population by placing agricultural implements of every kind and description, fence and baling wire, cotton bagging and ties, low-priced blankets, boots and shoes, cement, nails, lumber, coal, harness, saddles, cotton gins, wagons, carts, bagging for grain, wool and other bags, sewing machines, and many other products of daily utility on the free list. In common with the rest of our people, our agricultural population will share in the benefits brought about by the reduction of the duty on sugar and its eventual elimination. The substantial reductions made all along the line on cotton and woolen goods, wearing apparel of every description, on crockery, household furnishings, and utensils, hardware, and similar products of our factories, will remove a con-

siderable part of the burden of tariff taxation now borne by the farmer as well as the dweller in the city and the laborer in the factory, fields, and mines.

SCHEDULE H.—SPIRITS, WINES, AND OTHER BEVERAGES.

An important change made in this schedule, with reference to imports, was the elimination of the additional duty assessed on containers of mineral water of certain sizes. The duty on these being specific, there seems to be no valid reason to depart from the practice established over 70 years ago as an integral part of our tariff legislation and only infringed upon in exceptional cases, namely, not to assess duty on containers with contents dutiable at specific rates. Otherwise this schedule was left intact, as being, in connection with Schedule F, tobaccos, and the manufacture of tobacco, two of the heaviest and most legitimate revenue producers.

The Committee on Finance has added to this schedule a paragraph repealing the privilege of using wine spirits, or grape brandy, for the fortification of sweet wines, free of tax, and appropriate administrative machinery is provided. The amendment provides for the modification of the present statutes relating to the tax upon the wine spirits or grape brandy used in the fortification of pure sweet wine.

Section 42 of the act of October 1, 1890, relating to this subject, reads in part as follows:

"*That any producer of pure sweet wines who is also a distiller* * * * may use free of tax in the preparation of such wines * * * so much of such wine spirits so separated by him as may be necessary to fortify the wine for the preservation of the saccharine matter contained therein, * * * etc."

Section 45 of said act provides in part as follows:

"The use of wine spirits free of tax for the fortification of sweet wines under this act shall be begun and completed *at the vineyard of the wine grower* where the grapes are crushed and grape juice is expressed and fermented."

The tax for the manufacture and use of wine spirits for all other purposes is $1.10 per gallon. The statutes just referred to were later amended to provide for a charge of 3 cents per gallon for the wine spirits of grape brandy thus used to pay the expenses of the Government while attending and making the fortification of said sweet wines.

It will be noted that under this statute there are two classes of wine producers who are entitled to this privilege of 3 cents per gallon wine spirits. First, the wine producer "who is also a distiller." Secondly, the wine producer who has his winery "at the vineyard." All other manufacturers and users of these wine spirits must pay $1.10 per gallon. This discriminates, first, against all wine producers who are not distillers and who do not have their wineries at the vineyard, and, secondly, it discriminates against all other makers and users of wine spirits.

There is no sound reason for this legislative favoritism. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, there was used in the fortifying of sweet wines 6,322,303.9 gallons of this wine spirits or grape brandy. If this had been subject to the internal-revenue tax of $1.10 per gallon, the same as that paid by the users thereof, instead of paying 3 cents per gallon as provided for in this law, the revenue during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, would have been increased $6,954,534.29, and if these wine producers had to pay the tax which they ought to have paid, except for this special favoritism shown by the statutes above referred to, the revenue of the Government would have been increased since 1890 by $65,702 601.59. In other words, by this legislation, a bonus has been given to the producers of pure sweet wine of $65,702,601.69, nearly all of which has gone to the California wine producers.

A paragraph has been added to this schedule imposing upon wines known in the trade as "spurious or artificial" wines an internal-revenue tax of 25 cents per gallon, and requiring that all containers of wines or liquors which contain benzoic acid, benzoate of soda, salicylic acid, or fluorides shall be labeled with the per cent of such contents.

This was for the purpose of subjecting to taxation such wines as are made from the pomace of grapes, berries, or other fruits, where the alcohol strength of such wine does not exceed 24 per cent by volume.

In these low-class wines the chemicals above referred to are frequently added for the purpose of preservation and preventing fermentation.

SCHEDULE I.—COTTON MANUFACTURES.

The Senate committee has followed very closely the provisions of the House bill with reference to cotton manufactures. Most of the changes were made after consulting customhouse officials for the purpose of facilitating administration.

The House bill fixed the rate of duty on cotton yarns according to the number of the yarn and upon cotton cloth according to the number of the yarn contained in the cloth. The House bill provided a rate for cotton cloth, not bleached, dyed, etc., at from 7½ per cent on cotton made from yarns of lowest number, increasing to 27½ per cent where the highest number of yarns in the cotton cloth exceeded 99. It also provided that cotton cloth when bleached, dyed, etc., shall be subject to a duty of 2½ per cent ad valorem in addition to these rates.

For the purpose of preventing any doubt as to whether the 2½ per cent duty would be added for each one of the processes, the Senate committee expressly designated the rates to attach to cotton cloth when bleached, dyed, etc., giving in each instance the 2½ per cent increase from the rate on cotton cloth in the gray and providing only for one increase of 2½ per cent, even though one or more processes are used on a single piece of cloth.

It will be observed that the 2½ per cent increase contained in the House bill applies to cloth when bleached, dyed, etc., whether the bleaching, dyeing, etc., takes place before or after the cloth was woven, but the House bill does not provide for an increase of the duty on yarns if the yarns are bleached, dyed, etc., before the process of weaving takes place. The bill as reported provides for an increase of 2½ per cent upon yarns when bleached, dyed, etc. This makes no increase upon the rate of duty upon the cloths. It was simply a question as to the place at which the 2½ per cent increase should be made. The House made it on the cloths whenever they were bleached, dyed, etc., and the Senate committee made the increase take place with the yarns instead of the cloths if the yarns used by the weaver had already been bleached, dyed, etc. The increase was intended to be placed on account of the processes of bleaching, dyeing, etc., and the Senate made the increase where the process takes place.

The Senate committee reduced the duty on cotton card laps, roping, sliver, or roving, from 10 per cent ad valorem to 5 per cent ad valorem. The House bill provided a duty upon hose and half hose and stockings, if valued at not more than 70 cents per dozen, of 40 per cent ad valorem. The Senate committee changed this so that hose valued at not more than $1.20 per dozen bear a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem.

The House provided for a duty on cotton gloves of 35 per cent ad valorem. These gloves are of a class not generally in use, and the Senate committee increased the duty to 45 per cent ad valorem.

The House made a duty on handkerchiefs and mufflers composed of cotton, 30 per cent ad valorem. The Senate committee reduced the duty upon handkerchiefs and mufflers, not hemmed, to 25 per cent ad valorem.

The Senate committee increased the duty on collars and cuffs from 25 per cent ad valorem, to conform to the duty provided on products manufactured from cotton cloth.

SCHEDULE J.—FLAX, HEMP, AND JUTE, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

The fundamental amendments proposed by the Senate committee to Schedule J consist in transferring hemp, tow of hemp, flax, and tow of flax, hackled, etc., to the free list. These amendments are strictly in line with the general purposes and objects of the revision, and bring hemp and flax into line with all other textile raw materials.

Burlaps, or fabrics of simple jute yarns, used for making bagging for grain, wool, and similar agricultural products are also transferred to the free list, thus giving the farmer generally, and especially the grain and wool producers, the same relief as is given the cotton growers by putting jute cotton bagging on the free list.

Corresponding reductions are also made in the duties on practically all manufactured products composed of flax and hemp.

SCHEDULE K.—WOOL, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

The essential changes in Schedule K and their significance may be reviewed as follows:

(*a*) The Senate committee, as a result of its investigations, thought that the rates on tops and yarns in the House bill, though materially lower than the rates in the present law, were still too high, and therefore reduced them from 15 per cent to 5 per cent.

(*b*) It was thought inconsistent to retain a schedule dealing with cotton hosiery and leave wool hosiery to be covered only in general language. Hence a wool hosiery schedule corresponding to the cotton hosiery grouping has been introduced.

(*c*) There was thought to be no good reason for the retention of a duty on goat hair when wool was free, hence the hair of the Angora goat, alpaca, and other like animals have likewise been relieved of duty.

(*d*) Reductions have been made in the derived products of goat hair, such as tops, yarns, etc., to adjust the schedule to the basis afforded by making goat hair free.

Essentially the plan of duties on wool and woolens devised by the House has been left unchanged in its basis, the changes being mostly in the direction of reductions. Wool blankets valued at less than 40 cents per pound were made free, and the duty on low-priced hosiery was reduced and the duty on the higher quality increased.

SCHEDULE L.—SILKS AND SILK GOODS.

Articles dutiable under this section are justly considered luxuries and subject to as high duties as purposes of revenue will permit. Consistent with this view, H. R. 3321 has made but very slight reductions in the ad valorem rates, and expected revenues to be derived from this schedule are practically the same as those obtained under the existing law. The House bill, however, substituted throughout this schedule ad valorem rates instead of specific rates as at present. The Finance Committee has not raised the rates provided in the House bill except in the instance of certain handkerchiefs, and in the rates on ribbons where the duty was raised from 40 per cent ad valorem to 45 per cent ad valorem. Inversely, it has reduced the rates on yarns, threads, etc., of artificial silks from 35 per cent ad valorem to 25 per cent ad valorem. With the view of protecting the expected revenues, the Finance Committee recommends the adoption of specific rates which are substantially the equivalent of the House rates in the first four paragraphs of this schedule dealing with partially manufactured silk, spun silk, silk in the gum, velvets, and chenilles. The adoption of such specific rates was most urgently recommended by importers, domestic manufacturers, and customs officials alike, all of whom have convincingly argued that it is practically impossible to ascertain the value of imports under these paragraphs; they believed the rates on an ad valorem basis would lead to much litigation and invite undervaluation to the serious impairment of revenues.

Specific rates, however, necessitated a wide differentiation in the rates established according to the weight or the width of the material, fineness of yarn, and degree of manufacture. Such a system of cumbersome rates may seem undesirable from a theoretical point of view, but for the purposes of practical administration of the law it was thought advisable.

SCHEDULE M.—PAPER, BOOKS, ETC.

The House bill made very heavy reductions in the rates in this schedule and transferred about 46 per cent of imports under this schedule on the basis of 1912 to the free list.

The average ad valorem rate was lowered from 21.42 per cent to 11.85 per cent, a reduction of approximately 45 per cent.

The Finance Committee has raised the average ad valorem rate to 12.35 per cent, and this slight raise is due principally to changing the ad valorem rate in the House bill to specific rates. The reasons for doing this are the same as given in connection with Schedule L. The verbiage of some of the principal paragraphs was changed and the scope somewhat enlarged, and in this way what is thought a more satisfactory arrangement was arrived at in accordance with the recommendations made by the trade.

SCHEDULE N.—SUNDRIES.

This schedule embraces a variety of manufactures with little or no generic relationship between them and not covered by any other schedule in the tariff law.

The plan of arrangement in this schedule called for the transfer of a number of items scattered among other schedules amounting to many millions of dollars in value, and also the transfer of certain items from the dutiable schedule to the free list, and vice versa. These changes brought about an apparent increase in the average ad valorem rate to 33.5 per cent as indicated in the report submitted with the House bill. The chief cause for this apparent increase is the transfer of $52,000,000 worth of laces and braids and similar articles of luxury, dutiable at 60 per cent ad valorem, which hitherto were dutiable under Schedule J. As an additional cause tending in the same direction may be mentioned that many million dollars of imports dutiable at comparatively low ad valorem rates or low ad valorem equivalents, such as coal, coke, and leather, were transferred to the free list in the proposed bill, while, on the other hand, the duty on cut diamonds and other luxuries was raised, and in some instances the raw materials used for these luxuries placed on the dutiable list, which indirectly increased the average ad valorem rate.

The Finance Committee made rather extensive changes in this schedule, not only as far as the rates are concerned, but also with a view to eliminating possible ambiguity and uncertainty as to rates applicable to the individual items. This necessitated a broadening of the language; in some instances, an entire reconstruction of the respective paragraphs.

The Senate committee has raised the rates on ramie hat braid and manufactures thereof, because they are in the nature of luxuries, coming into broad competition with corresponding articles made of silks, also because of the tax on the raw material.

For like reasons a minimum specific duty of 36 cents a gross on pencils is proposed for the House rate. Increased duties are also provided on toilet sets and leather gloves.

The paragraph relating to buttons was reconstructed, assessing a higher rate of duty than is provided for in the House on buttons where foreign competition is heaviest, and lowering the duty below the rate prescribed in the House bill on buttons in which a competitive basis has not yet been reached.

The duty on blasting caps was raised from 75 cents per 1,000 to $1 per 1,000, so as to put an impediment in the way of importers of blasting caps of low quality, the use of which might involve loss of life and limb to the consumers.

Crude marine corals and meerschaum were made dutiable by the Finance Committee for reasons needing no further explanation.

Against these and other instances where the duty has been raised, the Senate committee has gone equally as far, if not farther, in the opposite direction. It has put crude artificial abrasives, fulminates, gunpowder, etc., glaziers' and miners' diamonds, harness, saddlery, not specially provided for, surgical catgut, unexposed photographic films, on the free list. It also made heavy reductions on agate buttons, cheap fur wearing material, manufactures of mother-of-pearl, hard rubber, photographic cameras which were transferred to this schedule from Schedule B. The rates in some few instances, notably in the case of films for moving-picture exhibits, were changed from an ad valorem to a specific basis, for the purpose of protecting revenues and to prevent undervaluations.

The Senate committee has changed very materially the provisions of paragraph 358, furs, etc., both in substance and in rates. Raw furs, hitherto on the free list, were made dutiable in the House bill at 10 per cent ad valorem, being considered a legitimate revenue product, and in this view your committee concurred. They differed from the House, however, as to the ultimate result of such a transfer for the following reasons: In 1912 imports of raw furs into the United States were valued at $17,000,000, and the report accompanying the House bill estimates an import under the 10 per cent rate of $14,000,000 with a corresponding revenue of $1,400,000.

These last figures seem unwarranted in view of the fact that exports of raw furs for 1912 were valued at $14,360,000, leaving a net surplus of imports over exports of only a little over $3,000,000. To what extent the raw furs of animals of the United States enter as a factor into the exports can not be established, but reliable testimony from interested and disinterested parties forces the conclusion that an overwhelming part of the American trade in imported furs is for reexport. Under such conditions the eventual revenue would be very considerably below the estimates of the House if the dealers are to take advantage of the drawback provisions of the law. This, it seems, however, is rather problematical, owing to the fact that the sorting and other operations necessary to prepare the furs for export involve almost insurmountable difficulties in the way of their being carried out under strict governmental supervision, as is required by the Treasury Department for drawback purposes. It seems, also, obvious that with a 10 per cent duty, if the benefit of the drawback is unavailable, the American fur traders would have small opportunity to carry on their business in the world markets against merchants of other countries with raw furs on the free list. The net result of levying a duty of 10 per cent on raw furs would, therefore, in all probability be, first, an absolute loss of a large amount of exports, with all the international exchange of merchandise which this involves, and, second, only a comparatively small net revenue. For these reasons, and because furs have always been on the free list and are on the free list in other countries, it was thought best not to incur the risk of a heavy curtailment in our export trade in this commodity at this time, where other sources of revenue are open to the Government and an extension of our foreign trade is deemed so important. Proceeding from such considerations, the Senate committee has retransferred furs to the free list.

Paragraph 386 has been entirely remodeled in phraseology and extent. The rate, too, was changed. The committee has made all due allowance for the free entry of all kinds of legitimate objects of art accessible or eventually to be made accessible to the masses for their education, but it saw no reason why art objects purchased abroad by the possessors of wealth, intended to be stored away in private mansions for the delectation of the owners and some few privileged friends and often bought merely to gratify a desire for ostentation and irrespective of cost, should not pay a reasonable duty toward the support of the Government.

THE FREE LIST.

Changes in the free list have, for the most part, been treated with sufficient fullness in connection with the respective schedules from which they were transferred.

Table II gives a summary of the articles on the dutiable list of the House bill which have been transferred to the free list, and need not be enumerated again.

Crude marine corals, glass enamel, crude meerschaum, oatmeal and rolled oats, as also extracts of nutgalls, Persian berries, and sumac, on the free list in the House bill, have been transferred to the dutiable list. Crude marine corals used in the manufacture of ornamental articles and crude meerschaum used in making meerschaum pipes are regarded as luxuries and therefore proper objects of taxation.

In the House bill fusible enamel is on the dutiable list. As a result of its investigation the committee did not see any tenable reason why glass enamel should not be placed in the same category with fusible enamel and likewise subject to a revenue duty.

Extracts of nutgalls, Persian berries, and sumac were placed on the free list in the House bill under a misapprehension, as hereinbefore stated in the discussion of the changes in Schedule A, and they were restored to the dutiable list for the reason there given.

Oatmeal and rolled oats, while used as a human food, their use for this purpose is circumscribed and can not be regarded as one of the necessaries in the sense that bread and many other food products are necessaries. After consideration the Senate committee decided it was advisable to impose upon these products a small duty of 33 cents per hundredweight, that being a reduction of 66.6 per cent from the rate in the existing law.

The other alterations made in the free list are largely descriptive, and were made for the purpose of facilitating the administration of the law. This is notably the case in paragraph 647, dealing with barbed and baling wire, and in paragraphs 654 to 658, dealing with works of art, the scope of which last paragraphs has been somewhat restricted. In paragraph 585, dealing with potatoes, the same countervailing provision was used as is carried in paragraph 646 on wheat and wheat products, so that imports of potatoes, wheat, and products thereof from countries that levy no duty on corresponding exports from the United States will be admitted free.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF IMPORTS AND REVENUES, BY SCHEDULES.

To arrive at a fair comparison of customs operations under the present law with those of the House bill and under the amendment proposed by the Senate committee, the same items must be considered under each respective schedule; that is, any item that is dutiable under either the present law, the House bill, or the Senate amendment must appear in the comparison throughout. For example, raw wool being dutiable under the present law, free under the House bill, as well as under the amendment proposed by the Committee on Finance, the import value of raw wool and similar materials must appear in Schedule K throughout. Similarly, furs, which are free under the present law and were again transferred to the free list under the amendment proposed by the Senate committee, appear in Schedule N throughout the comparison.

The same process was followed all along the line in the construction of Table III herewith appended. The itemized imports under the respective schedules of this table are estimates only. They have all been recalculated and the results are therefore not comparable with the corresponding data furnished in the report on H. R. 3321.

TABLE III.—*Comparative statement of imports, revenues, and average ad valorem rates, by schedules, under the present law and under H. R. 3321 as passed by the House and as amended by the Senate for a full year after all its provisions have been in full operation.*

| | Imports under present law (1912). | Estimated imports. | | Free listed by— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Under House bill. | Under Senate bill. | House. | House and Senate. |
| SCHEDULE A. | | | | | |
| Imports | $63,877,494 | $65,925,786 | $66,343,320 | $3,425,637 | $7,808,188 |
| Duties | $12,389,654 | $12,987,887 | $12,486,011 | | |
| Average rate of duty (per cent) | 19.39 | 19.70 | 18.82 | | |
| SCHEDULE B. | | | | | |
| Imports | $22,489,321 | $28,334,985 | $27,879,984 | $108,081 | $1,198,482 |
| Duties | $11,273,032 | $9,209,632 | $9,000,757 | | |
| Average rate of duty (per cent) | 50.12 | 32.50 | 32.28 | | |
| SCHEDULE C. | | | | | |
| Imports | $50,649,306 | $76,597,232 | $76,651,232 | $6,567,032 | $12,420,727 |
| Duties | $17,731,323 | $16,252,475 | $14,092,370 | | |
| Average rate of duty (per cent) | 35.01 | 21.22 | 18.38 | | |
| SCHEDULE D. | | | | | |
| Imports | $24,253,765 | $25,029,173 | $25,029,173 | $18,888,150 | $18,888,159 |
| Duties | $3,041,800 | $898,425 | $898,495 | | |
| Average rate of duty (per cent) | 12.54 | 3.59 | 3.59 | | |
| SCHEDULE E. | | | | | |
| Imports | $105,743,850 | $111,865,725 | $111,865,725 | ..... | ..... |
| Duties | $50,951,199 | $40,196,405 | $40,196,405 | | |
| Average rate of duty (per cent) | 48.20 | 35.93 | 35.93 | | |
| SCHEDULE F. | | | | | |
| Imports | $31,116,027 | $30,595,300 | $30,595,300 | ..... | ..... |
| Duties | $25,571,509 | [1]$26,001,650 | [1]$26,001,650 | | |
| Average rate of duty (per cent) | 82.18 | 84.99 | 84.99 | | |
| SCHEDULE G. | | | | | |
| Imports | $138,082,162 | $142,623,081 | $143,766,847 | $19,621,862 | $25,371,424 |
| Duties | $34,027,924 | $21,442,830 | $21,863,368 | | |
| Average rate of duty (per cent) | 24.64 | 15.03 | 15.21 | | |
| SCHEDULE H. | | | | | |
| Imports | $20,421,978 | $21,911,066 | $21,911,066 | ..... | ..... |
| Duties | $17,334,945 | $18,937,140 | $18,937,140 | | |
| Average rate of duty (per cent) | 84.88 | [2]86.43 | [2]86.43 | | |
| SCHEDULE I. | | | | | |
| Imports | $24,688,535 | $34,026,500 | $34,251,500 | ..... | ..... |
| Duties | $11,257,235 | $10,368,983 | $10,069,075 | | |
| Average rate of duty (per cent) | 45.60 | 30.47 | 29.40 | | |

[1] The rates in this schedule remaining the same as under the House bill and as in the existing law. The increase in the estimated duties as also the average ad valorem rate is due solely to variations in the value of importations.

[2] Though the rates are not increased, the estimated imports show an increase over 1912 because the latter was a year of abnormal importations due to the termination of the reciprocity agreements with countries producing commodities dutiable under Schedule H. In anticipation of the higher rates of duty effective after the termination of these agreements the importations were increased. Normal imports under existing rates of duty may now be expected since the overstock is practically consumed.

TABLE III.—*Comparative statement of imports, revenues, etc.*—Contd.

| | Imports under present law (1912). | Estimated imports. | | Free listed by— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Under House bill. | Under Senate bill. | House. | House and Senate. |
| SCHEDULE J. | | | | | |
| Imports | $62,964,947 | $61,699,031 | $62,457,271 | $370,741 | $26,939,782 |
| Duties | $20,815,320 | $16,176,747 | $9,789,646 | | |
| Average rate of duty (per cent) | 33.06 | 26.22 | 15.67 | | |
| SCHEDULE K. | | | | | |
| Imports | $48,361,374 | $96,120,000 | $96,120,000 | $33,309,415 | $33,309,415 |
| Duties | $27,072,116 | $12,774,000 | $12,548,000 | | |
| Average rate of duty (per cent) | 55.98 | 13.29 | 13.05 | | |
| SCHEDULE L. | | | | | |
| Imports | $24,023,205 | $28,060,600 | $28,049,310 | | |
| Duties | $12,166,266 | $12,252,085 | $12,360,465 | | |
| Average rate of duty (per cent) | 50.65 | 43.66 | 44.06 | | |
| SCHEDULE M. | | | | | |
| Imports | $22,834,184 | $24,960,141 | $24,736,141 | $11,426,841 | $11,426,841 |
| Duties | $4,886,670 | $3,061,230 | $3,145,955 | | |
| Average rate of duty (per cent) | 21.40 | 12.26 | 12.72 | | |
| SCHEDULE N. | | | | | |
| Imports | $187,572,596 | $177,537,806 | $179,254,806 | $9,282,559 | $10,000,220 |
| Duties | $56,578,887 | $56,988,279 | $56,391,386 | | |
| Average rate of duty (per cent) | 30.11 | 32.04 | 31.46 | | |
| Total imports | $827,078,744 | $925,286,426 | $928,911,675 | $103,000,327 | $147,367,238 |
| Total duties | $304,899,360 | $257,583,768 | $247,780,723 | | |
| Average rate of duty (per cent) | 36.86 | 27.84 | 26.67 | | |

The predominant features of this table are the great reduction in average rates and the increase of imports to be admitted free under the amendments proposed by the Senate committee. The House bill has free listed imports valued, on the basis of 1912, at $103,000,000; this amount has been increased under the amendment proposed by the Senate committee to $147,367,000. Partly owing to this transfer, and also owing to the reduction in the House rates, the total revenues under H. R. 3321 as amended by the Senate Committee on Finance have been reduced from $257,583,000 to $247,780,000, a total reduction in revenues from imports of $9,600,000. The average ad valorem duty levied on imports for the year 1912 under the existing law, as shown by this table, was 36.86 per cent; based on estimated imports under the House bill, the ad valorem rate was 27.84 per cent; and under the amendment proposed by the Senate committee the average rate is reduced still further to 26.67 per cent.

Expressed in percentage, the reduction in the average ad valorem rate on all imports made by the amendments of the Senate committee is as follows:

| | Per cent. |
|---|---|
| From the rates under the existing law | 27.64 |
| From the rates of the House bill | 4.22 |

GOVERNMENT REVENUES.

Revenues for the current fiscal year, and especially those from customs receipts, though covering a period of transition from a policy of high protection to a policy of competitive tariff legislation, will be fully equal to the expenditures appropriated for the corresponding period.

The estimates were made by Treasury experts on lines usually adopted in such contingencies. Table IV, as below, gives a balance sheet for receipts and disbursements for the current fiscal year.

TABLE IV.—*Disbursements of the Government and estimated receipts under H. R. 3321 as amended by the Senate committee for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.*

[Statistics of the ordinary receipts and expenditures of the Government, including those of the Post Office Department, but excluding those for the Panama Canal, the sinking fund, and the national bank-note redemption fund.]

| Item. | Estimated revenues for fiscal year ending June 30, 1914. |
|---|---|
| RECEIPTS. | |
| Revenues for 10 months under H. R. 3321 as amended, less duty on sugar | $173,250,000 |
| Duties on imports under the Payne bill for 2 months, exclusive of sugar and wool, additional under Payne bill | 40,650,000 |
| Duties on sugar 8 months under Payne bill and 4 months under H. R. 3321 | 47,000,000 |
| Duties on wool 5 months under Payne bill | 5,830,000 |
| Total customs receipts | 266,730,000 |
| Internal revenue (including $5,000,000 from tax on cotton futures) | 297,000,000 |
| Wine and liquor tax under amended H. R. 3321 for 6 months | 750,000 |
| Corporation tax | 37,000,000 |
| Income tax for 10 months | 58,330,000 |
| Sales of public lands | 5,000,000 |

TABLE IV.—*Disbursements of the Government and estimated receipts under H. R. 3321, etc.*—Continued.

| Item. | Estimated revenues for fiscal year ending June 30, 1914. |
|---|---|
| RECEIPTS—continued. | |
| Miscellaneous | $52,000,000 |
| Postal revenues | 280,000,000 |
| Total | 996,810,000 |
| DISBURSEMENTS. | |
| Civil and miscellaneous | 175,000,000 |
| War Department | 169,000,000 |
| Navy Department | 148,000,000 |
| Indian service | 20,000,000 |
| Pensions | 180,000,000 |
| Interest on public debt | 22,790,000 |
| Postal service | 280,000,000 |
| Total | 994,790,000 |
| Surplus | 2,020,000 |

It will be seen from Table IV, as above, that according to expert computations the estimated receipts for the current fiscal year will exceed expenditures by about $2,000,000. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, during which period the House bill as amended by the Committee on Finance will have been in full operation, the additional customs revenues allowed for in the above estimate, owing to the continuation of the Payne rates for part of the year, will not be available. But the income tax, as well as the tax on spurious wines, wine and grape brandy used in the fortification of pure sweet wines, and the tax on cotton futures will have been operative for a full year, and the revenues so realized, together with the natural increase in customs receipts, will, it is confidently expected, more than equal the economical needs of the Government.

SECTION II.—THE INCOME TAX.

In ascertaining the taxable income of an individual the House provision of the bill allows an exemption of $4,000 and allows no additional exemption on account of wife or children, except in the case of a wife living permanently apart from her husband, in which case the wife may be independently taxed and would be entitled independently to an exemption. By paragraph C of the bill as reported, and which paragraph is amendatory of a portion of paragraph D of the bill as it passed the House, your committee reduces the amount of exemption of net income to $3,000 and allows on account of marriage an additional exemption of $1,000 to either the husband or wife where they are living together, but not to both. In the case of a minor child or children living with and dependent upon the parent such parent is allowed an additional exemption of $500 for one minor child and up to $1,000 on account of minor children, except where both parents are taxable, in which case no exemption is allowable on account of children. By the amendment the lowest possible exemption to any one person would be $3,000 and the highest possible exemption to any one person $5,000. While the amendment may make no wide difference in the volume of revenue derivable from the tax, it is deemed equitable as recognizing the added obligations on account of marriage and children and salutary as emphasizing the family as the unit in our social structure.

Paragraph D is further amended to obviate the constitutional objection to computing the tax on income accruing prior to the date on which the amendment to the Federal Constitution authorizing the tax went into effect. The proposed amendment is repeated in the text of the bill wherever necessary to secure uniformity and effectuate its intent and purpose. The practical effect of the amendment, in connection with other provisions of the bill, is to continue in force the present corporation tax to March 1, 1913, and to compute, assess, and collect the income tax for the remaining months of the calendar year, allowing for these 10 months five-sixths of the deductions authorized by this section of the bill. Thereafter the tax becomes computable, assessable, and payable on the income for each succeeding calendar year.

Your committee conceived that so much of the provision of paragraph E as requires lessees of real estate to make return of rents and withhold and pay the tax would prove, in many cases, impracticable of administration and propose to amend the paragraph in this respect by requiring the landlords to make their own returns, except in cases where the tenants, by the terms of the lease, are required to pay the State and municipal taxes, local assessments and cost of insurance, maintenance and repairs against the property, in which cases the tenants are authorized to deduct the tax from the gross rental and pay the same. The amendment further provides that where the owner is a corporation the tenant shall not be required to deduct the tax from the gross rental, but that the corporation shall be required to make the return and pay the tax.

The paragraph is further amended by requiring that when under a contract entered into before this act takes effect "the payment to which the taxable person is entitled is required to be made without any deduction by reason of any tax imposed, the obligor shall not be compelled to make such deduction or withhold the income tax," but shall be required to give notice to the collector of the payment made as a part of his return, which payment is thereupon required to "be computed as a part of the income of the taxable person." If the obligor fails to give such notice to the collector, then "he shall be personally liable for the tax if the same is not paid by the taxable person."

Paragraph F is amended so as to provide that nothing in this section of the bill shall apply to "business leagues, nor to chambers of commerce or boards of trade, not organized for profit of a private stockholder or individual; nor to any civic league or organization not organized for profit, but operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare."

Immediately following the foregoing amendment a further provision is inserted to meet the cases of States, cities, towns, and other political subdivisions which are in receipt of income from sources other than that of taxation and about which question was raised that such in-

comes might be held subject to the tax. One State enjoys a revenue from the gross earnings of a railway company to which a land grant was made by the State years ago. A city under its contracts with the street railway companies is entitled to a certain per cent of the net earnings per annum. While it was regarded improbable under the provisions of the bill that these revenues to States and municipalities would be construed as taxable income, to foreclose all doubt the amendment is inserted expressly exempting such revenues from the operation of the act.

Paragraph F is further amended by the insertion of the following:

"That mutual life insurance companies shall not be required to return as a part of their income any portion of premium deposits actually returned to their policyholders within the year for which the income tax is paid, nor any portion actually credited to the policyholders by being applied as a deduction from the amount of the premium otherwise due the company within the year for which the income tax is returned."

The paragraph is also amended so that in ascertaining net income a corporation, joint-stock company, or association may deduct interest on an amount of indebtedness equal to the sum of one-half of its combined bonded indebtedness and paid-up capital stock, instead of on an amount equal to its capital stock, as provided in the bill as it passed the House, and the paragraph is further amended as follows:

"That in case of indebtedness wholly secured by collateral the subject of sale in ordinary business of such corporation, joint-stock company, or association, the total interest secured and paid by such company, corporation, or association within the year on any such indebtedness may be deducted as a part of its expense of doing business."

Attention is invited to an amendment proposed to paragraph H. A peculiar situation exists in Alaska. Under a Federal statute the railroads of that Territory are subject to a license tax of $100 per mile of track per annum. About all but one line of the railroads in the Territory are insolvent, and on portions of some of them operation has practically ceased. The Department of Justice, the railroad companies, the people of Alaska, and all others concerned seem to agree that the $100 a mile is a futile tax and should be superseded by some other form of taxation. To meet the situation an amendment is proposed which, in addition to the normal tax of 1 per cent, subjects the railway corporations doing business in Alaska to a 4 per cent tax on their net income from the business done in that Territory, and provides that this additional tax shall be in "lieu of the license tax of $100 per mile per annum now imposed by law."

Your committee have submitted other amendments to this section, but these go to administrative detail rather than to substance. The graduation of the income and the rate of tax imposed are unchanged, and other substantive provisions remain as they came from the House, save in the respects indicated in the foregoing.

SECTION III.—TAX ON CONTRACT FOR FUTURE DELIVERY OF COTTON.

In considering sources for raising necessary revenue the committee felt authorized to select for this purpose the business of dealing in what is known as "cotton futures" on the cotton exchanges of the country and other like places. This business has been the subject of thorough and protracted discussion, with the result of a divided public opinion as to whether the business is wholly pernicious and therefore to be suppressed, or is a real service in the distribution of one of our great agricultural products and therefore to be encouraged. Without assuming to dispose of this controverted issue, the committee adopted, as a justifiable course for present action, the imposition of a tax on such transactions on the cotton exchanges of the country as are not consummated by actual delivery of the cotton specified in such contracts. It is contended by persons related to the sale and consumption of cotton that there is a legitimate branch of the business of dealing in contracts for the future delivery of cotton on cotton exchanges in the way of hedging actual cotton for sale or manufacture. It is, however, admitted by all that there is a large volume of business done upon these exchanges nominally for the purchase and sale for future delivery of cotton where no delivery is ever made, and where there is no real intention to make any such delivery, and the transaction in its last analysis is one of gambling on the future price of one of the staple agricultural products of the country. This latter practice is universally recognized as an evil, and by none more emphatically than by those who claim to resort to the cotton exchanges of the country for protection by means of the so-called hedging system. The tax imposed by the committee is deemed to be sufficiently small to make its payment justifiable by those who resort to the exchanges for the purpose of hedging and sufficiently large to deter the activities of those who resort to such exchanges for the sole purpose of speculation and gambling in the differences of price created from time to time by fluctuations frequently artificially produced.

The committee believes the subject matter to be one fit for the imposition of a proper tax, not only because of its indirect influence in eliminating a parasite which has afflicted the business of dealing in purchases of cotton for future delivery, but because it will result in the collection of a considerable sum of revenue from a source which in its usual operation produced abnormal profits from a business that is not susceptible of just taxation in any other way. The committee is advised that since 1907 no official record of the extent of the dealings on the cotton exchanges in contracts for future delivery is accessible to the public, but reliable estimates fix these dealings at about 130,000,000 bales annually in recent years. It seems to be the consensus of opinion that about 10 per cent of the contracts of sale and purchase of cotton for future delivery is embraced in that branch of the business known as hedging, and that the other 90 per cent thereof is of a speculative or gambling character, where no delivery of the product is ever really intended to be made. If the effect of the proposed tax is to eliminate all of the latter class of business and to leave intact that part of the dealings resorted to for hedging purposes, the revenue derived from this tax should amount to about $7,000,000 a year, and if its imposition does not have the effect of eliminating the gambling or speculative end of the business the revenue derived therefrom will be enormously in excess of this amount.

SECTION IV.—ADMINISTRATION.

The committee deemed the amendments of the House entirely too drastic. We found the tax administration features of our Government were scattered back for half a century, here and there, chaotic, somewhat confusing, but, at any rate, with nearly all debatable points adjudicated, and we thought it better to leave the law for the present substantially as it is, making a provision for a joint committee of the two Houses to revise, simplify, and codify, and to report back to the House Ways and Means Committee by the 1st of January next.

It is believed that in nearly every case where we struck out a provision of the House bill it was new legislation. Some of the new legislation was so obviously right we have left it in.

We added some few amendments for statistical purposes. One of them will be found beginning on line 12, page 215, and going down to and including line 17 on same page, and others for the same purpose will be noted by the reader as he goes through the bill.

Another of these provisions will be found beginning on line 21, on page 219, going down to and including line 7, page 220. Every Senator will recognize there has been a great deal of trouble in determining the precise ad valorem equivalent of a specific duty where many articles are in the same paragraph and where the Government's statistical returns are made for the entire paragraph. This is especially true with regard to "jumping duties.' We thought in this amendment to get a list or enumeration of articles in sufficient detail as to time and quantity and value to obviate the trouble which has been referred to.

We do not think that the new and extensive power of giving to the Secretary of the Treasury, without appeal, the right to determine the existence or nonexistence of a foreign market should be given. It was putting too much power into one man's hands, especially when it is remembered that the Secretary of the Treasury would not be the person to exercise the power, but some special agent of the Treasury would be, the Secretary acting, necessarily, upon his report without much personal knowledge of the facts.

The House bill required a fee of $1 with respect to each separate appraisement. We thought a fee of $1 with respect to the appraisement of an invoice would be sufficient.

The House required also a separate fee of $1 for each separate protest with regard to each article protested and did not permit the protest as to appraisal and the protest as to duty to be included in one document. We saw no more reason why the various grounds of objection to the action of an appraiser should not be included in one document and one fee to cover it all than why various counts should not be placed in a declaration as in a court of law, one fee including them all. At present there is no fee required to be paid at all.

On page 235, lines 3 to 9, inclusive, we struck out the language giving inquisitorial and judicial functions to an appraiser, and leaving it to the discretion of the general appraiser or Board of General Appraisers whether an importer could be present himself or by his attorney to examine and cross-examine witnesses. We substituted for that provision the language beginning on line 20, page 230, going down to and including the word "Appraisers," on line 6, page 231, and required reasonable notice to be given both to the importer and to the Government of the subjects and times of hearings, and permitting the attorneys representing both to be present, but admitting the use of affidavits as being necessary sometimes to take the place of oral testimony and as being simpler than depositions.

We adopted the House provision on line 17, same page, saying that the absence of samples would not invalidate an appraisement or reappraisement, but with an amendment that this should apply only to the cases where neither party in interest had demanded the inspection of the merchandise or sample.

We agreed with the House in its policy of doing away with the contingent-fee arrangements between lawyers and importers at the ports of entry, and we undertook, in the language beginning on line 7, down to and including line 13 on same page, to strengthen and clarify its purpose. We believed with the Ways and Means Committee that a great deal of unnecessary litigation had been brought about and perpetuated by the contingent-fee custom at the ports of entry.

We struck out the very drastic language of the House, line 3, down to and including line 9, page 235, giving to the report of a collector or chief officer of customs the whole force and effect of a judgment of a United States district court, without the right of appeal or any other right. We had doubts of the constitutionality of that provision, but no doubt at all that it was of very doubtful expediency.

You will note an amendment, beginning on line 9, down to and including the first word on line 12, page 236. We thought the decision of the Board of General Appraisers and of the appraisers ought to be published in full when either the board or the Secretary of the Treasury desired. Thus the reasons for the decision would appear to the enlightenment both of the officers and of the importers.

We struck out the language of the House, beginning with the words "and in," on line 13, page 236, down to and including the word "defendant," on line 17, which placed the burden of proof at all stages of litigation upon the defendant; that is, in court. Under the present law the burden of proof rests upon the Government as long as the goods are in the custody of the Government and before they are delivered; then the burden shifts to the importer.

We struck out paragraphs U, V, and W of the House bill, all being new, and, in our opinion, drastic and capable of abuse, if not certain of being abused. This was more especially true of paragraph U, where an innocent American importer could have been punished, and in some cases even perhaps bankrupted, because of the refusal of a firm in a foreign country to submit its books to our inspection. Paragraph V of House bill carried this principle very much further, and penalized not only those engaged in the importation of merchandise, but those "engaged in dealing with such imported merchandise," which might have been stretched to cover the case of a retail merchant in the heart of South Dakota to whom goods had been shipped without any knowledge upon his part of whence they were imported or how.

Paragraph W of the House bill provided for a registry of commissionaires or purchasing agents in each of the United States consulates abroad, and undertook to give our Government what was closely akin to extraterritorial jurisdiction in foreign countries. We thought that the United States Government and its people would not permit any such exercise of authority and jurisdiction by another Government in our own country and that we ought not to attempt to exercise it abroad.

Paragraphs U, V, and W were not only obnoxious to the objection that they were too drastic and would be subject to abuse, but were clearly violative of international equity and equality.

The committee struck out the language of the House on line 3, page 251, beginning with the words "or which," down to and including the words "allowed therein," on line 7. It is a general Democratic principle that the people living in any territory under the flag ought to be treated like people living in any other part of our common domain. As long as the Filipinos are under the flag of the United States they should be entitled to the same rights and privileges as residents of New York or California, and certainly not entitled to any greater rights or privileges than either. A man importing goods into the port of New York from New Orleans containing foreign materials which had not paid duty at New Orleans and which were taxable under the

tariff law to the value of more than 50 per cent of the total value which the materials were subject to, or manufactures of tobacco containing 20 per cent of foreign tobacco subject to an import duty, would have to pay a tax upon the 50 per cent in the one case and the 20 per cent in the other. There was no reason why, therefore, the importations from the Philippine Islands should be permitted to contain 50 per cent and 20 per cent of the materials taxable under our import laws and yet allowed to come free into continental United States. The truth is that, the 10-year period prescribed by the treaty with Spain having expired, imports into the Philippines now ought to be subject to precisely the same duties as in the balance of the United States, although it might be well to let the revenues from importations into the Philippine territory go into the Philippine treasury.

Your committee struck out subsection 7 of paragraph J, page 263, giving a discount of 5 per cent on all duties upon goods imported in American bottoms. The provision was in contravention of some 19 or 20 treaties of the United States without having been preceded by the courtesy of a notice of revocation, and was very properly protested against by the high contracting parties with whom we had the treaties. In our opinion it would have led to no good result, as every other country could have retaliated, and all the countries at the end would have been just about where they started. Moreover the country which could use that principle with most force and effect in injuring other countries would be the country with the largest merchant marine, and the country which could least effectively use it would be the country with the smallest merchant marine. We were therefore not only inviting an endless retaliation but a retaliation where our opponents would have had in nearly every case the better of it, and in many cases infinitely the better.

The provision on page 267 providing for the withdrawal for home consumption of cigars manufactured entirely of tobacco imported from any one country, provided the manufacturing is done under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, and provided that the United States Government shall put a stamp upon the box containing the cigars to indicate their character and the country of origin of tobacco of which made and place of manufacture, was adopted to meet a condition prevailing in this country and to enable the independent manufacturers of tobacco to have better chances with the Tobacco Trust. It was furthermore done because where cigars made out of Cuban tobacco are manufactured in Cuba the Cuban Government affixes its stamp, which attests the place of origin of the tobacco, and every cigar connoisseur is controlled by the presence or absence of that stamp.

There was no reason why cigars made of identically the same tobacco by American labor and American capital should not have an advantage of a Government stamp here, attesting the same purity of origin, etc., thus putting cigars made out of Cuban tobacco in the American market upon an equality of opportunity of sale with cigars made out of Cuban tobacco in the Cuban market, provided only that the manufacturing was done under such rules and regulations as to prevent any possibility of fraud in substituting other tobaccos for the ones attested by the Government to compose the cigars. It is believed that this proviso will very largely increase our revenue because it will encourage the importation of Cuban tobacco, paying a very high duty, by increasing the sales of cigars made out of Cuban tobacco upon American soil.

We struck out the dumping clause of the House provision, first, because it applied to only dutiable articles, and if to be applied to any articles at all it seemed to us it ought to apply to all; secondly, if it did apply to all it was capable, under an unfriendly administration, of being used as a means of increasing the duty upon dutiable articles 15 per cent, and of putting articles upon the free list under a duty of 15 per cent.

The provisions contained in the existing law with regard to undervaluations and the increasing tax because of it up to 70 per cent is a very good antidumping provision and, as we are informed and believe, immediately stopped dumping in the American market, and this, too, without making it discretionary with any executive officer (to be exercised in a broad way) to raise the duty.

On lines 11 to 17, inclusive, on page 273, we have given to the circuit courts of appeal in certain cases concurrent jurisdiction with the Court of Customs Appeals. The Court of Customs Appeals sits in Washington. Frequently litigation may arise in Portland, Me., or in San Diego or San Francisco, Cal., and we thought the settlement of controversies ought to be nearer the place of residence of the citizen than the existing system permits them to be.

Finally, recognizing the chaotic, confused, and scattered nature of the tax administration laws of the United States, we provided in the amendment, beginning on line 18, page 273, and going down to and including line 14, page 274, for a joint committee consisting of four Members of the House and three Members of the Senate to investigate and consider the revenue administration laws—simplify, revise, harmonize, and codify them. We gave to this committee the power to subpœna and compel the attendance of witnesses, to record and print hearings and employ an expert clerk, a stenographer or stenographers, make a final report to the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and print it for the use of the Senate and the House, and required it to make this report not later than February 1, 1914. We make an appropriation for the purpose of the sum of $15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment ending on line 18, page 276, has already been explained as having been intended to offset a possible constitutional objection to the retroactive power of Congress and to continue the old excise law in operation until the new income-tax law shall become operative.

RETALIATORY DUTIES.

The Committee on Finance calls special attention to the provision designated to furnish the President with power to impose tariff duties of a retaliatory character upon all articles comprised in a specified list. For some years there has been a development of maximum and minimum tariffs abroad, and in not a few instances the Government of the United States has been compelled to see its citizens subjected to harsh and discriminating tariff treatment abroad without being able under the law to afford relief. The tariff act of 1909 recognized this situation and established a general maximum schedule of duties 25 per cent higher than the general or minimum rates of the law. This maximum schedule has proved embarrassing, clumsy, and inadequate, and the situation under it has been less satisfactory than that which previously existed. No material advantages have been derived from it, but, on the contrary, it has stood in the way of successful commerce with other countries. The provision now recommended will, it is believed, place in the hands of the President powers which, though extensive in their sphere, are sufficiently circumscribed to permit of their being exerted within the limits assigned them without disturbing the general fiscal system of the United States. Wise use of the retaliatory power will, it is reasonably to be expected, bring about equitable arrangements with those countries which do not now afford us fair treatment, and it is probable that the weapon thus provided will be so available and effective as to render its actual use entirely unnecessary under any ordinary conditions.

Accordingly the bill H. R. 3321, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, is reported back with amendments, with the recommendation that as amended it do pass.

Mr. STONE. In this connection I wish to send to the desk a concurrent resolution, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) was read and referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there be printed 30,000 copies of the report (S. Rept. No. 80) of the Finance Committee of the Senate, accompanying the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes; 20,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 10,000 for the use of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I have polled the Committee on Printing on the concurrent resolution and I report it back and ask for its immediate consideration.

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

Mr. STONE. I desire to state to the Senate that the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from North Carolina, will to-morrow on the assembling of the Senate make the statement he had intended to make to-day, giving a general analysis of the bill and such observations as he thinks proper to add. He is not able to be here to-day, but he will be here to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. STONE. I ask that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. CUMMINS. Before that is done——

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to give notice that on Monday next, July 21, I will address the Senate, after the routine morning business, on the pending tariff bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that immediately following the statement by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], which is to be made to-morrow, I will address the Senate upon the tariff bill, not to interfere, of course, with the notice already given, although the Senator from Utah has known of my purpose for some time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri asks that the consideration of the tariff bill be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. STONE. That the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri asks that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

COTTON TIES AND COTTON BAGGING.

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate resolution 134, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Commerce be, and is hereby, directed to investigate the recent advance in price of bagging used in baling cotton; also the advance in price of ties used in banding or baling cotton; and to report to the Senate at the earliest possible time the cause or causes for said advances.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, some time in the early spring—about the usual time when the prices for covering and putting in marketable order the great commercial crop of the South were being considered—inquiries were coming in from the merchants and from different sources throughout the South as to just what would be the current price or what would be the status, so far as any legislation is concerned. I was unable to answer that, as I suppose other Senators interested were unable to answer it.

Subsequent to that there have come letters in great numbers calling attention to the fact that, without any reason, the price of this common article, the covering of the American cotton crop, has advanced 2 cents a yard, aggregating a cost to the producers of cotton of $1,800,000. The parties engaged in the manufacturing business, as I am informed from the Department of Commerce this morning, are only 14 in number. Those 14 are subsidiaries, according to my information, to the American Manufacturing Co., 63 Wall Street, New York.

I have attempted to investigate to find what is the reason for this rise in price from 8 cents a yard last year, on exactly the same covering, to 10 cents a yard this year, and I have been unable to find it. There is no report current that the jute crop has been short; there is no report that there has been any excess in the cost of labor; but at the arbitrary will of these few parties engaged in this industry, in the preparation of the

article, $1,800,000 is to be added to the cost of marketing a great product.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this is rather refreshing to me, because in the past I have always heard the Senator from South Carolina say that the reason for these extreme prices has been the tariff.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It is the cause, in my opinion, now.

Mr. SMOOT. The pending bill provides that cotton bagging shall be free. So, I say, it is quite refreshing to me to hear the Senator now ask for reasons why there is an increase in the price of cotton bagging.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator from Utah well knows that those engaged in this business have been protected by a duty that forbade competition and importation. Realizing the danger which now threatens them and knowing that they have this one stroke at the American people, they are holding them up to get $1,800,000 before they are forced by the Democratic tariff to deal fairly.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator ought to know that the few manufacturers of this country of cotton bagging have not a million eight hundred thousand dollars on hand, nor any considerable portion of it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I suspect that is one of the reasons why they want to get it.

Mr. SMOOT. All I wanted to call the Senate's attention to was that the rate on cotton bagging is only six-tenths of a cent a square yard. Now, the Senator from South Carolina rises in his seat and says the price has advanced 2 cents a pound.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. SMOOT. In the very face of free bagging. I say to the Senator that there is some other cause for increased prices besides the tariff, as I have told him in the past. Instead of being increases by American manufacturers in the future, he will find the foreign manufacturers dictating to the southern planters as to what they shall pay for their cotton bagging.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. All I have to say in reply to that is that on account of the duty existing previously the great arteries of trade through which the article passed were preempted by that duty, and it takes some time even with a smaller duty for trade to become accustomed to the fact that the markets of our country are open to competition. Now, with free bagging a thing that is possibly permanent—and which I hope will be permanent under the long stretch of Democratic rule that lies before us—they are getting ready to go out of business, and as a last stroke under their monopoly and under their protection they are exacting $1,800,000 from the people who are dependent upon them for this cover.

Mr. SMOOT. The manufacturers of cotton bagging have very little cotton bagging on hand to-day. There is no question about it, and I do not want the planter of the South to be misled, and I promise him foreign dictation in prices after the passage of this bill. After this tariff bill becomes law, the American manufacturers of cotton bagging will be wiped out of existence, and the Senator knows that that will be the case. He has admitted that they will cease making these goods. The southern planter will be the sufferer. I want the Senator to remember that I predict this day that the cotton planter of the South, as soon as the American manufacturer is destroyed, will pay more for his cotton bagging than last year, and it will be an advance of more than six-tenths of a cent a square yard, the present duty.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If this is a sample of their beneficence to the cotton planter I should like to contribute to their destruction, which I have consistently done up to the present. But I want to call attention to the fact, Mr. President, that there is some cause, and the people who produce this article are entitled to know what that cause is.

Mr. President, there are other Senators here who have received communications like my own, and there are Senators present who are not forgetful of the period of about 1898 that we went through, almost paralleling this very condition on the part of the growers of cotton throughout the South, when the price was put up arbitrarily so high as to cost the American cotton grower anywhere from 35 to 50 cents per bale at the arbitrary will of those who have a monopoly of this article.

My resolution instructs the Secretary of Commerce to investigate it. If it is a natural cause, the simple law of supply and demand that is producing this burden upon the American people, then there is nothing to be done; but if upon investigation it is found that this is done in spite of the law we have for the regulation of this kind of oppression, it should be known.

I think it is the duty of the Senate to pass this resolution and let the officers of the Government charged with it see that the facts shall be laid before the Senate. If the cotton growers of this country have got to pay $1,800,000, let them pay it legitimately along the line of supply and demand, and not at the sweet will of a combination who wish to raise the price and extract this stupendous sum from the cotton growers.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LIPPITT. I have not the slightest objection in the world to the passage of this resolution. If the Senator from South Carolina thinks that it will throw any light upon the situation, I am quite ready to join with him in having that light thrown.

I simply rose to ask him about the statement which he made a few minutes ago, of which I am not informed, in which he said that the factory or factories, I do not know which, making this cotton bagging, in consequence of the proposed tariff bill, were now preparing to close their industry and go out of business.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I did not say that. I said, in contemplation of taking advantage of their monopoly and the protection that was thrown around them, they were putting up the price in order that they might take advantage of that they had been enjoying all these years. I did not say that they were about to go out of business, because I do not believe they will. I believe there is a legitimate profit in the business on the lines of competition. I believe there is illegitimate profit in it that they have been enjoying all these years or they would not be clamoring for protection.

Mr. LIPPITT. Then I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am glad the Senator called it to my attention.

Mr. LIPPITT. I understood the Senator to make that assertion.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; I made no such assertion.

Mr. LIPPITT. So far as the inquiry goes, I can see no objection to it at all. If any light can be thrown on the situation, there is no reason in the world why it should not be.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I have received letters and communications from parties in my State who are interested in this question. I want to say that one communication which I have before me is not from a cotton grower, but from those who are known with us as cotton warehousemen, cotton factors, those who sell immediately the cotton bagging to the cotton grower. I have a letter here from a concern known as Peacock's Warehouse, in the town of Pavo, in my State, men who are entirely reputable and whose statements can be relied upon with perfect confidence, in which it is stated that now, as the cotton crop is about to be marketed, they are charged by the manufacturers 20 per cent higher for bagging than they have ever been charged before and 15 per cent higher for ties than they have ever been charged before.

The principal interest which these factors or cotton warehousemen have in this question of increased price is that they may not be misunderstood by their customers. They do not desire that it shall be thought by the grower of cotton that they are the parties who are imposing this additional burden upon them, and consequently these communications to us inquiring as to the cause of this enormous increase in the cost of these articles.

Now, Mr. President, I do not propose to be now misled into an argument on this subject of the tariff. I do not think that this particular situation is one where a discussion of the tariff is going to lead to any particular information on this subject or give any relief. I suppose, Mr. President, from what I have heard, though I am not informed fully, that the increase in price is due to the fact that a trust has gotten possession of this business and is controlling it and can put the price arbitrarily wherever it pleases. I presume that is the fact.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is speaking of the foreign trust? Of the foreign trust, that is true.

Mr. BACON. I do not know about there being a foreign trust. Those whom we deal with in this country are certainly those who are the immediate parties putting this into force and operation. Whether they have any relations with parties in a foreign country or not I do not know; but if my information is correct there are parties in this country who absolutely control the question of the production of bagging. The jute is imported into this country and the bagging is manufactured in this country. If my information is correct, the entire busi-

ness of the manufacture of bagging has been absorbed by parties who have gone into a combination for this purpose. Of course there is no way by which we can say that they shall sell for less, but if there is anything in law, Mr. President, in this country there is a way by which those who seek thus to oppress the people shall be brought to judgment and punishment.

While this resolution has in contemplation the Department of Commerce, the department which I think should direct its activities particularly in this direction is the Department of Justice. If it be true, as I have no doubt from the letters which I have and which have been sent tc the Senator from South Carolina and others, that there is a combination in this country of those who are manufacturing bagging, a combination by which they have absorbed to themselves all the manufacture of this product, and that they are arbitrarily levying a tax of from $1,000,000 to $1,800,000 in excess of legitimate profits upon the producers of cotton in this country as a result of this combination, then if the Department of Justice can not bring them to judgment it is of little use that we should have such a law upon the statute book.

I have heard, Mr. President, the expression of the desire that the antitrust law should be one that should "have teeth in it." That is a somewhat coarse expression, but it is one frequently used. If the statements now made are true, that this combination of bagging manufacturers have deliberately, without any justification and solely in the lust of extortion, deliberately set themselves to work through the power of their monopoly to levy a tax between $1,000,000 and $1,800,000 upon the cotton growers of this country, then, Mr. President, if the Sherman antitrust law is one which has any efficacy it is a time when not simply the penalties of fine should be imposed, but when the prison doors should be closed upon these men.

Mr. President, it is difficult to conceive of a thing more iniquitous than this. The most laborious, never-ceasing, hard-working people in this country are the agricultural classes, and chief among them are those who raise cotton. It takes 12 long months in the year, and there is in general very little direct profit in it to the men who grow it except when occasionally conditions are such that the price goes above the normal standard. When men have been engaged in this important industry, devoting to it during all the year all their time and their energies, and just at a time when there is a possibility of their reaping some small profit as the fruit of their labors to have a lot of men sit in an office and by this monopolistic combination in violation of law exact from these men nearly $2,000,000, certainly presents an occasion when the powers of the Department of Justice should be brought into play and practically demonstrated.

I think, Mr. President, that here is the place for the activities of the Department of Justice to manifest themselves. I trust that the resolution, whether it will accomplish anything or not through the Department of Commerce, will have the effect of calling the attention of the Department of Justice to a situation which requires immediate attention. I trust that it may result in securing such a judgment against them as will be a warning in the future to those who will flagrantly defy and violate the law of this country which prohibits such combinations and such extortionate exactions from the people of the land through combinations and monopolies.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have no objection whatever to the passage of the resolution. I think that it is very proper indeed that the investigation should be made. I will watch with particular interest the report when made, because we shall have some reason given other than that the tariff has raised the price.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] says that these goods are made entirely in this country. There were 13,365,349 square yards of them imported in 1912.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Will the Senator from Utah again state how many yards were imported?

Mr. SMOOT. There were imported 13,365,349 square yards.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Is the total amount of consumption stated?

Mr. SMOOT. The total amount of production is stated in dollars and cents.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. But the tables do not give the number of yards consumed?

Mr. SMOOT. No; but the total amount of production is $3,507,000. To show the Senator the values they place upon these goods, I will say that I find that the unit of value of bagging is 4.7 cents per square yard.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I merely rose to call the Senator's attention to the fact that there is used in this country for the covering of cotton alone something like 120,000,000 square yards.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I was giving these figures——

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, when merely 10 per cent is imported, it is not unreasonable, speaking generally, to say that the article is manufactured in this country.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the figures of the department are right, the production in this country is $3,507,000, then, of course, there is not 120,000,000 square yards used, because it could not possibly be, considering the production at the price at which it is sold. But be that as it may, I simply want to say that it strikes me very forcibly, if Senators of the South expect to get any advantages at all from free bagging, that they will have to vote against House subsection 2, paragraph 1, which provides:

I. That no goods, wares, articles, and merchandise—except immediate products of agriculture, forests, and fisheries—manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by convict labor, or principally by children under 14 years of age in countries where there are no laws regulating child labor, shall be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited.

Mr. President, these very goods, and particularly bags, sacks, and all fabrics that come in for the manufacture of bags and sacks, for grain bags, and so forth, used by the farmers all over the country, are made in Calcutta. I have in my office photographs showing children from 9 years up who are laboring in those mills. The only clothing the men, women, and children wear is the breech clout. The wages are from 8 to 10 cents a day, and their bodies show that they are almost starved to death. Pass this provision, and I want to say to every farmer in this country and to every cotton grower of the South, if the American manufacturer is destroyed that you will thereby prevent the importation of these goods that are needed by all farmers and all cotton growers in this country from Calcutta.

I simply call that now to the attention of the Senate for its consideration.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah seems to have some doubt upon the estimate of the number of yards of bagging used in this country in the baling of cotton. It takes about seven yards to cover a bale of cotton. If the Senator will multiply 15 by that number, he will get a pretty accurate estimate of the amount of bagging used in this country.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, Mr. President, what I am quoting from are the figures of the department.

Mr. BACON. The department may be wrong, but the estimate that I suggest is one that no one will dispute. We know how many bales of cotton have been made in the country; we know how many yards it takes to cover a bale of cotton; and we know how much 7 times 15 would be.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me ask the Senator, then, if there is not a great quantity of second-hand bagging used in the baling of cotton?

Mr. BACON. I am not myself engaged in the production of cotton. I am simply an observer. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is doubtless familiar with the matter.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator from South Carolina if that is not a fact?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. There is a great deal of piece bagging, but that piece bagging is as nothing in proportion to the other. I will state to the Senator that, even the sale of that piece bagging is, through some manipulation of the market with which I am not familiar, controlled entirely by the same persons who sell the whole bagging. Just how they have obtained control I am unable to say, but I hope that the investigation will reveal that fact.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no sympathy with the control, Mr. President, at all. I only suggested this to account for the difference between the report made by the department and the amount used as stated by the Senator from South Carolina. I think that that fully explains the matter, because I do know that there is a great deal of secondhand bagging used for the covering of cotton.

Mr. BACON. I do not want to delay this matter. I simply wish to say that I am not going to go into the subject of the tariff discussion now. I have no doubt that will be very fully discussed by those more competent than myself. Really, the principal object I have in saying anything at all is to try to incite the Department of Justice to action in reference to this matter and to get at it pretty quickly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Utah a question. If it be true that this bagging is made in Calcutta under conditions such as the Senator has detailed, how does it happen that we have not much larger importations of it?

Mr. SMOOT. On account of the six-tenths of 1 cent per square yard under the present law; but this bill proposes——

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand; but can our manufacturers compete with this condition in Calcutta and be protected by the small duty now imposed on that foreign product?

Mr. SMOOT. That is a pretty fair duty on the square yard; in fact, I think the duty amounts to nearly 10 per cent on this very coarse article; but so far, in the past, it has allowed our manufacturers in this country to manufacture a great part of the cotton bagging that is used here.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I understand this resolution merely directs the Secretary of Commerce to make an inquiry and to report.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all.

Mr. STONE. If that is the full scope of the resolution, I have no objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

FOREIGN TARIFF SYSTEMS AND INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a report prepared by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the other House, entitled "Foreign Tariff Systems and Industrial Conditions." This document was the subject of some pretty severe strictures at the hands of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] on June 21. Without referring in detail to the bill and to the speech that was at that time made, it was in substance charged that this report was prepared in support of the hobby of the Secretary of Commerce and that figures were manipulated to support certain conclusions. At the end of the speech these words were used:

> Whenever statistics are gathered from the realm of speculation, and with no other object in view than to demonstrate some pet idea, the information sought to be conveyed by them necessarily becomes misleading, and such a practice should be condemned, no matter by whom indulged in.

The subject is discussed under such subheads as "Bolstering up the Secretary's hobby," "Manipulating the figures," and so forth. If these statements were to go unchallenged, it would be doing a great injustice to the Secretary of Commerce, as well as to the bureau chief and his aids who prepared this document. The fact is that this document had its origin in a communication which was addressed by the honorable chairman of the Way and Means Committee of the other House to the then Secretary of Commerce, the Hon. Charles Nagel, under date of November 29, 1912, to which a certain reply was made, a portion of which is contained in the document referred to.

Later the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, on January 1, 1913, addressed another letter to Mr. A. H. Baldwin, the chief of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. The work was immediately taken up by that bureau. It progressed very rapidly. It was completed, I believe, about April 5. The entire work of this report was made by a Republican bureau under the direction of a Republican Secretary of Commerce. That bureau has not been changed in any particular since the Democratic administration was installed on March 4, 1913. The collation of figures and the deductions therefrom are all the work of that bureau. It has not been since reorganized.

In the interest of truth and that the facts may exactly appear in the RECORD, so that they may be in the possession of Senators, I desire to send to the desk a letter addressed to me by the Secretary of Commerce, under date of July 2, 1913, with the request that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, July 2, 1913.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I note that Hon. REED SMOOT, Senator from Utah, made an address before the Senate on the 21st of June, which is printed on pages 2123–2127, inclusive, of the RECORD of that date, respecting the pamphlet entitled "Foreign Tariff Systems and Industrial Conditions," to which reference is made somewhat in detail in the Senator's address. In particular this language was used by Senator SMOOT:

"* * * but some one in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce evidently thought it was wise to try and bolster up the Secretary's theories."

Perhaps I ought to add the following clause from the first sentence of the Senator's address:

"The work of any Government bureau should be free from anything akin to partisan bias."

I venture respectfully to suggest that the statements made in what is alleged to be serious debate by the distinguished Senator from Utah should have the merit of accuracy.

The pamphlet from which the Senator quotes was not published by or for this department or any bureau of it. It was prepared entirely by appointees of the past administration, and the whole matter was originated and developed almost to its final stages before the present administration entered office.

The department gave to the press on May 13, 1913, a brief summary prepared by the authors of the pamphlet and has utilized a portion of 150 copies kindly given it by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, for whom the document was prepared and by whose order it was printed and published.

The matter had its origin in a letter from Hon. O. W. UNDERWOOD, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, to Hon. Charles Nagel, dated November 29, 1912, pursuant to which there was furnished on February 19, 1913, to Mr. UNDERWOOD by Hon. B. S. Cable, Acting Secretary, certain data which now forms that portion of the pamphlet covered by pages 10 to 12, inclusive. Meanwhile, on January 1, 1913, Mr. UNDERWOOD, by letter direct to Mr. A. H. Baldwin, then and now Chief of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, requested further information, the preparation of which was at once undertaken and, as the records of the department show, was well under way during the month of January. It reached its final form on April 5, and was then presented by me in the form of a report to Mr. UNDERWOOD with letter stating that it was "in compliance with your request of January 1, 1913."

Certain abstracts of foreign books and articles were on April 12 transmitted to Mr. UNDERWOOD, which form a portion of the publication made by the Ways and Means Committee.

On April 17 this department was advised by Mr. UNDERWOOD "that the material will be published in pamphlet form by the Ways and Means Committee."

The substance of the Senator's address has been examined by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, who advise as follows:

"Senator SMOOT states that the report 'contains statements that are not founded on fact and which should never have appeared in the report of any bureau.' His chief criticism of the report is twofold. He claims (1) that the statistical treatment on pages 29–42 is faulty, but fails to indicate in what respects the minor differences in census methods vitiate the results, and (2) that the smaller outlay for labor in comparison with the value added by manufacture in the United States, as compared with the United Kingdom, is 'ridiculous,' apparently on the assumption that the statistics show lower labor cost in comparison with quantity of output, while the comparison is really based on value, and three times at least in the report (pp. 34, 38, and 41) the effect of the difference in price level is emphasized.

"The most striking feature of Senator SMOOT's speech is the fact that practically all the arguments against the use of the figures on which the bureau's report is based are quotations of some of the qualifying statements contained in the report itself. In the report the attempt was made to present, as fully as the facilities of the bureau permitted, the data deemed pertinent to the inquiries of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and all differences in statistical method were carefully explained. In the use of the statistics allowance should be made for such differences in method, but no reasons have been adduced by Senator SMOOT to show that these differences are sufficient to affect materially the comparisons made in the report.

"Special reference should be made to the following points in the speech of Senator SMOOT:

"1. That the report has a political bias.

"2. That the comparison of average ad valorem duties is unfair, because of differences in method of valuation and because of the absence of averages 'for France and some other countries' based on dutiable imports alone.

"3. That the inclusion in the British census of production of certain industries excluded by the census of the United States renders the results of the two censuses incomparable.

"4. That the omission from the British returns of the number of establishments and the amount of capital prevents comparison with the United States census.

"5. That differences exist between the census methods of the two countries in respect to engine capacity.

"6. That the data used for the wages paid in the United Kingdom 'are absolutely fraudulent.'

"A separate reply to each of these points of criticism is given below:

"1. The claim that the report shows a partisan bias on the part of the bureau is unfounded. The report was not prepared by the bureau on its own initiative. The subject matter was practically determined by the questions submitted for consideration, and the statistics presented were selected, without preconceived theory, as the most authoritative and the most comparable that were available within the field prescribed. The conclusions stated were merely the expression in text of the averages shown in the tables, and inferences that it was deemed were open to question were carefully avoided.

"2. France is the only country for which the dutiable imports were not given separately for at least one year, and the reason for the absence of such figures is indicated on page 10 of the report. It is hardly fair to suggest that separate figures for dutiable imports were omitted in the case of foreign countries for the purpose of emphasizing the high ad valorem rates in the United States, in view of the fact that no comparison is made in the report between the United States rates and those of foreign countries, and that in the United States statistics the average ad valorem duty is shown on the basis of both total imports and dutiable imports, so that a comparison with the rates for foreign countries may be made on either basis. In regard to the method of converting the specific rates of the French tariff into ad valorem rates by the use of the official figures for the value of imports it may be said that, while no high degree of accuracy can be claimed for the French figures, they could hardly be characterized as 'rankest kind of guesswork.' It may also be added that similar methods for ascertaining the value of the foreign trade are employed by a number of European countries, including Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy. A full discussion of the statistical methods of different countries, prepared by this bureau, is given in House Report No. 5, Sixty-third Congress, first session, pages 499 to 506, to which pages reference is made on page 10 of the report on 'Foreign tariff systems and industrial conditions.'

"3. The data for certain industries included in the census of the United Kingdom and not in the census of the United States have been deducted from the British returns and a separate column shown under the heading 'Manufactures proper,' which is fairly comparable with the returns of the United States. Most of the comparisons in respect to industrial efficiency of the two countries are, however, based on returns for separate industries which are obviously not affected by the total number of industries that are included in the British census.

"4. Similarly the absence from the British report of returns for the number of establishments and for the capital employed does not affect in any way the comparisons made, which have to do exclusively with

(a) Value added by manufacture; (b) capacity of engines; (c) number of wage earners; (d) amount of wages.

"5. As will be seen from the statement on page 31 of the report, there is no variation in the methods of compiling the figures for engine capacity in the United Kingdom and the United States, except in regard to the motors using purchased current. The amount of current used for other purposes than power is estimated at not more than one-fourth of the purchased current, and while it is not shown separately in the original returns and can not therefore be deducted, the amount is not sufficient to affect materially the comparison.

"6. The figures used in the report of the bureau for purposes of comparison with census returns were taken from the British Board of Trade report on earnings and hours of labor in 1906, as stated on page 38 of the report, and not, as inferred by Senator SMOOT, from the report of the board of trade on wages and cost of living. The British investigation of the subject of earnings and hours of labor was not so comprehensive as the United States census of manufactures, but the proportion of wage earners employed in the different industries covered by the British investigation is sufficient to indicate accurately the general level of wages in those industries. Senator SMOOT refers in particular to the comparative outlay for wages in the glove industry of the United States and the United Kingdom, apparently on the assumption that the outlay is larger in the United Kingdom. The figures which he quotes from the report show the contrary, and the importation of gloves into this country from the United Kingdom would therefore seem quite natural. The low wage cost for Canada, which Senator SMOOT declares 'unbelievable,' may be due, as suggested on page 38, to the fact that some of the Canadian industries are confined to finishing or assembling operations.

"In view of the amount of space devoted by Senator SMOOT to the question of low wages in the United Kingdom as compared with wages in the United States, there is reason to believe that there is a tendency on his part to confuse the rate of wages and the amount of wages paid. It was not the intention of the bureau to convey the impression that the industrial efficiency of the United States was due to cheaper labor; the figures given in the report show, on the contrary, that in spite of the higher rate of wages paid in the United States the outlay for wages in proportion to the value of the net output is less than in the United Kingdom, owing to the more economical employment of labor at high wages in combination with highly developed machinery. A striking illustration of that form of industrial efficiency is presented by the automobile industry, in which the supremacy of the United States, in regard to low and medium priced cars produced in large quantities by automatic machinery, is admitted generally and attested by the rapidly growing export trade."

The distinguished Senator from Utah, if he is to establish his contentions, must explain away our sales of manufactured goods of all kinds abroad in competition with the world to the extent during the fiscal year just closed of about $1,500,000,000. In particular he should show why the chief increase in our export trade is in the sales of fully finished manufactures, in which lines the increased sales for the first 11 months of the last fiscal year were $96,000,000.

I await with interest the Senator's explanation as to why, when we can not, as he is understood to believe, compete with the world we are as a matter of fact doing so increasingly. How is it that we sell if we are unable to sell, and if we are able to sell how is it that we need to be guarded against our customers?

Finally, let me add that the personnel and organization of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce remains to-day just as it was taken over from the preceding administration. In neither respect is it deemed fully satisfactory. Therefore the problem of reorganizing this important bureau so that it may more efficiently gather and publish commercial statistics and better promote the foreign and domestic commerce of the Nation has long been the subject of study. A tentative plan for the reorganization of the bureau has been prepared which it is intended soon to present to the President for his approval, and which will in due course be laid before Congress.

Yours, very truly,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD, *Secretary.*

Hon. ATLEE POMERENE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, of course it was not so intended, but the report itself points out the particulars—I am speaking generally now—wherein the tables are not mathematically correct. We all understand that when it comes to the collection of data to prove a given state of facts, a given condition, there may be modifications due to different conditions existing in different countries, and these facts are specifically pointed out in the report itself. I think that it was entirely unfair, though no doubt it was not so intended, that the criticism was made that this report was dictated by party bias.

In discussing the question of the efficiency of labor in the several countries, the Senator from Utah, in attempting to refute the position taken by the Secretary of Commerce, makes the statement that—

The imports alone would demonstrate the falsity of the assertion that labor is more efficient here than abroad.

Assuming, for the sake of the argument, that that statement is true, by the inexorable force of his own logic, then, when the fact appears, as it does appear, that during the last year we exported to foreign countries $1,500,000,000 worth of goods, a large part of which were manufactured products, that must prove the superior efficiency of American labor over that which exists in any other country.

I do not care to take the time to now discuss this report further, but I thought that it was due to Senators that this letter should be laid before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. It is rather a remarkable circumstance, Mr. President, that the Secretary of Commerce should write a letter to a Senator of the United States, being a defense of a report prepared by his department, and have it delivered immediately upon his answer to a resolution of the Senate of June 26, 1913, asking for certain information. I am glad the Senator has had that——

Mr. POMERENE. I did not hear the Senator's statement.

Mr. SMOOT. I said it was a rather remarkable circumstance that the Secretary of Commerce should address a letter to a Senator of the United States upon the subject covered by the letter, and that it should be delivered at the same time he responds to a resolution of the Senate.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator the date of the resolution to which he refers?

Mr. SMOOT. The date of the resolution is June 26, 1913, and the communication of the Secretary of Commerce transmitted in response to that resolution only reached the Senate an hour or so ago.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah——

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not making any particular objection to that, but I prefer now to answer——

Mr. POMERENE. No; Mr. President, I insist upon the right to answer the insinuation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator that I have made no insinuation at all. I am simply stating the facts. I have the report here in my hand.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the fact is that that communication has been in my possession for nearly 10 days. I have had it here on several occasions with the intention of presenting it. The opportunity, in my judgment, did not present itself until to-day. If any fault lies in the fact that it was not presented, it is mine, and not that of the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no criticism to offer on that point, either as to the Senator or as to the Secretary of Commerce. I thought, though, that it was rather a peculiar circumstance that it should be presented to the Senate at exactly the same time that the Senate received the communication from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting a response to the Senate resolution of June 26.

Mr. POMERENE. I am afraid the difficulty arises from the fact that my very distinguished friend from Utah is always suspicious of everything that does not accord with his own pet theory.

Mr. SMOOT. That remark, Mr. President, is uncalled for and unjust, and does not do credit to the Senator from Ohio.

There is sent to the Senate to-day a response to the Senate resolution of June 26, 1913, offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT]. I want to call the Senate's attention to this report, to the admission that is made in this communication, and let them judge whether I was not justified in calling the country's attention to a document that has been issued by one of the departments of the Government upon request of the Ways and Means Committee. I felt when I read that report that it was time to call a halt upon issuing reports based upon the sort of information that this report contains.

The Secretary of Commerce says:

The resolution speaks of "The Report of the Department of Commerce entitled 'Foreign Tariff Systems and Industrial Conditions.'" The Department of Commerce took no initiative with respect to this report.

Of course it did not. Upon the very title-page it says that it was issued at the request of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and I so stated in my remarks.

The Secretary continues:

The publication bearing this title is a committee document published by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, containing a report prepared at the request of that committee by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, as the title of the pamphlet shows. The Committee on Ways and Means kindly gave to the Department of Commerce 150 copies of the pamphlet. A brief summary, a single page prepared by the authors of the report, was given to the press by the department on May 13, 1913. No edition of the pamphlet was issued by the Department of Commerce.

Mr. President, after that pamphlet was issued, and after it was in the hands of the Ways and Means Committee, and after it no doubt had been examined by the members of the Department of Commerce, did a single person from that department call attention to the now admitted fact that the figures in the report were incorrect? Did anyone in Congress undertake to correct them? Did anyone even intimate that they were not to be put out to the public as absolute facts?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. Does not the report itself point out the particulars in which these tables are not complete?

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator to wait until I get through, and then I will answer him by this communication. I am not complaining of any figures that are in the report that are not incorrect, but I want to show the Senator that the Secretary of Commerce says some of them are not correct. I am calling his attention to the fact that their incorrectness was never called to the attention of Congress nor did Congress or anybody else ask for a reprint whereby the errors could be corrected.

I read from the Secretary's letter:

The resolution mentions "the statements that it takes 504 horsepower in the United States to add the same value to cotton goods as 114 horsepower does in the United Kingdom."

This is the wording of the resolution, about which I had nothing whatever to say and with the preparation of which I had nothing to do.

I continue reading:

If reference is made to page 39 of the pamphlet, this language does not quite accurately represent what there appears. It is stated in the table on page 39 that there are 504 horsepower capacity of engines in the United States for every $100,000 added by manufacture, and that there are 114 horsepower capacity of engines in the United Kingdom for every $100,000 added by manufacture. It is respectfully pointed out that the statement of the resolution that it "takes 504 horsepower in the United States to add the same value" as 114 horsepower in the United Kingdom is another and very different thing from the statement that there are 504 horsepower capacity of engines in the United States for the same value of output for which there are 114 horsepower capacity of engines in the United Kingdom. It is one thing to have the horsepower capacity exist, it is another and different thing to state that its full use is required for a certain result.

What are the facts? Let us take them from what the Secretary says:

The corrected statement should therefore be that there are 504 horsepower capacity of engines in the United States for every $100,000 added by manufacture as compared with 571 horsepower capacity of engines in the United Kingdom for every $100,000 added by manufacture, and that there are 147 wage earners in the United States for every $100,000 added by manufacture as compared with 255 wage earners in the United Kingdom for every $100,000 added by manufacture.

If a corrected statement had been made, I never should have addressed the Senate; but after May 23, when the report was issued, it was circulated through the country, and nobody asked for a correction of the figures. As the statement says, instead of 114 horsepower, the corrected statement ought to be 571 horsepower; and instead of 47 wage earners in the United States it ought to be 147.

Why should the Secretary of Commerce object to a Senator of the United States making a correction of a matter which, as I stated, was absurd on its face? It is, and I have nothing to withdraw.

Again quoting:

In view of the corrections thus brought to the attention of the department, a rigorous reexamination of all the statistics contained in the report of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to the Committee on Ways and Means was ordered. Several other purely clerical errors have been discovered, the more significant ones being as follows:

Should not they have been corrected?

(1) Tin plate, capacity of engines in the United Kingdom 707 horsepower (instead of 105 horsepower) for every $100,000 added by manufacture; (2) butter, cheese, condensed milk, and oleomargarine, 112 (instead of 49) wage earners in Canada for every $100,000 added by manufacture, and $321 (instead of $141) as wages in Canada for every $1,000 added by manufacture.

Mr. President, has it come to this, that when a Senator knows figures are not correct he can not call attention to the fact?

I want to say to the Senate now that I do not remember the issuance of a document similar to this since I have been a Member of this body. Documents are generally issued by the departments of the Government or by the House or Senate. This report was requested by the Ways and Means Committee from the Secretary of Commerce, and was issued by that committee. No number was given to it. It was not made a public document. It was simply printed by the Ways and Means Committee and sent broadcast through the country. I have no doubt in my mind but that it was sent for the purpose I said it was—to bolster up the rates made in the tariff bill by the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

So that all of this information may be at hand and in the RECORD at once, I now ask that the communication from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting his response to the Senate resolution of June 26, 1913, be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. LIPPITT addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. SMOOT. I will be through in just a minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to be acquainted with the character of that document.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], on June 26, offered a resolution in the Senate calling for certain information from the Secretary of Commerce. This is a communication from the Secretary of Commerce in answer to that resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What was the subject of it?

Mr. SMOOT. The subject was a document issued by the Ways and Means Committee of the House, prepared by the Department of Commerce at the request of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the nature of the reply?

Mr. SMOOT. I have just been reading from the reply, and a great deal of it is in the RECORD in my remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I happened not to be in the Chamber at the time. What is the substance of it?

Mr. SMOOT. It is in answer to a resolution offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], in which certain information was requested as to statistics that were printed in this particular document.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely thought the matter might lead to some debate this afternoon. If so, it would be better for us to hear just what the reply was rather than to print it.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I quoted a great deal of it. If there is any objection, I will withdraw the request.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I have no objection to its being printed. I merely suggested that perhaps it would be better to have it read, so that we could all understand it, before it is printed.

Mr. SMOOT. We have been discussing it now for nearly three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know; but the Senator has been discussing it without reading it. I should like to have it read.

Mr. SMOOT. I withdraw the request.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to have it read so that it will go out as a part of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator from Mississippi will permit me for just a minute, I think perhaps I can clear up the situation somewhat. The paper from which the Senator from Utah has just been reading is in reply to a resolution——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from Rhode Island does not understand me. I was not asking for an explanation. I thought this document ought to be read to the Senate as a part of the remarks of the Senator from Utah, so that it might go to the country and might go to Senators' minds at the same time with the criticism of it by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. LIPPITT. I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that it has already been arranged that this document, the reply of the Secretary, shall be printed in to-day's RECORD; so that all of this matter will appear where it can be plainly seen and criticized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that, but it is not present in our minds with the criticism of it which the Senator from Utah is making.

Mr. SMOOT. I made no criticism of the report.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I heard some very violent criticisms of the statisticians, and a suggestion that they had made their figures purely to please the Ways and Means Committee, and various other things. My mind recurred to one Austin, a statistician, and how for years and years his figures simply pleased the Republicans, and I thought perhaps there might be some merit in this document.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that I have offered no criticism of the Secretary's report. I was quoting from the Secretary's report to sustain the statement I made in the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Secretary's report sustain or renege upon the other document that the Senator from Utah was criticizing?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will allow the report to go into the RECORD, it will be seen that it admits that many of the figures in the report are wrong.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did we ever have an investigation of Austin's statistical reports during the Senator's term of service?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether Mr. Austin prepared these figures or not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not say he made them. I do not think he did.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that the Secretary of Commerce says some of the figures are wrong, and anybody that knew anything about this country and England, or had studied the question at all, knew they were wrong. My criticism is not a criticism of his report. It is a criticism of the pamphlet that was issued by the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am somewhat accustomed to the quiet assumption of my friend, the Senator from Utah, that people who hold different views from his do not know anything about the subject under discussion, or much of anything else; but it has become such a habit of thought with him that

I am not always inclined to believe that it is a conclusive thing. I shall not insist upon his reading the report now and shall make no objection to its going into the RECORD. I merely wanted to call attention to the fact that the mental attitude of Senators might be different if they had heard the report together with the criticism.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I withdrew the request; so I shall not ask that the letter be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi does not seem to object to it. Some of the rest of us would like to see the letter or report.

Mr. SHIVELY. And the Senator from Utah ought to remember that thus far there has been no objection to his request.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I will ask that the communication be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As part of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. SHIVELY. I understand that it will appear as part of the Senator's remarks?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; in connection with the remarks I have been making.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Senate Document No. 134, Sixty-third Congress, first session.]

COTTON STATISTICS.

Letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a response to a Senate resolution of June 26, 1913.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, July 11, 1913.*

SIR: By direction of the President, I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of the following resolution of the Senate, under date of June 26, 1913:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
*June 26, 1913.*

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Commerce be directed to furnish, for the use of the Senate, detailed information—

First. To show how the figures referring to cotton goods in the table on page 39 of the report of the Department of Commerce entitled "Foreign Tariff Systems and Industrial Conditions" were obtained; and

Second. To establish, if possible, the correctness of the statements that it takes 504 horsepower in the United States to add the same value to cotton goods as 114 horsepower does in the United Kingdom, and that 47 wage earners in the United States add as much to the value of cotton goods as 255 do in the United Kingdom.

Attest:

JAMES M. BAKER, *Secretary.*

The resolution was referred to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and to the Division of Foreign Tariffs therein, in which division the data to which the resolution refers were prepared and their reply follows.

Before quoting it, however, permit me, in justice to my predecessors, by whom this work was authorized and by whose appointees the figures were gathered and the report prepared from beginning to end, to suggest what seems to be misapprehensions in the resolution itself adopted by the Senate. It may be stated also that the work was well advanced before the department came under my charge.

The resolution speaks of "the report of the Department of Commerce entitled 'Foreign Tariff Systems and Industrial Conditions.'" The Department of Commerce took no initiative with respect to this report. The publication bearing this title is a committee document published by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, containing a report prepared at the request of that committee by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, as the title of the pamphlet shows. The Committee on Ways and Means kindly gave to the Department of Commerce 150 copies of the pamphlet; a brief summary, a single page prepared by the authors of the report, was given to the press by the department on May 13, 1913. No edition of the pamphlet was issued by the Department of Commerce.

The resolution mentions "the statements that it takes 504 horsepower in the United States to add the same value to cotton goods as 114 horsepower does in the United Kingdom." If reference is made to page 39 of the pamphlet this language does not quite accurately represent what there appears. It is stated in the table on page 39 that there are 504 horsepower capacity of engines in the United States for every $100,000 added by manufacture, and that there are 114 horsepower capacity of engines in the United Kingdom for every $100,000 added by manufacture. It is respectfully pointed out that the statement of the resolution that it "takes 504 horsepower in the United States to add the same value" as 114 horsepower in the United Kingdom is another and very different thing from the statement that there are 504 horsepower capacity of engines in the United States for the same value of output for which there are 114 horsepower capacity of engines in the United Kingdom. It is one thing to have the horsepower capacity exist; it is another and different thing to state that its full use is required for a certain result.

The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Division of Foreign Tariffs, advises:

"First. The figures shown in the table on page 39 of the report, with the exception of the last column, are averages based on the statistics presented in the table on pages 36–37. The method adopted for calculating the amount of wages in the United Kingdom, shown in the last column, is fully explained in the third paragraph on page 38.

"Second. The averages for the engine capacity in the United Kingdom and the number of wage earners in the United States for every $100,000 added by manufacture in the case of cotton goods are incorrect. For the former the correct amount, derived from the returns on page 36, is 571 horsepower and for the latter 147 wage earners."

The corrected statement should therefore be that there are 504 horsepower capacity of engines in the United States for every $100,000 added by manufacture as compared with 571 horsepower capacity of engines in the United Kingdom for every $100,000 added by manufacture, and that there are 147 wage earners in the United States for every $100,000 added by manufacture, as compared with 255 wage earners in the United Kingdom for every $100,000 added by manufacture. Justice to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce requires me to point out that the printing of the figure 47, clearly a typographical or clerical error, may perhaps be accounted for by the repetition of the figure 47 in the second line above of the same column of the same table.

In view of the corrections thus brought to the attention of the department a rigorous reexamination of all the statistics contained in the report of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to the Committee on Ways and Means was ordered. Several other purely clerical errors have been discovered, the more significant ones being as follows: (1) Tin plate, capacity of engines in the United Kingdom 707 horsepower (instead of 105 horsepower) for every $100,000 added by manufacture; (2) butter, cheese, condensed milk, and oleomargarine, 112 (instead of 49) wage earners in Canada for every $100,000 added by manufacture, and $321 (instead of $141) as wages in Canada for every $1,000 added by manufacture. Neither has adverse bearing on the question of relative industrial efficiency in the United States.

As soon as the work of review is completed, such errata as exist will be communicated to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, by whose direction the report was printed. The general comparisons shown on pages 41 and 42, under the heading of "Relative industrial efficiency," are not appreciably affected by any of the changes. Neither are the comparisons by industries, on page 39, modified to the disadvantage of the United States in respect to industrial efficiency, save in the change in the relation of wage earners in the cotton industry from 47 to 255 in favor of the United States to 147 to 255, also in favor of the United States.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
*Secretary.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
*Washington, D. C.*

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Ohio criticizes, indirectly at least, the statement I made in relation to the efficiency of American labor, and points out the great exportations of American goods as proof that my statement was incorrect.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. SMOOT. In just a minute; then I will be through. If the Senator will read my remarks, he will find that I state that there are certain lines of manufacture where the machinery and the process of handling in great quantities are such that they do produce goods in this country which are exported; and it is true that it is the efficiency of labor, if that can be called "efficiency of labor," that allows the exportation of these goods, namely, the heavy steel products—not the light ones.

Mr. POMERENE. Did the Senator refer to that in his last speech?

Mr. SMOOT. I think if I had a copy of it here I could show the Senator where I referred to certain lines of goods that are manufactured here in great quantities by the use of machinery that is far advanced over some of that used in foreign countries.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have a very distinct recollection that the Senator, with his usual zeal to sustain himself, sought to point out the very great difference between the wages of bricklayers in this country and bricklayers in other countries, and between the wages of carpenters in this country and carpenters in other countries.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator deny those figures?

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, no; but it would have been very much more instructive to the country at large if the Senator had pointed to the low wages that are paid in some of the very highly protected industries of the country, instead of referring to the wages which are paid in the unprotected industries of the country, such as those to which I have referred, and which the Senator knows are not even indirectly affected by the tariff.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not know any such thing. The Senator knows that the bricklayer in this country is protected above all other workers. His work in a foreign country can not be imported into this country. Of course he is directly benefited by the American tariff.

Mr. POMERENE. Is there anything on the statute books preventing a bricklayer from coming into this country?

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; there is not.

Mr. POMERENE. Or preventing a carpenter from coming into this country?

Mr. SMOOT. That is not the point. The point is that when he comes into this country he receives a greater wage. The Senator is speaking of the low wage paid in many of the industries in this country. I defy the Senator to name a single, solitary industry in the United States that is not paid higher wages than are paid in any other country in the world.

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, Mr. President, we have heard that argument time out of mind.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not make it as an argument now. I ask the Senator to point out one such instance.

Mr. POMERENE. If the Senator will be a little patient, I will point out the truth about it. Our protectionist friends,

time out of mind, have been accustomed to point to the daily wages that exist in this country and compare them with the daily wages that exist in other countries; but they have always, or nearly always, failed to point to the wage cost per unit of production. That is the difference between the Senator and the Secretary of Commerce. The truth is that in very many of the industries of this country the wage cost per unit of production is much less than it is in Europe. For that reason many of the manufactured products of this country are sold abroad in competition with the pauper-paid labor of Europe. That is the fact which our friend the Senator from Utah is constantly trying to ignore.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to ask the Senator to name one industry in this country——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. POMERENE. Just one moment. The distinguished Senator from Utah, since this debate began, referred to the fact that in Great Britain and Germany the cost of production is higher than it is in this country.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know what the Senator refers to.

Mr. POMERENE. If the Senator will recall what he has stated, he will remember it.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator said that in the manufacture of the heavier products of iron and steel in this country we could beat the foreign countries. That is the fact.

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; I did not say any such thing.

Mr. POMERENE. It is extremely fortunate that we have a reporter.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am willing to let the notes speak for themselves. I simply said that it was the heavier products of the steel manufacturer of this country that were shipped abroad. That is what I said. I did not say anything in relation to the cost per unit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah pardon me just one more interruption. Then I think I shall try to let him finish his speech without further interruption.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has just apparently squelched the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] by asking him to name a single industry in the United States which pays lower wages at this time than the same industry in some other country. The sophism underlying it all is that he throws himself upon an undisputed and indisputable fact, and then assumes that the reason of it is that the particular industry has been protected. The trouble with his assumption is one which I will point out.

I shall now ask the Senator a question, and shall yield to him to answer it. My question will have reference to a time when we were Colonies, when we had no protective system, and when we were subject to industrial tyranny on the part of the mother country, at a time when, as the great Pitt said, "an American could not make a horseshoe."

I want to ask the Senator, and I want to give him six weeks in which to answer it, because I do not want to take any advantage of him right now, and I will give him a cheap two-dollar-and-a-half chromo if he can answer it in the affirmative, whether he knows during colonial times, when we were 13 Colonies of Great Britain, a single industry in the United States in which the laborers were on the average and as a rule not paid a higher wage than they were paid in Great Britain?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it will not take me six weeks or six minutes to answer that question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

Mr. SMOOT. I know of a good many such industries; and I want to call attention to a report that was made to the Senate by the committee on the high cost of living. If the Senator will examine that report he will find out whether wages were not less in this country even at that time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Prior to the Declaration of Independence?

Mr. SMOOT. Prior to the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Less than they were in Great Britain?

Mr. SMOOT. Less than they were in Great Britain.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Or any other European country?

Mr. SMOOT. A hod carrier was not receiving the amount here that he was in Great Britain. A bricklayer was not receiving the amount here that he was in Great Britain. I do not know as to the cotton planter, but I doubt it very much.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There were no cotton planters then.

Mr. SMOOT. I mean, the people of the South.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The United States exported, I believe, 20 bales of cotton some years after the War of Independence.

Mr. SMOOT. I think, perhaps, the Senator is old enough to remember the time when the wage of the laboring man in the South was no higher than it was in England.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The wage of the laboring man in the South at that time was the wage of a slave, as a rule; that is, no wage in money measure at all. I am talking about the wages of the laboring man in that part of the United States where wages were paid.

Then the Senator has just made the assertion that he can find somewhere, somehow, the proof of the fact that in Colonial days there were higher wages in Great Britain than in America. I put against it, without knowing what his sources are and what he proposes to rely upon for a basis, my statement that he can not find it and that he can not prove it, and that it never existed as a fact.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Every man who came to America as a traveler, whether from France or from Great Britain, dwelt in his diary and the report of his travels in those days upon one salient fact, the high amount of pay received by common workmen. Every historian of any standing has referred since to the same fact.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. In one moment I shall yield. If any figures have been since originated by somebody or other for the purpose of proving the contrary, they were figures that did not exist at the time the conditions existed. It cost more in those days to hire a servant in an American household than it did in Great Britain. It cost more to hire a hostler. It cost more to hire a bricklayer. It cost more to hire a carpenter. Indeed, it is a well-known fact to everybody from the West that it costs more now in any comparatively unsettled new part of this country to hire a carpenter or bricklayer or house servant or farm laborer than it does in the well-settled parts of the country. Why? Because there is more work to be done and there are less skilled and unskilled laborers of that sort to do the work wanted.

What is the result, then, of the ratiocination along this line, as far as there is any? It is just simply this, that where you have a comparatively new country to compare with a comparatively old country the comparatively new country has more jobs to be done and less laborers to perform them, and the comparatively old country has more laborers to work and less work to be done. The former, therefore, by the law of demand and supply of work, pays higher and the latter lower wages for the work actually done.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if he will not yield to me for just two or three minutes. I am anxious to leave the Chamber, and I should like to make a short statement, which I have been trying to make for nearly half an hour.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know that the Senator is peculiarly unfortunate in that. Every now and then we are caught that way. I suppose he has got the habit as a manufacturer of thinking he ought to come in whenever he pleases; but I yield to him, anyhow, now.

Mr. LIPPITT. I will not delay the Senate more than two or three minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, there has been here under discussion the reply to a resolution which I introduced asking for information from the Department of Commerce in regard to the pamphlet upon tariff statistics which the Senator from Utah has discussed. In that pamphlet there were two very remarkable statements made. One was that it took five times as much horsepower to make American cotton goods as it did to make English cotton goods. The other was that it took five times as much labor in England to make American goods as it did in this country. One of those statements——

Mr. SHIVELY. Does the Senator mean, to make American goods in England?

Mr. LIPPITT. One was that it took five times as much horsepower in this country as in England; the other was that it took five times as much labor in England as in America. One of those statements was highly complimentary to the textile industries of this country. One of those statements was highly critical of the textile industries of this country.

From my general knowledge on this subject I could not believe that either of those statements was even remotely true, and if there was any evidence in support of it, I knew my constituents engaged in the industry would want very much to know the reason for it, that they might investigate it.

I therefore introduced a resolution asking the Secretary of Commerce to state whether or not those statements of his were

correct; and if so, upon what ground they were founded. He now sends in his reply, and the reply is that whereas there was in his original statement five times as much horsepower used in this country as in England, there is more horsepower used in England than there is in this country; and his reply in regard to the point that it takes five times as much labor in England as it does in this country to make the goods, is that the figure of 47 people, as used in connection with that statement, should have been 147; in other words, that it in reality takes nearly four times as many people to make these goods as he had originally stated.

Now, I am not disposed in any way to criticize the causes which led up to these misstatements. I simply wanted the facts stated as they should be, and not have this information sent broadcast over the country, to be used as it naturally would be.

I therefore merely wish to put on record the same day that the publication from the Secretary will be printed, and I ask that it be printed by itself and not in connection with anybody's remarks, as it has come to the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall object to that for I am sure the Senator from Utah desires——

Mr. LIPPITT. Then I ask that it be printed in connection with my remarks, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall object to that. The Senator from Utah brought it up, and the main part of his speech was a criticism of it; and I want it to appear in that connection.

Mr. LIPPITT. I have no objection to its appearing with the remarks of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator wants it to appear additional, in connection with his remarks?

Mr. LIPPITT. Additional.

Mr. WILLIAMS. All right; I have no objection to that.

Mr. LIPPITT. Therefore, I simply wanted to go on record with the report as now communicated to the Senate by the Secretary of Commerce, showing that it is entirely the opposite of the figures that appear in the pamphlet which gave rise to the resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. May the Chair inquire of the Senator from Rhode Island if he is aware of the fact that it is already ordered to be printed in the RECORD? Is it to appear three times?

Mr. LIPPITT. I suggested that it be so printed, and the Senator from Mississippi objected to its going into the RECORD as an independent document. If it is to go in as an independent document, I do not care to have it printed in connection with my remarks. If it is not to go in as an independent document I want it printed in connection with my remarks so that it may be clearly evident to anybody who peruses the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection to printing it with the Senator's remarks.

The report referred to is as follows:

[Senate Document No. 134, Sixty-third Congress, first session.]

COTTON STATISTICS.

Letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a response to a Senate resolution of June 26, 1913:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, July 11, 1913.*

SIR: By direction of the President, I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of the following resolution of the Senate, under date of June 26, 1913:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
*June 26, 1913.*

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Commerce be directed to furnish, for the use of the Senate, detailed information—

First. To show how the figures referring to cotton goods in the table on page 39 of the report of the Department of Commerce entitled "Foreign Tariff Systems and Industrial Conditions" were obtained; and

Second. To establish, if possible, the correctness of the statements that it takes 504 horsepower in the United States to add the same value to cotton goods as 114 horsepower does in the United Kingdom, and that 47 wage earners in the United States add as much to the value of cotton goods as 255 do in the United Kingdom.

Attest:

JAMES M. BAKER, *Secretary.*

The resolution was referred to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and to the Division of Foreign Tariffs therein, in which division the data to which the resolution refers were prepared, and their reply follows.

Before quoting it, however, permit me, in justice to my predecessors, by whom this work was authorized and by whose appointees the figures were gathered and the report prepared from beginning to end, to suggest what seems to be misapprehensions in the resolution itself adopted by the Senate. It may be stated also that the work was well advanced before the department came under my charge.

The resolution speaks of "the report of the Department of Commerce entitled 'Foreign Tariff Systems and Industrial Conditions.'" The Department of Commerce took no initiative with respect to this report. The publication bearing this title is a committee document published by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, containing a report prepared at the request of that committee by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, as the title of the pamphlet shows. The Committee on Ways and Means kindly gave to the Department of Commerce 150 copies of the pamphlet; a brief summary, a single page, prepared by the authors of the report, was given to the press by the department on May 13, 1913. No edition of the pamphlet was issued by the Department of Commerce.

The resolution mentions "the statements that it takes 504 horsepower in the United States to add the same value to cotton goods as 114 horsepower does in the United Kingdom." If reference is made to page 39 of the pamphlet, this language does not quite accurately represent what there appears. It is stated in the table on page 39 that there are 504 horsepower capacity of engines in the United States for every $100,000 added by manufacture, and that there are 114 horsepower capacity of engines in the United Kingdom for every $100,000 added by manufacture. It is respectfully pointed out that the statement of the resolution that it "takes 504 horsepower in the United States to add the same value" as 114 horsepower in the United Kingdom is another and very different thing from the statement that there are 504 horsepower capacity of engines in the United States for the same value of output for which there are 114 horsepower capacity of engines in the United Kingdom. It is one thing to have the horsepower capacity exist; it is another and different thing to state that its full use is required for a certain result.

The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Division of Foreign Tariffs, advises:

"First. The figures shown in the table on page 39 of the report, with the exception of the last column, are averages based on the statistics presented in the table on pages 36–37. The method adopted for calculating the amount of wages in the United Kingdom, shown in the last column, is fully explained in the third paragraph on page 38.

"Second. The averages for the engine capacity in the United Kingdom and the number of wage earners in the United States for every $100,000 added by manufacture in the case of cotton goods are incorrect. For the former the correct amount, derived from the returns on page 36, is 571 horsepower and for the latter 147 wage earners."

The corrected statement should therefore be that there are 504 horsepower capacity of engines in the United States for every $100,000 added by manufacture as compared with 571 horsepower capacity of engines in the United Kingdom for every $100,000 added by manufacture, and that there are 147 wage earners in the United States for every $100,000 added by manufacture, as compared with 255 wage earners in the United Kingdom for every $100,000 added by manufacture. Justice to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce requires me to point out that the printing of the figure 47, clearly a typographical or clerical error, may perhaps be accounted for by the repetition of the figure 47 in the second line above of the same column of the table.

In view of the corrections thus brought to the attention of the department a rigorous reexamination of all the statistics contained in the report of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to the Committee on Ways and Means were ordered. Several other purely clerical errors have been discovered, the more significant one being as follows: (1) Tin plate, capacity of engines in the United Kingdom 707 horsepower (instead of 105 horsepower) for every $100,000 added by manufacture; (2) butter, cheese, condensed milk, and oleomargarine, 112 (instead of 49) wage earners in Canada for every $100,000 added by manufacture, and $321 (instead of $141) as wages in Canada for every $1,000 added by manufacture. Neither has adverse bearing on the question of relative industrial efficiency in the United States.

As soon as the work of review is completed, such errata as exist will be communicated to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, by whose direction the report was printed. The general comparisons shown on pages 41 and 42, under the heading of "Relative industrial efficiency," are not appreciably affected by any of the changes. Neither are the comparisons by industries, on page 39, modified to the disadvantage of the United States in respect to industrial efficiency, save in the change in the relation of wage earners in the cotton industry from 47 to 255 in favor of the United States to 147 to 255, also in favor of the United States.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
*Secretary.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
*Washington, D. C.*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not think there is anything in the world that poor, erring, fallible humanity has made so many mistakes about as in connection with the fact of mistaking a coincidence for cause and effect. Wages are higher in Australia than they are in Great Britain. Wages were for many years higher in New Zealand than they are in Great Britain. Wages for long years have been higher in Cape Colony than they have been in Great Britain. Yet New Zealand and Australia are protectionist colonies and Cape Colony was a free-trade colony and England is a free-trade country. Wages have been higher in England than they were in Germany, and yet Germany is next to the United States, and Russia, the most barbarous of all nations in connection with the prevalency of protectionism.

Now, then, when a man says that the reason why wages are higher in Great Britain than they are in Russia or Germany or France is because Great Britain is a free-trade country and Russia and Germany and France are protectionist, he simply makes a mistake or else he willfully makes a misstatement. The truth is that they are higher in England because the general standard of living of the English people is higher than of the people upon the Continent.

You frequently hear it said that high wages produce a high standard of living. The truth is that, as a rule, a higher standard of living—the people having once become accustomed to it—demands of necessity and obtains higher wages.

The next truth is that as a general proposition, although not always true, wages are high just in proportion as institutions are democratic. In using that word I do not mean democratic spelled with a big D of course, but with a little d. In other

words, just in proportion as the will of the people is asserted in government itself, it is also proportionately asserted in industrial life, and as a majority of the people are laborers, their will is asserted and they always will strike for higher wages. Just in proportion as the people are suppressed the laboring man is suppressed, and his wage suppressed with him. Just in proportion as institutions are popular the laboring man has labor rights which he may assert by strike or otherwise, and in proportion as he may assert them he obtains a higher wage, and in proportion as he can not or dare not assert his rights by strike or by ballot or otherwise, he receives lower wages.

Then, in addition and in the next place, wages, as a rule, are in inverse proportion to the price of fertile lands. Agriculture is the basic, natural business of man. A man is not going to work for a low wage if he can go out and buy cheap land or rent land cheaply. You can not press him in a factory if he can do that. Consequently, as a rule, in countries with cheap fertile lands, wages in factories are high, because a man demands it and can get it. He must have it or he will not work in the factory. That is the next principle.

The next principle is this, and I have stated this once before: Wherever there are two jobs hunting one man there are high wages. Whenever there are two men hunting one job there are low wages. In a new country which is industrially not developed but developing there are generally two jobs, or more than one, at any rate, hunting one laborer; and in an old developed country, depressed and worn out, especially if it be overridden by a burden of militarism and navalism and everything else, there will be found two men hunting one job, or at least more than one man hunting one job, and so wages are low.

Now, let us try to be honest with one another. The God's truth is that free trade does not increase wages; protectionalism does not increase wages. The next truth is that either may, and the next truth is that either may not. It depends upon other conditions entirely.

Now, here is Mississippi and here is Utah. Here is Alabama and here is North Dakota. They are living exactly under the same tariff tax laws; they are subject to precisely the same fiscal arrangements; they have precisely the same rights of popular government; and yet wages in North Dakota are about double what they are in Alabama, and wages in Utah for the same sort of work are about double what they are in Mississippi.

Now, why? Because Alabama and Mississippi comparatively are developed up to the ability of their peculiar sort of labor to develop them.

Now, what is the character of the labor? An inefficient, ignorant, uninitiative negro labor. So it is paid half as much because it is worth half as much as the labor of Utah or North Dakota; in fact, it is not worth half as much, to be still more paradoxical. It is better paid in proportion to what it is worth to the man who employs it than the man in North Dakota and Utah is. The tariff has nothing to do with it in either case.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Tariff had nothing to do with American wages prior to the Revolution. Tariff had nothing to do with English wages prior to the Revolution. Tariff has nothing to do with the fact that English wages are higher now than wages in Germany or France. The tariff has nothing to do with the fact that wages in the Transvaal are higher than they are in various parts of Great Britain.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator yield?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator says that the tariff has nothing whatever to do with the wage that may be paid in Utah or with the wage that may be paid in Mississippi. I want to call his attention to the fact that as to the labor in Mississippi coming in contact with the labor in Utah, Mississippi does not produce what Utah produces; but the tariff has a great deal to do with the wage in Utah for this reason: Utah produces, we will say, lead.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not talking about lead. I am going to leave the protected interests out.

Mr. SMOOT. This is the only point in answer to the Senator. If there was no protection whatever on lead and it could be shipped into this country free, we could not pay the wage that is paid a miner—$3.50 to $4.75 a day—as against the labor in Spain; that is, about 50 or 60 cents a day, or the labor in Mexico, if conditions in that country were such that mining could go on uninterrupted, where wages of about 50 cents a day are paid.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. I only say to the Senator that it could not be done; we could not produce lead in this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have heard that so frequently that I almost believe it.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator may not believe it, but I know——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have heard it so frequently that I almost believe it. You know the force of habit on the human mind. Now, Utah not only mines lead, but she mines copper, and copper is not protected, and the copper man receives the same wages as the lead man. But I was not talking about Utah's especial and protected industries.

Mr. SMOOT. Allow me——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Wait one moment. I was not talking about your protected industries.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all I am talking about.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am talking about industries as compared with men. I was not talking about any industry as alone peculiar to you. Of course, you can not effect any comparison—any 14-year-old schoolboy ought to know that—between Utah and Mississippi upon a lead basis, because Mississippi does not produce any lead. I could not say what the wages in Mississippi, if we had lead, would be; but I can say that we hire men as hostlers and herders to attend our horses, cattle, and sheep. We raise corn, like you do; we raise oats, like you do; we cut hay, like you do; we hire general farm labor, like you do. We have cotton factories. I do not know whether you have or not. Have you?

Mr. SMOOT. No; we have no cotton factories.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We can not then compare that, but I bet if you had cotton factories your laborers in the cotton factories would be paid more highly than ours. In all the things where we can compare with one another, because of having like work, you pay a higher wage.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know——

Mr. WILLIAMS. You pay more for bricklayers; you pay more for carpenters; you pay more for farm laborers. As far as the farm laborers are concerned and various of these other people, the Senator will remember that I brought a lot of that out before the Finance Committee when we were sitting on the question of Cuban reciprocity.

Now, I am trying to reenforce this fact, that the next great reason for the difference in labor is the efficiency of the labor itself. Mississippi has a much more fertile soil on the average than Utah. Her white population is equal to that of Utah in every possible respect. Her climate is superior to that of Utah, so far that the angels in heaven would not undertake to compare them.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator has never been in Utah, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I passed through it once and that was enough for me.

Mr. SMOOT. Then he is a good judge if he passed through the State.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I passed through once and that was enough for me. We had to close down the windows most of the time to keep the alkali dust out of our throats; but up to that time there were a mighty few things that looked green to a Mississippian except a Mississippian himself, of course, in Utah. I suppose if I had gone among genuine Utah folks I would have felt green at any rate.

What is the only difference with regard to labor and wages between the two States? In Utah you have a live, wide-awake, intelligent, progressive, enterprising, initiative, and inventive white labor. In Mississippi we have an indolent, good-natured, careless, thriftless, happy-go-lucky negro labor. The white man spends 10 months thinking about his wife and children to where he spends 1 thinking about himself. He spends 10 minutes thinking about the future to where he spends 1 thinking about the present. He is building and building and building for wife and children and children's grandchildren. The negro is building for nothing except what he wants to eat to-day and some sort of an assurance of what he can eat during the balance of the month.

Do you want to know the real cause of American prosperity? It consists chiefly in these two things: First, hitherto in our history cheap, fertile land, in inverse ratio to which wages were fixed; and, in the second place, the fact that the most adventuresome, enterprising, and initiative people of all countries came here to make their homes—men who were not afraid to cut away from old ties; in the early days, men who were not

afraid to carry a plowhandle in one hand and a rifle in the other while they worked at achieving what? Not happiness for themselves—a fool knew that he could be happier in an English or Middle States village—but in working out a future heritage for their children and their children's children.

Then, with the democratic institutions, which had their birth in the woods, where one man was another man's equal provided he could handle the rifle and the ax equally well, came the disappearance of all caste, all rank, all authority, everything except the authority of reason as between man and man. So they built themselves up in Albemarle County, Va., and out in Vermont; down in Tennessee, and in Kentucky, and Ohio, across the river from one another.

The only superiority we have over other people is the fact that our sires were the men who were willing to take great big risks for their children, and, being thrown out into the world by themselves, without the aid of an industrial society, had to do everything. So, they had to be inventive, not because of superior intelligence but because of superior necessity. I will call the Senator's attention to the fact that just in proportion as this country is in that attitude to-day, wages are high in one section as compared with another.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator's conclusions as to wages being high and low just in proportion as we have fertile lands to be developed——

Mr. WILLIAMS. And cheap lands.

Mr. SMOOT. Fertile and cheap lands to be developed by the people will hardly be justified, in my opinion, by the facts, for this reason: Twenty years ago there were in the United States more lands subject to entry than there are to-day, and 20 years ago wages were not so high as they are to-day.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that; and wages have since increased.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. So the Senator's conclusions——

Mr. WILLIAMS. The answer to that is very simple. While men have increased in number and land has grown in value, yet owing to the great inventiveness and initiative of the American people jobs have grown faster than either; work has grown faster than either; and it was growing faster than either from 1850 to 1860 under the lowest tariff this country has ever seen. By the way, if you will take that decade from the beginning to the end of it, it will compare favorably with any decade in which this country ever existed in industrial activities, in increased banking power, in the increased percentage of railroad facilities—of course the mileage did not compare with that at present or during the last few years, but the percentage of increase was immensely larger—the number of new farms opened, the number of new mines developed, the number of new factories opened, and what may surprise some of you is the fact that during the last half of that decade the part of the country showing the greatest advance, as compared with itself previously, was the South, which since that time has lagged comparatively.

Mr. President, I did not intend to break into this discussion. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] just a moment ago asked me if I were going to take up a lot of time discussing the tariff instead of getting a vote as soon as we could, and I said "No"; but I simply could not resist when I saw the confidence, the aplomb, the nonchalance, the intellectual certainty of my friend the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. It reminds me a little of what Lord Mansfield said about Thomas Babington Macaulay. He said, "If I were as cocksure of one thing in the world as Thomas Babington Macaulay is of everything, I would be the happiest man of my acquaintance." The Senator must get over the idea that people who differ with him do not know anything. For the most part they do not, but it is not because they differ from him; it is because, for the most part, humanity does not know much anyway. Very few of us do, and I will frankly confess that after a study of this tariff question the more we study it the greater our consciousness of our ignorance grows. If the Senator from Utah is not prepared to confess that, I am so far as I am concerned. Let us not be too sure now of our intellectual superiority to one another.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not want to go unchallenged the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi, wherein he intimates that I have said at any time, here or elsewhere, that no one knows anything. That is a conclusion the Senator draws, but it is not what I have said.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will tell the Senator why I said that, and then he may explain it. It was because, in attacking this report to which he has referred, he turned to some one—I forget to whom—and said: "Anybody who knew anything about anything, or about conditions in England, knew better than to believe the statements contained in that report." The men who prepared the report were sincere, men who were trying to arrive at the truth.

Mr. SMOOT. But they admit it is not correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They have admitted two errors in the report, as I understand.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, there are more than that, as the Senator will see if he will read the report.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well; I have heard of but two.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to say, in explanation, that I am positive that if the Senator from Mississippi had picked up the report and read the statement there that 47 people in the United States could make $100,000 worth of cotton goods, which it required 255 people in England the same time to make, he would know that it was not true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would have known that it was a misprint, and I would not have required any information of anybody to inform me of that fact.

Mr. SMOOT. And that is all I said.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have before me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 13, 1913, which contains a quotation from the report of the British Board of Trade on the wage question in 1904, volume 1, page 280. Without stopping to read it, I ask permission of the Senate to incorporate it in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and permission to do so is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

At the outset it should be understood that the problem of comparing the average level of wages of the different countries is a very difficult and complex one, not only because of the defects of the data, but also because of the essential ambiguity of the problem itself.

1. We may approach the question of comparative wages from two entirely different points of view, leading to divergent and sometimes even to opposite conclusions. We may either seek to compare the material well-being of the wage earners or the wages cost of a given amount of work.

From the former point of view we are mainly interested in the average money income of the wage-earning population, modified, of course, by differences in cost of living, but irrespective of differences in the efficiency of labor. If a bricklayer in France earns half the wages of a bricklayer in America, we should say his money wages were half as great, although conceivably the American might lay so many more bricks per hour that his labor might be even cheaper to his employer. From the second point of view we are interested, not in the weekly income of the laborer, but in his wages regarded as an item in the cost of production, i. e., the wages cost of hewing a ton of coal, spinning a pound of yarn, or laying a hundred bricks, of course under identical conditions.

How entirely divergent are the above two methods of comparison will be realized from the fact that competent American economists are of the opinion that in the United States the average "labor cost" of a given volume of production is at least as low in Europe, if not lower, while the average income of the working classes is certainly higher in America than in any European country. However this may be, it is clear that the real cost of labor varies much less from country to country than the level of weekly wages or of yearly earnings, and that a high labor cost is compatible with low wages, and vice versa, owing to the variations in the efficiency of labor.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I also desire to add as a part of my remarks merely a paragraph from the Census Report on Manufactures for the year 1902, part 1, page 61. I ask permission to have that inserted in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and permission to do so is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

He (Mulhall) estimated £107, or about $500, for Great Britain in 1894 and £270, or about $1,300, for the United States, the latter being nearly three times the English average. In 1900 the census shows an average product per wage earner of $2,450, nearly five times Mr. Mulhall's estimate for Great Britain.

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 5 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING.

On motion of Mr. KERN, it was

*Ordered*, That hereafter the daily sessions of the Senate be 12 o'clock noon until otherwise ordered.

Mr. BACON. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, July 19, 1913, at 12 o'clock m.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate July 18, 1913.*

MEMBER OF THE EXCISE BOARD OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Joseph C. Sheehy, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Excise Board for the District of Columbia for a term of one year from July 1, 1913.

COMMISSION OF MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION.

William L. Chambers, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Mediation and Conciliation, as provided for in the

act approved July 15, 1913, entitled "An act providing for mediation, conciliation, and arbitration in controversies between certain employers and their employees."

G. W. W. Hanger, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Commissioner of Mediation and Conciliation, as provided for in the act approved July 15, 1913, entitled "An act providing for mediation, conciliation, and arbitration in controversies between certain employers and their employees."

MINISTER.

Charles S. Hartman, of Montana, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador, vice Montgomery Schuyler, jr.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Maurice T. Dooling, of California, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California, vice John J. De Haven, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Albert Schoonover, of California, to be United States attorney for the southern district of California, vice A. I. McCormick, whose term has expired.

James C. Wilson, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Texas, vice William H. Atwell, whose resignation has been accepted.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Joseph S. Davis, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia, vice George F. White, whose term has expired.

John Montag, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon, vice Leslie M. Scott, who is serving under appointment by the United States district court.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Le Roy E. Cummings, of South Dakota, to be receiver of public moneys at Pierre, S. Dak., vice Douglas W. Marsh, term expired.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

First Lieut. Neb B. Rehkopf, First Field Artillery, to be captain from July 11, 1913, vice Capt. James H. Bryson, First Field Artillery, detailed in the Quartermaster Corps on that date.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Joe Eikel, of Texas, late midshipman, United States Navy, to be second lieutenant of Field Artillery, with rank from July 14, 1913.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 18, 1913.*

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Robert T. Menner to be a lieutenant commander.

Asst. Surg. Joseph J. A. McMullin to be a passed assistant surgeon.

Carpenter Theodore H. Scharf to be a chief carpenter.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):

Richmond K. Turner.
Henry F. D. Davis.
Eugene E. Wilson.
Francis T. Chew.
William R. Munroe.
John F. Shafroth, jr.
Walter L. Heiberg.
Charles L. Best.
Allan G. Olson.
John C. Jennings.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons, Medical Reserve Corps:

William H. Massey.
David S. Hillis.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Hubert L. Bolen to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Oklahoma.

PROMOTIONS IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

ASSISTANT SURGEONS.

Joseph Bolten.
Robert Clarence Derivaux.
John Sebastian Ruoff.
Tully Joseph Liddell.
Harry Clinton Cody.
Walter Lewis Treadway.

POSTMASTERS.

FLORIDA.

Samuel M. Wilson, Bartow.

IDAHO.

H. E. King, Nampa.

IOWA.

L. H. Brede, Dubuque.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Sophie Sherman, Donnybrook.

OHIO.

William H. Beam, Ansonia.
J. H. Connor, West Union.
Charles H. Hackett, Yellow Springs.

TEXAS.

W. L. Coleman, Alpine.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *July 18, 1913.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O righteous God, in whom is all wisdom, power, and goodness, help us, we beseech Thee, to subdue the evil within us, to strengthen and accentuate the good, that we may increase the confidence of our fellows in our integrity and thus widen the sphere of our activities, and have a closer walk with Thee. That our ways may be ways of usefulness and all our paths be paths of peace, that we may praise and magnify Thy holy name, in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 15, 1913, was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY NEXT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next. I understand there are one or two little matters that may come up at that time under suspension of the rules, particularly one about the extension of time for buildings.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, why not make it Tuesday? That matter could be called up at any time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wanted particularly to accommodate the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McCOY] about a public building, about which there is urgent necessity.

Mr. MANN. As far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to pass the bill now.

Mr. McCOY. Mr. Speaker, if it would be possible to get unanimous consent to modify the special order that was made on Tuesday last, so that the call of committees could be taken up, I presume that my bill could come in in that way, and then the other matter could come in later.

Mr. MANN. The call of committees would be the regular order on Tuesday in any event. I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that he make Tuesday suspension day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Tuesday next may be suspension day, in lieu of Monday next, and that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next, and that Tuesday next be substituted in lieu of Monday for suspension day. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to loan the bell of the late U. S. S. *Princeton* to the borough of Princeton, N. J.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

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

S. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to loan the bell of the late U. S. S. *Princeton* to the borough of Princeton, N. J.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Monroe doctrine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, in asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to be of service to the Congress and to the people of the United States, by bringing to their attention a remarkably thoughtful and able essay on "The Monroe doctrine: An obsolete shibboleth," printed in the Atlantic Monthly, June, 1913.

The author, Hiram Bingham, Ph. D., professor of Latin-American history and curator of the collection on Latin America at Yale, is an archæologist of note, a man brought up in sympathetic association with different races of men, and whose great work in exploration has made him especially familiar with the people of the South American Continent and with their point of view. I commend a careful reading of his statement to all those who, as Members of the National Legislature, must soon face definite issues that concern this dictum, which is neither international law nor doctrine, but merely an expression of our own views, a statement of our intentions, which can only be enforced upon others by the power of arms.

The article is as follows:

"THE MONROE DOCTRINE: AN OBSOLETE SHIBBOLETH.

"(By Hiram Bingham.)

"I.

"'The American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by European powers. * * * We should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence, and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration, and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling, in any other manner, their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. * * *'

"Thus, in 1823, did President James Monroe, acting under the influence of his able Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, enunciate a doctrine which has been the most universally accepted foreign policy that we have ever had. No one questions the fact that the enunciation of this policy of 'America for Americans,' and our firm adherence to it for so many years has had a very decided effect upon the history of the Western Hemisphere.

"There have been times when ambitious European monarchs would have liked nothing better than to help themselves to poorly defended territory in what is now termed Latin America. When the doctrine was originated the Holy Alliance in Europe was contemplating the overthrow of republican government in Spain, and unquestionably looked with extreme aversion at the new Republics in South and Central America, whose independence we were hastily recognizing. Russia was reaching out beyond Alaska. The firm declaration of this policy of exclusion, backed up by England's attitude toward the Holy Alliance, undoubtedly operated to give the American Republics sufficient breathing space to enable them to get on their feet and begin the difficult process of working out their own salvation, a process which was rendered all the more difficult by reason of Hispanic racial tendencies, of centuries of autocratic colonial government, and of geographical conditions which made transportation and social intercourse extremely arduous.

"Journeys across Peru even to-day may be beset with more difficulties than were journeys from Mississippi to California 60 years ago—before the railroads. It still takes longer to go from Lima, the capital of Peru, to Iquitos, the capital of Peru's largest Province, and one which the Putumayo atrocities have recently brought vividly to our notice, than it does to go from London to Honolulu.

"Had it not been for the Monroe doctrine the American Republics would have found it very much more difficult to maintain their independence during the first three-quarters of a century of their career. And this notwithstanding the fact that the actual words 'Monroe doctrine' were rarely heard or seen.

"In 1845, without mentioning this shibboleth by name, President Polk declared that the United States would not permit any European intervention on the North American Continent. This, as Prof. Coolidge has brought out (see, for an able exposition of the Monroe doctrine, Prof. A. C. Coolidge's The United States as a World Power (Macmillan).—The Editors), pushed the theory further than it has been carried out in practice, although it restricted the original idea by leaving South America out of account.

"A few years later, while we were engaged in civil war, Napoleon III attempted to set up a European monarch in Mexico. Scarcely had we recovered, however, from the throes of our great conflict when Mr. Seward took up with the French Government the necessity for the withdrawal of the French troops from Maximilian's support. Here we were acting strongly in accordance with the best traditions of the Monroe doctrine, and yet the mysterious words were not employed in the correspondence.

"In fact, while it was generally understood that we would not countenance any European interference in the affairs of North and South America, it was not until 1895, during the second administration of President Cleveland, that a Secretary of State thought it expedient or necessary to restate the Monroe doctrine and to bring us to the verge of a European war by backing it up with an absolutely uncompromising attitude. Venezuela had had a long-standing boundary dispute with British Guiana. Nobody cared very much either way until it was discovered that in the disputed territory were rich gold fields. In the excitement which ensued the Venezuelans appealed to the United States, and Secretary Olney, invoking the Monroe doctrine, brought matters to a crisis.

"Our defiant attitude toward Great Britain astonished the world and greatly pleased the majority of American citizens. The very fact that we had not the slightest personal interest in the paltry 60,000 square miles of jungle southeast of the Orinoco added to our self-esteem. It raised our patriotism to the highest pitch when we realized that we were willing to go to war with the most powerful nation in Europe rather than see her refuse to arbitrate her right to her ancient possession of a little strip of tropical forest with a Government which was not in existence when England took British Guiana, but which was an 'American Republic.' Fortunately for us Lord Salisbury had a fairly good sense of humor and declined to take the matter too seriously. Instead of standing, in the proverbial British manner, strictly for his honor and his rights, he politely ignored the boundary commission which we had impetuously called into existence, and, dealing directly with his neighbor Venezuela, arranged for an international court of arbitration.

"In our exuberance over the success of Mr. Olney's bold and unselfish enunciation of the Monroe doctrine we failed to realize several aspects of this question.

"In the first place, we had proudly declared the Monroe doctrine to be a part of international law, failing to distinguish between law and policy.

"In the second place, we had assumed a new theorem. In the words of Mr. Olney: 'The States of America, South as well as North, by geographical proximity, by natural sympathy, by similarity of governmental constitutions, are friends and allies, commercially and politically, of the United States.'

"A few years earlier the then Secretary of State, Blaine, had brought into existence the International Union of American Republics and had enunciated the doctrine of pan-Americanism, which has glowed more or less cheerfully ever since.

"Mr. Olney's words recognized this doctrine. But when he gave 'geographical proximity' as one of the reasons for this pan-American alliance he overlooked the fact that the largest cities of South America are geographically nearer to Spain and Portugal than to New York and New England. He failed to consider that the rich east coast of South America is no farther from Europe than it is from Florida, and that so far as the west coast is concerned, it actually takes longer to travel from Valparaiso, the chief South American west coast port, to San Francisco, the chief North American west coast port, than it does to go from Valparaiso to London. Peru is as far from Puget Sound as it is from Labrador.

"Most of our statesmen studied geography when they were in the grammar school and have rarely looked at a world atlas since. In other words, we began the new development of the Monroe doctrine with a false idea of the geographical basis of the pan-American alliance.

"Furthermore, the new Monroe doctrine was established on another false idea, the existence of 'natural sympathy' between South and North America. As a matter of fact, instances might easily be multiplied to show that our South American neighbors have far more natural sympathy for, and regard themselves as much more nearly akin to, the Latin races of Europe than to the cosmopolitan people of the United States.

"How Spain feels was shown recently in the case of a distinguished Spanish professor who was able to find time to make an extended journey through Latin America, urging pan-Hispanism, but could find no time to make an extended journey through the cities of the United States, although offered lavish hospitality and considerable honorariums. How Brazil feels was seen a few years ago in Rio de Janeiro, when Brazil was holding a national exposition. Each State of that great Republic had a building of its own, but no foreign nations were represented except Portugal, the mother country, which had her own building.

"Of the difficulties of establishing any kind of an alliance between ourselves and the South American Republics no one who has traveled in South America can be ignorant. As has been well said by a recent Peruvian writer: 'Essential points of difference separate the two Americas—differences of language, and therefore of spirit; the difference between Spanish Catholicism and the multiform Protestantism of the Anglo-Saxons; between the Yankee individualism and the omnipotence of the state natural to the South. In their origin, as in their race, we find fundamental antagonisms. The evolution of the north is slow and obedient to the lessons of time, to the influences of custom; the history of the southern peoples is full of revolution, rich with dreams of an unattainable perfection.'

"One of the things which make it, and will continue to make it, difficult for us to treat fairly with our southern neighbors is our racial prejudice against the half-breed. As Señor Calderon bluntly says, 'Half-breeds and their descendants govern the Latin-American Republics'; and it is a well-known fact that this leads to contempt on the part of the average Anglo-Saxon. Such a state of affairs shows the difficulty of assuming that pan-Americanism is axiomatic, and of basing the logical growth of the Monroe doctrine on 'natural sympathy.'

"In the third place, the new form of the Monroe doctrine declared, in the words of Secretary Olney, that the 'United States is practically sovereign on this continent.' This at once aroused the antagonism and the fear of those very southern neighbors who, in another sentence, he had endeavored to prove were 'friends and allies, commercially and politically, of the United States.'

"Less than three years after the enunciation of the new Monroe doctrine we were at war with Spain. The progress of the war in Cuba and the Spanish colonies was followed in South America with the keenest interest. How profoundly it would have surprised the great American public to realize that while we were spending blood and treasure to secure the independence of another American Republic, our neighbors in Buenos Aires were indulging in the most severe and caustic criticism of our motives! This attitude can be appreciated only by those who have compared the cartoons published week after week during the progress of the war in this country and in Argentina. In the one, Uncle Sam is pictured as a benevolent giant saving the poor maid Cuba from the jaws of the ferocious dragon, Gen. Weyler, and his cruel mistress in Spain. In the other, Uncle Sam, in the guise of a fat hog, is engaged in besmirching the fair garments of the Queen of Spain in his violent efforts to gobble up her few American possessions. Representations of our actions in the Philippines are in such disgusting form that it would not be desirable to attempt to describe some of the Argentine cartoons touching upon that subject.

"Our neighbors felt that a decided change had come over the Monroe doctrine. In 1823 we had declared that 'with the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere' (so runs the original Monroe doctrine). In 1898 we not only interfered, but actually took away all of Spain's colonies and dependencies, freeing Cuba and retaining for ourselves Porto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines.

"Without for a moment wishing to enter into a discussion of the wisdom of our actions, I desire to emphasize the tremendous difference between the old and the new Monroe doctrine. This is not a case of theories and arguments, but of deeds. What are the facts?

"In 1895 we declare that we are practically sovereign on this continent; in 1898 we take a rich American island from a European power; and in 1903 we go through the form of preventing a South American Republic from subduing a revolution in one of her distant Provinces, and eventually take a strip of that Province because we believe we owe it to the world to build the Panama Canal. Again, let it be clear that I am not interested at this point in defending or attacking our actions in any of these cases; I merely desire to state what has happened and to show some of the fruits of the new Monroe doctrine. 'By their fruits ye shall know them.'

"Another one of the 'fruits' which has not escaped the attention of our neighbors in South America is our intervention in Santo Domingo, which, although it may be an excellent thing for the people of that island, has undoubtedly interfered with their right to do as they please with their own money.

"Furthermore, within the past three years we have twice landed troops in Central America and taken an active part by way of interfering in local politics. We believed that the conditions were so bad as to justify us in carrying out the new Monroe doctrine by aiding one side in a local revolution.

"Of our armed intervention in Cuba it is scarcely necessary to speak, except to refer in passing to the newspaper story, credited and believed in Cuba, that if American troops are again obliged to intervene in the political life of that country they will not be withdrawn, as has been the practice in the past.

"The menace of intervention, armed intervention, the threatened presence of machine guns and American marines have repeatedly been used by Latin-American politicians in their endeavors to keep the peace in their own countries. And we have done enough of that sort of thing to make it evident to disinterested observers that the new Monroe doctrine, our present policy, is to act as international policeman, or at least as an elder brother with a big stick, whenever the little fellows get too fresh.

"Is this doctrine worth while?

"Let us see what it involves, first, from the European; second, from the Latin-American point of view.

"II.

"By letting it be known in Europe that we shall not tolerate any European intervention or the landing of European troops on the sacred soil of the American Republics, we assume all responsibility. We have declared, in the words of Secretary Olney, that the United States is 'practically sovereign on this continent, and that its fiat is law upon the subject to which it confines its interposition.' Therefore European countries have the right to look to us to do that which we prevent them from doing. A curious result of this is that some of the American Republics float loans in Europe, believing that the United States will not allow the Governments of their European creditors forcibly to collect these loans.

"Personally I believe that it ought to be an adopted principle of international law that the armed intervention of creditor nations to collect bad debts on behalf of their bankers and bondholders is forbidden. If this principle were clearly understood and accepted, these bankers and underwriters would be far more particular to whom they lent any great amount of money, and under what conditions. They would not be willing to take the risks which they now take, and many unfortunate financial tangles would never have a beginning. It is natural for a Republic which has great undeveloped resources, much optimism, and a disregard of existing human handicaps, to desire to borrow large amounts of money in order to build expensive railroads and carry out desirable public improvements. It is equally natural that capitalists seeking good interest rates and secure investments, should depend on the fact that if the debtor country attempts to default on its national loans, the Government of the creditors will intervene with a strong arm. It is natural that the money should be forthcoming, even though a thorough, businesslike, and scientific investigation of the possessions and resources of the borrowing nation might show that the chances of her being able to pay interest, and eventually to return the capital, were highly problematical and to be reckoned as very high risks.

"Millions of dollars of such loans have been made in the past. It is perfectly evident that many of these loans can not be repaid; that the time is coming when the creditor nations will look to us as the policeman or 'elder brother' of the Western Hemisphere to see to it that the little boys pay for the candy and sweetmeats they have eaten. Is it worth while that we should do this?

"One can not dodge the truth that the continuation of our support of this doctrine implies that we will undertake to be responsible for the good behavior of all of the American nations. If we are the big brother with the club, who will not permit any outsider to spank our irritating or troublesome younger brothers, we must accept the natural corollary of keeping them in order ourselves, for we can not allow the American family to become a nuisance, and some members of it have a decided tendency in that direction. Is this task worth while? Will it not cost more than it is worth? Is there not a better way out of the difficulty?

"Furthermore Europe knows that in order to continue to execute our self-imposed and responsible mission we must run counter to the most approved principles of the law of nations.

"The right of independence is so fundamental and so well established a principle of international law, and respect for it is so essential to the existence of national self-restraint, that armed intervention, or any other action or policy tending to place that right in a subordinate position, is properly looked upon with disfavor, not only in Latin America, but by all the family of civilized nations. The grounds upon which intervention is permitted in international law differ according to the authority one consults, but in general they are limited to the right of self-preservation, to averting danger to the intervening State, and to the duty of fulfilling engagements. When, however, the danger against which intervention is directed is the consequence of the prevalence of ideas which are opposed to the views held by the intervening State, most authorities believe that intervention ceases to be legitimate. To say that we have the right to intervene in order to modify another State's attitude toward revolutions is to ignore the fundamental principle that the right of every State to live its life in a given way is precisely equal to that of another State to live its life in another way.

"In the last analysis no intervention is legal except for the purpose of self-preservation, unless a breach of international law has taken place or unless the family of civilized States concur in authorizing it.

"If, then, our adherence to the Monroe doctrine means practically disregard of the principles of the accepted law of nations, is it worth while to continue? Why should we not abandon the Monroe doctrine, and publicly disclaim any desire on our part to interfere in the domestic quarrels of our neighbors? Why should we not publicly state to Europe that we shall not intervene except at the request of a Pan American Congress, and then only in case we are one of the members which such a Congress selects for the specific purpose of quieting a certain troublesome neighbor?

"III.

"From the Latin-American point of view, the continuance of the Monroe doctrine is insulting, and is bound to involve us in serious difficulties with our neighbors. We seem to be blind to actual conditions in the largest and most important parts of Latin America, such as Brazil, Argentina, and Chile. We need to arouse the average citizen to study the commercial situation and the recent history of those three Republics. Let him ponder on the meaning of Brazil's $100,000,000 of balance of trade in her favor. Let him realize the enormous extent of Argentina's recent growth and her ability to supply the world with wheat, corn, beef, and mutton. (In 1912 Argentina's exports amounted to $480,000,000, of which $200,000,000 represented wheat and corn and $188,000,000 pastoral products.—The Author.) Let him examine Chile's political and economic stability. Let him ponder whether or not these nations are fit to take care of themselves, and are worthy of being included in an alliance to preserve America for the Americans, if that is worth while, and if there is any danger from Europe. Let him ask himself whether or not the A B C powers—that is, the Argentine, Brazilian, and Chilean Governments—deserve our patronizing, we-will-protect-you-from-Europe attitude.

"The fact is we are woefully ignorant of the actual conditions in the leading American Republics. To the inhabitants of those countries the very idea of the existence of the Monroe doctrine is not only distasteful but positively insulting. It is leading them on the road toward what is known as the 'A B C' policy, a kind of triple alliance between Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, with the definite object of opposing the encroachments of the United States. They feel that they must do something to counteract that well-known willingness of the American people to find good and sufficient reasons for interfering and intervening; for example, for taking Porto Rico from Spain, for sending armies into Cuba, for handling the customs receipts of Santo Domingo, for taking a strip of territory which (South Americans believe) belongs to the Republic of Colombia, for sending troops into Nicaragua, and for mobilizing an army on the Mexican frontier. (In regard to the latter point it may be stated, in passing, that it is not the custom for South American nations to mobilize an army on a neighbor's frontier merely because that country is engaged in civil war or revolution.)

"To the 'A B C' powers even the original Monroe doctrine is regarded as long since outgrown and as being at present merely a display of insolence and conceit on our part. With Brazil now owning the largest dreadnoughts in the world; with Argentina and Chile building equally good ones; with the fact that the European nations have long since lost their tendency toward monarchical despotism and are in fact quite as democratic as many American Republics, it does seem a bit ridiculous for us to pretend that the Monroe doctrine is a necessary element in our foreign policy.

"If we still fear European aggression and desire to prevent a partition of South America on the lines of the partition of Africa, let us bury the Monroe doctrine and declare an entirely new policy—a policy that is based on intelligent appreciation of the present status of the leading American powers; let us declare our desire to join with the 'A B C' powers in protecting the weaker parts of America against any imaginable aggressions on the part of European or Asiatic nations.

"Some people think that the most natural outlet for the crowded Asiatic nations is to be found in South America, and that Japan and China will soon be knocking most loudly for the admission which is at present denied them. If we decide that they should enter, well and good; but if we decide against such a policy, we shall be in a much stronger position to carry out that plan if we have united with the 'A B C' powers.

"If these 'A B C' powers dislike and despise our maintenance of the old Monroe doctrine, it is not difficult to conceive how much more they must resent the new one. The very thought that we, proud in the consciousness of our own self-righteousness, sit here with a smile on our faces and a big stick in our hands, ready to chastise any of the American Republics that do not behave, fairly makes their blood boil. It may be denied that this is our attitude. Grant that it is not, still our neighbors believe that it is, and if we desire to convince them of the contrary we must definitely and publicly abandon the Monroe doctrine and enunciate a new kind of foreign policy.

"We ought not to be blind to the fact that there are clever authors residing in Europe who take the utmost pains to make the Latin Americans believe—what they are unfortunately only too willing to believe—that we desire to be not only practically but actually sovereign on the Western Hemisphere. A recent French writer, Maurice de Waleffe, writing on The Fair Land of Central America, begins his book with this startling announcement of a discovery he has made:

"'The United States have made up their mind to conquer South America. Washington aspires to become the capital of an enormous empire, comprising, with the exception of Canada, the whole of the New World. Eighty million Yankees want to annex not only 40,000,000 Spanish-Americans but such mines, forests, and agricultural riches as can be found nowhere else on the face of the globe.'

"Most of us, when we read those words, smile, knowing that they are not true; yet that does not affect the fact that the Latin American, when he reads them, gnashes his teeth and believes that they are only too true. If he belongs to one of the larger Republics, it makes him toss his head angrily and increases his hatred toward those 'Yankis,' whose manners he despises. If he belongs to one of the smaller Republics, his soul is filled with fear mingled with hatred, and he sullenly awaits the day when he shall have to defend his State against the Yankee invaders. In every case the effect produced is contrary to the spirit of peace and harmony.

"In another book, which is attracting wide attention and was written by a young Peruvian diplomatist, there is a chapter entitled 'The North American Peril,' and it begins with these significant words: 'To save themselves from Yankee imperialism, the American democracies would almost accept a German alliance or the aid of Japanese arms; everywhere the Americans of the north are feared. In the Antilles and in Central America hostility against the Anglo-Saxon invaders assumes the character of a Latin crusade.' This is a statement not of a theory, but of a condition set forth by a man who, while somewhat severe in his criticism of North American culture, is not unfriendly to the United States, and who remembers what his country owes to us. Yet he asserts that in the United States 'against the policy of respect for Latin liberties are ranged the instincts of a triumphant plutocracy.'

"The strident protest in this book has not gone out without finding a ready echo in South America. Even in Peru, long our best friend on the southern continent, the leading daily papers have during the past year shown an increasing tendency to criticize our actions and suspect our motives. Their suspicion goes so far as actually to turn friendly words against us. Last September a successful American diplomat, addressing a distinguished gathering of manufacturers in New York, was quoted all over South America as stating that the United States did not desire territorial expansion, but only commercial, and that the association should combat all idea of territorial expansion if any statesman proposed it, as this was the only way to gain the confidence of South America. This remark was treated as evidence of Machiavelian politics. One journalist excitedly

exclaimed, 'Who does not see in this paternal interest a brutal and cynical sarcasm? Who talks of confidence when one of the most thoughtful South American authorities, Francisco Garcia Calderon, gives us once more the cry, no longer premature, "Let us be alert and on our guard against Yankeeism."'

"Even the agitation against the Putumayo atrocities is misunderstood. 'To no one is it a secret,' says one Latin-American writer, 'that all these scandalous accusations only serve to conceal the vehement desire to impress American and English influence on the politics of the small countries of South America; and they can scarcely cover the shame of the utilitarian end that lies behind it all.'

"Another instance of the attitude of the Latin-American press is shown in a recent article in one of the leading daily papers in Lima, the Government organ. In the middle of its front page in a two-column space is an article with these headlines: 'North American excesses—The terrible lynchings—And they talk of the Putumayo!' The gist of the article may easily be imagined. It begins with these words: 'While the Saxons of the world are producing a deafening cry over the crimes of the Putumayo, imagining them to be like a dance of death, and giving free rein to such imaginings; while the American Government resolves to send a commission that may investigate what atrocities are committed in those regions, there was published, as regards the United States, in La Razón, of Buenos Aires, a fortnight ago the following note, significant of the "lofty civilization and high justice" of the great Republic of the north.' Here follows a press dispatch describing one of the terrible lynchings which only too often happen in the United States. Then the Peruvian editor goes on to say, 'Do we realize that in the full twentieth century, when there is not left a single country in the world whose inhabitants are permitted to supersede justice by summary punishment, there are repeatedly taking place, almost daily, in the United States lynchings like that of which we are told in the telegraphic dispatch?'

"IV.

"Is it worth our while to heed the 'writing on the wall'?

"Is it not true that it is the present tendency of the Monroe doctrine to claim that the United States is to do whatever seems to the United States good and proper so far as the Western Hemisphere is concerned? Is there not a dangerous tendency in our country to believe so far in our own rectitude that we may be excused from any restrictions, either in the law of nations or in our treaty obligations, that seem unjust, trivial, or inconvenient, notwithstanding the established practices of civilized nations? Our attitude on the Panama tolls question, our former disregard of treaty rights with China, and our willingness to read into or read out of existing treaties whatever seems to us right and proper have aroused deep-seated suspicion in our southern neighbors, which, it seems to me, we should endeavor to eradicate if we have our own highest good at heart.

"Are we not too much in the state of mind of Citizen Fix-it, who was more concerned with suppressing the noisy quarrels of his neighbors than with quietly solving his own domestic difficulties? Could we see ourselves as our southern neighbors see us in the columns of their daily press, where the emphasis is still on the prevalence of murder in the United States, the astonishing continuance of lynching, the freedom from punishment of the vast majority of those who commit murder, our growing disregard of the rights of others, bomb outrages, strikes, riots, labor difficulties—could we see these things with their eyes, we should realize how bitterly they resent our assumed right to intervene when they misbehave themselves or when a local revolution becomes particularly noisy.

"So firmly fixed in the Latin-American mind is the idea that our foreign policy to-day means intervention and interference that comments on the splendid sanitary work being done at Panama by Col. Gorgas are tainted with this idea.

"On the west coast of South America there is a pesthole called Guayaquil, which, as Ambassador Bryce says, 'enjoys the reputation of being the pesthouse of the continent, rivaling for the prevalence and malignity of its malarial fevers such dens of disease as Fontesvilla on the Pungwe River in South Africa and the Guinea coast itself, and adding to these the more swift and deadly yellow fever, which has now been practically extirpated from every other part of South America except the banks of the Amazon. * * * It seems to be high time that efforts should be made to improve conditions at a place whose development is so essential to the development of Ecuador itself.' Recent efforts on the part of far-sighted Ecuadorian statesmen to remedy these conditions by employing American sanitary engineers and taking advantage of the offers of American capital were received by the Ecuadorian populace so ill as to cause the fall of the cabinet and the disgrace of the minister who favored such an experiment in modern sanitation.

"Peru suffers from the conditions of bad health among her northern neighbors, and yet the leading newspapers in Peru, instead of realizing how much they had to gain by having Guayaquil cleaned up, united in protesting against this symptom of 'Yanki' imperialism, and applauded the action of the Ecuadorian mob.

"Is it worth while to continue a foreign policy which makes it so difficult for things to be done, things of whose real advantage to our neighbors there is no question?

"The old adage that actions speak louder than words is perhaps more true in Latin America than in the United States. A racial custom of saying pleasant things tends toward a suspicion of the sincerity of pleasant things when said. But there can be no doubt about actions. Latin-American statesmen smiled and applauded when Secretary ROOT, in the Pan-American Congress at Rio Janeiro, said, 'We consider that the independence and the equal rights of the smallest and weakest members of the family of nations deserve as much respect as those of the great empires. We pretend to no right, privilege, or power that we do not freely concede to each one of the American Republics.' But they felt that their suspicions of us were more than warranted by our subsequent actions in Cuba, Santo Domingo, and Nicaragua. Our ultimatum to Chile on account of the long-standing Alsop claim seemed to them an unmistakably unfriendly act and was regarded as a virtual abandonment by Secretary Knox of the policy enunciated by Secretary ROOT.

"Another unfriendly act was the neglect of our Congress to provide a suitable appropriation for the Second Pan-American Scientific Congress.

"Before 1908 Latin-American scientific congresses had been held in Argentina (Buenos Aires), Brazil (Rio Janeiro), and Uruguay (Montevideo). When it came Chile's turn, so kind was her feeling toward Secretary ROOT that the United States was asked to join in making the Fourth Latin-American Scientific Congress become the first Pan-American. Every one of the four countries where the international scientists met had made a suitable, generous appropriation to cover the expenses of the meeting. Chile had felt that it was worth while to make a very large appropriation in order suitably to entertain the delegates, to publish the results of the congress, and to increase American friendships. This First Pan-American Scientific Congress selected Washington as the place for the second congress, and named October, 1912, as the appointed time for the meetings. But when our State Department asked Congress for a modest appropriation of $50,000 to meet our international obligations for this Pan-American gathering, our billion-dollar Congress decided to economize and denied the appropriation. When the matter came up again during the Congress that has just finished its sessions, the appropriation was recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but was thrown out on a technical point of order.

"Now, you can not make a Latin-American believe that the United States is so poor that it can not afford to entertain international scientific congresses as Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, and Chile have done. They argue that there must be some other reason underlying this lack of courtesy. No pleasant words or profuse professions of friendship and regard can make the leading statesmen and scientists throughout Latin America forget that it was not possible to hold the Second Pan-American Scientific Congress because the United States did not care to assume her international obligations. Nor will they forget that Chile spent $100,000 in entertaining the First Pan-American Scientific Congress and that the 10 official delegates from the United States Government enjoyed the bounteous Chilean hospitality and were shown every attention that was befitting and proper for the accredited representatives of the United States.

"In short, here is a concrete case of how our present policy toward Latin America justifies the Latin-American attitude toward the country that has been maintaining the Monroe doctrine.

"V.

"Finally, there is another side to the question.

"Some of the defenders of the Monroe doctrine state quite frankly that they are selfish, and that from the selfish point of view the Monroe doctrine should at all costs be maintained. They argue that our foreign commerce would suffer were Europe permitted to have a free hand in South America. Even on this very point it seems to me that they make a serious mistake.

"You can seldom sell goods to a man who dislikes you, except when you have something which is far better or cheaper than he can get anywhere else. Furthermore, if he distrusts you, he is not going to judge your goods fairly or view the world's market with an unprejudiced eye. This can scarcely be denied. Everyone knows that a friendly smile or cordial

greeting and the maintenance of friendly relations are essential to 'holding one's customers.' Accordingly, it seems that even from this selfish point of view, which some Americans are willing to take, it is absolutely against our own interests to maintain this elder-brother-with-the-stick policy, which typifies the new Monroe doctrine.

"Furthermore, Germany is getting around the Monroe doctrine, and is actually making a peaceful conquest of South America which will injure us just as much as if we had allowed her to make a military conquest of the southern Republics. She is winning South American friendship. She has planted colonies, one of which, in southern Brazil, has 350,000 people in it, as large a population as that of Vermont and nearly as large as that of Montana. Germany is taking pains to educate her young business men in the Spanish language, and to send them out equipped to capture Spanish-American trade. We have a saying that 'Trade follows the flag.' Germany has magnificent steamers, flying the German flag, giving fortnightly service to every important port in South America—ports where the American flag is practically never seen. She has her banks and business houses which have branches in the interior cities. By their means she is able to keep track of American commerce, to know what we are doing, and at what rates. Laughing in her sleeve at the Monroe doctrine as an antiquated policy, which only makes it easier for her to do a safe business, Germany is engaged in the peaceful conquest of Spanish America.

"To be sure, we are not standing still, and we are fighting for the same trade that she is, but our soldiers are handicapped by the presence of the very doctrine that was intended to strengthen our position in the New World. Is this worth while?

"At all events let us face clearly and frankly the fact that the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine is going to cost the United States an immense amount of trouble, money, and men.

"Carried out to its logical conclusion, it means a policy of suzerainty and interference which will earn us the increasing hatred of our neighbors, the dissatisfaction of Europe, the loss of commercial opportunities, and the forfeiture of time and attention which would much better be given to settling our own difficult internal problems. The continuance of adherence to the Monroe doctrine offers opportunities to scheming statesmen to distract public opinion from the necessity of concentrated attention at home by arousing mingled feelings of jingoism and self-importance in attempting to correct the errors of our neighbors.

"If we persist in maintaining the Monroe doctrine, we shall find that its legitimate, rational, and logical growth will lead us to an increasing number of large expenditures, where American treasure and American blood will be sacrificed in efforts to remove the mote from our neighbor's eye while overlooking the beam in our own.

"The character of the people who inhabit the tropical American Republics is such, the percentage of Indian blood is so great, the little understood difficulties of life in those countries are so far-reaching, and the psychological tendencies of the people so different from our own, that opportunities will continually arise which will convince us that they require our intervention if we continue to hold to the tenets of the Monroe doctrine.

"It is for us to face the question fairly and to determine whether it is worth while to continue any longer on a road which leads to such great expenditures and which means the loss of international friendships.

"That international good will is a desideratum it needs no words of mine to prove to anyone. Looked at from every point of view, selfishly and unselfishly, ethically, morally, commercially, and diplomatically, we desire to live at peace with our neighbors and to promote international friendship. Can this be done by continuing our adherence to the Monroe doctrine?

"From the unselfish point of view and from the point of view of the world's peace and happiness, there seems to be no question that the Monroe doctrine is no longer worth while. Mr. Bryce, in an able exposition in his recent 'South America,' has clearly pointed out that the Spanish-American's regard for the United States and his confidence in its purposes have never even recovered from the blow given by the Mexican War of 1846 and the annexation of California. For many years a political tie between ourselves and the other American Republics was found, says Mr. Bryce, in our declared intention 'to resist any attempt by European powers either to overthrow republican government in any American State or to attempt annexation of its territory. So long as any such action was feared from Europe the protection thus promised was welcome, and the United States felt a corresponding interest in their clients; but circumstances alter cases. To-day, when apprehensions of the old kind have vanished and when some of the South American States feel themselves already powerful, one is told that they have begun to regard the situation with different eyes. "Since there are no longer rain clouds coming up from the east, why should a friend, however well intentioned, insist on holding an umbrella over us? We are quite able to do that for ourselves if necessary."' Mr. Bryce continues: 'It is as the disinterested, the absolutely disinterested and unselfish, advocate of peace and good will that the United States will have most influence in the Western Hemisphere, and that influence, gently and tactfully used, may be of incalculable service to mankind.'

"Old ideas, proverbs, catchwords, national shibboleths, die hard. No part of our foreign policy has ever been so continuously held and so popularly accepted as the Monroe doctrine. Hoary with age, it has defied the advance of commerce, the increase of transportation facilities, and the subjugation of the yellow-fever mosquito. Based on a condition that has long since disappeared, owing its later growth and development to mistaken ideas, it appears to our South American neighbors to be neither disinterested nor unselfish, but rather an indisputable evidence of our overweening national conceit. The very words 'Monroe doctrine' are fraught with a disagreeable significance from our neighbors' point of view. There is no one single thing nor any group of things that we could do to increase the chances of peace and harmony in the Western Hemisphere comparable with the definite statement that we have outgrown the Monroe doctrine, that we realize that our neighbors in the New World are well able to take care of themselves, and that we shall not interfere in their politics or send arms into their territory unless cordially invited to do so, and then only in connection with and by the cooperation of other members of the family.

"If it is necessary to maintain order in some of the weaker and more restless Republics, why not let the decision be made not by ourselves, but by a congress of the leading American powers? If it is found necessary to send armed forces into Central America to quell rebellions that are proving too much for the recognized Governments, why not let those forces consist not solely of American marines, but of the marines of Argentina, Brazil, and Chile as well? In some such way as this we can convince 'the other Americans' of our good faith and of the fact that we have not 'made up our minds to conquer South America.' By adopting a foreign policy along these lines we can establish on a broad and solid foundation the relations of international peace and good will for which the time is ripe, but which can not arrive till we are convinced that the Monroe doctrine is not worth while."

APPLIANCES FOR ENGINES IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know the subject upon which the gentleman desires to speak.

Mr. RAKER. It is upon the subject of headlights for engines engaged in interstate commerce, upon the subject of proper engines and appliances for engines engaged in interstate commerce, and one or two other matters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith some resolutions by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, adopted at their twenty-sixth convention, held in the city of Washington, D. C., during the month of June, 1913, in which they urge legislation by Congress upon the following subjects:

1. Placing some restrictions upon immigration into the United States.

2. That a proper headlight law be enacted, embodying the provisions of H. R. 103, Sixty-third Congress, first session.

3. That common carriers engaged in interstate commerce be compelled to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances.

4. That Senate bill No. 4, Sixty-third Congress, first session, relating to our merchant marine, etc., be speedily enacted into law.

All of these are important matters and demand immediate attention and consideration by this Congress. I am in full accord with the purpose to be accomplished by each of these resolutions.

BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND ENGINEMEN,
*Peoria, Ill., July 12, 1913.*

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: By instructions of the twenty-sixth convention of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, held in the city of

Washington, D. C., during the month of June, 1913, the following resolution is transmitted for your information:

"Whereas for many years representatives of labor organizations have urged upon Congress the necessity of the placing of some restriction upon the immigration of millions of foreign people to the United States, by which unrestricted immigration American labor has been displaced, wages reduced, labor unions destroyed, and the American standard of living seriously affected: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the national legislative representative at Washington is hereby instructed to join with representatives of all other labor organizations in an endeavor to induce the United States Congress to adopt laws that will restrict any immigration that tends to lower the standard of living of the American working people: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That the international president and the general secretary and treasurer be, and are hereby, instructed to file a copy of these resolutions with the President of the United States and the Members of both Houses of Congress."

Yours, respectfully,

W. S. CARTER,
*President.*

Attest:

A. H. HAWLEY,
*General Secretary and Treasurer.*

---

BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND ENGINEMEN,
*Peoria, Ill., July 12, 1913.*

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: By instructions of the twenty-sixth convention of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, held in the city of Washington, D. C., in the month of June, 1913, the following resolution adopted by that convention is transmitted to you for your information:

"Careful perusal of the report rendered by the Bureau of Standards convinces us that the electric headlight alone will afford adequate protection to the lives of our members, the traveling public, and the property of the railroads, but to overcome the claims of class legislation made by manufacturers of other lights, it was deemed advisable that a clause be inserted in the bill providing for other lights if the required candlepower could be furnished.

"We have ascertained that laws have been passed in 20 States, namely, Alabama, Arizona, Mississippi, Montana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, Colorado, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Ohio, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Wisconsin, providing for headlights to meet certain requirements. In the first 11 States mentioned laws have been passed requiring locomotives to be equipped with electric headlights, and 1,500 candlepower, measured without the aid of a reflector, is specified. The other 9 States have laws requiring a headlight which will enable the engine crew to clearly discern an object the size of a man at distances varying from 500 feet in Ohio to 800 feet in Kansas, South Carolina, and Wisconsin.

"We find that, in addition to these States in which laws have been enacted, the railroads in the State of California have agreed to equip all locomotives used in road service with electric headlights of not less than 1,500 candlepower, with the addition of a 60-candlepower incandescent light to be placed in the headlight and controlled with a switch in the cab, making it possible to operate or cut out either light independent of the other. This latter improvement for the purpose of overcoming the objections interposed by certain officials of these railroads that headlights of this power are dazzling in their brightness and have a tendency to blind the engineer, preventing him from properly observing signals, etc.

"After giving careful consideration to the foregoing, we recommend that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, in convention assembled, indorse House bill No. 103, introduced by Congressman JOHN E. RAKER, of California, at the first session of the Sixty-third Congress.

"That the international president, acting in the capacity of national legislative representative, be, and is hereby, authorized and instructed to use all honorable means to secure the passage of this bill.

"That he issue a circular letter to all lodges in the United States calling upon them to furnish him with specific cases where wrecks have occurred (giving dates, casualties, and such information as will properly identify same) that could have been averted had the locomotives been equipped with headlights of sufficient power; also specific instances where such accidents were averted because of the locomotives having been equipped with proper headlights.

"That we furnish each lodge in each State with the name and addresses of their Congressmen and request them to write a suitable letter to each urging them to support this headlight bill.

"That we address a suitable letter to W. S. Stone, grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, requesting that he take similar action through the divisions of that organization.

"That a copy of this indorsement of House bill No. 103 be forwarded to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and to Congressman JOHN E. RAKER."

Yours, truly,

W. S. CARTER,
*President.*

Attest:

A. H. HAWLEY,
*General Secretary and Treasurer.*

---

BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND ENGINEMEN,
*Peoria, Ill., July 12, 1913.*

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER, *Washington D. C.*

DEAR SIR: By instructions of the twenty-sixth convention of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, held in the city of Washington, D. C., during the month of June, 1913, the following resolution is transmitted for your information:

"Whereas the law to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto, was passed by Congress as a result of long and vigorous efforts on the part of this and kindred organizations whose members were being killed or injured by boiler accidents; and

"Whereas the passage and enforcement of this law has greatly added to the safety and comfort of locomotive firemen and enginemen, and has facilitated train movement and reduced engine failures by bringing about improved conditions of the motive power to which the provisions of the law apply; and

"Whereas it is a well-known fact that accidents and derailments are frequently due to the defective condition of locomotive machinery, which is not covered by the law, and that additional protection to locomotive firemen and enginemen, and to the traveling public, would result from an extension of its provisions to cover all parts of the locomotive as well as the boiler and its appurtenances: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this convention indorse the present locomotive-boiler inspection law and commend the efficient and practical manner in which it has been enforced by the Locomotive Boiler Inspection Division of the Interstate Commerce Commission; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this convention earnestly urge Congress to enact, and the President to approve, such additional legislation as may be necessary to extend the authority of the Locomotive Boiler Inspection Division of the Interstate Commerce Commission to cover all parts of the locomotives and tenders, so that when locomotives are operated with any defect which makes them in an unsafe or improper condition for service, the same action may be taken and penalties applied that now apply to 'locomotive boilers and their appurtenances'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a special committee be appointed to deliver this resolution to the President."

Yours, respectfully,

W. S. CARTER,
*President.*

Attest:

A. H. HAWLEY,
*General Secretary and Treasurer.*

---

BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND ENGINEMEN,
*Peoria, Ill., July 12, 1913.*

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: By instructions of the twenty-sixth convention of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, held in the city of Washington, D. C., during the month of June, 1913, the following resolutions adopted by that convention are hereby transmitted for your information and consideration:

"Whereas the absence of native Americans in our merchant marine is conclusive evidence that the living conditions of our seamen are so far below the usual standards as to cause our men and boys to shun this calling; and

"Whereas the increase in wrecks of vessels and the increase in the loss of life proves that the standard of skill of the men employed is continually deteriorating, the dangers to life at sea increasing; and

"Whereas the official investigation of wrecks all point to and demand some real and effective remedy; and

"Whereas congressional committees have had hearings during the sessions of Congress for the last dozen years, and there has finally passed the House a measure which has since had the unqualified approval of the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by this the Twenty-sixth Convention of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen*, That we indorse Senate bill No. 4 and urge its adoption as recommended by the departments above referred to at this session of Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House, to the President of the United States, and to Senator LA FOLLETTE, the author of the bill in the Senate."

Yours, respectfully,

W. S. CARTER, *President.*

Attest:

A. H. HAWLEY,
*General Secretary and Treasurer.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN THE RECORD.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I hold no brief to speak for the present Democratic administration in relation to the Caminetti-McNab controversy. But I can not remain idly by and permit stand-pat Republican politicians to traduce—and in my judgment willfully misrepresent and misinterpret—the actions of Secretary Wilson and Attorney General McReynolds in this matter. I do not believe that the Attorney General, as the head of the Department of Justice in this city, should have the power to control Federal court prosecutions in distant States. This power should be vested in the local courts and attorneys alone. However, for many years the Attorney General has directed at will such prosecutions. Indeed, they have ordered the local attorneys to dismiss prosecutions, and in the noted case of the prosecution of Mansfield, McMurray & Cornish, in the southern district of Oklahoma, in the year 1905, the Attorney General peremptorily ordered the local attorney to dismiss said indictment before the creation of the new State. This order was made and these men were never tried, though it is well known that they were guilty, as charged, with defrauding the Chickasaw Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma out of the sum of $28,876.90. Now, in this Caminetti case, a short continuance was all that was asked. Why did not these valorous defenders of justice criticize President Roosevelt and Taft for dismissing many prosecutions? Mr. Speaker, the editorials of several of the leading papers of the United States will answer my question more fully than I have time to do, and suffice it for me to say that I fully concur in their statements and conclusions.

These editorials are as follows, viz:

[From the Washington Post.]

THE DIGGS-CAMINETTI CASE.

The political twist that has been given the Diggs-Caminetti case was well illustrated at San Francisco Tuesday, when United States Judge Van Fleet was compelled to rebuke the grand jury for filing a report

in which the jury assailed Attorney General McReynolds and President Wilson. The offensive report was returned to the jury with the sharp reminder that it had better attend to its own business and not set itself up as a critic of national officers.

There has been altogether too much buncombe and hysteria in this case—buncombe on the part of the politicians who are using it for their own advantage, and hysteria on the part of ill-informed persons who have been misled into thinking that "white slavers" guilty of an atrocious crime have been protected by the Government.

The evidence against Diggs and Caminetti is conclusive. The outcome of the trial, whether conducted immediately or whether it be postponed, is a foregone conclusion. There was no palliation in Washington of the hideous offense, and no evidence has been adduced to show that the Government was derelict in any respect in working up the case against the defendants. It was cunningly made to appear, however, that the Government was willing, and even anxious, to defeat the ends of justice by postponing the case a couple of months. If there had been any such monstrous motive in the hearts of the Government chiefs there would have been justification for the indignation that has been expressed. But the remote danger in delay was grossly exaggerated in order to cast discredit upon the President and his Attorney General. The natural tendency of the public to resent interference with the course of justice was fomented into hysterical indignation by politicians for their own purposes.

The Diggs-Caminetti case in itself is shocking enough, but it is made much worse by muckraking politicians who use it for the purpose of imputing base motives to the heads of the Government.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex., June 28, 1913.]

"Frightened rabbits never got away quicker than the President and the Attorney General when this matter was brought up," exclaims Mr. MANN, the minority leader in the House, in referring to the California white-slave episode. And yet we may be sure that if the President had paltered with this situation for as long as a day Mr. MANN would have been even more indignant and have declared, when finally the President had acted, that he had been reluctantly driven to act by outraged public opinion. All which is merely illustrative of the petty and demagogic motives that make up so large a part of our party politics. The action of Secretary Wilson and of Attorney General McReynolds was a gross and inexcusable blunder, but there has not been disclosed one fact or circumstance to suggest that either of them was actuated by unworthy motive. As for the course of the President, both the precise action that he took and the promptness with which he took it deserve the applause of the whole country, and if there were more sincerity in our political controversies and a greater regard for the truth, Republicans would be as ready as Democrats to applaud him. Not the least regrettable consequence of such episodes as this is the exhibition of hypocrisy which they usually occasion.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Journal, July 11, 1913.]

ON DRESS PARADE.

The process of extracting political buncombe out of the Caminetti-McNab episode continues.

Never before were so many gentlemen shocked at a white-slave case. Never before were so many alleged virtuous persons thundering in the index. More apostles of virtue are on dress parade now than at any time in a century. From the racket raised one would think there never was a white-slave case before. Gentlemen are holding up their hands in holy horror, and many of them are gentlemen who have probably been helping to perpetuate vice, who have been extracting profits from vice and have helped to furnish recruits for vice.

Young Caminetti is vile. No postponement of his case should have been requested by the Secretary of Labor. Attorney General McReynolds ought not to have postponed the cases at the request of the Secretary of Labor. The whole incident has been blundering.

But thousands of other cases have been postponed by order of the Attorney General. The case against the Chicago beef packers was postponed by order of the Attorney General until the packers finally escaped conviction by pleading the statute of limitation in court. Not one of the gentlemen now yelling their heads off was up protesting against the order of postponement then. Mr. McNab was not then so outraged by a postponement that freed men who have indirectly extorted millions from their countrymen. Congressman MANN, who was virtuously vociferous on the floor, attacking the President, never lifted his voice then.

The Sherman law has been a law more than 20 years, and its provisions for sending trust magnates to jail have been postponed by Republican Attorney Generals so consistently and so studiously that not one captain of industry has ever been jailed.

But no McNab has ever resigned before; no Congressman KAHN, of California, has ever protested; no Congressman MANN has ever been shocked.

But they are all whooping it up now, whooping it up as though young Caminetti were the original white slaver and they the cleanest, most virtuous persons outside of paradise.

Young Caminetti will be thoroughly prosecuted, and he ought to be. But for the itch of some gentlemen for office and but for their desire to do something by which to exploit themselves for office, he could have been tried, convicted, and punished and the country been spared the hideous details of his crime.

The main feature of the whole hullabaloo is the willingness of the McNabs and others to capitalize the nasty facts of a white-slave case as a means of getting official position.

[From the Denver News, July 11, 1913.]

M'NAB AND HIS FEARS.

One Mr. McNab, of San Francisco, who happened to have held over as United States district attorney for California, worked up a violent wrath a few days ago and forthwith telegraphed his resignation to the President for immediate action. The McNab grievance was that a couple of criminal cases which he had a palpitating ambition to try at once were postponed for a few months, and immediately he concluded that there was a dark and deep-laid conspiracy hatching somewhere in the Department of Justice at Washington. Whereupon the President, harking to the McNab anxiety, investigated, found that the California lawyer was wrong, and let Mr. McNab out of a job precisely as the lawyer had requested in various kinds of language, following rather voluminous intimation and suggestion.

Now it appears to the satisfaction of everyone save McNab and a few of his cronies close to the singing waves of the Golden Gate that there never was any intention of deferring the trial of the cases indefinitely and that everything was done in legal fashion, just as is agreed every day in law courts to meet fair and reasonable conveniences. The accused will be tried in the near future, but the prosecutor will not be McNab. This will likely displease the gentleman with the distended and vociferous vocabulary, but it will hardly hurt the administration of justice much.

The McNab idea was to besmirch the character of United States Attorney General McReynolds and incidentally to play a little game of small politics, which might inure to the standing of the stand-pat wing of the Republican Party, of which he is a stern and inflexible pillar. But between the President and the Attorney General they have effectually punctured the scheme. McNab says the incident is now closed. So is McNab, glory be!

THE PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, volumes have been written upon the Panama Canal project, but because of the lack of knowledge of many of the authors, there has been consequent inaccuracy in the statements of those dealing with the subject, and I am constrained to the belief that a vast majority of the people to-day are as ignorant of the facts upon this subject as I confess myself to have been previous to my recent semiofficial visit to the Canal Zone.

Undoubtedly many have spoken or written with earnest desire to properly portray the wonders of this stupendous undertaking. Few possess sufficient knowledge of this particular kind of work to enable them to properly describe the active operations of the canal commission.

That the work of building the canal requires high-class mechanical skill and ingenuity, none can gainsay. Our able commission has perfected an organization of men who are peers in their respective professions. They have resolutely and diligently pursued the policy laid down with the beginning of this gigantic task in 1904, have surmounted innumerable unforeseen obstacles, and are now nearing the completion of the work which, when completed, will stand a perpetual monument to American skill, courage, and ingenuity.

The following facts, prepared by William M. Baxter, jr., official guide and lecturer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, will be found a descriptive, instructive, and interesting story from an absolutely reliable and authoritative source.

THE PANAMA CANAL.

THE CANAL ZONE.

"The Canal Zone is a strip of land 10 miles wide, 5 miles each side of the center line of the canal, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific. All told, it contains 436 square miles, of which the United States now owns about 363 square miles. The remainder is privately owned and was not acquired by the Government, as it was not needed for the construction of the canal. If, however, this land should ever be needed, the United States can by its treaty right acquire, either by purchase or by the exercise of the right of eminent domain, any lands, buildings, water rights, or other properties necessary for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, or protection of the canal.

"The two cities of Panama and Colon, although within the boundaries of the Canal Zone, are excluded from it and are under the Government of Panama. They have no outlet, however, except through the zone. The United States reserves the right to enforce sanitary ordinances in those two cities, and also to maintain public order in the event that the Republic of Panama is unable to do so.

ROUTE OF CANAL.

"The canal traverses this zone from Colon to Panama in a general southeasterly direction, Panama being located 22 miles east of a line running due south from Colon.

"In passing through the canal from the Atlantic vessels enter a sea-level channel extending from deep water in the Atlantic to the foot of the locks at Gatun. This channel is 7 miles in length, 500 feet wide, and 41 feet deep.

"At Gatun, vessels are lifted from sea level to 85 feet above through a flight of three locks, passing directly into the waters of Gatun Lake.

"Gatun Lake is an artificial body of water with an area of approximately 164 square miles. This lake is formed by impounding the waters of the River Chagres and its tributaries by means of a large dam at Gatun, where there is a break in the range of hills which surround the basin of the Chagres. By building a dam a mile and a half long across this gap, it is possible to back up the waters of the Chagres and form the Gatun Lake. The surface of this lake stands 85 feet above sea level, the summit level of the canal, and extends from Gatun clear through the Culebra Cut to the southern end at Pedro Miguel, a distance of 32 miles. From the foregoing it can be clearly seen that the Culebra Cut is merely a spur of the Gatun

Lake, the same water level existing in the cut as in the balance of the lake.

"Vessels after entering the lake may go at practically full speed for a distance of 23 miles from Gatun to the mouth of the cut. The first 16 miles of the channel through the lake is to be 1,000 feet wide, and is marked by buoys on the surface of the lake; then for 4 miles the channel is to be 800 feet wide, narrowing to 500 feet for 3 miles before entering the cut. Through the Culebra Cut, which is 9 miles in length, the channel is to be 300 feet in width at the bottom. Passing through this cut at a reduced speed, vessels arrive at the Pedro Miguel Lock at the south end, through which they are lowered in one step from 85 feet above sea level to 55 feet above, a drop of 30 feet, passing out into Miraflores Lake, a small artificial lake covering an area of about 2 square miles. This lake is formed by impounding the waters of the Cocoli, the Rio Grande, and the Pedro Miguel Rivers by means of the dam, locks, and spillway at Miraflores. The dam at this point runs practically parallel to the locks on their west side instead of at right angles to them. This is done in order to take in the Cocoli River, which comes in from the west, striking midway of the locks, which makes it necessary either to divert this stream or else to build a dam so as to throw it back into the lake. The latter plan gives additional water for the lake and avoids the silting up of the sea-level portion of the canal at the point at which the diverted Cocoli would enter it. The spillway is located on the east side of the locks between the side wall and a rocky point, and is of sufficient size to discharge all the water that might flow through one of the twin locks at Pedro Miguel in the event that an accident should establish free communication between Gatun and Miraflores Lakes. In this way an accident at Pedro Miguel does not necessarily endanger the locks at Miraflores.

"Passing through the Miraflores Lake, a distance of a mile and a half, through a channel 500 feet in width, the vessels arrive at the Miraflores Locks and pass down through two locks in flight from 55 feet above sea level to the sea-level channel on the Pacific side, steaming out through this channel from the foot of the locks at Miraflores to deep water in the Pacific, a distance of 8 miles.

"The total length of the canal is 50½ miles and the time for passing through from one ocean to the other will be from 10 to 12 hours, according to the speed a vessel maintains in the lake area. Three hours of this time are taken up in passing through the six locks. Of the total length of the canal, 40 miles will be of sufficient width to allow vessels to go at practically full speed, there being 15 miles of sea-level channel, 7 on one side and 8 on the other, and 25 miles of open lake navigation in the two lakes, in all of which the minimum channel width is to be 500 feet, and the maximum 1,000 feet. This leaves only 10½ miles which is at all narrow, 9 miles being in the cut where the bottom width is to be 300 feet and through which vessels will go at a reduced rate of speed, and the remainder being through the locks, where the vessel will be towed by means of electric towing engines. Everywhere except through the locks vessels will go under their own power.

OCEAN LEVELS.

"The general conception seems to be that the Pacific Ocean is higher than the Atlantic; this, however, is not the case. Mean sea level, the point midway between extreme high and low tide, is exactly the same in both the Atlantic and the Pacific. The difference is all in the tides. There is an average tide on the Pacific of 20 feet, while there are approximately but 20 inches of tide on the Atlantic side.

"This excessively high tide on the Pacific side is apparently due to the shape of the Bay of Panama, which, being shaped like a funnel, tends to exaggerate the action of the tide. The same thing occurs at several other points throughout the world, the most remarkable case being the Bay of Fundy in Nova Scotia, where the tide sometimes rises and falls 60 feet.

BREAKWATERS.

"Breakwaters are being constructed on both the Pacific and the Atlantic sides. The one on the Pacific end is simply an extension of a large dump at East Balboa of material excavated from the Culebra Cut, connecting Naos Island with the mainland, and designed to cut off a cross current which comes in at right angles to the line of the canal. This current, although moving slowly, carries an enormous amount of silt and sand, and it was to prevent the filling in of the sea-level portion of the canal that this breakwater was constructed.

"The Toro Point breakwater on the Atlantic side extends northeast from Toro Point a distance of 11,000 feet, and is designed to protect the Bay of Limon from heavy storms which occur during the winter months and are commonly known as 'northers.' These storms are of such violence that when one occurs vessels can not lie at the docks at Cristobal and Colon, but are forced to move out into deep water to seek shelter farther down the coast in the land-locked harbor of Porto Bello. In addition to this breakwater a mole is being built in connection with the dock-improvement work at Cristobal, behind which the docks will be constructed. If it should be found, after this mole is completed, that still further protection is required, then a second breakwater will be extended from the headland opposite Toro Point.

FRENCH WORK.

"Active work was started by the French on their canal in 1881, and this first French company, which was organized by De Lesseps, failed during the latter part of 1888, after spending $260,000,000. For five years the company remained in the hands of a receiver, and in 1894 the new French company was organized and kept up the work on a very small scale until 1904, when the United States took over the construction.

"The plan of this last French company was to build a lock-type canal with a total of eight locks and a summit level through the Culebra Cut at 97 feet above sea level. Starting just behind Cristobal Point, in order to secure the protection of that point against the northers, and extending for 16 miles inland to Bohio, the canal was to be a sea-level type. At Bohio a dam and two locks were to be located, forming the Bohio Lake, with a surface level of 65 feet above sea level. Passing through this lake a distance of 14 miles the vessels would arrive at Bas Obispo, at the northern end of the cut, where it was intended to locate two more locks with a combined lift of 32 feet. In order to secure water for the summit level through the cut it would have been necessary to build an additional reservoir at Alhajuela, farther up the valley of the Chagres, bringing a ditch line along the hillsides from this lake down and into the cut. Passing through the cut, vessels were to be lowered to the Pacific through four locks, one at Paraiso, two at Pedro Miguel, and one at Miraflores, from which point a sea-level canal 8 miles long led out into deep water in the Pacific.

FRENCH PURCHASE.

"The rights and property of this French company were purchased by the United States for $40,000,000, and up to date our country has realized on this purchase, on a very conservative estimate, over $42,000,000.

"Out of 80,000,000 cubic yards of excavation work which the French company had done only 30,000,000 yards were useful in the construction of the present type of canal, and in estimating the value of the French purchase an allowance of $25,389,240 was made for this excavation work. It had cost approximately $120,000,000.

"The value of the Panama Railroad was estimated at $9,000,000. This railroad was acquired by the French at a cost of $18,000,000. In addition to these two main items, the purchase included a great deal of machinery, and the commission is to-day using 85 French locomotives and 7 ladder dredges included in the property purchased. The French also turned over a great many buildings, maps, and scientific data, including records of the flow of the Chagres River through a period of 15 years. On these records it is impossible to place any cash value, as they would not have been available at any price had not the French kept these records, and with the present type of canal it is a matter of vital importance to be able to estimate accurately the volume of the flow of the Chagres, as it is the Chagres that supplies the water to fill the Gatun Lake and make the lockages through the canal. Now, due to the fact that we have secured these French records, we have a complete record of the flow of the Chagres extending through a period of 23 years.

RELOCATION OF PANAMA RAILROAD.

"As the construction of the canal progressed, it became necessary from time to time to abandon small sections of the original Panama Railroad line, which was built in 1850 by three Americans—Aspinwall, Stephens, and Chauncey. In 1908 the section between Mindi and Tiger Hill was relocated, as the old line passed right through the site of the Gatun Dam and Locks. In 1910 the section between Pedro Miguel and Corozal was relocated, establishing the line permanently at an elevation sufficiently high to be above the level of Miraflores Lake, and on February 15, 1912, the relocated line between Gatun and Matachin was put into service, as the rising water of the Gatun Lake, due to the closing up of the Chagres at Gatun on February 9, soon flooded most of the old line between these points.

"The Gatun Lake now stands 50 feet above sea level, at which elevation it floods the old railroad right of way to about Tabernilla and covers an area of over 90 square miles.

"Finally, with the canal completed, a new railroad will have been constructed, running from Colon to Panama entirely on the east side of the canal. The new road after leaving Gatun swings east along the hillsides, and crossing through the lake on high earth fills, follows the borders of the lake to Gamboa, where it crosses the Chagres on a steel-girder bridge a quarter of a mile long. From here it swings away from the cut and, passing around back of Gold Hill, follows the Pedro Miguel Valley to Pedro Miguel. Originally it was intended to carry the railroad through the cut on a bench 10 feet above the water, but the slides in the cut made that impracticable.

GATUN DAM AND LAKE.

"The Gatun Dam is a huge earth structure and is, in fact, more of a mountain than a dam. It is so constructed as to complete the natural range of mountains which, excepting at this one point, entirely surround the low-lying basin of the Chagres. By completing this basin it is possible to retain the waters of the Chagres and thereby form the Gatun Lake.

"The dam is constructed of two outer walls of dry fill, a large part of which was excavated from the Culebra Cut. These two walls, or toes, as they are usually called, were constructed so as to be 1,200 feet apart (inside measurement) and this space in between the two walls was filled with a mixture of sand and clay which was sucked up from the river bed of the Chagres, both above and below the dam, by means of large suction dredges, and then pumped through long pipe lines into the space between the two walls of dry-earth fill. About 20 per cent of the material passing through these pipe lines was solid matter, the balance water. After the solid matter settled the surplus water was drained off and in that way the inner portion of the dam was built up. This inner core is usually known as the hydraulic core and forms the water-tight portion of the dam. After the hydraulic core had been carried a short way above the water level it was discontinued, and the outer walls were then carried higher and closer together until they entirely encased and capped over the inner core.

"The Gatun Dam at the base is 2,100 feet, or about a half mile, thick—400 feet thick at the water surface and 100 feet wide across the crest. The crest of the dam stands 105 feet above sea level and 20 feet above the surface of the water of the lake. The length of the dam measured along the crest is 7,500 feet, but of this length only 500 feet will be subject to the full pressure of 85 feet of water, due to the natural rise of the ground along the inner slopes of the dam.

"In connection with this dam it is interesting to know that a Frenchman named Lepinay was the first to propose the plan of constructing a dam at Gatun. He proposed this plan in 1879 to the International Scientific Congress which had been convened at Paris to determine upon the general route of the proposed canal, but De Lesseps, who was the leading spirit of this Congress, was so strong an advocate of the sea-level canal that Lepinay's plan was hardly discussed, and is simply a matter of record.

SPILLWAY.

"The spillway, which is located about midway of the dam, is built right into a natural hill which stood at an elevation of 110 feet above sea level. This hill was practically solid rock, so it was only necessary to cut a channel 300 feet wide through this hill and line it with concrete, building a dam across the head of this channel to form the spillway or regulating works for Gatun Lake. This dam forms nearly a semicircle across the head of the spillway channel and will be constructed of solid concrete up to elevation 69. At this level piers rise 45 feet apart on the crest of the solid portion of the dam, and in between these piers come the steel gates 19 feet high which control the level of the lake.

"With these gates closed the crest of the dam would be 88 feet above sea level, so that it would be possible to store up water in the Gatun Lake up to about 87 feet above sea level. The normal level of the lake is to be 85 feet, and it will be maintained at that level during most of the year; just at the last of the rainy season, however, the lake level will be brought up to 87 in order to supply the water for lockages during the dry season. This will give an additional 2 feet of water over an area of 164 square miles, which would be sufficient to make 58 lockages a day during the dry season; that is 10 more than could possibly be made with vessels following one another at intervals of one hour.

"With the lake at 85 the spillway will be capable of discharging 154,000 cubic feet per second, which is more than the greatest momentary discharge on the Chagres River at Gatun.

"If the Gatun Lake should ever go to elevation 92 the spillway would be capable of discharging over 200,000 cubic feet of water per second, which is very nearly equal to the discharge of the Horseshoe Falls at Niagara. In addition to the control of the Chagres effected by means of the spillway, there is the great reservoiring effect of the Gatun Lake, it being of such great area that it would take the greatest known flood of the Chagres River nine hours to raise the level of the lake 1 foot, even though no water was discharging through the spillway at Gatun.

WATER SUPPLY.

"To those who are skeptical as to the supply of water which will be available to fill the Gatun Lake the following figures may be of interest:

"The rainy season on the Isthmus usually extends through the last eight months of the year and the remaining four months make up the dry season.

"At Colon the average annual rainfall amounts to 130 inches a year and, as one comes across the Isthmus from Colon to Panama, the rainfall decreases gradually until at Panama the rainfall averages 70 inches per annum. Now, as one goes east and west from the zone, one gets into sections that are more mountainous in which it rains almost every day in the year, so that at Porto Bello one finds an annual average rainfall of 173 inches. In 1909 Porto Bello had 237 inches of rain; during one month of that year it had 58 inches, or more than the average annual rainfall around New York or Boston, which is 40 to 45 inches.

"Porto Bello also holds the record for 24 hours' rainfall, which amounted to 10.86 inches. The greatest recorded rainfall for one hour is 5.86 inches at Balboa in June, 1906. The heaviest rainfall of short duration occurred at Porto Bello in December, 1911, amounting to 2.46 inches in three minutes.

"The area drained by the Chagres and its tributaries is 1,320 square miles, and in 1910 the volume of the discharge of that river at Gatun equaled once and a half the volume of water that will be contained in the Gatun Lake. At Gamboa the river has been known to rise 40 feet in 24 hours and to discharge one hundred times the water that it does in the dry season, amounting during one flood to a flow of 170,000 cubic feet per second, which equals two-thirds of the volume of water which passes over the Horseshoe Falls at Niagara.

POWER PLANTS.

"On the east side of the spillway will be located a large hydroelectric plant. This plant will take water from the Gatun Lake, pass it through turbines, and discharge it through openings in the side wall of the spillway channel, thereby generating all the power necessary to operate the lock machinery throughout the entire length of the canal. This plant consists of three 2,000-kilowatt generators, one of which is a reserve, producing ordinarily over 5,000 horsepower, with a reserve of 2,500 horsepower.

"The fall from the level of Gatun Lake to the level of the spillway floor being 75 feet, the supply of water for operating this plant will be ample at all times of the year.

"As an extra precaution, however, the present 6,000-horsepower construction plant at Miraflores, which is an oil-burning steam plant, will be retained as an auxiliary to the Gatun plant should it ever be needed.

CULEBRA CUT.

"The Culebra Cut, from which it was necessary to excavate over 105,000,000 cubic yards of rock and earth, representing nearly half of the excavation work on the entire canal, begins at the point where the canal leaves the valley of the Chagres, near Bas Obispo, and follows the winding valley of the Rio Obispo until it reaches the Continental Divide, near Culebra. After cutting through the divide it follows the valley of the Rio Grande to Pedro Miguel.

"The cut is 9 miles long and will be 300 feet wide on the bottom. At all the angles it is widened out sufficiently to allow a vessel 1,000 feet long to make the turn with perfect ease. The average depth to which it was necessary to excavate below the natural surface was approximately 120 feet through the entire length of the cut. At the point where the Continental Divide was severed, between Gold Hill and Contractor's Hill, the cutting will average 375 feet.

EXCAVATION.

"On January 1, 1913, there remained to be excavated throughout the cut 5,501,419 cubic yards of material. In the year 1911, 16,600,000 cubic yards were excavated; so that at this time there remains to be taken out less material than was excavated in the past 12 months. The 5,501,419 cubic yards which are still to be excavated lie in the cut in the shape of a mound 4 miles long at the base and 25 feet high. At the highest point this summit is located just opposite Culebra, and the mound slopes both ways from that level, so that on either end of the cut a point is reached where the excavation work

has been carried down to the final grade. Thirty-eight steam shovels are at work excavating this material, each one taking out on an average 1,500 cubic yards of rock and earth each day. Records have been made, however, of over 4,000 cubic yards in eight hours. As a matter of fact, the number of hours that a steam shovel is generally employed in loading cars amounts to only about six, as the problem in the cut is more one of transportation than of excavation, and it is not possible to keep trains standing under the shovels more than six hours out of the eight. All told, there are now about 75 miles of track in the cut, of which it is necessary to move about a mile each day. At the present time about 150 loaded trains of earth are passing out of the cut daily, but at the time when the excavation work was at its maximum 175 trains were leaving each day, which amounted to about one train every two and one-half minutes. The monthly output from the cut reaches close to 1,500,000 cubic yards.

"The buckets used on most of the shovels in the cut load 4 and 5 cubic yards at a time, which by weight means from 6 to 7½ tons to the bucketful.

DRILLING AND BLASTING.

"All of the material which is excavated by the shovels is first drilled and then blasted before it can be handled, and in the length of the cut a great number of drills are constantly working. All of these drills, of which there are two styles, churn and tripod, are operated by compressed air supplied from one long air main which parallels the line of the cut. Three compressor plants are pumping into this line, one located near the middle and one near each end of the line. The average depth to which the holes are drilled is 24 feet, and after drilling to this depth a small charge of dynamite is placed in the hole and discharged by means of the magneto battery, enlarging in that way the size of the hole at the bottom. Then, after the hole has cooled off it is ready to receive the large charge of dynamite varying from 75 to 200 pounds to each hole. This charge is exploded by means of the regular electric-light current, the ordinary magneto battery having been found too unreliable and its use resulted in too many misfired shots, which had to be subsequently excavated, thereby greatly endangering the lives of the workmen.

"Each month an average of 75 miles of drill holes are sunk, and if all the drill holes which have been put down since the United States has been at work were placed end to end the hole would pass entirely through the earth, coming out in the Indian Ocean south of the island of Sumatra. Five hundred thousand pounds of dynamite are used each month in the cut, and on the entire canal 800,000 pounds are consumed.

SLIDES.

"At the present time, there are in the length of the cut 19 slides varying greatly in size, the total area involved amounting to 210 acres. One of the largest is the Cucaracha slide just south of Gold Hill, which started during the French time and now covers an area of 47 acres, and is broken back a distance of 1,800 feet from the center line of the cut. A great number of smaller slides have occurred throughout the cut, the worst section for slides being right around the town of Culebra. From time to time small slides have occurred here on both the east and west banks, which have gradually combined, forming two large slides, until they have become more difficult to handle than the Cucaracha slide.

"Two general characters of slides are found in the cut. One is the true slide, which is a mass of earth that is sliding from a hard surface that pitches toward the cut, and this slide is glacial in its action. There are no means of overcoming or correcting this character of slide; the only thing that can be done is to take the material out as it slides in and continue to do so until the sliding material reaches an angle flat enough to stand. The other is a slide that is caused by the great weight of the banks on either side of the cut weighting down and squeezing out the soft underlying strata, which in giving away bulge up at the bottom of the cut, allowing the banks on either side to settle. These banks in settling break loose and begin to move toward the cut. The first movement of the banks in this kind of slide is downward and then the lateral motion follows. The slides near Culebra are of this type. In order to correct this character of slide steam shovels are working on top of the banks, taking material off the top, thereby reducing the weight of the banks and to a certain extent preventing further sliding.

DIVERSION CHANNELS.

"As the cut follows the valleys of the Rio Obispo and Rio Grande, it was necessary to divert these streams and their main tributaries to prevent the cut from being flooded during the rainy season. So that paralleling the line of the cut on the west side we have the Rio Grande and Comacho diversions, and on the east side the Obispo diversion. These diversion channels parallel the line of the cut and carry off the water of these small streams, as well as a large part of the surface drainage water, thus preventing the flooding of the cut itself. These channels were all started by the French, but were enlarged after the United States began work on the canal.

LOCKS.

"There are six locks in the canal, three in flight at Gatun, one at Pedro Miguel, and two in flight at Miraflores. All locks are constructed in pairs, so that vessels can go in opposite directions at the same time. Each lock or flight of locks is in general to be reserved for ships going in one direction, the twin lock or flight being used for vessels going in the opposite direction.

"The length of the lock chamber is 1,000 feet, the width 110 feet, and the depth of water over the sills 41⅔ feet in fresh water and 40 feet in salt water.

"The Pedro Miguel Lock is the same in all the essential features as the other locks, and as there is only one lift at this point it is the best one to describe.

"A simple definition of a lock is a walled chamber between two bodies of water of different levels having gates at either end, in which it is possible to confine vessels while they are being raised or lowered from one level to another by allowing water to flow in or out of the lock chamber.

"The method of raising or lowering the level of the water in the lock chamber varies on different lock canals. The lock chambers on most of the old canals are emptied or filled through sluice gates that slide up and down in the lock gates themselves. This system, however, caused a great deal of surging of the water at that end of the lock at which it was flowing in or out, and the system that has been adopted on the Panama Canal was designed with the idea of avoiding this disturbance of the water in the lock.

"All the locks on the Panama Canal have two parallel lock chambers, separated by a center wall. The water is brought in or out of these chambers through huge tunnels 18 feet in diameter passing lengthwise of the lock through the center and side walls. Branching out from these tunnels at right angles and running out under the lock floor are laterals, and these laterals communicate with the lock chamber through openings in the lock floor. The flow of water in or out of the lock is controlled by the gate valves located at both the upper and lower ends of the feed tunnels. In order to raise the water in the lock chamber the valves at the lower end are closed and the ones at the upper end opened. The water then flows from the upper level into the lock, passing down the tunnel in the side wall, and out through the laterals under the floor, coming up through the openings in the floor. It continues to flow in this way until the elevation of the water in the lock chamber is the same as that of the water above. To lower the water in the lock the process is simply reversed. The upper valves are closed and the lower ones opened. The water then flows out from the lock chamber and, passing back through the same tunnels that brought it in, seeks the level of the water below. So that in order to raise a vessel from one level to another the level of the water in the lock chamber is brought to the same level as that at which the vessel stands.

"The lock gates are then opened, the vessel passes into the chamber, and the gates are closed. Water is then allowed to flow into the lock until the vessel is raised to the level of the upper body of water, and with the same level on both sides of the upper gates those gates are thrown open, the vessel passing out at a greater elevation than that at which it entered the lock.

"The big tunnels passing through the side walls are the main operating tunnels, the one through the center wall being an auxiliary used to assist in filling the lock during the latter part of the operation, thereby increasing the volume of the inflow at the time when the velocity of the water entering the lock from the side wall tunnels is decreasing, keeping up in that way an average rate of filling which would amount to about 2 feet per minute. So that at Pedro Miguel, where the lift is 30 feet, a vessel would be raised from one level to the other in 15 minutes. The desired rate of filling can be kept up for the 600-foot and 400-foot locks by the side culvert only. It is probable that the center wall tunnel will be used only in case of the 1,000-foot lockages.

"From the center wall tunnel laterals, which alternate with laterals from the side walls, lead out under the floors of both lock chambers. They are controlled, independent of the main tunnel, by cylindrical valves located at the head of each tunnel, so that it is possible to close the laterals all the way down on one side, opening those on the other side, and feed water to one lock chamber; or, by reversing the process, feed water to the other chamber. By opening the valves to the laterals on both

sides it is possible to pass water through from one chamber to the other, in that way effecting a saving of water whenever vessels are going in opposite directions at the same time.

"Another means of economizing water is by using the intermediate lock gate which divides the 1,000-foot lock into two sections of 600 and 400 feet, respectively; so that in putting through small vessels it is not necessary to fill or empty the entire chamber.

ELECTRIC LOCOMOTIVES.

"The protective devices are one of the most interesting features of the lock construction, and of these the electric locomotives are the most important. About 90 per cent of all accidents to other locks have been due to misunderstanding in signals between the captain and engineer of the vessel, and all accidents of that kind will be eliminated by requiring vessels to go through the locks in tow of electric locomotives operating on the center and side walls of the locks. A vessel comes in and ties up to the center wall, which is extended beyond the side walls at both the upper and lower ends of the lock simply to act as a wharf or mooring wall. The vessel waits here until the locomotives come down and tow it up to a point where the locomotives on the side walls make fast their lines. The vessel then goes into the lock chamber with two locomotives in front towing, one on either side, and two others behind to retard when she gets into proper position.

"These towing locomotives operate on tracks close to the edge of the wall and engage in a center cog rail. While running on this cog rail the maximum speed at which they can operate will be 2 miles per hour. When they have completed a tow, however, they switch over to a track farther back from the edge of the wall and here the cog rail is omitted, so that they can return at a greater speed.

PROTECTIVE CHAIN.

"Should a vessel not obey the order to stop out alongside the center wall, but come ahead, it first would encounter a chain stretched across the entrance to the lock chamber. This chain connects on either side with large hydraulic cylinders located in shafts in the lock walls. The pressure from these cylinders causes the chain as it plays out to offer more and more resistance to the motion of the vessel. The chain is capable of stopping in 70 feet a 10,000-ton vessel running 4 miles per hour. The stock from which it is to be forged is three inches in diameter.

"When not in use the cylinders are forced up and the weight of the chain carries it down into the groove in the bottom of the lock floor and the vessel passes over it.

GUARD GATES.

"If a vessel should break through the fender chain, it would then ram the lock gate; but with this contingency in view two gates instead of one have been provided at the upper and lower ends of the highest lock in each flight, the upper or guard gate of each pair serving to protect the lower gate from ramming. Both gates would have to be broken down to put the lock out of commission.

LOWER GUARD GATE.

"At the lower end of all the sets of locks a small guard gate has been put in, mitering the other way from the main lock gates, which miter toward the high level, and it has been designed to serve two purposes: First, as a coffer gate or dam if at any time it is necessary to pump the water from the lower lock chamber; second, as a guard gate to the lower lock gate, for, mitering as it does, it will stand a heavier blow from the lower side than the lock gate itself.

EMERGENCY DAM.

"If all of these devices should fail and there should be an accident which would establish free communication between the two levels above and below a lock, a most destructive accident would be the result, for the velocity of the water flowing through the lock chamber would be 24 feet per second and the discharge would amount to 90,000 cubic feet per second. In order to shut off this water and prevent it from tearing out the lock floor it is necessary to employ a device known as an emergency dam, of which there are two installed at the upper end of each set of locks, one for either side. These resemble a swing bridge, and when put into use they are swung out across the lock and from their lower side a set of openwork wickets are lowered, engaging in a grooved sill on the lock floor. When these wickets are down and in place, small plates resembling little flat cars are allowed to run down, one on each wicket, building up a row of plates across the bottom, one joining the other. When the first complete set has been let down 9 feet of water will be shut off, and then another set of plates will be let down, until finally the water rushing through the lock will be entirely shut off. Of course, there will be some seepage through the plates, but the water above this temporary dam will be still water and the electric locomotives will go down and take in tow a floating caisson, or hollow steel float, and towing it around seat it against a sill at the upper end of the lock chamber. Then by filling water into the caisson it is sunk, entirely shutting off the water flowing through the lock. The emergency dam is then raised and the necessary repairs made to the locks.

LOCK GATES.

"The construction of the lock gates is also interesting. They were built up of big horizontal girders weighing from 12 to 18 tons each, with vertical framework in between and sheathing plate both on the inside and outside of this frame. They are cellular in construction and the lower half of the gate is an air chamber which supports about three-quarters of the weight of the gate when submerged. The upper half of the gate is arranged with openings in the plates on the upstream side, so that water can flow in or out of the upper half of the gate at the same time that it flows in and out of the lock, increasing the weight of the gate as the height of the water on the outside increases, overcoming in that way the lifting effect of the air chamber in the bottom of the gate as it is placed deeper and deeper under water.

"These gates vary in height from 47 to 82 feet, and in weight from 300 to 700 tons to each half gate. If each half gate were laid flat one on top of the other they would build up a tower containing 58,000 tons of steel standing 32 feet higher than the Singer Building in New York. There are 92 half gates and each is 7 feet in thickness.

"Another interesting comparative figure is one pertaining to the excavated material. All of the excavated material which will have been taken out when the canal is completed, including the 30,000,000 cubic yards of useful French excavation, if loaded on one train of flat cars similar to the wooden cars one sees commonly on the work, would make a train over 110,000 miles long, reaching more than four times around the earth.

SANITATION.

"Not one single factor has been more important in making the construction of this canal a possibility than that of sanitation. One of the worst snags that the French ran against was this very question of sanitation. Unfortunately there are no accurate figures obtainable on the lives lost during the French time; the only figures available are for the mortality in Ancon Hospital, which for the eight years between 1881 and 1888 amounted to 5,527. But the French were at this time doing their work by contract, and each contractor was charged a dollar per day for each man he had in hospital. It will readily be understood, therefore, that if the French contractor were anything like the ordinary contractor, not a very large proportion of the sick would go to this hospital. We hear of many individual instances of heavy loss. The first French director, Mr. Dingler, came to the Isthmus with his wife and three children. At the end of the first six months all had died of yellow fever except himself. One of the French engineers, who was still on the Isthmus when we first arrived, stated that he came over with a party of 17 young Frenchmen. In a month they had all died of yellow fever except himself. The superintendent of the railroad brought to the Isthmus his three sisters; within a month they had all died of yellow fever. The mother superior of the sisters nursing in Ancon Hospital told me that she had come out with 24 sisters. Within a few years 21 had died, the most of yellow fever. Many other instances of this kind could be cited. During the eight years that the Americans have been at work on the canal the death roll has reached 5,141, of which 995 have been deaths from violence. For the fiscal year 1912 the death rate per thousand on the Isthmus was lower than in almost any large city in the United States, as the following figures will show:

| | |
|---|---|
| Deaths from accidents | 3.08 |
| Deaths from diseases | 7.08 |
| Total deaths from all causes | 10.16 |

"The most important work of the sanitary department and the one which has had most to do with the reduction of the death rate is undoubtedly that which has to do with the control of the breeding of mosquitoes, so that I will speak only of that one feature of its work.

"I have found it a very prevalent idea among the visitors to the Isthmus that the mosquitoes have been entirely exterminated from the zone; such, however, is not the case, for,

although there are 448 square miles within the zone, the destruction of the mosquito is carried on over only about 100 square miles. Outside of this area of 100 square miles mosquitoes can be found just as thick as they ever were; but by constant vigilance and effort the number of mosquitoes in the sanitated areas has been reduced to such a very few that adult mosquitoes are but seldom seen by the casual observer.

"For the purpose of sanitation the zone is divided into sanitary districts, each district being placed in charge of a sanitary inspector. As a general rule, the sanitary work is carried on to a distance of about 1,000 yards outside the extreme limits of any inhabited district, as this has been found to be about the flying radius of the varieties of mosquitoes which the sanitary department has to deal with. The work of controlling the mosquitoes within these districts falls under three heads:

"First. Elimination of favorable breeding places by filling, drainage, removal of grass to favor evaporation, clearing of banks of streams and other bodies of water to give access to fish that eat the larvæ of the mosquitoes, removal of vegetation and other foreign matter, such as algæ, which gives shelter to the larvæ of the mosquitoes, introduction of water supplies to reduce the number of water-holding containers in which the yellow-fever mosquito breeds, and screening of such water containers as can not be done away with.

"Second. By oiling or larvaciding such bodies of water as can not be conveniently and economically eliminated, the oil used for this purpose being the ordinary crude oil and the larvacide a mixture of creosote, caustic soda, and resin.

"Third. By preventing the access of mosquitoes to the inhabitants by effectively screening as many dwellings as possible and, in addition, by catching in specially designed traps and by hand such mosquitoes as find their way into dwellings.

"By the constant application of these methods the malaria rate has been reduced from about 6.83 per cent of employees admitted each month to the hospital in 1906 to about 1 per cent per month for the current year, and in totally eliminating yellow fever from the cities of Panama and Colon and the Canal Zone, the last case of this disease having occurred in Colon in May, 1906."

*Interesting facts and figures.*

| | |
|---|---|
| Length of canal from deep water to deep water ... miles | 50½ |
| Length from shore line to shore line ... do | 40 |
| Time of transit through completed canal ... hours | 10 to 12 |
| Time of passage through locks ... do | 3 |
| Bottom width of channel, maximum ... feet | 1,000 |
| Bottom width of channel, minimum, 9 miles Culebra Cut ... feet | 300 |
| Locks, in pairs | 12 |
| Locks, usable length ... feet | 1,000 |
| Locks, usable width ... do | 110 |
| Gatun Lake, area ... square miles | 164 |
| Gatun Lake, channel depth ... feet | 85 to 45 |
| Culebra Cut, channel depth ... do | 45 |
| Excavation, estimated total ... cubic yards | 212,504,138 |
| Excavation, amount accomplished to Jan. 1, 1913, cubic yards | 188,280,312 |
| Excavation by the French ... cubic yards | 78,146,960 |
| Excavation by French, useful to present canal, cubic yards | 29,908,000 |
| Excavation by French, estimated value to canal | $25,389,240 |
| Value of all French property | $42,799,826 |
| Concrete, total estimated for canal ... cubic yards | 5,000,000 |
| Weight of 1 cubic yard of concrete or earth ... pounds | 3,000 |
| Relocated Panama Railroad, estimated cost | $9,000,000 |
| Relocated Panama Railroad, length ... miles | 47.1 |
| Maximum grade on Panama Railroad ... per cent | 1.25 |
| Maximum curve on Panama Railroad ... degrees | 7 |
| Gauge of Panama Railroad ... feet | 5 |
| Canal Zone, area ... square miles | 448 |
| Canal and Panama Railroad force actually at work (about) | 35,000 |
| Canal and Panama Railroad force, Americans (about) | 5,000 |
| Cost of canal, estimated total | $375,000,000 |
| Amount spent by French | $260,000,000 |
| Work begun by Americans | May 4, 1904 |
| Date of official opening | Jan. 1, 1915 |
| Population of Colon | 17,740 |
| Population of Panama City | 37,505 |
| Tide on Pacific side ... feet | 20 |
| Tide on Atlantic side ... inches | 26 |
| Area drained by the Chagres River ... square miles | 1,320 |
| Average rainfall at Colon ... inches | 130 |
| Average rainfall at Panama ... do | 70 |
| Average rainfall at Porto Bello ... do | 173 |
| Maximum rainfall of record for 3 minutes ... do | 2.46 |
| Maximum rainfall of record for 1 hour ... inches | 5.86 |
| Maximum rainfall of record for 24 hours ... do | 10.86 |
| Maximum temperature of record ... °F | 96.6 |
| Minimum temperature of record ... do | 59 |
| Average mean temperature | 79 |
| Mean relative humidity ... per cent | 89 |
| Evaporation per annum ... inches | 52 |
| Maximum momentary discharge of Chagres at Gamboa, cubic feet per second | 170,000 |
| Volume of water passing over the Horseshoe Falls at Niagara ... cubic feet per second | 250,000 |
| Average amount excavated in 8 hours by each steam shovel in cut ... cubic yards | 1,500 |
| Record for 8 hours for steam shovels of any class ... do | 5,554 |
| Record for 8 hours for 70-ton shovels, 3-yard bucket, cubic yards | 3,910 |
| Location of rock crushers and sand pits: | |
| Atlantic side— | |
| Rock quarry, Porto Bello, capacity, cubic yards per day | 3,000 |
| Sand pits, Nombre de Dios. | |
| Pacific side— | |
| Rock quarry, Ancon Hill, capacity, cubic yards per day | 2,000 |
| Sand pits, Point Chame. | |
| Amount of oil used per month ... barrels | 75,000 |
| Cost of same ... per barrel | $1.10 |
| Amount of coal used per month ... tons | 35,000 |
| Cost of same, delivered in fire box ... per ton | $6.00 |
| Number of miles of track on Isthmus (about) | 500 |
| Death rate per thousand, 1912: | |
| Accidents | 3.08 |
| Disease | 7.08 |
| Total from all causes | 10.16 |

*Equipment.*

| | |
|---|---|
| Steam shovels: | |
| 105-ton, 5 cubic yard dippers | 15 |
| 95-ton, 4 and 5 cubic yard dippers | 32 |
| 70-ton, 2½ and 3 cubic yard dippers | 35 |
| 66-ton, 2½ cubic yard dippers | 6 |
| 45-ton, 1¾ cubic yard dippers | 10 |
| 26-ton | 1 |
| Trenching shovel, ¾ cubic yard dipper | 1 |
| Total | 100 |
| Cranes: | |
| American | 60 |
| French | 9 |
| Total | 69 |
| Locomotives: | |
| American— | |
| 106 tons | 100 |
| 105 tons | 40 |
| 117 tons | 20 |
| Total | 160 |
| French— | |
| 20 tons | 5 |
| 28 tons | 20 |
| 30 tons | 16 |
| 38 tons | 36 |
| Decauville | 8 |
| Total | 85 |
| Narrow gauge, American, 40 tons | 10 |
| Narrow gauge, American, 16 tons | 23 |
| Electric | 12 |
| Total | 45 |
| Grand total | 290 |
| Drills: | |
| Mechanical churn, or well | 265 |
| Tripod | 361 |
| Total | 626 |
| Cars: | |
| Flat, used with unloading plows | 1,800 |
| Steel dumps, large | 600 |
| Steel dumps, small | 1,200 |
| Ballast dumps, steel | 12 |
| Ballast dumps, wood | 12 |
| Steel flats | 500 |
| Narrow gauge | 200 |
| Motor | 6 |
| Pay car | 1 |
| Total | 4,331 |
| Spreaders | 26 |
| Track shifters | 9 |
| Unloaders | 26 |
| Pile drivers | 13 |
| Dredges: | |
| American ladder | 1 |
| French ladder | 7 |
| Dipper | 3 |
| Pipe-line | 7 |
| Seagoing suction | 2 |
| Clam-shell | 1 |
| Total | 21 |
| Rock breaker, floating | 1 |
| Tugs | 12 |
| Towboat | 1 |
| Houseboats | 2 |
| Clapets | 11 |
| Pile driver, floating | 1 |
| Crane boat | 1 |
| Barges, lighters, and scows | 70 |
| Launches | 14 |
| Cutters | 3 |
| Drill boats | 2 |
| Derrick barges | 2 |

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted:

To Mr. HULINGS, for five days, on account of important business.

To Mr. GOEKE, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. LA FOLLETTE, for one week, on account of illness.

To Mr. MANAHAN, for three weeks, on account of important business.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—FRED HOPPE.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. GARD to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers accompanying H. R. 23460, granting a pension to Fred Hoppe, Sixty-first Congress, second session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

MAURY DIGGS AND DREW CAMINETTI.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up for present consideration House resolution 181, that four hours of debate be had upon the resolution, one half of the time to be controlled by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, myself, and the other half to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the leader of the minority, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], the leader of the Progressive Party; and that at the expiration of the four hours of debate it be in order, without amendment, to move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that there be four hours of general debate on what is known as the Kahn resolution, House resolution 181, one-half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] and one-half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], and that at the end of that time, without amendment or intervening motion, the motion to lay the resolution on the table be voted upon. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Is the resolution now before the House?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then I desire to submit a preferential motion. I move that the resolution do lie on the table.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, pending the suggestion made by the gentleman from Tennessee, I desire to make a statement.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the House is well aware of the responsibility which is imposed upon any committee of this House in the handling of any particular resolution or bill. The committees are appointed for the purpose, and a chairman is selected in furtherance of that purpose, of giving careful and proper consideration to the matters referred to the committees. The Committee on the Judiciary gave careful consideration to this resolution and of every question touching it. They were unanimous in their report and conclusion that the resolution had accomplished its purpose, and were unanimous in the recommendation that it ought to lie on the table.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAYTON. I wanted in justice to myself to make one more observation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I did not want to open the matter up for debate.

Mr. CLAYTON. I will endeavor not to do that. But as in the nature of a postulate for what I was coming to say, I have said what I have.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on several occasions the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] has manifested a desire to speak to this resolution. Of course it is not within the power of the committee nor any Member of this House to prevent the gentleman from California at some time during the session of Congress to speak on this subject. It occurred to the chairman of the committee and to his associates, all with whom he could confer, that it would perhaps be well under all the circumstances that the gentleman from California be permitted now to engage in the remarks that he desires to submit to the House, the range of which I can not tell, and that the chairman and the committee should also have an opportunity to reply to anything that he might say, if such reply was deemed advisable or necessary. The Attorney General has said in effect that he had no desire to withhold anything from publication pertaining to the so-called Caminetti case, but that on the contrary it is his desire that the fullest publicity be given to his acts and doings. He has concealed nothing and has done nothing for which he wants any excuse on the part of this House. Now, in pursuance of that, I will be frank to state it to the House——

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, Mr. Speaker, I dislike to object, but I will say to the gentleman——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLAYTON. I am not going to discuss the question, but I would like to state one sentence.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not want to be in the position of objecting, but——

Mr. CLAYTON. Just one sentence.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said that he wished to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CLAYTON. Will the gentleman from Illinois allow me to add one sentence?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. CLAYTON. And that is, I feel myself, and my colleagues of the committee with whom I have conferred feel, in some way under obligation to make the proposition that I have made, and to respectfully ask the House to accede to it, and to respectfully insist upon it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That was not the position of the committee the other day when it reported the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution having been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON], he having withdrawn his motion to lay on the table, is he not entitled to the floor for the discussion of the resolution ahead of any demands of any person to be recognized for the purpose of moving to lie on the table? It is perfectly patent, Mr. Speaker, when a bill is called up before the House, if any Member on the floor can take off his feet a person in charge of the bill by a motion to lay the bill on the table, it would be a very common method of filibustering.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to insist that I have the floor.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard.

The SPEAKER. Section 740 of the Manual says:

> In debate the members of the committee, except the Committee of the Whole, are entitled to priority of recognition for debate, but a motion to lay a proposition on the table is in order before the Member entitled to prior recognition for debate has begun his remarks.

Therefore the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] is in order.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes before the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] is put.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman desire to discuss this case in any way?

Mr. KAHN. No. I want to show the committee why this motion should not prevail.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. McKELLAR. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The motion to lay on the table is not debatable. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] to table this resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided, and there were—ayes 91, noes 67.

Mr. MANN. I ask for tellers, Mr. Speaker.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee and Mr. CLAYTON took their places as tellers.

The House again divided, and the tellers reported—ayes 99, noes 75.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays. We are here for all summer now.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 132, nays 85, answered "present" 7, not voting 205, as follows:

YEAS—132.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abercrombie | Broussard | Carr | Eagle |
| Aiken | Brown, W. Va. | Carter | Fergusson |
| Alexander | Bruckner | Church | Fitzgerald |
| Ashbrook | Brumbaugh | Claypool | FitzHenry |
| Aswell | Buchanan, Tex. | Collier | Floyd, Ark. |
| Baker | Bulkley | Connelly, Kans. | Francis |
| Baltz | Burgess | Davenport | Gard |
| Barkley | Burke, Wis. | Davis, W. Va. | Garner |
| Bartlett | Burnett | Decker | Garrett, Tenn. |
| Beakes | Byrnes, S. C. | Deitrick | Garrett, Tex. |
| Bell, Ga. | Byrns, Tenn. | Dickinson | Gilmore |
| Booher | Candler, Miss. | Dixon | Gittins |
| Borland | Caraway | Doremus | Glass |
| Bowdle | Carlin | Doughton | Goodwin, Ark. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gregg | Kinkead, N. J. | Oldfield | Stringer |
| Hamlin | Kirkpatrick | Patten, N. Y. | Sumners |
| Hardwick | Konop | Pepper | Taggart |
| Hardy | Korbly | Peterson | Talcott, N. Y. |
| Harrison, Miss. | Lazaro | Quin | Taylor, Ark. |
| Hay | Lee, Ga. | Reed | Ten Eyck |
| Heflin | Lesher | Reilly, Conn. | Thacher |
| Hill | Lever | Russell | Thomas |
| Holland | Lloyd | Sabath | Tuttle |
| Houston | McAndrews | Sharp | Underwood |
| Howard | McGillicuddy | Sims | Vaughan |
| Hughes, Ga. | McKellar | Sisson | Walsh |
| Hull | Maguire, Nebr. | Smith, Md. | Watkins |
| Igoe | Montague | Smith, Tex. | Watson |
| Jacoway | Moon | Stanley | Webb |
| Johnson, S. C. | Morgan, La. | Stedman | Whaley |
| Keating | Morrison | Stephens, Nebr. | Wilson, Fla. |
| Kennedy, Conn. | Oglesby | Stephens, Tex. | Wingo |
| Kettner | O'Hair | Stout | Young, Tex. |

NAYS—85.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Austin | Evans | Lindbergh | Sherley |
| Barton | Foster | Lobeck | Shreve |
| Bell, Cal. | French | McCoy | Sinnott |
| Brockson | George | McGuire, Okla. | Sloan |
| Bryan | Gillett | McKenzie | Small |
| Burke, S. Dak. | Gray | Mann | Smith, Idaho |
| Butler | Greene, Mass. | Mapes | Smith, Minn. |
| Callaway | Hamilton, N. Y. | Martin | Stafford |
| Campbell | Hayden | Miller | Stevens, N. H. |
| Casey | Helgesen | Mondell | Stone |
| Chandler, N. Y. | Helvering | Morgan, Okla. | Tavenner |
| Cline | Henry | Moss, W. Va. | Taylor, Colo. |
| Cooper | Johnson, Ky. | Neeley | Thomson, Ill. |
| Cox | Johnson, Utah | Nolan, J. I. | Towner |
| Cullop | Johnson, Wash. | Page | Treadway |
| Curry | Kahn | Payne | Walters |
| Davis, Minn. | Kelly, Pa. | Prouty | Weaver |
| Dillon | Kennedy, Iowa | Raker | Willis |
| Donovan | Kent | Roddenbery | Woods |
| Doolittle | Kinkaid, Nebr. | Rupley | |
| Dyer | Knowland, J. R. | Scott | |
| Elder | Lewis, Pa. | Seldomridge | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adamson | Crisp | Murray, Okla. | Smith, J. M. C. |
| Clayton | Fowler | Rubey | |

NOT VOTING—205.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adair | Fairchild | Kiess, Pa. | Rainey |
| Ainey | Faison | Kindel | Rauch |
| Allen | Falconer | Kitchin | Rayburn |
| Anderson | Farr | Kreider | Reilly, Wis. |
| Ansberry | Ferris | Lafferty | Richardson |
| Anthony | Fess | La Follette | Riordan |
| Avis | Fields | Langham | Roberts, Mass. |
| Bailey | Finley | Langley | Roberts, Nev. |
| Barchfeld | Flood, Va. | Lee, Pa. | Rogers |
| Barnhart | Fordney | L'Engle | Rothermel |
| Bartholdt | Frear | Lenroot | Rouse |
| Bathrick | Gallagher | Levy | Rucker |
| Beall, Tex. | Gardner | Lewis, Md. | Saunders |
| Blackmon | Gerry | Lieb | Scully |
| Borchers | Godwin, N. C. | Lindquist | Sells |
| Bremner | Goeke | Linthicum | Shackleford |
| Britten | Goldfogle | Logue | Sherwood |
| Brodbeck | Good | Lonergan | Slayden |
| Brown, N. Y. | Gordon | McClellan | Slemp |
| Browne, Wis. | Gorman | McDermott | Smith, N. Y. |
| Browning | Goulden | McLaughlin | Smith, Saml. W. |
| Buchanan, Ill. | Graham, Ill. | Madden | Sparkman |
| Burke, Pa. | Graham, Pa. | Mahan | Steenerson |
| Calder | Green, Iowa | Maher | Stephens, Cal. |
| Cantrill | Greene, Vt. | Manahan | Stephens, Miss. |
| Carew | Griest | Merritt | Stevens, Minn. |
| Cary | Griffin | Metz | Sutherland |
| Clancy | Gudger | Mitchell | Switzer |
| Clark, Fla. | Guernsey | Moore | Talbott, Md. |
| Connolly, Iowa | Hamill | Morin | Taylor, Ala. |
| Conry | Hamilton, Mich. | Moss, Ind. | Taylor, N. Y. |
| Copley | Hammond | Mott | Temple |
| Covington | Harrison, N. Y. | Murdock | Thompson, Okla. |
| Cramton | Haugen | Murray, Mass. | Townsend |
| Crosser | Hawley | Nelson | Tribble |
| Curley | Hayes | Norton | Underhill |
| Dale | Helm | O'Brien | Vare |
| Danforth | Hensley | O'Leary | Volstead |
| Dent | Hinds | O'Shaunessy | Walker |
| Dershem | Hinebaugh | Padgett | Wallin |
| Dies | Hobson | Palmer | Whitacre |
| Difenderfer | Howell | Parker | White |
| Donohoe | Hoxworth | Patton, Pa. | Wilder |
| Dooling | Hughes, W. Va. | Peters | Williams |
| Driscoll | Hulings | Phelan | Wilson, N. Y. |
| Dunn | Humphrey, Wash. | Platt | Winslow |
| Dupré | Humphreys, Miss. | Plumley | Witherspoon |
| Eagan | Jones | Porter | Woodruff |
| Edmonds | Keister | Post | Young, N. Dak. |
| Edwards | Kelley, Mich. | Pou | |
| Esch | Kennedy, R. I. | Powers | |
| Estopinal | Key, Ohio | Ragsdale | |

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. METZ with Mr. WALLIN.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. ADAMSON with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.

Until further notice:

Mr. SAUNDERS with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. DALE with Mr. AVIS.

Mr. GOEKE with Mr. FESS.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. MURDOCK.

Mr. RICHARDSON with Mr. ESCH.

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. MITCHELL with Mr. WINSLOW.

Mr. HELM with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. DONOHOE with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. DENT with Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. RUBEY with Mr. HAWLEY.

Mr. ADAIR with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. BARNHART with Mr. ANDERSON.

Mr. BATHRICK with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. BEALL of Texas with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BLACKMON with Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin.

Mr. BROWN of New York with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. CONRY with Mr. CARY.

Mr. COVINGTON with Mr. DANFORTH.

Mr. CURLEY with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. DIES with Mr. CRAMTON.

Mr. DUPRÉ with Mr. FARR.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. FALCONER.

Mr. HAMMOND with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. FREAR.

Mr. FAISON with Mr. GOOD.

Mr. FERRIS with Mr. GREENE of Vermont.

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. HAUGEN.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. GOULDEN with Mr. HOWELL.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington.

Mr. GUDGER with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. HULINGS.

Mr. HARRISON of New York with Mr. LANGHAM.

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. JONES with Mr. LA FOLLETTE.

Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. MCLAUGHLIN.

Mr. LEVY with Mr. LINDQUIST.

Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. MANAHAN.

Mr. L'ENGLE with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. PETERS with Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. LOGUE with Mr. MERRITT.

Mr. MCDERMOTT with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. MAHER with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. POST with Mr. NELSON.

Mr. POU with Mr. PARKER.

Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. PLATT.

Mr. RAINEY with Mr. PLUMLEY.

Mr. RAUCH with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. POWERS.

Mr. ROTHERMEL with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. ROUSE with Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. SWITZER.

Mr. SHERWOOD with Mr. STEENERSON.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. VARE.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi with Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. TEMPLE.

Mr. UNDERHILL with Mr. VOLSTEAD.

Mr. WALKER with Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.

Mr. WHITACRE with Mr. WILDER.

Mr. WHITE with Mr. WOODRUFF.

Mr. WILSON of New York with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. WITHERSPOON with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. STEPHENS of California.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. MOORE.

Mr. CRISP with Mr. HINDS, commencing July 2, until further notice.

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. J. M. C. SMITH, until further notice, ending August 6, except on banking and currency.

Mr. PADGETT with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts, until further notice, ending July 26.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will begin over at the left and call the names of gentlemen desiring to change their votes.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no," but on account of a pair with Mr. ALLEN, of Ohio, I wish to change my vote to "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. J. M. C. SMITH, and he answered "Present."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, how is the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. TOWNER, recorded?

The SPEAKER. He is not recorded.

Mr. MANN. Several gentlemen state that he voted "no" on the first roll call.

The SPEAKER. The roll call shows that he did not vote at all.

Mr. MANN. A gentleman right here says he heard him respond on the first roll call.

The SPEAKER. Where is Mr. TOWNER?

Mr. MANN. I presume he is at lunch, although I do not know. He went out, presuming or knowing that he had voted.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I was here and heard Mr. TOWNER vote "no" in a very distinct voice.

The SPEAKER. How did the matter of Mr. TOWNER's vote get up?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Because his name was called on the second roll call.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I heard him vote on the first roll call, and then I heard the Clerk's voice calling his name a second time.

The SPEAKER. Of course, on the statements made, the Clerk will record him as voting "no."

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye." I notice that I am paired with the gentleman from Maine, Mr. HINDS. I wish to withdraw my vote, and to answer "present."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I should like to inquire how the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. LEWIS, is recorded.

The SPEAKER. He is not recorded.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. He voted "no," Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen must be here and attend to their own business.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. He was here and voted twice, on both the first and second call.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. LEWIS, here?

Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania, and he voted "No."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask if the regular order now is the proposition to instruct the conferees on the bill (H. R. 32) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge in and for the eastern district of Pennsylvania?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the previous question not having been ordered upon that bill, it can come up only when that order of business is reached.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it is evident that the bill has been sent to conference. As I understand the parliamentary situation, it is this: The House had before it two Senate amendments. It acted on those two Senate amendments, disagreeing to both, I believe, and then passed a resolution asking the Senate for a conference. Now, so far as the House is concerned, it could have stopped there. It was not necessary for the House to name the conferees in order to send the bill to the Senate. As a matter of fact, it could have sent the bill to the Senate without asking for a conference at all. So I take it, under the parliamentary situation, if nothing further is done the bill will go to the Senate without further proceedings, except that there will be no conferees appointed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not state the whole case, though. There was a motion made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] to instruct the conferees.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is just what I am saying, Mr. Speaker. Now, the thing pending is not the passage of a disagreement on the part of the House to the Senate amendments. That is concluded. The bill is out of this House. The House can at any time disagree to the Senate amendments and send a bill over to the Senate without asking for a conference, and upon the Senate asking for a conference the House could subsequently, as a matter of privilege, appoint the conferees; so that, so far as the status of the bill is concerned, I take it that the bill is practically out of this House. The only question that is pending before this House is the question of appointing conferees, and that is a privileged matter in this House.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the gentleman will yield for a moment——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman from Alabama yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield first to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK].

Mr. HARDWICK. Is seems to me, if the gentleman's position is correct, it would deprive the House of one of its undoubted rights under the rule, namely, the right to instruct the conferees.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all.

Mr. HARDWICK. Why not? If the gentleman's position is sound, and the Chair could at any time appoint the conferees as a matter of right, then there would be no place for the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] to instruct the conferees.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman misunderstood what I stated.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman allow me to answer this question of the gentleman from Georgia first?

Mr. MANN. That matter is not before the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But I do not like to be discourteous to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. The proposition I make is not that the Speaker can appoint the conferees without the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] first being voted upon. I do not contend that at all. I contend that whenever these conferees are appointed the Speaker must, prior to the appointment of the conferees, lay before the House the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP]; but I do contend that this bill could have gone to the Senate without any motion to appoint conferees—absolutely so. We were not compelled to ask for a conference. We could have disagreed to the Senate amendments and sent the bill back.

Mr. HARDWICK. But we have asked the Senate for a conference.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. That part can go to the Senate. The bill itself can not go——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The bill can go to the Senate without——

Mr. HARDWICK. Not until you get the House conferees appointed.

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

Mr. MANN. On reflection I agree with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that the bill has reached a privileged status. I doubt whether the gentleman is correct about sending the bill over to the Senate before the House has disposed of the motion before it, but that is not——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I happened to do that with one of the tariff bills in the last Congress, because I did not want to appoint the conferees.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman did not ask for a conference there.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. The gentleman disagreed to the Senate amendments and let it go without asking for a conference. But I do think that the gentleman is correct in contending that the bill has reached a privileged status where it can be called up at any time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman is right about that. I had the other impression at first.

The SPEAKER. How does the gentleman contend that it has reached that status?

Mr. MANN. The House has disposed of everything that it could dispose of in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. The Senate amendments were Union Calendar amendments and would have had to be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, except that by unanimous consent here they were considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. But the House has disposed of those amendments by disagreeing to them, so that the matter is now before the House, not before the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and hence has reached the privileged status, the House having disagreed to the Senate amendments. Otherwise the matter could never be called up, for you can not go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on this bill any longer, because there is nothing pending that could be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RODDENBERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. RODDENBERY. I notice that on the calendar for to-day appears the bill H. R. 32, being a bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge in Pennsylvania. If as a matter of fact the bill is now out of the House, why should it be upon the calendar at all?

Mr. MANN. I did not say the bill was out of the House. I do not think the bill is out of the House, but I do not think that is a question that is material.

Mr. RODDENBERY. If the bill is still in the House and it be in the House and is not finished business, is it not necessarily unfinished business?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will state to the gentleman that if the bill were in the House, and there were no question of appointing conferees at all and the Senate amendments had been disagreed to and the bill sent back to the Senate, it would still be a privileged motion in the House, and the gentleman from Alabama could move to appoint conferees and ask for a conference.

Mr. RODDENBERY. But the motion of the gentleman from Indiana to instruct the conferees, followed by the motion of the gentleman from Alabama to move the previous question, was made at a time when the House was acting as in Committee of the Whole, so far as the RECORD shows.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman asked unanimous consent that this bill might be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. When the amendments had been passed upon and voted on the status or consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole had ceased, and the status of the bill in the House then reached the stage it would have reached if the amendments had been considered in the Committee of the Whole, and the committee had risen and reported them back to the House, and the House were considering them. To appoint conferees or to ask for a conference is not a function of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, but it is a function of the House itself, and this question of asking for a conference and appointing conferees on a bill in disagreement between the two Houses has always been considered a matter of privilege and is a matter of privilege at this time.

Of course, I do not mean to say that that interferes at all with the motion of the gentleman from Indiana. Whenever the matter comes up that motion comes up also, but I do contend that it is a matter of privilege for the gentleman, whenever he is recognized for that purpose by the Speaker, to move to call the matter before the House and have it disposed of.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON].

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, then, the proposition before the House is to instruct the conferees in accordance with the motion made by the gentleman from Indiana, and I move the previous question on that proposition.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana to instruct the conferees.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana to instruct the conferees.

The motion was agreed to.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. CLAYTON, Mr. WEBB, and Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma.

CALL OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk proceeded to call the committees.

FEDERAL BUILDING, NEWARK, N. J.

Mr. McCOY (when the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was called). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCOY. Is it in order now to move to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the bill (H. R. 6383) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, and so forth?

The SPEAKER. It is not. There are two limitations when the House starts on this call. Once started, the call must be finished, unless it be interrupted by a committee having business upon the calendar.

Then, after 60 minutes has been consumed, it is in order for one to move to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. If the 60 minutes are not consumed, and the call goes clear around, then, at the end of the call, it has been ruled that it is as though 60 minutes had been consumed, and the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union is then in order. The Clerk will proceed with the call.

The Clerk proceeded with and concluded the call of committees.

Mr. McCOY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6383) to amend section 19 of an act entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings; to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings; to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings; to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration on the bill H. R. 6383, with Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois in the chair.

Mr. McCOY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCOY rose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCOY. I yield for a question. How long a time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. MANN. I desire to be recognized in my own time.

Mr. McCOY. I believe that I should first make a statement about the bill.

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. McCOY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to amend a section of the public buildings bill of the Sixty-second Congress, which section, No. 19, provided that the Secretary of the Treasury might sell the public building in the city of Newark, N. J., now used for the post office and for other Government uses, and invest the proceeds of the sale of that building in the purchase of a new site for a post office and other Government offices and in the erection of a new building upon that site.

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds believed that it had accomplished that purpose, but when the bill came before the Secretary of the Treasury he felt it necessary to obtain an interpretation of it from the Attorney General's office, and that interpretation was that, although the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to expend for the purchase of a new site a part of the proceeds of the sale of the old site, he was not authorized to expend any part of those proceeds for the erection of a new building.

The result of that situation is this, due to one or two provisions contained in section 19 of the public buildings bill: In that bill it was provided that the Government should not be authorized, notwithstanding the proposed sale of the old building, to pay any rent for the use of that old building. The bill also provided that no money should be available for the purchase of a new site and for the erection of a new building except such money as we could get from the sale of the building and site now owned. Now, the net result of that is that we must find a purchaser for this old building under the terms of a contract providing for payments at such times as the Secretary of the Treasury will need to have money for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a new building.

Now, the would-be purchaser who signs that contract can not go into possession of the present building until the new building is completed and we are ready to occupy it. Consequently, although he is paying his money down, he will not be able to get into possession of the building and get any use of the property until such time. So the only thing for him to do when he comes to make up his mind how much he can afford to pay for this building, knowing that he will not be able to get possession of it for two and one-half years or, as the matter now stands with us, perhaps not for five years, he will say, "I am going to pay out certain sums of money for certain periods of time, and, although this building and site to-day, if I could get the deed, might be worth two and one-quarter millions, if I can not get the deed for it immediately, and have to pay my money out long in advance, I have got to offer as much less for the site and the building as the amount of interest I shall lose on the money I have been paying to the Government comes to."

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

Mr. McCOY. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. As I understand the bill, it proposes to authorize the sale of the site at a price not less than $1,800,000, the Government to remain in possession of the present building on this site until the new Federal building is completed and ready for occupancy?

Mr. McCOY. That is right.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think that is a very good way to sell a site——

Mr. McCOY. I do not.

Mr. MANN (continuing). When the purchaser does not know whether he will be in possession in three years, five years, or seven years, and maybe longer?

Mr. McCOY. Personally, I should have prepared some other sort of provision, but that was the provision which the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds inserted.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman takes the provision of the existing law relating to this sale in this bill, I understand?

Mr. McCOY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Now, this bill also provides for a special architect?

Mr. McCOY. It does; yes.

Mr. MANN. The last Democratic House repealed the Tarsney Act. Now, are there special reasons why a special architect or a consulting engineer ought to be employed on this building?

Mr. McCOY. I think so, and I was just about to state the reasons, which are that we are limited in the sale of this building to obtaining for it the sum of $1,800,000. Now, it is supposed that the building and site are worth something like two million to two and one-quarter million dollars. We have had no appraisal put on it. But, as I say, the purchaser has to discount the amount he will offer for the building, because he is going to be out of possession for a long period, and if we can not get ready to complete this building by the employment of special architects, he will be forced to make so large a discount on those payments that necessarily he will be obliged to offer less than $1,800,000 for the site; and if so, the bill fails us altogether.

Mr. AUSTIN. If you should depend on the Supervising Architect's office to prepare the plans of that building, it must take its regular order, and this building will not be reached for five and one-half to six years?

Mr. McCOY. That is it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Whereas if this amendment is passed it furnishes you for immediate use an architect who will complete these plans and enable the Supervising Architect's office to complete this building within these two years and a half? And the bill itself here provides for a maximum amount to be paid the Supervising Architect which is equal to the present cost of getting out and preparing plans in the Supervising Architect's office?

Mr. McCOY. So I understand; and the money which is paid for the fees of a special architect comes out of the proceeds, and consequently the payment for such services will not in any way postpone any other project which is now in the office of the Supervising Architect.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCOY. For a question; yes.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. It is a short statement apropos of what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] has stated. He will recall as a member of the committee that when the evidence was submitted by the committee from Newark favoring this plan, they made it perfectly clear that the situation there was extremely urgent; and I know that he and the other members of the committee who were present will bear out my colleague [Mr. McCOY] in his contention that everything that is possible to be done in order to pass this measure, which means so much to the city of Newark, should be done at this time.

Mr. AUSTIN. I will say to the gentleman that when this bill was up recently, perhaps a week or ten days ago—and we discussed it pretty thoroughly—I stated it was the most congested Government building in the United States.

I made that statement after a personal investigation as a member of the subcommittee from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and gave the figures showing that the number of employees when the building was completed was 181, whereas at present the number is 440. The present building is wholly inadequate. It would be inhuman and cruel to the public officials to require them to occupy that overcrowded building for six and a half years, or perhaps eight years, because the Supervising Architect's office is five and a half or six years behind in its present work, and it will require a period of two or three years at least to construct a new building, which would make the period of its occupancy at least eight years. So that unless this relief is granted, the purchaser of the present lot and building must wait at least eight years before he can occupy it for his purposes, whereas under the conditions prescribed by the Treasury Department, if he buys it and pays down $800,000—the outside price for a new lot—he would be out of his money, $800,000, for eight years, and the interest on which, at 5 per cent, would amount to over $320,000.

On the other hand, if we give this relief and pass this bill, the Government employees will be relieved, the public will have an up-to-date building, such as they deserve and need in that city, at the end of two and a half years, and the Government itself would save at least $200,000 or $250,000 in the matter of interest.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCOY. For a question; yes.

Mr. MONDELL. It is proposed in this bill to allow the use of 5 per cent of the cost of the building for the services of an architect?

Mr. McCOY. Not to exceed that amount.

Mr. MONDELL. That is for the purpose of expediting the erection of the building, which ought to be done probably in any event, but particularly in view of the conditions under which the building has been sold. The gentleman has suggested that if built in the usual way, under the plans of the Supervising Architect, it may be seven or eight years before the building is completed and ready for occupancy, and the bidder for the old building would be justified in assuming it would be that length of time and bid accordingly. I consider the provision for an architect a wise one, but in making this provision, would it not also be wise to estimate a reasonable length of time within which the successful bidder may be certain that he can move into and occupy his premises?

While you are attempting to provide for the completion of the building at the earlier date, are you, as a matter of fact, giving the bidder for the property any more assurance than he had before? You are encouraging his hopes and increasing his expectation of the use of the building at a reasonably early date, but you are still leaving the whole thing in the air. Under those circumstances, I doubt if you would get a better bid for the property than you would if you did not have this provision in your bill, whereas if you added an amendment to the effect that the date when the purchaser shall have possession shall not extend beyond a certain time at the utmost, then the purchaser would have an assurance upon which he can bid with some degree of certainty as to when he can enjoy the property. It seems to me that while the committee has wisely provided for expediting the erection of the new building, it has not given any assurance that will have the effect of the Government receiving a larger price for the property.

Mr. McCOY. I would say in regard to that, that in the contract which the Secretary of the Treasury will draw, and consequently in the advertisements for bids, he will undertake to specify the time not later than which the possession of the old site will be delivered.

Mr. MONDELL. Will he do that?

Mr. McCOY. He is bound to do that for the reason that the gentleman from Wyoming stated. He is bound to get the price.

Mr. MONDELL. Can he do it? Can he do it under the provisions of this act, that the purchaser shall not have the use of property until the new building is completed? Could the Secretary make a contract in the face of a mandatory provision in this bill to the effect that the Government should enjoy the use of the property until the new building was completed?

What would happen if the new building was not completed at the expiration of the period fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury in his contract? Here is the act of Congress. That governs.

Mr. McCOY. He will fix a time sufficiently long ahead to make certain of that, and I believe he will provide in the contract for a time later than that at which the title can be delivered and provide that the price will have to be increased by the proper percentage in case of an earlier delivery of possession. In other words, he will give himself plenty of time, so that beyond peradventure almost the building can be completed, and if the title to the old building is delivered sooner than that the purchaser will have to increase his price by so much.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman assume that under this legislation the Secretary of the Treasury can make a sale under which the price may be graduated, depending upon the date when the purchaser may come into possession of the property?

Mr. McCOY. No; but the Secretary of the Treasury, in the exercise of sound judgment, would, under this bill, I believe, be authorized to say to the purchaser, for instance, "We will deliver title to the old building and possession within two years and a half from a certain date." Now, if he wanted to, he could absolutely leave the contract in just that shape, and notwithstanding the Government was ready to go into possession of the

new site at an earlier date, he could wait for that date so fixed and deliver possession of the old building. Now, if that is so, he could go further and say, "We may be able to deliver possession of the building six months sooner than that date, and if we do, then your price must be so much more for the property."

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman evidently has not got my idea.

Mr. McCOY. I think that I have.

Mr. MONDELL. Assuming that under this legislation the Secretary of the Treasury shall make a contract in which the property is to be turned over in a given time, if at that time the new building should not be ready for occupancy, that contract would be without force or effect in the face of this legislation.

Mr. McCOY. Yes; I think the gentleman is quite right.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me answer that.

Mr. MONDELL. What advantage would it be to the purchaser that the Secretary was willing to make a contract with him that would have no force or effect if perchance the building were not completed? It would be perfectly idle. It seems to me the way to meet it is for Congress, after consultation with the Supervising Architect's Office, to fix a date at which the purchaser may have the building. Then it is the business of the Supervising Architect, or of the architects that he employs, to finish the building by that time. It might be well to fix the penalty for failure to turn over the property at the date fixed at a sum equal to a fair rent, and it might be well to provide for a small bonus for earlier delivery of the property.

Mr. McCOY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], of the committee, to answer that.

Mr. AUSTIN. If this amendment to the original omnibus bill becomes a law, the first thing that will happen will be this: The Supervising Architect, an able and efficient man, will engage outside architects to prepare plans and specifications. He can require them to complete them within a definite time. Then he can also advertise for bids for the construction of this building under these plans and specifications, and can require the completion of the building within a fixed time; and with that information, there is no difficulty about the Secretary of the Treasury fixing a definite date when the new building will be completed and ready for occupancy on the part of the employees of the Government and when the old or present building can be delivered to the purchaser or new owner.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; but as an assurance to the purchaser that would have no force or value whatever, because if perchance anything should occur to delay the building any contract or agreement that the Secretary may have entered into would have no force or effect, because Congress has provided that the Government shall enjoy the use of the old building until the new one is completed without regard to any agreement the Secretary may make.

Now let me make this suggestion to the gentleman: In a case of this kind there will not, I assume, be many bidders. I assume that there will be comparatively few people wanting to purchase. Every one of those purchasers would base his bid on the proposition that under this act he might not have the enjoyment of his property for 5, 10, or, in an extreme case, 15 years. There is nothing in this act which insures him the use of his property in a quarter of a century. It is true that you have endeavored to increase his grounds of hope and expectation relative to the early use and enjoyment of the property by providing for a special architect; but what if the special architect should be a slow-moving gentleman, and what if there should be the usual amount of red tape unwound before this building is completed? What assurance is there to the purchaser? That is my proposition. You have attempted to secure a better price for the Government by providing for some additional architects; but, as a matter of fact, you will not get a dollar more than you would if you did not have that provision in the bill, for there is no assurance that this provision will actually expedite the erection and completion of the building. You hope it will. Why not do as any business man would? Fix a reasonable date, let the penalty for nonfulfillment be a reasonable rent, and a reasonable bonus for the turning over of the property at an earlier date.

Mr. AUSTIN. This amendment has been submitted to the Treasury Department. It has been carefully examined by the Supervising Architect's Office. It has been approved by that office, and they are satisfied that they can do precisely what we have claimed, if Congress will amend the original act.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. McCOY. I believe I have the floor. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. I desire to ask a question of the gentleman from Tennessee, to whom the gentleman from New Jersey yielded.

Mr. McCOY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] to say that before selling the present site he might go ahead and prepare plans for the new building. Did I understand that correctly?

Mr. AUSTIN. I did not state it exactly in that way. I said this is about what will happen in the event that this legislation is granted, that in discussing the question of a definite time when the building can be turned over to the purchaser, the Supervising Architect will employ an outside architect. Before he is employed he can tell exactly how long it will require to prepare these plans and how long to complete the new building under contract, specifying the time or date of completion.

Mr. MANN. Is this all before the present site is sold?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I think not.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCOY. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will withhold his point of order. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McCOY] has been here right along, endeavoring daily to bring this matter up. After the clear, concise, and intelligent statement that was made by his colleague from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] there can be no question in the mind of any of those who are present as to the urgent necessity for this public improvement in the city of Newark. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of no quorum present is well taken. There are but 60 Members present.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6383) to amend section 19 of an act entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings; to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings; to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings; to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913, and had come to no resolution thereon.

REQUEST TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the request of Mr. HAY for unanimous consent to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers accompanying the bill to correct the military record of David Crowther, Sixty-second Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, this request will be granted.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order heretofore agreed to, adjourned until Tuesday, July 22, 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 the Treasury transmitting a copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for $10,907.81 to pay the interest on the principal sum of the judgment of the Circuit Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Tennessee in favor of J. E. Parrish against the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers (H. Doc. No. 147); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, Conn. (H. Doc. No. 148); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on examination and survey of Appoquinimink River, Del. (H. Doc. No. 149); to the

Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a letter from the Acting Secretary of War submitting an estimate for an additional appropriation required in the work of prevention of deposits, harbor of New York, etc. (H. Doc. No. 150); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for establishing a cost accounting system in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (H. Doc. No. 146); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6903) authorizing the payment of damages to persons for injuries inflicted by Mexican federal or insurgent troops within the United States during the insurrection in Mexico in 1911, and making appropriations therefor, and for other purposes, and the same was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEITRICK: A bill (H. R. 6913) for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Cambridge, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 6914) 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; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6915) appropriating $50,000 (as a deficiency appropriation) for the purpose of providing necessary assistance to the Secretary of the Interior to care for 2,200 cases now on appeal from the General Land Office to the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DILLON: A bill (H. R. 6916) prescribing the duties of the Federal judges in cases tried by a jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6917) restricting the franking privilege in certain cases; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 6918) to provide for the erection of a public building at Junction City, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DONOVAN: A bill (H. R. 6919) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to William Timmons, in the town of Greenwich, in the State of Connecticut, one bronze or brass cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6920) to amend section 20 of chapter 1 of the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and as heretofore amended by fixing the limitation within which actions may be brought on bills of lading; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 6921) to amend an act entitled "An act granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THACHER: A bill (H. R. 6922) to provide for enlarging the site for the United States building at Plymouth, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6923) providing for the transfer of forest reserves from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 6924) authorizing and directing the Public Health Service to acquire site and erect hospital; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 6925) providing for the regulation, identification, and registration of automobiles engaged in interstate commerce and the licensing of the operators thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 6926) for the erection of a Federal building at Albia, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6927) for the erection of a Federal building at Newton, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 6928) amending the act providing for a tax on notes secured otherwise than by bonds of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6929) amending the act of May 30, 1908, regarding national currency associations, the issuance of additional circulating notes, and other matters, by extending the limitation of said act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PROUTY: A bill (H. R. 6930) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers," etc., approved March 2, 1893, so as to require railroad companies to equip their coaches with cinder deflectors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 6931) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to the town of Fremont, county of Mahaska, State of Iowa, for the use of the Phil Kearney Post, No. 40, Department of Iowa, Grand Army of the Republic, two condemned iron or steel fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOBSON: A bill (H. R. 6932) to encourage, equalize, and standardize vocational education among the several States; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 6933) providing for an appropriation for the use of the Interior Department in considering cases on appeal from the General Land Office to the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARTON: Resolution (H. Res. 204) directing the Commissioner of Corporations to make a full and complete report of the cost of an armor-plate factory, etc.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Resolution (H. Res. 205) authorizing the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to continue investigations of the Shipping Trust; to the Committee on Accounts.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 6934) granting a pension to Anthony H. Walich; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6935) granting a pension to Rutherford B. H. Kinback; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6936) granting an increase of pension to George W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6937) granting an increase of pension to Francis Mathews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6938) granting an increase of pension to Birtzell Gotham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6939) to reimburse Edward B. Kelley for moneys expended while superintendent of the Rosebud Indian Agency in South Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6940) for the relief of J. Cooney; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6941) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6942) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 6943) granting a pension to Charles F. Pandorf; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6944) granting a pension to John Pearson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6945) granting a pension to Nolan Read; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6946) granting a pension to Thomas Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6947) granting a pension to Beatrice Snyder; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6948) granting a pension to James Skelton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6949) granting a pension to James M. Ballard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6950) granting a pension to Harry B. Robb; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6951) granting a pension to Edward McCabe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6952) granting a pension to Hale F. Hamilton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6953) granting a pension to Thomas E. Haggerty; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6954) granting a pension to John C. Ferneding; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6955) granting a pension to Edward F. Denny; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6956) granting a pension to Charles Mayrwieser; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6957) granting a pension to James E. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6958) granting a pension to Alice V. Lutes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6959) granting a pension to Fenton B. King; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6960) granting a pension to Daniel Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6961) granting a pension to Horace W. Hunt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6962) granting a pension to Fred Hoppe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6963) granting a pension to Joseph Debli; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6964) granting a pension to George B. Bolender; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6965) granting a pension to Edward Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6966) granting a pension to Hettie H. Burt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6967) granting a pension to Royal Colvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6968) granting a pension to Mrs. William H. Earley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6969) granting a pension to Lucinda St. John; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6970) granting a pension to William Shoemaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6971) granting a pension to Eliza Jane Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6972) granting a pension to Fredrica Wurthner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6973) granting a pension to Jacob Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6974) granting a pension to Annie O'Neil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6975) granting an increase of pension to James Heyburn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6976) granting an increase of pension to John Muir; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6977) granting an increase of pension to Lawrence Dempsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6978) granting an increase of pension to Francis Keating; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6979) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6980) granting an increase of pension to John Barbeau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6981) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Bigelow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6982) granting an increase of pension to John Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6983) granting an increase of pension to Christian H. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6984) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus D. Coulson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6985) granting an increase of pension to John Sipple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6986) granting an increase of pension to William M. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6987) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Gigandet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6988) granting an increase of pension to Eli R. Westfall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6989) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Hanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6990) granting an increase of pension to Milton Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6991) granting an increase of pension to William Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6992) granting an increase of pension to John M. Allender; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6993) granting an increase of pension to William D. Tod; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6994) granting an increase of pension to John G. Whitman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6995) granting an increase of pension to William W. Wolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6996) granting an increase of pension to William H. Noggle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6997) for the relief of George Sloughman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6998) to remove the charge of desertion against James Featherstone; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6999) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of John L. Yohn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7000) to remove the charge of desertion against Anton Smith, alias Charles Roehmer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7001) to remove the charge of desertion against James Green; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7002) to remove the charge of desertion against Mathias Henry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 7003) granting an increase of pension to Asbury C. Lower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7004) granting an increase of pension to Hiram J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 7005) granting an increase of pension to David N. Cochran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 7006) granting a pension to Addie Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7007) granting a pension to Alice O. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 7008) granting an increase of pension to William Bartlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7009) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Diltz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7010) granting an increase of pension to Tennessee A. Blackburn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PETERSON: A bill (H. R. 7011) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Donnelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 7012) granting an increase of pension to David Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7013) for the relief of Francis W. Maxwell; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 7014) for the relief of A. C. Brice, late consul of the United States to Matanzas, Cuba; 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 Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Peoria, Ill., relative to safe and suitable boilers and headlights on railroad engines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petition of the Brooklyn Traffic Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the retention of the Commerce Court; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Peoria, Ill., favoring restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Peoria, Ill., favoring improvement of the living conditions of our seamen; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petition of the California State Branch of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks, protesting against the passage of any legislation making any change in the Reilly eight-hour law; to the committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation for a reform in the Consular Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 6940) for the relief of the estate of J. Cooney; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the Banana Buyers' Protective Association of New York, N. Y., protesting against a tariff on bananas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Peoria, Ill., relative to proper headlights and safe and suitable boilers on railroad engines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Peoria, Ill., favoring the restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Peoria, Ill., favoring improvement in the living conditions of our seamen; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of the members of the Pierre Commercial Club, of Pierre, S. Dak., favoring Federal ownership of buildings for foreign representatives; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Peoria, Ill., favoring the passage of legislation compelling the use of safety appliances, etc., for all common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Peoria, Ill., favoring the passage of immediate legislation tending to restrict immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Brown Shoe Co., St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of legislation for the adoption of the postal express; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the National Life Insurance Co., Chicago, Ill., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Peoria, Ill., favoring the passage of House bill 103, requiring that locomotives be equipped with lights of certain specified requirements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Peoria, Ill., favoring the passage of Senate bill 4, to better the living conditions, etc., of seamen; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of sundry residents of Gooding, Idaho, relative to land owned by the Oregon & California Railroad Co. and to the right of applicants to purchase the same from the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of the Association of Quartermen and Leadingmen of the Puget Sound Navy Yard, indorsing House bill providing for Saturday half holidays for all Government employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the North Western Association of Box Manufacturers, of Portland, Oreg., favoring an increase of the rate of interest now paid on postal savings to 3 per cent and the establishment of a farm-loan department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Peoria, Ill., favoring the passage of immediate legislation tending to restrict immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Peoria, Ill., favoring the passage of Senate bill 4, to better the living conditions, etc., of seamen; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Peoria, Ill., favoring the passage of legislation compelling the use of safety appliances, etc., for all common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Peoria, Ill., favoring the passage of House bill 103, requiring that locomotives shall be equipped with lights of certain specified requirements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Pennsylvania State Launderers' Association favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Switchmen's Union of North America protesting against the passage of the workmen's compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, favoring restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, relative to proper headlights and safe boilers for railroad engines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, favoring bill for improvement in living conditions for our seamen; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Banana Buyers' Protective Association, New York, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the proposed import tax on bananas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Petition of the Central Council of Business Men and Taxpayers' Association of Buffalo, favoring the appointment of a national commission to consider a plan for vocational education; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THACHER: Petition of the Boston Fruit and Produce Exchange, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, favoring the adoption of a more stringent immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, favoring the extension of authority of locomotive boiler inspectors of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

SATURDAY, *July 19, 1913.*

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

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

### ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR PENNSYLVANIA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 32) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge in and for the eastern district of Pennsylvania and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and agree to the conference asked by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from North Carolina how many amendments there are in the bill?

Mr. OVERMAN. I have no idea. I only know what was the action of the House of Representatives in requesting a conference.

Mr. NORRIS. If the matter could go over, the amendments would be printed under the rule, would they not?

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; the amendments ought to be printed. When the bill comes back from conference the Senate should be fully informed as to the amendments, whether there is an agreement or a disagreement, as the case may be.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to say to the Senator from North Carolina that, as I understand the situation, while I have not seen the amendments I have heard what, for instance, one of the amendments is, and I should like to reserve the right at the proper time to move to concur in that particular amendment. I am not prepared to do it now, and I may not on examination want to make the motion. I have not been able to find out what the particular amendment is.

Mr. OVERMAN. I confess to the Senator that this is the first time I have had my attention directed to it. The House having asked for a conference, I think it is our duty to agree to the conference, unless the Senator desires to make a motion now. I am not sufficiently informed as to the amendments, and I will have to examine the bill. It may go over, if the Senator desires.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will let it go over, I do not think there will be any delay caused. The House does not meet to-day.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am told that the House of Representatives disagrees to the amendments of the Senate. It is a House bill.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, if that is the parliamentary situation, my motion would be to recede from the Senate amendments.

Mr. OVERMAN. That would be the proper motion.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to have an opportunity to examine it, and if I think it proper I will make that motion.

Mr. OVERMAN. With that understanding, I withdraw my motion for the present so as to let the Senator have time to examine it. I will call it up again next week.