

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 7, 1914.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou art the giver of every good and perfect gift. We come reverently before Thee to seek Thy blessing. These, Thy servants, have assembled to administer the sacred trust that has been committed to them in the interest of all the people. We pray that God's presence may be with them, guiding them in their deliberations and the formation of their final conclusions, that in all the work they do Thy name may be glorified through the peace and prosperity of the Nation. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ACCOUNTS OF WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of an examination of the accounts, books, and records of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., together with a copy of the stenographic record of all of the proceedings included in the investigations. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and will not be ordered printed at this time.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

- H. R. 1262. An act for the relief of Hugh P. Strong;
- H. R. 2733. An act authorizing J. A. Matheny, of Colony, Wyo., to make homestead entry;
- H. R. 1055. An act for the relief of T. S. Williams;
- H. R. 3468. An act for the relief of the heirs of the late Samuel H. Donaldson;
- H. R. 6939. An act to reimburse Edward B. Kelley for moneys expended while superintendent of the Rosebud Indian Agency, in South Dakota;
- H. R. 9848. An act for the relief of the New England Steamship Co.;
- H. R. 10232. An act for the relief of Col. Alfred C. Sharpe;
- H. R. 10345. An act for the relief of C. M. Hammond; and
- H. R. 10763. An act for the relief of Dr. L. W. Culbreath.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

- S. 832. 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. 833. 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. 834. 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; and
- S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution relating to supervision of the Lincoln memorial.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a memorial of General Herkimer Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa., and a memorial of Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry Branch, American Continental League, of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against an appropriation being made for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Williamstown, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Harmonie Verein of Vincennes, Ind., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. OLIVER. On behalf of my colleague [Mr. PENROSE], who is unavoidably absent, I wish to present certain petitions and memorials.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions and memorials will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. OLIVER (for Mr. PENROSE) presented memorials of sundry citizens of Donora, Pittsburgh, Kersey, Leisenring, and Roseto; of McKinley Lodge, No. 283, Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, of Pottstown; of Denaburger Lodge, No. 647, Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also (for Mr. PENROSE) presented petitions of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Warren, Pittsburgh, Reading, Westchester, Pottstown, Marshallton, Ambler, Honey Brook, and Northbrook, and of Betsy Ross Council, No. 119, Daughters of Liberty, of Gettysburg, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also (for Mr. PENROSE) presented memorials of General Richard Montgomery Branch, General Sumter Branch, George Washington Branch, Yorktown Branch, Daniel Morgan Branch, Robert Morris Branch, Valley Forge Branch, General Knox Branch, George Rogers Clarke Branch, Benjamin Harrison Branch, General Nathaniel Greene Branch, and of Benjamin Franklin Branch, American Continental League, all of Philadelphia; of the Irish-American Club Branch, American Continental League, of Wilkes-Barre; of County Galway Men's Social and Beneficial Association; and of the Patrick O'Donnell Club, of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against any appropriation by Congress for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also (for Mr. PENROSE) presented memorials of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, McKeesport, Erie, Greensburg, and Clarion; of the Turn Vereins of Jeannette, McKees Rocks, Gibbstown, Woodlawn, Sharpsburg, Johnstown, Carlisle, Roscoe, Elco, and Coal Center, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. PENROSE) presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for a revision of the navigation laws, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also (for Mr. PENROSE) presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the appointment by the President of clerks of the United States courts, etc., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. PENROSE) presented memorials of sundry citizens of Sellersville, Telford, and Souderton, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also (for Mr. PENROSE) presented a petition of the Neighborhood Men's Bible Class, of Pittsburgh, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Lancaster, N. H., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the New Hampshire Branch of the German National Alliance, of Manchester, N. H., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Manchester, N. H., praying that an appropriation be made for the survey of the Merrimac River, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Bottlers' and Drivers' Union No. 229, of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation granting the right of freedom of speech, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PERKINS presented memorials of the Chamber of Commerce of Berkeley, the Chamber of Commerce of Vallejo, the Chamber of Commerce of Monterey, the Board of Trade of

San Francisco, the Merchants' Association of Lodi, and the Chamber of Commerce of Santa Cruz, all in the State of California, remonstrating against the proposed separation of the Central and Southern Pacific Railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the College Park Association of San Jose, of the congregations of the Congregational Church of Blue Lake, of St. Paul's Episcopal Church of Healdsburg, and of the Congregational Church of Cotati, all in the State of California, praying for the suspension for one year of the naval programs of the great powers, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of Concordia Lodge, No. 20, of Woodland, Cal., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented resolutions adopted by the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Martinsburg, W. Va., favoring the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were reported to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey presented a memorial of Independent Newark Lodge, No. 255, Independent Order B'rith Abraham, of New Jersey, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of the Polish Political Club, of Torrington, Conn., and a memorial of Zalozony 21, Komitet Obrony Narodowej, Hartford, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BRADLEY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ashland, Ky., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction annually of two new battleships, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. JONES presented petitions of the congregations of the Sprague Memorial Presbyterian Church, of Tacoma; the First Presbyterian Church, of Snohomish; of the Union Congregational Church, of Granite Falls; and of the First Presbyterian Church, of Republic, all in the State of Washington, praying for the suspension for one year of the naval programs of the great powers, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ALASKAN COAL.

Mr. JONES. I have resolutions adopted at a meeting of former residents of Alaska who are thoroughly familiar with the coal situation there in reference to the character of coal and the tests made by the Government. I ask that the resolutions may be printed in the Record; they are not long. I will not ask that they be read.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The "Yakima-Alaskan Sourdoughs," an organization composed of former residents of Alaska now residing in Yakima County, State of Washington, in meeting assembled at North Yakima, Wash., January 21, 1914, directed the executive committee of the organization to prepare resolutions on behalf of the organization, as follows:

"Whereas the test of the coal from the Bering River coal field in Alaska made by the United States Navy is reported unfavorable to said coal as suitable for use by the United States Navy; and

"Whereas it is reported that the coal used for said test was not a fair sample of Bering River coal, that the same was old surface coal and filled with dirt, and suspicious circumstances surrounded the obtaining of the same; and

"Whereas the United States Navy will soon make tests of coal of the Matanuska coal fields of Alaska to ascertain whether the same is suitable for use of the Navy; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we believe that the coal tested by the United States Navy as Bering River coal was not a fair and honest sample of coal from the Bering River coal field;

"That we believe that either careless, ignorant, or dishonest methods were used in obtaining the coal tested so as to prevent a fair and honest sample of said Bering River coal being furnished for testing by the United States Navy;

"That knowledge of said coal for many years causes us to believe that a test of a fair sample of said coal will show that the same is a high-grade coal, suitable for use on naval vessels; and

Resolved, That we believe the same methods that were used with the Bering River coal will be used to prevent a fair sample of Matanuska coal being furnished for testing by the United States Navy unless proper care and diligence is used regarding the same; and further

Resolved, That we look with confidence to Hon. W. L. JONES, Senator from the State of Washington, and Hon. JAMES WICKERSHAM, Delegate to Congress from Alaska, to see that proper safeguards are used to insure an honest and fair sample of the Matanuska coal being

obtained for the United States Navy to test the same for naval use; and

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to Hon. W. L. JONES and Hon. JAMES WICKERSHAM.

"E. B. VELIKANJE.
"R. B. MILLROY.
"ARTHUR BALDWIN.
"GEORGE THOMAS.
"F. G. KASSELMAN.
"MRS. N. C. RICHARDS.
"GEO. A. NOBLE."

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted a report (No. 231) accompanied by a bill (S. 4407) authorizing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of condemned cannon and cannon balls, which was read twice by its title.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills and joint resolutions, reported adversely thereon and the bills and joint resolutions were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 2660) donating cannon to the city of Prescott, Ariz.;

A bill (S. 2266) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of El Paso, Ill., two condemned bronze or brass cannon, with their carriages and a suitable outfit of cannon balls;

A bill (S. 2350) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate condemned cannon and balls;

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

A bill (S. 2710) authorizing the Secretary of War to make a donation of condemned cannon and cannon balls;

A bill (S. 3211) donating cannon to the city of West Point, Miss.;

A bill (S. 3316) authorizing the Secretary of War to make a donation of condemned cannon and cannon balls to the city of Salisbury, Md.;

A bill (S. 3453) donating cannon to the county of Uinta, in the State of Wyoming;

A bill (S. 3691) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two cannon and 34 cannon balls to the John A. Logan Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Salina, Kans.; and

A bill (S. 3848) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion to deliver to the city of Tucson, State of Arizona, two condemned bronze or brass cannon, with their carriages and outfit of cannon balls.

A bill (S. 4111) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the United Spanish War Veterans, Camp Lee Forby, No. 1, of Omaha, Nebr., two brass or bronze cannon or fieldpieces, with their carriages;

A bill (S. 4208) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of McPherson, Kans., two cannon or fieldpieces;

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 46) authorizing the delivery to the proper authorities of the city park in the city of Aberdeen, in the State of Washington, two condemned bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces and suitable outfit of cannon balls;

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 47) authorizing the delivery to the Dan McCook Post, No. 105, Grand Army of the Republic, of one condemned bronze or brass cannon or fieldpiece and a suitable outfit of cannon balls;

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) authorizing the delivering to the Dan McCook Post, No. 105, Grand Army of the Republic, at Wenatchee, Wash., of one condemned bronze or brass cannon or fieldpiece and a suitable outfit of cannon balls;

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) authorizing the delivering to the town of Somerset, Ky., of one condemned bronze or brass cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage and a suitable outfit of cannon balls;

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 69) authorizing the Secretary of War to make donation of condemned cannon and cannon balls; and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 102) authorizing the delivery to the proper authorities of Columbia County, State of Washington, of two condemned bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces and suitable outfit of cannon balls.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to which were referred the bill (S. 1986) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Henry Fuller (Rept. No. 232), the bill (S. 3594) to correct the military record of Peter Duchane (Rept. No. 233), and the bill (S. 1990) to correct the military record of Samuel J. Kearns (Rept. No. 234), to submit adverse reports thereon.

I feel that I ought to call the attention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to these bills, as he introduced them.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. As I understand, these are unfavorable reports from the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Yes; and with the recommendation that they be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I suppose they could go to the calendar.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I have no objection to their taking that course, if the Senator wishes it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I will request that they be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be placed on the calendar.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF ELECTRICAL MEANS OF COMMUNICATION.

Mr. BANKHEAD. On January 31 there was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads a communication from the Postmaster General, transmitting the report of the special committee of the Post Office Department on Government ownership of electrical means of communication. Accompanying the report were maps and illustrations. I report back from the committee this matter and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing, with the request that it, together with the accompanying illustrations, be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on Printing for consideration.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. OLIVER (for Mr. PENROSE):

A bill (S. 4398) to grant an honorable discharge to Paschal C. Hibbs; to the Committee on Military Affairs;

A bill (S. 4399) granting pensions to soldiers confined in so-called Confederate prisons;

A bill (S. 4400) to increase the pensions of the blind who served in the War with Mexico or the Civil War;

A bill (S. 4401) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Lyshon (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4402) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 4403) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Stafford, Kans., one cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 4404) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel N. Robbins (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 4406) granting an increase of pension to John A. Shannon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 4408) granting a pension to Harriet E. Vose;

A bill (S. 4409) granting an increase of pension to Samuel I. Scammon;

A bill (S. 4410) granting an increase of pension to Alvin H. Ellis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4411) granting an increase of pension to Almarian Dickey (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4412) granting an increase of pension to Michael Andrews, jr. (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4413) granting an increase of pension to Franklin K. Prescott (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4414) granting a pension to Almatia Turner (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

RADIUM-BEARING ORES.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 4405) to provide for and encourage the prospecting, mining, and treatment of radium-bearing ores in lands belonging to the United States, for the purpose of securing an adequate supply of radium for Government and other hospitals in the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I take occasion to say to the Senate that I am hoping to have a report from the Committee on Mines and Mining in relation to this bill by Tuesday morning, and as the case is one of the very highest urgency I will then ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

I make this statement so that those who are interested in the matter may have an opportunity to examine the draft of the bill, which will be laid upon the desks of Senators on Monday morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

WATER POWER ON PUBLIC LANDS.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 4415) to aid and to regulate the development, operation, and maintenance of water powers on lands of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, this is a bill relating to the development of water power on the public lands of the United States. It is a matter of very great importance. The bill has been prepared with a great deal of care, although I have no doubt that important changes may be suggested. I trust the measure will have very careful consideration. It provides for the development of water power for the reclamation of arid lands, for domestic purposes, and any purpose to which water power may be put. So it may properly, I think, be referable to one of several committees. I ask that it may be referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

AMENDMENTS TO POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. OLIVER (for Mr. PENROSE) submitted an amendment proposing that hereafter upon all mail matter of the first class when deposited in any post office for delivery within the limits of the post office delivery district the rate of postage chargeable shall be 1 cent for each ounce or fraction thereof, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Post Office appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

He also (for Mr. PENROSE) submitted an amendment providing that in addition to the compensation now allowed by law the further sum of \$25 per month be allowed each rural delivery carrier serving a route of 18 miles or more for maintenance of horses, buggies, and such other equipment as is necessary in the discharge of his duties as a letter carrier, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Post Office appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRYAN submitted an amendment providing that the personnel of the membership of the committees and commissions created and provided for in sections 1 and 8 of the act approved August 24, 1912, shall continue with the same authorities and powers, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Post Office appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. OLIVER (for Mr. PENROSE) submitted two amendments intended to be proposed to the omnibus claims bill, which were referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—WILLIAM M. THOMAS.

On motion of Mr. HITCHCOCK, it was

Ordered, That leave be granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers in the case of William M. Thomas (S. 6075, 61st Cong.), there having been no adverse report thereon.

SURVEY OF MADDOX CREEK, VA.

Mr. SWANSON submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16), which was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to have a survey made and estimate submitted as early as practicable of the cost of the improvement of Maddox Creek, Va., with a view of improving navigation.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS.

Mr. BRYAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 266), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

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

THE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 267), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Immigration or any subcommittee thereof be authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate of the Sixty-third Congress.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAWS.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 208), which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the report of the commission appointed by the National Civic Federation and the American Federation of Labor to study the operation of State workmen's compensation laws be printed as a Senate document, together with the appendix accompanying said report, and that 5,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate.

ADDRESS BY HON. B. B. HARE.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a copy of an address by the Hon. B. B. Hare, assistant in agricultural education and rural economics, Department of Agriculture, delivered at the Conference of Common Good, at Columbia, S. C., August 6-7, 1913, on a plan to aid farmers in obtaining long-time loans at low rates of interest to buy and improve homes. I ask that the paper be referred to the Committee on Printing, to ascertain if it shall be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action will be taken.

INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF LIVE STOCK.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I present an article by S. H. Cowan, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, relative to the interstate transportation of live stock affected with contagious diseases. Mr. Cowan is the representative of the Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas and of the American National Live Stock Association, and by direction of those associations he submitted the article to the chairman of the committee. I ask that the article be referred to the Committee on Printing, with a view to having it printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action will be taken.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

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

S. 234. An act 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;

S. 4094. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Columbia River at or near Vancouver, Wash.; and

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution relating to supervision of the Lincoln Memorial.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 1262. An act for the relief of Hugh P. Strong; and

H. R. 2733. An act authorizing J. A. Matheny, of Colony, Wyo., to make homestead entry.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1055. An act for the relief of T. S. Williams;

H. R. 3468. An act for the relief of the heirs of the late Samuel H. Donaldson; and

H. R. 9848. An act for the relief of the New England Steamship Co.

H. R. 6039. An act to reimburse Edward B. Kelley for moneys expended while superintendent of the Rosebud Indian Agency in South Dakota was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 10232. An act for the relief of Col. Alfred C. Sharpe was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 10345. An act for the relief of C. M. Hammond was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 10763. An act for the relief of Dr. L. W. Culbreath was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN & HARTFORD RAILROAD.

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

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution 260, by Mr. NORRIS, requesting the Interstate Commerce Commission to reopen its examination of the affairs of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on the resolution. I do not know the exact form the resolution is ultimately to take, but am very much in favor of some resolution of this kind. It is especially appropriate at this particular time, while the question of increased railway rates is before the Interstate Commerce Commission, that the people of the country should be enlightened as they have been by the discussion on this floor of the charges that have been made by a very responsible paper.

I do not think, Mr. President, while the scoundrelism in the old management of the New York, New Haven & Hartford is before the public that the equal scoundrelism of the Frisco Railroad should be absolutely lost to the public gaze. These two institutions seem to have been twins in infamy. There is even a broader question as affecting our welfare in disclosures of this kind and in manipulations of this kind than the mere question of robbing the stockholders, which is bad enough, and that is the effect that such transactions have upon our securities in this country and abroad. The report of the commission in the Frisco hearing condemned certain banking houses that had taken the obligations of the Frisco Co. when they knew, according to the report, that the Frisco Co. was on the verge of bankruptcy. That drew from one of the banking houses a letter which was sent, I assume, to every Member of the Senate, from Speyer & Co., of New York. I wish to put a little of that in the RECORD. They say:

You state in your report that "the sale of securities to the investing public through the bankers at a time when every appearance indicated the insolvency of the issuing company invites and warrants condemnation of all those who assisted or participated in such sale."

Then Messrs. Speyer & Co. go ahead and give themselves a certificate of character, but they do not answer the charge that through foreign bankers they sold these securities or placed them on the market and destroyed or helped to destroy the confidence which foreign people had in our investments and our securities. There are other Senators here, I think, who perhaps have more definite knowledge than I have on that question.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will yield to me—

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

Mr. KENYON. I am glad to do so.

Mr. LODGE. On the point that the Senator from Iowa has just raised, it seems to me that it is a subject which ought to be investigated. I believe it was Speyer & Co.—

Mr. KENYON. Speyer & Co.

Mr. LODGE. It was Speyer & Co. who sent the circular and apparently had the loan. I do not know how much of that loan was placed abroad, but a large part of it was certainly placed in Paris. In that circular Speyer & Co. state that their own commissions were very moderate, but if I have been correctly informed, and what I have heard comes from the other side of the water, the loan of the San Francisco company was largely placed in Paris. The condition of the road was pretty well known in this country. It was not easy to place it on the New York market or any other large American market. The loan therefore was taken to Paris. I understand, and if I am wrong an investigation will correct me, all the leading Paris bankers were induced to take up the loan and endeavor to sell the securities by receiving a very large commission, which I have heard it stated was as high as 7½ per cent. The people of France have no knowledge of an American investment. They knew nothing about this road of their own knowledge. They depend upon the banking institutions of their own country to guide them in an investment of that kind. The loan was put out in that way. The bankers took it up, incited to do so by the great commissions that were paid to them, and a large part of the loan, at least, was placed in that way in France. Within two or three months, I do not know just how soon after the placing of the loan, but within a very short time, the railroad went into bankruptcy, and those people abroad found themselves the victims of what they regarded as a simple swindle.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator who were the losers in that transaction. Who were those people?

Mr. LODGE. They were the investors in France, the great bankers of Paris being all substantially, as I have been informed, engaged in placing these bonds.

Mr. KENYON. And receiving a large commission?

Mr. LODGE. Receiving a large commission for doing so; they had no difficulty in placing them, because their constituency was wholly ignorant and relied on them.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Does not the fact that they exacted a very large commission evidently show that they were acquainted with the character of the securities?

Mr. LODGE. I think that would be quite a reasonable inference; but certainly they were paid a large commission for what they did.

Mr. KENYON. The American bankers at least were acquainted with the character of the security. The commission so stated in its report.

Mr. LODGE. The commission makes that statement, but the commission does not go into the transaction abroad. The result of it was to give a worse blow to American credit and the standing of American business and American securities abroad than we have ever received. I think it is a very serious thing to have injured the good business name of this country in such a way.

These facts have come to me and have been told me on what I believe to be good authority. As I said, they came from the direction of people who were victims in Paris. I think it is something which ought to be known; we can not probably do anything about it here in the way of prosecution, but at least it should be known what methods have been employed in the placing of a loan abroad, which, in its results, have injured the good name of the United States and the American credit throughout Europe.

Mr. KENYON. I am very thankful to the Senator for injecting these remarks in what I have to say.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Iowa if the firm of Speyer & Co. are not the authorized fiscal agents of the United States in London?

Mr. LODGE. Yes, they are; they have been made so since the 4th of March.

Mr. OLIVER. Appointed by the President.

Mr. KENYON. I did not know about that. I am glad to have that information.

Mr. LODGE. I am not sure, but I think that is the case.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. In England only.

Mr. LODGE. In England they are the agents of the United States. They have taken the place of the Seligmans, I think, in London.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the suggestions of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts show that these genteel financial plunderers are not only robbing their stockholders, but that they are robbing American credit of its standing abroad as well as at home.

I had intended to read into the RECORD an editorial from which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] read yesterday. I will not take the time, however, to read it, but wish to have it made a part of my remarks. It states the situation very clearly; and I think the New York World is entitled to the thanks of the American people for exposing the tale of infamy that the Senator read yesterday—the exposé of as corrupt a gang of financial plunderers as ever robbed a bank, and without requiring the same amount of courage that it does to rob a bank. They belong rather to that class of guardians who would rob their wards. These men, intrusted with the funds, with the property, with the management of great institutions such as the Frisco and the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, instead of using this property to help their stockholders, have been plundering them.

I suppose it must be a great deal of satisfaction to the hardy Puritan of New England, who has a little stock, as thousands of them have, in the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.—and as many whom I know, whose husbands left them this stock, considering it as good as Government bonds—for his little household, as they gather around their breakfast table in the morning, limited possibly to codfish and Uneeda Biscuits, to pour out their blessings to Providence, not that the Democratic Party has revised the tariff and attempted to reduce the cost of living, but that the directors of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. have made it impossible for them to overeat, at least. Then, as that sturdy New England character goes in and sits by his fireside, he can pick up a book that is now being circulated free all over the United States by the railroads at the expense of the people who are paying railroad fares and freight rates, describing the great blessings of the splendid management of railroads in this country and the terrible danger of governmental ownership and control; and as he draws his enthusiasm from that, he can wonder why, when these matters have been public matters for many years, if he goes out and steals a bucket of coal or a loaf of bread for his family, he will go to jail, while these eminent gentlemen, who have stolen what he had, instead of going to jail, will go to Europe or to some villa somewhere or upon an automobile or yachting party trip or give great banquets and luncheons costing the sums which the Senator from Nebraska yesterday showed were spent by directors and included in "other expenses."

That sturdy New England character, that splendid character, is going to wonder why it is that Congress sits around with bills before committees that would remedy this evil, bills that sleep the sleep that in all human probability never will know any awakening.

Mr. President, I did not intend to say as much as I have. I now ask that this editorial of the New York World on "A chapter of financial infamy," which concludes with the significant words, "There can be no 'constitution of peace' with piracy and plunder," be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

The editorial referred to is as follows:

A CHAPTER OF FINANCIAL INFAMY.

The World to-day undertakes to show what became of the \$12,000,000 of money belonging to the stockholders of the New Haven, which, according to Chairman Prouty of the Interstate Commerce Commission, "vanished into thin air."

Needless to say this money did not vanish "into thin air." It vanished into the coffers of J. P. Morgan & Co. It was taken out of the treasury of the New Haven by Mr. Morgan and his associates to recompense J. P. Morgan & Co. for loans they had made practically without security to a dummy corporation, organized to conceal various financial manipulations in connection with the construction of the Westchester road. Even the exposure of life insurance corruption revealed no more cold-blooded piece of Wall Street piracy than the transaction whose scaly history is printed elsewhere in to-day's issue of the World.

Whoever wishes to know how the stockholders of a great railroad company can be swindled, robbed, and ruined by due process of law is invited to study carefully the steps by which the Westchester road was unloaded upon the unfortunate New Haven after President Mellen had informed the New Haven directors that the Westchester stock was worth "about 10 cents a pound." Whoever wishes to understand the cold, calculated villainy by which the New Haven has been bled white, and its helpless stockholders cheated of the dividends which represent the only means of support that thousands of them have, is invited to study this chronicle of "high finance" to the last, least line.

If J. P. Morgan and his associates had gone into the offices of the New Haven, blown open the safe, and stuffed these millions into their pockets, they would have been guilty of burglary. But what a burglar might have done brazenly and defiantly they accomplished by stealth and cunning. In the long run the New Haven would have been better off if they had stolen this money outright from its safe, for then it would not have been saddled with the continuing burden of the Westchester, which is a steady drain upon its resources.

Thousands of men are in jail for offenses against society which were picayunish in comparison with this stupendous achievement in respectable robbery. It would be bad enough if the Westchester transaction stood by itself, but it is only one link in a long chain of financial infamy by which one of the richest railroad systems in the country was sold into slavery.

Mr. Morgan is dead, but his estate is not dead. His executors still hold the tainted profits that were acquired in this transaction and the courts are open to the New Haven stockholders to sue for restitution. Mr. Morgan is beyond the reach of the law, but his associates who are still living are not beyond the reach of the law. Guilt in their case is still personal, and if they can not be punished under any State statute for the grosser offenses, these offenses were nevertheless part of the violation of the Sherman antitrust law to which the New Haven, as a corporation, has confessed. Whatever measure of mercy and immunity is shown toward the corporation, there should be neither mercy nor immunity for directors who participated in the colossal swindles by which the New Haven has been brought to the verge of bankruptcy. Here is the time, place, and occasion for the Wilson administration to erect its gibbet of shame and prove again that the criminal statutes of the United States know neither rich nor poor.

There can be no "constitution of peace" with piracy and plunder.

Mr. WEEKS obtained the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if my colleague will allow me a moment, I wish to state that I find in the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission as to the San Francisco Railroad that receivers were applied for on May 27, 1913. The report states that—

The Frisco sold to Speyer & Co., of New York, shortly before the receivers were appointed, \$3,000,000 of its general-lien 5 per cent bonds, French series, at a price of 78.

Those bonds were sold to French investors on April 24, May 2, May 10, and May 14, 1913; and on May 27, 1913, the receivers were applied for. Such transactions do not give us a very good reputation abroad.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, understanding that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] was contemplating offering a resolution of inquiry into the affairs of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., and finding it necessary to be absent from the Chamber last Tuesday, I asked him to offer the resolution when I could be present, because I might wish to submit some comments on it and on conditions in New England. The Senator very courteously made the statement on introducing the resolution last Tuesday that he wished it to go over on account of the arrangement he had made with me, and I wish now to express my appreciation to him for having done so.

I rise now to advocate and indorse the general purposes of the resolution which the Senator has introduced. It is un-

necessary to go into the conditions as they exist in New England at this time, but the fact is that the Boston & Maine Railroad Co. and the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., both of which have been dividend-paying properties for more than 40 years, are in serious financial distress.

There are different reasons for this condition. It can not be charged that the Boston & Maine Railroad is in that condition for the same reason that the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad is, because the Boston & Maine Railroad has not been making additions to its properties and taking on other properties during the immediate past. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad has done so to a very large degree, as has been stated on this floor, adding to its capitalization more than \$300,000,000 in one form or another.

I am not prepared, and I do not think any man is prepared, to state definitely whether there has been any looting of the New Haven properties or the New Haven treasury in so doing, whether there has been bad judgment used in so doing, or whether in the end it may be advantageous in some degree to the railroad situation in New England; but it has, for the time being at least, seriously injured a great number of stockholders in New England and elsewhere, and it has impaired the confidence which the public is justified in having in good railroad management in this country.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has made very careful investigations into some phases of this condition. I do not know exactly how far they have gone, but Mr. Commissioner Prouty states, in a letter to the Senate, which came as a result of an inquiry from the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce [Mr. NEWLANDS], that they have investigated as far as the commission believes it has power to do, but that there is a large amount of information obtained by the commission which has not been made public which might answer all of the purposes of the Senate. When that information has been furnished to the Senate, if additional investigation is required in any form, it seems to me that that will be the time to ask that it be made. In the meantime I am going to support the resolution as introduced by the Senator from Nebraska, because I for one, representing in part a great New England State, wish to have every ray of light which can be found let in on the affairs of this corporation.

If there have been men in responsible positions guilty of looting those properties, I want them sufficiently and adequately punished. In any event, this is a time when the stockholders of those railroads and the people of New England may justly say, "Give us all the information there is, so that we may have an adequate and correct basis on which to reestablish the credit of these properties and put them in proper condition to adequately serve that community."

I should support the resolution anyway, but I hope the Senator from Nebraska will modify the preamble sufficiently so that we may ask for all the information which the Interstate Commerce Commission has on the subject and also ask for further investigation if the commission thinks further investigation should be given. If that should not be sufficient, we may then proceed to make such further investigation as the Senate may believe necessary, in order that we may have all the information which bears on this important subject.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I shall support the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] with the greatest relish. The story which has been published in the New York World and which has been recited by the Senator from Nebraska is not altogether new in character. I am old enough to remember the looting and piratical robbery of the old Erie Railroad, when Jay Gould and Jim Fiske, who were the participants in that robbery, fled from the city of New York over to New Jersey and domiciled themselves in a little hotel in order to prevent the possible service of legal processes on them. It was a horrible scandal. Fortunes were wrecked that a few men might be enriched. So these incidents are not new in our history. I feel that this looting of the New York & New Haven Railroad is only a revival; it has only broken out through the thin shell which concealed it.

I had a letter from a woman, who described herself as a widow with two children, living in New Haven, in which you could almost see the tears in her eyes. She said the little that was left to her by her husband from hard work and hard toil on his part and on her own part, because she shared with him as a toiler, was stored up in the stock of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. She says, "We thought it as good as gold, and held on to it. To-day we are bereft of an income, and Heaven only knows what shall become of me and my children." Why she should have written to me I do not know, although I am frank to say that my heart beats and swells in sympathy for those who have been made the victims of a condi-

tion of this kind. She asks if something may not be done by the great United States toward ferreting out the wrong and demanding restitution, if possible, of the money of which she has been robbed.

I feel, Mr. President, that we have definite knowledge. The Senator from Massachusetts says that we can not absolutely charge that this money was stolen, but the fact remains that these men are as chary of publicity as the average mortal, and yet there is not a mother's son of them who has come out and denied the charges made by the New York World. I believe those charges are true.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. WEEKS. I think the Senator from New Jersey and I only differ in the character of our language in this matter. It is true that the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. did make a very comprehensive reply to the statement made by Mr. Commissioner Prouty sometime ago, but I do not think it ought to be charged against that corporation that it has not made a definite reply to the New York World article, because that was published only last Sunday.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That is true; but they have had time since that publication of last Sunday to give us some reason to believe that the charges made were false.

Mr. WEEKS. Yes, Mr. President; but—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Railroad reports and the thimble-rigging tabulations of scheming bankers will deceive the best of us, and I feel that I can get no knowledge as to their methods or as to their honesty through the report, of which I have seen a synopsis prepared by the New York & New Haven Railroad. I trust this measure—

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAULSBURY in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that the charges contained in the New York World of last Sunday, which I have quoted, are not the first charges made by that paper. They have been making similar charges for the last several weeks.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Oh, yes. As I have said, it is as old as the hills; but this has happened to be the time when it has broken through the shell. The public mind has been blunted. We have seen the thing go on, as I have said, from the days of the Erie looting, and we had a taste of it in the New York insurance scandal, because of which a certain individual very prominent in insurance affairs went to Europe, and lives to-day in glory in "gay Paree," where it is said he wears gilt buckles on his shoes; and yet through his manipulations and those of others hundreds of men were bereft of their money. I say that any other course than sifting this to the very bottom will not satisfy the ends of justice or satisfy the public demands.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, when the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] was on the floor I asked if the firm of Speyer & Co. were not the fiscal agents of this Government in London. I was not quite certain at that time whether such was the case or not; but I find that the nomination of this firm as fiscal agents for the Navy Department was sent to the Senate in April by the President, and afterwards, on the 1st of May, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], chairman of the Finance Committee, reported from that committee and asked for immediate consideration of a resolution confirming the appointment, which was adopted. I send that resolution to the desk and ask the Secretary to read it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. When was that?

Mr. OLIVER. On the 1st day of May.

Mr. TOWNSEND. 1913?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether that appointment was before or after the failure of the Frisco road?

Mr. OLIVER. I think it was before the failure.

Mr. LODGE. It was before the appointment of receivers. The nomination of this firm of bankers came to the Senate in April. The Senate decided, very properly, that such agents were not officers of the United States and were not subject to confirmation by the Senate, and then passed the resolution which the Secretary is about to read, approving the appointment. The deal in French bonds was going on at the time, but application for the appointment of receivers was not made until the 27th of May.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate approve the appointment of the Right Hon. Sir Edgar Speyer, Bart., P. C., and the Messrs. Henry Oppenheimer, Henry William Brown, Henry Gordon Leith, James Speyer, and Eduard Beit von Speyer, trading under the name, style, and firm of Speyer Bros., at London, England, to be special fiscal agents of the Navy Department at that place, agreeably to the nomination.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not intend at this time to take up the time of the Senate, but it seems to me that the reading into the Record yesterday of a letter from a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission and a letter of Judge Prouty, who made the report of the commission at the time of the investigation of the New Haven Railroad affairs, requires some comment and perhaps makes it necessary to make some amendment of the resolution.

I stated yesterday that I believe anyone who will examine the report of Judge Prouty will agree with me that it shows on its face that the investigation of the affairs of this road was not complete. As far as the report is concerned, it does not attempt to trace many millions of the money that it shows were unlawfully taken from the stockholders of the company. In the space of nine years \$204,000,000 was diverted into investments that were not properly connected with the railroad. Of course that was not all a loss, because they got something for it; but the report shows several places where amounts as high as twelve and thirteen million dollars, as Judge Prouty said, "vanished into thin air."

If the commission have in their possession information that has not been communicated to Congress and is not referred to in the opinion of Judge Prouty, of course it would be useless to make another investigation for the purpose of getting the same information. I do not want to duplicate the work. In my judgment, from all I have learned in regard to it and what I have in a very brief way tried to state to the Senate, the Interstate Commerce Commission have not exhausted the subject and have not exhausted all their powers in the matter. In order that there may be no question about it, however, I send to the desk an amendment to the resolution that I think will cover the matter in dispute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the first five lines of the resolution as printed and in lieu thereof to insert:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be requested to make public the facts in its possession concerning the financial transactions of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., and, so far as it may be necessary to get additional information to thoroughly cover the subject, to reopen the examination of the affairs of that company and make a further investigation of its financial transactions with a view to ascertaining—

Mr. NORRIS. So that the body of the resolution will remain just as it is, with the exception of the introductory part, which will make it unnecessary, of course, for them to make any investigation in regard to any facts they may have in their possession.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I will ask the Senator from Nevada if he has any objection to the amendment?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I was about to state that with the amendment suggested by the Senator from Nebraska the resolution is entirely satisfactory to me. I will say that I made inquiry of the Attorney General this morning, and he informed me that the offenses would come under State laws and would have to be prosecuted by the State officials.

Of course we all know that, owing to the inertia of the local authorities, the National Government has been compelled in many cases to enter upon an enlargement of its criminal jurisdiction under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution; and if that inertia continues to prevail in the various States it may be necessary for us to have national legislation upon the subject. I feel assured, however, that the local authorities in New England will take hold of the criminal phase of this matter vigorously.

So far as the resolution in its present form is concerned, it seems to me it will serve a very useful purpose, and that we will have the recommendations of the Interstate Commerce Commission as to the legislation necessary to prevent the recurrence of similar transactions. I am, therefore, in hearty accord with the resolution as amended by the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska offer this as a modification of the original resolution?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I simply wish to put in one more quotation from the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission on the St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad matter.

I quoted what they said about the placing in Paris of the bonds of the French series. Then the commission say:

Speyer & Co. should have been aware of the poverty of the Frisco and of its difficulties in obtaining funds, as they advanced that company, on April 24, \$725,000 on its demand note, and \$50,000 on its demand note dated April 29, and applied the proceeds of the sale of \$1,000,000 of these bonds—

That is, the bonds they were planting in Paris— on May 2 to the liquidation of these notes.

That was to pay themselves. They did that while they held the position of agents of the United States. Though the French people and investing public may be very wrong, they not only think it is a reflection on American business methods and the honor of the business men of the United States, but they think such conduct is a reflection on the United States, whose fiscal agents this firm were.

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

The resolution as modified was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be requested to make public the facts in its possession concerning the financial transactions of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., and, so far as it may be necessary to get additional information to thoroughly cover the subject, to reopen the examination of the affairs of that company and make a further investigation of its financial transactions, with a view to ascertaining—

First. What became of the funds of said company invested in the various enterprises and corporations mentioned in the opinion of the Interstate Commerce Commission, No. 2384, case No. 4845, entitled "The New England investigation in the matter of rates, classifications, regulations, and practices of carriers," submitted May 20, 1913, and decided June 20, 1913.

Second. Whether the person or persons authorizing such investment of the funds of said company and the person or persons receiving the benefit thereof are liable to punishment under existing laws.

Third. Whether, under existing law, such funds so invested can be recovered on behalf of the stockholders of said company.

Fourth. What legislation, if any, is necessary to prevent the recurrence of similar transactions.

THE NAVAL MILITIA.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 8667.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8667) to promote the efficiency of the Naval Militia, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be read first for committee amendments.

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

The Secretary read the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, in section 5, page 4, line 23, before the word "appointment," to strike out "professional"; in line 24, before the word "examination," to insert "professional"; and on page 5, line 20, after the words "And provided further," to strike out "That when vessels in the service of the United States, commanded by Naval Militia officers, cooperate or act in conjunction with vessels commanded by officers of the Navy, the exercise of command over such combined force shall be determined by the rank which such commanding officers hold, except that, for the purposes of this proviso, Naval Militia captains, commanders, and lieutenant commanders shall be junior to lieutenant commanders of the Navy, unless specially certified for a higher grade by examination held under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy" and insert "That Naval Militia officers mustered as such into the service of the United States under the provisions of this act shall rank with but after officers of the Regular Navy in the same grade and rank; except that for the purpose of determining who shall exercise command over a combined force, composed of vessels commanded by Naval Militia officers and of vessels commanded by officers of the Navy acting in conjunction, all officers of the Naval Militia of or above the rank of lieutenant commander will be regarded as junior to lieutenant commanders of the Navy," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 5. That every officer and enlisted man of the Naval Militia who shall be called forth in the manner hereinbefore prescribed shall be mustered for service without further appointment or enlistment, and without further professional examination previous to such muster, except for those States and Territories and the District of Columbia, if the case may so be, which have not adopted a standard of professional and physical examination prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy for the Naval Militia, and whose officers and petty officers shall not have been examined and found qualified in accordance therewith by boards of officers which shall be appointed by said Secretary: *Provided, however*, That any officer or enlisted man of the Naval Militia so qualified who shall refuse or neglect to present himself for such muster upon being called forth as herein prescribed, shall be subject to trial by court-martial and shall be punished as such court-martial may direct: *Provided further*, That when in the service of the United States, officers of the Naval Militia may serve on courts-martial for the trial of officers and men of the Regular or Naval Militia Service, but in the cases

of courts-martial convened for the trial of officers of the Regular Service, the majority of the members shall be officers of the Regular Service; and officers and men of the Naval Militia may be tried by courts-martial the members of which are officers of the Regular or Naval Militia Service, or both: *And provided further*, That Naval Militia officers mustered as such into the service of the United States under the provisions of this act shall rank with but after officers of the Regular Navy in the same grade and rank; except that for the purpose of determining who shall exercise command over a combined force, composed of vessels commanded by Naval Militia officers and of vessels commanded by officers of the Navy acting in conjunction, all officers of the Naval Militia of or above the rank of lieutenant commander will be regarded as junior to lieutenant commanders of the Navy.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 10, page 8, line 9, after the word "District," to insert "made"; in line 13, after the word "made," to strike out "nor" and insert "or without"; and in line 23, after the words "United States," to strike out "except as hereinafter provided," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 10. That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to procure, by purchase or manufacture, and issue from time to time to the Naval Militia such number of United States service or other arms, accessories, accouterments, equipment, uniforms, clothing, equipage, and military and naval stores of all kinds, under such regulations as he may prescribe, as are necessary to arm, uniform, and equip all of the Naval Militia in the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia in accordance with the requirements of this act without charging the cost or value thereof or any expense connected therewith against the allotment of such State, Territory, or District made from the annual appropriation provided for the arming and equipping of the Naval Militia in the annual appropriation for the Navy, or in any other general appropriation for the Naval Militia that may hereafter be made, or without requiring payment therefor, and to issue from time to time ammunition suitable for such arms as the Naval Militia of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia may be equipped with, and to exchange said arms, accessories, accouterments, equipment, equipage, stores, and ammunition when the same shall have become obsolete, without receiving any money credit therefor, for other arms, accessories, accouterments, equipment, equipage, stores, and ammunition suitable for the Naval Militia: *Provided*, That said property shall remain the property of the United States and be annually accounted for by the governor or other proper officer of the States, Territories, and the commanding general District of Columbia Militia: *Provided further*, That each State, Territory, and the District of Columbia shall, when and as required by the Secretary of the Navy, turn in to the Navy Department, or otherwise dispose of, in accordance with the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, without receiving any money credit therefor, and without expense for transportation or otherwise, such or all property theretofore issued under the provisions of this act. To provide means to carry into effect the provisions of this section, the necessary money to cover the cost of procuring, exchanging, or issuing of arms, accessories, accouterments, equipment, uniforms, clothing, equipage, ammunition, and military and naval stores to be exchanged or issued hereunder is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That the sum expended in the execution of the purchases and issues provided for in this section shall not exceed the sum of \$200,000 in any fiscal year: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall annually submit to Congress a report of expenditures made by him in the execution of the requirements of this section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will call the attention of the Senator from Florida to line 8, page 3, and line 9, page 4, where the phraseology is used, "the laws of the Union." In all other instances in the bill the words "United States" are used, and I suggest to the Senator that it would be, perhaps, better to have it read "the laws of the United States."

Mr. BRYAN. Very well. In line 8, on page 3, I move to strike out the word "Union" and to insert "United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRYAN. On page 4, line 9, I move to strike out the word "Union" and insert the words "United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask to have printed in the RECORD that portion of the House report made by Mr. PADGETT, chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, which I designate on this copy.

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

[House Report No. 94, Sixty-third Congress, second session.]

EFFICIENCY OF NAVAL MILITIA, ETC.

Mr. PADGETT, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, submitted the following report (to accompany H. R. 8667):

The bill as amended meets the recommendations of the Navy Department, as well as the officers of the Naval Militia of the various States. At present there is no Organized Naval Militia, but many States of the Union have organizations which are independent and which are not subject to Federal control except wherein they receive the benefit of an annual appropriation of \$125,000, distributed among the various State organizations proportionate to their strength at the rate of about \$10 per man. In order that the State organizations may participate in this Federal appropriation the Navy Department attempts to require certain regulations to be enforced regarding the care of the equipment loaned

to such organizations and in matters of the general efficiency of the personnel.

The provisions of the bill under consideration tend to promote the efficiency of the various Naval Militias, and creates an Organized Militia which, in time of war, under certain conditions, will be subject to Federal control. In time of peace the Navy Department shall have such control as to prescribe the physical, moral, and military qualifications of the officers and enlisted men thereof. It is believed, therefore, that a more useful auxiliary of the naval force will be created, a force well trained and ready for service at the outbreak of war, and yet so organized as not to destroy local interest and sentiment, which is essential to all volunteer organizations in time of peace.

The bill establishes and defines, as far as is practicable, the same relation between the Regular Navy of the United States and the Organized Naval Militia as exists between the Regular Army and the National Guard under the terms of what is known as the Dick bill. The bill carries an appropriation of \$200,000 per year, and will make the allotment per man approximately the same as in the terms of the Dick bill for the National Guard.

The bill provides that enlistments in the Organized Militia shall be carried on under the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, which are, in fact, the same as required for entrance into the Regular Navy, and also provides for examinations of officers who may desire to qualify for commissions in the Regular Navy in the event of war.

It is not contemplated that the Organized Naval Militia shall enter the naval service of the United States in time of war as separate and distinct organizations in charge of fighting ships, but that the organizations may be divided up among the various fighting vessels in the battle line and its officers disseminated throughout the fleet. Experience has shown that with the limited Federal control possessed by the Navy Department at present, the State Naval Militia organizations as they exist to-day are efficient and perform excellent work during their summer maneuvers with the fleet, where they drill side by side with the regular officers and men of the Navy.

The Naval Militia at the outbreak of the Spanish War actually furnished in the war 3,332 officers and men, and so efficient was their work during the war that they received favorable commendation from their various commanding officers of the Regular Navy, and the strength of the Naval Militia in the various States grew to about 5,500 men and became a most valuable recruiting bureau for the Navy Department. The militia of the various States to-day numbers about 8,126 efficient and well-trained officers and men. If this bill be enacted into law, the President, in the event of war, can call upon these men, and the department states that they can be on board ship in fighting condition within a very short period of time.

Furthermore, the naval service has become so technical in character that those who would volunteer for duty in the service in time of need should be provided with facilities for perfecting themselves in the essentials of the service in time of peace. The Naval Militia of the various States is composed of highly trained mechanics and engineers, whose daily trades and professions particularly fit them for the technical service of the Navy. It is therefore on the Naval Militia that the department may largely depend for skilled artisans and technically trained men who have sufficient training in the naval side of their respective trades or professions to make them valuable for immediate service at any time.

Strength of Naval Militia organizations as reported on July 1, 1913.

State.	Officers.	Petty officers and men.
California.....	61	634
Connecticut.....	21	232
District of Columbia.....	12	139
Florida.....	16	133
Illinois.....	40	505
Indiana.....	17	292
Louisiana.....	27	346
Maine.....	6	120
Maryland.....	18	139
Massachusetts.....	42	640
Michigan.....	22	242
First Battalion.....	18	260
Second Battalion.....	17	222
Minnesota.....	15	211
Missouri.....	16	193
New Jersey.....	14	202
First Battalion.....	8	161
Second Battalion.....	14	124
New York.....	23	226
Headquarters.....	30	482
First Battalion.....	24	401
Second Battalion.....	21	326
Third Battalion.....	44	331
North Carolina.....	9	161
Ohio.....	14	124
First Battalion.....	23	226
Second Battalion.....	17	208
Oregon.....	16	193
Pennsylvania.....	18	146
Rhode Island.....	21	283
South Carolina.....	13	145
Washington.....		
Wisconsin.....		

Total number of officers..... 620

Total number petty officers and men..... 7,506

Grand total..... 8,126

In connection with the questions bearing upon the existing requirements in the various militias as to physical qualifications and professional qualifications the following excerpts from the Militia Law and Regulations of the State of Massachusetts are given as a general example:

"REGULATIONS, ARTICLE 4.

"SEC. 74. Every candidate for admission to the Massachusetts Volunteer Militia must be an able-bodied male of 18 years or upward.

"Enlistment.

"78. Officers making enlistments will prepare these rolls in triplicate.
 "79. Company commanders, immediately upon making enlistments, will notify recruits to appear before them to sign the enlistment rolls, and, after physical examination by a medical officer, will then order the recruits to appear at such time and place as shall be appointed for muster.
 "80. In signing enlistment rolls recruits will sign the Christian names in full.

"81. In the case of a regiment the companies of which are scattered in such a manner that the recruits can not, without much expense, go to a medical officer, the regimental commander will order such officer to travel to the armories of companies having recruits to muster, notifying the company commanders of such visit, and ordering them to have their recruits ready for examination at a stated time.

"MILITIA LAW.

"Sec. 84. The officers named in the preceding section as recruiting officers shall be mustering officers for mustering in and administering the prescribed oath of enlistment to all soldiers enlisted by them. Mustering officers shall forward to the commander in chief, through the proper military channels, the returns of the enlistment and muster in of soldiers as soon as practicable and not later than 10 days thereafter. Such returns shall be in such form and accompanied by such certificates, descriptive lists, and other information relating to the recruit as may be required by law or prescribed in orders by the commander in chief. But no recruit shall knowingly and intentionally be accepted who is not eligible for enlistment under the law or who is physically or otherwise below the standard prescribed by the commander in chief. No recruit having been accepted shall be mustered into the service until all the requirements of the statute law, of the militia regulations, and of all proper orders relating to the enlistment and muster in of soldiers have been complied with.

EXHIBIT A.
EXAMINING BOARDS.

"Sec. 61. Commissioned officers—except the staff officers of the commander in chief, medical officers, veterinarians, and chaplains—shall, upon being notified as provided in section 51, appear before a board of three medical officers, which shall examine the officers who appear before it as to their physical fitness to perform their duties. Such officers as said board finds to be physically competent, and so certifies, shall thereafter appear before an examining board, consisting of not less than five nor more than seven officers designated by the commander in chief. Members of said board shall not take part in the examination of or give any opinion, information, or advice as to the fitness or competence of any officer who has any business or family connection with them or might, as a result of the examination, come under their immediate command. The commander in chief may, if he thinks it necessary, make a temporary detail to fill a vacancy in said board caused by temporary ineligibility or absence.

"Sec. 62. A complete record shall be kept by the secretary of the board, elected by the board from its members, of all meetings of the board. Such record shall embrace a statement at length of the proceedings, including the names of the members present, the name of any officer temporarily assigned for duty upon the board, the name of any officer who is absent and the cause of his absence, the name of every officer examined and the questions put to him, with his answers, and copies of all communications from and the originals of all communications to the board, with the findings and action of the board in each case and the reasons therefor. Such record shall be submitted to the board at its next meeting thereafter for approval or correction.

"Sec. 63. After receiving from the board of medical officers a certificate of physical competency in the case of each officer who appears before it, the examining board shall examine all such officers as to their military, moral, and general qualifications as hereinafter set forth, and shall administer the oaths prescribed by section 73. If, in the opinion of the board, the officer is competent, it shall so certify to the commander in chief, who shall issue his order announcing the result of the examination. If the officer fails to pass a satisfactory examination, the board shall so notify him, and he may, within 10 days after the time when he receives such notice, appeal for a reexamination to the commander in chief, who may, after an examination of the record of the case, order a reexamination of such officer before said board or before a board convoked by him for the purpose.

"Sec. 64. Medical officers and veterinarians shall appear before an examining board, consisting of three medical officers designated by the commander in chief, which shall certify the competency of such officer, or give its reasons for refusing so to certify, and in case of a refusal it shall transmit the complete record, with its reasons for refusal, to the commander in chief. It shall administer the oaths prescribed for other commissioned officers.

"Sec. 65. An officer who fails to appear before a board of examiners within 40 days after the date of his election or appointment, and who does not furnish satisfactory explanation of his absence, or who fails to pass a satisfactory examination before the board authorized to examine or reexamine him, shall forthwith be discharged by the commander in chief; but such officer may enlist to secure continuous service, and his enlistment shall date from the day of his election to the office for which he failed to pass a satisfactory examination if he so enlists within 30 days after the date of his discharge from the office to which he was elected. A commissioned officer who has been discharged by reason of failure to pass a satisfactory examination shall not be eligible for election or appointment to a commission within two months after such discharge.

"Sec. 66. An officer resigning his commission may enlist to secure continuous service, and his enlistment shall date from the day of his resignation if he is mustered within 30 days thereafter.

"Sec. 67. Examinations for staff positions, except for members of the staff of the commander in chief, medical officers, and veterinarians, may be of such general character as to experience and moral and military qualifications as the board may in each case determine. A staff officer shall at his request, or if the board so orders, be examined in the manner provided for other officers.

"Sec. 68. Other officers shall be examined by written questions prepared in advance, equal in number and as nearly as possible equal in difficulty for officers of the same grade, the answers to which shall be in writing; but such questions may be greater in number and difficulty for officers of higher grades. A number of sets of such questions for the several grades shall be prepared in advance, under the direction of the board, for examination of officers of the several grades. No special set of questions shall be used in the examination of any officer. All questions propounded in examinations as to the technical military qualifications of an officer shall be based on military textbooks of recognized authority, to be selected from time to time by the examining

board. The titles of all books so selected and the number required shall be furnished to the Quartermaster General by said board, and the specific parts thereof adopted as the basis of examination shall be promulgated to the volunteer militia by the commander in chief in such manner as to indicate the exact scope or standard required of candidates in each respective grade or staff position, and the Quartermaster General shall furnish upon requisition to officers accountable for public property, copies of such books for the use of such officers and of those belonging to their commands. At such written examinations every officer shall also make, upon a prepared form, answers showing his military service and experience and his residence and occupation. Any other questions which the board or any member thereof may desire to ask shall be fully written out and the answers thereto shall be in writing. The board may make other inquiry relative to the officer ordered before it for examination, but such inquiry and the answer thereto shall in all cases be in writing, and all communications from and to the board shall be a part of the record and shall be preserved upon its files. Neither the board nor any member thereof shall make any inquiry or receive any communication, oral or written, relative to an officer before it, or who is to come before it, as to any matter affecting his qualifications as an officer in the militia except as above authorized.

"Sec. 69. The secretary of the board shall preserve all examinations, reports, and papers, and the findings of the board in the case of each officer; and the same shall, upon the demand of the commander in chief, be laid before him.

"Sec. 70. The provisions of the preceding nine sections shall, so far as they are applicable, apply also to any special board convoked by order of the commander in chief for examination of officers.

"Sec. 71. An officer who has passed his examination and has been assigned to duty shall not thereafter be ordered before the board of examiners while acting under the same commission; but said board may pass a candidate conditionally and order him to appear for further examination within 90 days after the date of his first examination, and an officer so conditionally passed who fails to appear before the board within the time designated, and does not furnish satisfactory explanation of his absence, or who then fails to pass a satisfactory examination, shall be discharged by the commander in chief.

"Sec. 72. An officer who in the opinion of his commanding officer is incompetent, or is impairing the efficiency of the organization to which he is attached, by mismanagement, neglect, or misconduct in civil life for which he is not amenable to court-martial, may, upon the request of his commanding officer, be ordered to appear before a special board of examiners, consisting of not less than three nor more than seven officers, none of whom shall be of lower rank than the officer under investigation. The members of such board may, for cause, be challenged by the accused as provided by the regulations as to courts-martial, and vacancies thus created shall be filled in the manner prescribed for military boards. Said board shall without delay inquire into the charges preferred against the accused, and may examine him, as provided in section 63, as to his mental and military qualifications; but the accused may produce any competent evidence, by witnesses or otherwise, and may be represented by counsel. The president of such board may administer oaths to witnesses, and may issue summonses as provided in section 185; and officers or soldiers failing to serve such summons, or failing to appear when so summoned without a sufficient excuse, shall be liable to trial by court-martial as for disobedience of orders, or may, as well as other witnesses failing to appear, be compelled to appear, as provided by section 10 of chapter 175 of the Revised Laws. Such board may, with the approval of the commander in chief, require a judge advocate to attend its sittings, when taking testimony or investigating any complaint. It shall report the facts, with the evidence and its recommendations, to the commander in chief, who may, if the board so recommends, discharge such officer. An officer failing to appear, as ordered, before such special board shall be discharged by the commander in chief.

The following excerpts from Massachusetts General Orders, No. 2, adjutant general's office, February 1, 1907, indicate the minimum professional requirements for officers in the Naval Militia:

EXHIBIT B.
Naval brigade.

Ensigns.....	Elements of Navigation, Henderson. Bowditch's Navigator..... Navy Regulations..... Militia Law.....	Pages 1-70, 185-189, 193. Pages 1, 6-25, 38-53, 61-64. Chapters 2, 4, 13, 35. Chapter 463, acts of 1905, and amendments.
	Regulations Massachusetts Volunteer Militia. Landing Force, United States Navy, 1905.	All. All except Part V. The School of Battalion and Brigade not required in examination for ensigns.
	Ship and Gun Drill, United States Navy, 1905. Boat Book, United States Navy, 1905. Bluejackets' Manual, United States Navy.	All except pages 130-200. All. All except pages 202-206, 214-224. Where this book conflicts with above the newest book will be authority.
Lieutenants (junior grade).	All that is required of ensigns, and Elements of Navigation, Henderson. Bowditch's Navigator.....	Pages 70-102, 133-144, 178-185, 189-193. Pages 65-73, 89-100, 111-113, 127-133, 148-154, 167 (par. 378).
	Nautical Almanac.....	Familiarize yourself with tables.
	Luce's Seamanship.....	Chapters 6, 14, 17, 18, 23 (pp. 444-447), 29 (pp. 476-479), 35.
	Navy Regulations.....	Chapters 3, 12.
	Company Record Books.....	Knowledge of.
Lieutenants.....	All that is required of lieutenants (junior grade), and Luce's Seamanship.	Chapters 11-13, 16, 28, 33 (pp. 518-519, 525, 526), 34 (pp. 582, 583), Appendixes F, G, K, N.
	Navy Regulations.....	Chapters 9-11.

Naval brigade—Continued.

Lieutenant commanders and captains.	All that is required of lieutenants, and Elements of Navigation, Henderson. Bowditch's Navigator.	Pages 103-133, 144-173, 202, 203. Pages 53-60, 100-110, 113-118, 142-147, 155-162, 169-172. Whole book. Do.
Books of reference for naval brigade line officers.	Sturdy's Navigator. Diehl's Compensation of Compass. Ingersoll's Gunnery.	
Adjutant.	Knight's Seamanship. Landing Force, United States Navy, 1905. Ship and Gun Drills, United States Navy, 1905. Bluejackets' Manual, United States Navy. Navy Regulations. Militia Law.	Whole book, except Part V. Part VII. All except chapters 5, 6. Chapters 2, 4, 13, 35. Chapter 465, acts of 1905, and amendments. All.
Ordnance officer.	Regulations Massachusetts Volunteer Militia. Bluejackets' Manual, United States Navy. Ship and Gun Drills, United States Navy, 1905. Boat Book, United States Navy, 1905. Landing Force, United States Navy, 1905. Navy Regulations. Militia Law.	All except pages 202-205, 214-234. All except pages 130-200. All. Part I. Chapters 2, 4, 13, 35. Chapter 465, acts of 1905, and amendments. All.
Equipment officer.	Regulations Massachusetts Volunteer Militia. United States Small Arms Firing Regulations, 1904. Navy Regulations. Militia Law.	All. All. Chapters 2, 4, 13, 35. Chapter 465, acts of 1905, and amendments. All.
Paymaster.	Boat Book, United States Navy, 1905. Regulations Massachusetts Volunteer Militia. Landing Force, United States Navy, 1905. Bluejackets' Manual, United States Navy. Quartermasters' Manual, United States Army. Navy Regulations. Militia Law.	Part I. All except chapters 5, 6. All. Chapters 2, 4, 13, 16, 35. Chapter 465, acts of 1905, and amendments. All.
Engineer and assistant engineer.	Regulations Massachusetts Volunteer Militia. Bluejackets' Manual, United States Navy. Barton's "Naval Engines and Machinery." Bieg's "Naval Boilers." Navy Regulations. "The Marine Steam Engine," by Richard Sennett and Henry J. Oram, fifth edition, 1900. Militia Law.	All except chapters 5, 6. Chapters 1, 2 (except pages 20-34), 3, 4 (except pages 50-84), 5 (except pages 96, 98, 107, 108), 7-9 (except pages 227-246), 14 (except pages 362-381), 17-19. Chapters 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-11, 13-15, 16 (except pages 255-266), 17. Chapters and appendix relating to engineers and engines and boilers. Also chapters 2, 4, 13, 35. All. Chapter 465, acts of 1905, and amendments. All.
Signal officer.	Regulations Massachusetts Volunteer Militia. Bluejackets' Manual, United States Navy. Landing Force, United States Navy, 1905. Navy Regulations. Militia Law.	All except chapters 5, 6. Part VI, except pages 424-484. Chapters 2-4, 13, 35. Chapter 465, acts of 1905, and amendments. All.
Assistant paymaster.	Regulations Massachusetts Volunteer Militia. Boat Book, United States Navy, 1905. Bluejackets' Manual, United States Navy. Same as paymaster, and, in addition, Manual for the Subsistence Department, United States Army, 1902.	All. All. All except chapter 5.

SUMMARY OF TEXTBOOKS.

"Infantry Drill Regulations, United States Army.
"Militia Law, chapter 465, acts of 1905.
"Field Service Regulations, 1905.
"Guard Manual, 1902.
"United States Small Arms Firing Regulations, 1904.
"United States Pamphlet on Correspondence.
"Regulations Massachusetts Volunteer Militia.
"Security and Information, Wagner.
"Manual of Army Cooks.
"Organization of Tactics, Wagner.
"Manual of Field Engineering, Beach.
"United States Army Regulations, 1904.
"Quartermasters' Manual, United States Army.

"Manual for Subsistence Department, United States Army, 1902.
"Light Artillery Drill Regulations.
"Dyer's Boots and Saddles.
"Dyer's Handbook of Light Artillery.
"Cavalry Drill Regulations, 1902.
"Manual of Visual Signaling, United States Signal Corps, 1905.
"Land Forces of United States, Elements of, 1905, Adjutant General's Office, Massachusetts.
"Catechism of Outpost Duty, Wagner.
"Articles of War, Revised Statutes, paragraph 1342.
"Winthrop's Abridgment of Military Law, fourth edition.
"Drill Regulations for Coast Artillery, United States Army.
"Tactics of Coast Defense, Wisser.
"The Gunner's Manual, Best.
"The Gunner's Catechism, Hamilton.
"Ordnance and Gunnery, Bruff.
"Lectures on Explosives, Walke.
"Mahan's Permanent Fortifications, Merour.
"Elements of Navigation, Henderson.
"Bowditch's Navigator.
"Navy Regulations, 1905.
"Landing Force, United States Navy, 1905.
"Ship and Gun Drills, United States Navy, 1905.
"Boat Book, United States Navy, 1905.
"Bluejackets' Manual, United States Navy.
"Nautical Almanac, 1906.
"Luce's Seamanship.
"Sturdy's Navigator.
"Diehl's Compensation of the Compass.
"Ingersoll's Gunnery.
"Knight's Seamanship.
"Barton's Naval Engines and Machinery.
"Bieg's Naval Boilers.
"The Marine Steam Engine, by R. Sennett and H. J. Oram, fifth edition, 1900.
"Notes on Military Hygiene, by Col. Alfred A. Woodhull."

EXHIBIT C.

[Circular letter No. 1.]

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1910.

SIR: The following concerning the constitution of the personnel of the Naval Militia is recommended to all organizations now in existence or that may hereafter be formed:

Since the plan of organization varies in the different States, and since any efforts toward uniformity must proceed by easy stages, the recommendations contained herein involve no changes in present organization; that is, where the organization consists of companies or divisions, line or engineer, or is modeled on the complement of a ship's company, these may remain as at present. The desideratum is that the total force shall contain men in the different ratings and callings—"deck," "engineer," "electrical," "mechanical," and "miscellaneous"—about in the proportion as a modern ship's complement. In other words, the total force, or a division or company, shall contain all branches of the service, just as the landing force from a ship has in its ranks all such branches. With such an organization any Naval Militia force is ready to man a ship in its entirety or fill vacancies in all ratings on a ship of the Navy.

The Naval Militia organizations began as essentially military organizations; the training was in armories, supplemented by work in relatively small boats. For this purpose the military organization was a natural and a good one. With the progress that followed the Spanish War, when vessels of small size—converted yachts, etc.—were available for loan to the Naval Militia, the conditions materially changed. The training is now becoming essentially naval. Vessels of large size—gunboats, small cruisers, and coast defense—are being assigned the militia. It is only necessary to cite the *Marblehead*, *Nashville*, *Isla de Cuba*, *Isla de Luzon*, *Yankee*, etc. The vessels should be manned by the Naval Militia as they would be by the Navy. The training should be such that on a sudden call to war the vessel should be able to proceed at once with a complete complement.

There are given below the complements of several types of vessels, showing about the relative proportion of the several more numerous branches:

Class of ship.	Deck force.	Engineer force.	Electrical force.	Total complement.
Battleship (Connecticut).....	461	240	30	834
Cruiser (New York).....	221	155	12	447
Cruiser (Chicago).....	196	119	8	377
Gunboat (Marblehead).....	121	77	4	239
Gunboat (Nashville).....	84	47	6	169
Monitor (Ozark).....	113	53	10	209

Organizations on this basis will be able to train completely on a vessel that they can man on telegraphic notice. It is therefore earnestly recommended that the States take up the matter along these lines and submit their organization in requesting the loan of a vessel.

While it is desired to approach as near as possible the above-mentioned proportions, it is desired to call attention to the fact that localities differ as to their resources in materials, and each should develop to the highest degree such facilities as its locality offers. In any case, the need in time of war or of peace of skilled men—engineers, electricians, telegraphers, wireless operators, and mechanics of all branches—is so great that it is recommended that the personnel be recruited in those branches at the expense of the seamen branch.

Respectfully,

BEEKMAN WINTHROP,
Assistant Secretary.

EXHIBIT D.

[Circular letter No. 2.]

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1910.

SIR: 1. The summer exercises of the Naval Militia organizations on the Atlantic coast for the season 1910 will take place July 24 to 31, inclusive, and this will require that the men of each organization obtain leave for at least the period July 23 to August 1, inclusive. The rendezvous will be at Gardiners Bay, Long Island, and the cruise

will be in that vicinity, visiting such ports as may be practicable, the vessels to disband in time to permit each visiting some large city for liberty.

2. The exercises of the organizations on the Great Lakes will take place August 8 to 17, inclusive, and this will require that the men of each organization obtain sufficient additional leave to enable them to arrive at the place of rendezvous prior to and leave after the completion of the cruise on the dates shown above. The rendezvous will be at Thunder Bay (Alpena), Mich., and the cruise will be down the Lakes to Buffalo, N. Y. It has been calculated that the cruise from Thunder Bay to Buffalo and return, maintaining a steady speed, will require about six days; therefore the necessity for 10 days, as outlined above, is apparent, as this period will allow 4 days for liberty, anchorages, and drills. Any less period than this will necessitate entirely remodeling the cruise, and it is requested that, if possible, the organizations make provision for this amount of time.

3. The following applies to the exercises of both the lake and the Atlantic coast organizations, as provided for in the preceding paragraphs:

Target practice will not be held during these exercises, but special circulars will be issued later on the subject. The exercises will consist of as much cruising, day and night, as is practicable, carrying on drills, signals, etc., the entire time. It is important that all line officers become as familiar as possible with Rules of the Road and all signal and cruising lights used in the Navy. To this end it is suggested that advantage be taken during the winter and spring of all opportunities offered by the Hydrographic Office to learn chart and compass work.

4. It is believed that keeping position "in formations" can be vastly improved if early attention is given to the following three points:

(a) Provide voice tubes, telephones, or some mechanical apparatus between the bridge and the engine room. (A report on the apparatus, if any, now installed, with recommendations for improvements, is requested at an early date. The department believes it is quite within the capacity of the Naval Militia and the ship keepers to install such apparatus.)

(b) Standardize the ship's propellers. (The department earnestly recommends that each organization proceed as soon as navigation permits to standardize the ship's propellers. Where there is no current, three runs over a carefully measured distance between landmarks that are perfectly located on the chart, noting accurately the time and counting the revolutions, will determine the revolutions per minute corresponding to a given speed. These experiments should be made for at least three speeds—one-half, three-quarters, and full speed—and a curve plotted for all speeds. The data, when obtained, should be forwarded immediately to the department.)

(c) Compasses to be carefully compensated and deviation tables prepared.

5. In view of this early notice the department will be gratified if the organizations cruising in their own vessels can arrange for a period of exercises of not less than 10 days together; that is, 10 days from the time of arriving at the place of rendezvous to the time the squadron disbands. The exercises aboard the battle ships will be for a period of eight days, exclusive of the time required to proceed to and return from the battle ships.

6. It is particularly desired that the attendance on the part of the Naval Militia be up to the full capacity of the vessels taking part.

7. A detailed itinerary for each of the lake and Atlantic coast exercises will be published later, so that necessary arrangements can be made for the sending and receiving of mail.

CRUISES OF INDIVIDUAL VESSELS OF ISOLATED ORGANIZATIONS—CALIFORNIA, LOUISIANA, NORTH CAROLINA, AND MISSOURI.

8. The department desires that the summer exercises of the Naval Militia of the States of California, Louisiana, North Carolina, and Missouri may be this year as complete and exhaustive as possible, and that practically every member of each organization shall take part.

9. As regards California, the *Marblehead* will take only a portion of the total strength of that organization. The excess over the complement of the *Marblehead* will be assigned to the Pacific Fleet, the necessary instructions in connection with such assignment to be made later. It is believed that by thus alternating the officers and men between the ships of the Navy and their own cruising vessel a progressive training will be established and the best results obtained.

10. The department selects the date July 17 to 24, inclusive, as the period for embarking the California organization on the vessels of the Pacific Fleet, and recommends that the cruise of the *Marblehead* take place at the same time. The above-mentioned period for instruction will require that the men of the organization obtain leave for at least the period July 16 to 25, inclusive.

11. As regards the organizations of Louisiana, North Carolina, and Missouri, it is not practicable for the vessels assigned to these States to take part in any combined exercises, and as there are not as yet any funds available for their transportation to and from the battleship fleet the department outlines the following suggestions:

(a) That each organization be recruited up to its allowed strength along the lines given in department's Circular Letter No. 1, of January 17, 1910.

(b) That the total force of each organization be divided into sections equal to the capacity of the cruising vessel.

(c) That arrangements be made for as many cruises of not less than seven days' duration as there are sections provided for by paragraph (b) above.

12. As a preparation for this cruising, it is important that the line officers become as familiar as possible with the Rules of the Road, anchoring, getting under way, etc., and should particularly take advantage of all opportunities offered by the hydrographic officer for instruction in chart and compass work.

13. The department leaves to each organization (Louisiana, North Carolina, and Missouri) the selection of the date for its exercises, but requests that an early decision may be arrived at and the entire organization so informed, that the maximum number of men may be able to secure the necessary leave from their vocations in order that they may take part.

14. The department recommends that each cruise of all individual vessels be continuous for the period allowed, not returning to the home port until the completion of each cruise, in order that the officers and men may get the maximum experience in navigating, anchoring, getting under way, etc., and become as familiar with the local waters as time will allow.

15. A naval officer will be detailed, if practicable, to accompany each vessel as adviser, and this applies to the exercises of the Atlantic coast, Great Lakes, and of individual vessels. In the meanwhile the naval recruiting officer in the port of each organization, if such an officer is available, will lend all assistance in his power in perfecting the plans as outlined above.

16. It is earnestly requested that the organizations of California, Louisiana, North Carolina, and Missouri submit to the department at as early a date as possible the tentative plans of the organization, including date set for cruises, in the matter of summer exercises, and the department will hold itself in readiness to render such assistance as is in its power.

EXERCISES ON THE BATTLESHIPS.

17. As the vessels assigned to the States on the Atlantic coast will accommodate but a portion of the total force of the respective organizations, those in excess of the complement of the State vessel will be sent to the Atlantic Battleship Fleet under arrangements similar to those of the exercises of 1909. In this connection the department at a later date will require a statement from each organization of the number of officers and men in the several ranks and ratings who will require assignment to the battleship fleet. Details as to the mode of transportation to and from the battleships can not be given at this date, as it may be dependent on legislative action. Such organizations as took part in the battleship fleet exercises of 1909 are familiar with the details. Bags and hammocks are required, but not mess gear.

18. For such organizations having no vessels, where the States have funds available for the pay, subsistence, and transportation of their men to and from points to be fixed by the department for the embarkation on transports, battleships, or other vessels, the question of assigning the men of those organizations to vessels for instruction will be given consideration.

19. With all the above arrangements strictly carried out, and the early knowledge by all members of the organization of the dates set for its exercises, whether combined or individual, the attendance should approach the total organized strength of each Naval Militia organization.

Respectfully,

BEEKMAN WINTHROP,
Assistant Secretary.

UNITED STATES NAVAL MILITIA, 1887-1907.

"An examination of the Naval Militia movement shows that it has grown out of an endeavor to create a force of men and ships to be available for reinforcing the Regular Navy on demand.

"Mr. Whitthorne introduced Senate bill 3320, February 17, 1887. 'To create a naval reserve of auxiliary cruisers, officers, and men from the mercantile marine of the United States.' The measure did not become a law. The Navy Department, in 1887, prepared a plan of organization for a Naval Militia.

"Mr. Whitthorne introduced, January 4, 1888, H. R. 1847, and substituted, June 26, 1888, H. R. 10622. 'To provide for the enrollment of Naval Militia and the organization of naval forces, etc.' This bill did not become a law, but it was the basis of State action in several States.

"On October 1, 1891, California, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, and Texas reported an enrolled Naval Militia of 1,149 men and officers. These forces were parts of the National Guard or Volunteer Militia of their States.

"In 1892 Texas had dropped out and South Carolina came in. The total enrolled Naval Militia was 1,794. The organizations of four States were drilled on seagoing men-of-war in the Navy.

"In 1893 the force reported from nine States was 2,376. The Naval Militia of five States drilled on naval vessels.

"In 1894 11 States reported 2,539 men, exclusive of officers. The Naval Militia of six States was drilled on naval vessels.

"In 1895 13 States reported 2,695 men, exclusive of officers. Most of the battalions went into camp. The Naval Militia of four States was drilled on naval vessels. One State's force made a boat reconnaissance and survey.

"In 1896 14 States reported 3,330 men, exclusive of officers. Most of the organizations were drilled on naval vessels. Some went into camp.

"In 1897 15 States reported 3,703 men. The Naval Militia of 12 States was drilled on naval vessels and with torpedo boats. Target practice, mainly with subcaliber guns, was given. A memorandum for the probable field of operations was prepared from the views of the Naval War College and reports of boards of inspections.

"This memorandum included—

- "1. Manning a flotilla for defense of interior waters.
- "2. Protection of harbors by mines and improvised batteries.
- "3. Maintenance of signal stations and a system of scouting.

"In 1898, prior to the outbreak of hostilities of the Spanish-American War, it was found necessary to make a large increase in the enlisted force of the Navy.

"The only additional trained men available were the officers and men of the Naval Militia of the several States, which, under appropriations from Congress, had been armed, equipped, and given training in the line of defense of the coasts and harbors. In the absence of authority for calling these men into service the governors of these States patriotically granted them leaves of absence or permitted them to resign from the Naval Militia in order to enlist in the Navy.

"During the war about 4,000 officers and men were added to the Navy in this manner and were assigned to duty in the auxiliary naval forces, the coast signal service, and especially on cruising ships, of which the *Yankee*, *Disie*, *Prairie*, and *Yosemite* were entirely officered and manned by them, with the exception of the commanding, executive, and navigating officers.

"These organizations were largely recruited outside of the seagoing class, and lacked the experience in gunnery, navigation, and habits of the sea necessary to immediate high efficiency in the Navy. On the other hand, they were men of a high standard of education and intelligence and rapidly acquired while on shipboard the necessary knowledge. The country has been amply repaid for the money expended in their instruction and training.

"The auxiliary naval force was authorized by resolution approved May 26, 1898, for coast defense. The personnel of the force was almost entirely contributed by the Naval Militia organizations of the several States. A small percentage was supplied by the merchant marine. Ten monitors were put in commission and officered and manned by the Naval Militia. Many of those vessels cruised from port to port and went to sea for target practice, which gave the officers and men valuable training. This service afforded a sense of protection to the people along our Atlantic coast line. Ten yachts and 5 tugs were purchased. At its maximum strength the auxiliary naval force included 41 vessels in commission.

"The duty of protecting mine fields and of maintaining quarantine regulations was performed by a fleet of 8 converted yachts, 10 converted tugs, and 1 side-wheel steamer, all officered and manned by men from the Naval Militia, and by 4 revenue cutters, with their regular officers and crews, which were stationed on the Pacific coast.

"The Atlantic coast line was divided into eight districts, in which were distributed 38 signal stations, officered and manned entirely by the State Naval Militia. This signal service extended along our coasts from Maine to Texas.

"Eight hundred and fifty-six volunteer officers served in the Navy in the Spanish-American War. A large proportion of them were officers of the Naval Militia. Secretary of the Navy John D. Long states:

"The zeal and attention to duty of these volunteer officers were of a high order."

"The experience of the Spanish-American War demonstrated the necessity of a national naval-reserve force to be subject to the call of the National Government in time of war. This war also demonstrated the fitness and efficiency of the Naval Militia to perform every duty that has been demanded of it.

"In 1899 the Naval Militia of 16 States was drilled under the supervision of regular Navy officers on men-of-war, and the enlisted men numbered 6,302.

"In 1900 nine militia forces were drilled on naval vessels, and the number of men dropped to 5,309. Five States had the use of vessels lent by the department under the provisions of the act approved August 3, 1894.

"In 1901 six States' militia were drilled under the direction of naval officers, and the number of enrolled men dropped to 4,679. The drills conducted by the militia officers were increased in number and improved in quality.

"From 1901 to 1906 the routine of drills has continued; the number of enrolled men has averaged 4,808.

"Several States have expended appropriations directly for their Naval Militia, and there is a tendency to distinguish between Naval Militia and National Guard plainly shown in State legislation.

"It is reported by inspecting officers of the Navy that the Naval Militia is lacking in proper facilities to secure the best results in drill and instruction.

"The Secretary of the Navy, by order dated October 21, 1905, has placed the Naval Militia under the Assistant Secretary. The allotments to the State militia of the funds appropriated by Congress are directed by him and are proportional to the number of enlisted men. The allotments are expended or disbursed by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, and arms, equipment, etc., are issued by the Bureau of Ordnance.

"There is annexed a table showing the naval vessels lent to the militia of the various States and the District of Columbia.

"The *Puritan*, of the District Naval Militia, is the only vessel with a modern battery used by the militia.

"The annexed tabulation of enlisted men of the militia shows the number enrolled for every year from 1891 to 1906, both years included. On same sheet is given the annual appropriations by Congress for arming and equipping the Naval Militia. The total is \$705,000 to date. The number of commissioned officers is about 10 per cent of the enlisted force.

EXTRACT FROM LIEUT. SOUTHERLAND'S REPORT ON THE OPERATIONS OF THE NAVAL MILITIA.

[Nov. 15, 1898.]

"A condensed résumé of the service performed by the Naval Militia during the war is as follows:

"California: The Naval Militia of this State at the outbreak of hostilities consisted of 37 officers and 527 men.

"Of this number, 13 officers and 80 men were mustered into the naval service, all of whom served on auxiliary naval force vessels.

"Connecticut: The Naval Militia of this State furnished 15 officers and 188 men to the naval service.

"Florida: The Naval Militia of this State, which at the outbreak of hostilities numbered 24 officers and about 200 men, supplied 6 officers and 93 men to the naval service. Of this number, 2 officers and 58 men served on auxiliary naval force vessels and 4 officers and 35 men served in the coast signal service.

"Illinois: The Naval Militia of this State furnished 19 officers and 709 men to the naval service. All volunteered for the war and saw active service in every field of naval operations on the Cuban and Porto Rican coasts. The majority of this number were assigned as follows:

Vessel.	Officers.	Men.
Indiana.....		17
Massachusetts.....		1
Oregon.....		60
Puritan.....		6
Newark.....		17
Amphitrite.....		2
Terror.....		9
Nashville.....		12
Annapolis.....		8
Vicksburg.....		8
Newport.....		26
Bancroft.....		6
Fern.....	1	8
Marietta.....		16
Cushing.....		3
Foot.....		2
Rodgers.....		1
Winslow.....		2
Leyden.....	1	4
Franklin.....	1	18
Dorothea.....		3
Sterling.....	2	
Texas.....	1	
Scorpion.....	1	
Yale.....		84
Harvard.....		57
Southern.....	1	9
Cassius.....	1	27
Yankton.....	1	39
New Orleans.....		3
Lancaster.....	4	46
Cincinnati.....		60
Detroit.....		2
San Francisco.....		8
Montgomery.....		20
Wilmington.....		13
Hector.....		21
Suwanee.....		4

Vessel.	Officers.	Men.
Mangrove.....		1
Lebanon.....		3
Oseola.....		1
Wompatuck.....		5
Maple.....		9
Niagara.....		4
Hawk.....		2
Saturn.....		1
Solace.....		1
Viking.....		2
Wasp.....		3
Peoria.....		1
Resolute.....		2
Vulcan.....		1
Accomac.....		1
Tecumseh.....		1
Siren.....	1	
Stranger.....	1	
Kanawha.....	1	
Alexander.....	1	

"Louisiana: The Naval Militia of this State furnished a total of 19 officers and 214 enlisted men to the Navy. In addition to this number about 200 men were recruited by the State authorities after the outbreak of hostilities, but were not taken into the regular service, enlistment in which had been stopped. Of the above number supplied to the service, 10 officers and 94 enlisted men were detailed to the U. S. S. *Passaic*, 7 officers and 97 men to the United States auxiliary naval force and at the Pensacola Navy Yard, and 2 officers and 23 men to the coast signal service. Of this detail to the Pensacola Navy Yard, 35 were sent to the receiving ship *Lancaster* at Key West and afterwards distributed to the ships of the North Atlantic Fleet.

"In addition to the above naval militiamen, 6 of the Louisiana battalion served in the Revenue-Marine Service; 20 served on Army transports, and 25 served in the various volunteer regiments recruited in the State of Louisiana; 3 enlisted in the Fifth United States Cavalry; 2 in the Eighteenth United States Infantry; and 2 in the Volunteer Artillery. These latter were men who failed to get into the naval service, but were anxious to serve their country in any capacity.

"Maryland: The Naval Militia of this State at the outbreak of the war consisted of 20 officers and 320 men, and its commanding officer was authorized by the governor to increase this number as occasion demanded. The total mustered into the United States naval service was 24 officers and 425 petty officers and enlisted men who were assigned as follows:

Ship.	Officers.	Men.
U. S. S. <i>Dixie</i>	10	267
U. S. S. <i>Apache</i>	4	24
U. S. S. <i>Ajax</i>	2	55
U. S. S. <i>Lancaster</i>		25
U. S. S. <i>Katahdin</i>	3	
U. S. S. <i>Dale</i>	4	31
U. S. S. <i>Restless</i>		6
U. S. S. <i>Elfrida</i>	5	
U. S. S. <i>Minneapolis</i>		11
Equipment Bureau.....	1	
U. S. S. <i>Dolphin</i>		1
Total.....	24	425

"Massachusetts: The Naval Militia of this State supplied 38 officers and 384 men to the naval service. Of this number, 7 officers and 138 men served on the U. S. S. *Prairie*; 20 officers and 246 men served on the auxiliary naval force vessels *Minnesota*, *Lehigh*, *Catskill*, *Governor Russell*, *East Boston*, *Wyandotte*, *Inca*, and *Seminole*; and 2 officers and 36 men served in the coast signal service.

"After the outbreak of hostilities this organization was increased, in accordance with an act of the Legislature of Massachusetts, by four divisions, each containing 3 officers and 55 men.

"Michigan: The Naval Militia of this State, which, at the beginning of the war, consisted of 18 officers and 175 men, furnished 11 officers and 270 men to the naval service, all of whom served on the U. S. S. *Yosemite*, many of this number having joined the organization after the commencement of hostilities.

"New Jersey: The Naval Militia of this State furnished 34 officers and 373 men to the naval service. Of this number, 20 officers and 261 petty officers and men served on the U. S. S. *Badger* and U. S. S. *Resolute*; 9 officers and 74 petty officers and men in the auxiliary naval force on the U. S. S. *Montauk*; and 1 officer and 19 petty officers and men in the coast signal service.

"New York: The Naval Militia of the State of New York furnished 49 officers and 805 petty officers and men to the United States naval service. The following statement will show, in detail, the disposal of this force:

Statement showing disposal of officers and men of the Naval Militia of New York who entered the United States Navy.

Organization.	Officers.	Men.
Staff of captain.....	3	
First Naval Battalion.....	10	267
First Separate Naval Division.....	1	16
Second Separate Naval Division.....		7
Second Naval Battalion.....		4
Total.....	14	294
Coast signal service.....	4	28
U. S. S. <i>Yankee</i>	8	265
U. S. S. <i>Stranger</i>	1	
U. S. S. <i>Vermont</i>	1	
U. S. S. <i>St. Paul</i>		1
Total.....	14	294

Statement showing the manner in which the officers and men of the Naval Militia of New York who entered the United States auxiliary naval force have been utilized.

Organization.	Officers.	Men.	Ordered to—	Officers.	Men.
Captain and staff.....	3		Nahant.....	8	97
First Naval Battalion.....	10	93	Jason.....	8	86
Second Naval Battalion.....	20	350	Englewood.....	2	32
First Separate Naval Division.....		13	Huntress.....		24
Second Separate Naval Division.....	2	55	Free Lance.....	2	17
			Restless.....		25
			Sylvia.....	2	26
			Elfrida.....	1	30
			Alleen.....	1	28
			Franklin.....		46
			Kanawha.....	1	25
			Coast signal service.....		2
			Third District Auxiliary Naval Force.....	2	
			Washington Auxiliary Naval Force.....	1	
			Yankee from New Hampshire.....		17
			New Hampshire.....	7	66
Total.....	35	511	Total.....	35	511

"North Carolina: The Naval Militia of this State furnished 9 officers and 189 men to the naval service.

"Pennsylvania: The Naval Militia of this State at the outbreak of the war consisted of 19 officers and 252 petty officers and men.

"Fifteen commissioned officers and 84 petty officers and men were mustered into the naval service. Two men from the ranks passed as officers and are included in the 15, but are not included in the 19.

"The reason why such a small number of men entered the service was that the Government stopped enlisting after two of the three divisions only had been examined, thus reducing the total examined by 4 commissioned officers and 84 petty officers and men. Two of the Philadelphia officers were unable to answer the call.

"Out of the two Philadelphia divisions examined, 49 were rejected physically, 21 were rejected because of under age, and the difference of 14 men did not report for examination.

"Those mustered into the service were as follows:

"One officer to command auxiliary naval force, fourth district.

"One officer to command U. S. R. S. St. Louis.

"One officer to command the U. S. S. Alleen.

"One officer to command the U. S. S. Minneapolis.

"Two officers to command the U. S. S. Viking.

"Six officers and 58 men to the U. S. S. Arctic.

"Two officers to the U. S. S. Huntress.

"One officer to the U. S. S. Sylph.

"Twenty-one men to the coast signal service.

"Rhode Island: The Naval Militia organization of this State consisted of 15 officers and 159 men at the outbreak of hostilities, of which number 8 officers and 147 men were mustered into the naval service, not including the commanding officer, who, being on the retired list of the Navy, was ordered to duty.

"South Carolina: At the outbreak of the war the Naval Militia of this State consisted of 21 officers and 302 men, which force was increased by 102 volunteers within 10 days after hostilities commenced. Of this number, 18 officers, 6 mates, and 187 enlisted men were mustered into the naval service and were distributed as follows:

Detailed for—	Commissioned officers.	Mates.	Enlisted men.
U. S. S. Celtic.....	6		80
Naval batteries, Port Royal.....	5		40
Coast signal service, fourth district.....	3		20
U. S. S. Cheyenne.....	1		15
U. S. S. Chickasaw.....	1		15
U. S. S. Waban.....	1		15
Assistant, naval station, Port Royal.....	1		
U. S. S. Massachusetts.....		1	
U. S. S. Hercules.....		1	
Navy yard, New York.....		4	
U. S. S. Morrill.....			2
Total (in United States Navy, 211).....	18	6	187

"In addition to the above, this organization furnished 16 men to the United States Volunteer Army. The remaining 198 men were not called out, but remained ready to serve at any time.

"Virginia: The Naval Militia of this State furnished 2 officers and 62 men to the Navy, of which number 48 men were enlisted in the regular service and 2 officers and 11 men did duty in the coast signal service.

"Although these organizations, many of whose members were recruited outside the seafaring class, failed to fully meet the requirements of the case, they were all upon which the General Government had to draw at the beginning of the war. A majority of these, through cooperation on the part of the governors of their States, answered the call of the Government and were mustered into the service for duty on cruising ships in the United States auxiliary naval force and in the coast signal service. The Navy Department was hampered in its efforts at rapid mobilization by its lack of Federal jurisdiction over these organizations, but in the end succeeded in obtaining a force of over 4,000 officers and men.

"Too much can not be said of the patriotism displayed by a majority of the members of these organizations, many of whom, although they had never been to sea before the war, knew that they were to face not only the dangers of war, but hardships to which they had never been accustomed.

"Of a total force of 24,123 enlisted men employed in the Navy during this war, 4,216 were mustered in from Naval Militia organizations, of which number about 2,600 served in the Regular Navy, the remainder in the auxiliary naval force and coast signal service. As a rule, they had not been sufficiently trained in a practical knowledge of the modern implements of war, of the ship's organization, and the requirements of

a sea life to make them of much actual value for some time after joining a vessel; but, possessing a high average of education and intelligence, they picked up their duties quickly, especially in those cases where they were surrounded by trained man-of-war's men, and when the war ended were becoming quite efficient in their various grades and rates."

On request from the Naval Militia of the various States, and also on the department's initiative, various articles of ship equipment and supplies are furnished the organizations, charging cost against appropriation "Arming and equipping Naval Militia." (In connection with the equipment, see Substatement B, attached.)

In cases where the department has not considered an article of equipment, when requested by a State, as absolutely necessary, yet possibly desirable, for a vessel on Naval Militia duty, or when the articles requested are in excess of a suitable allowance for such a vessel, charge has been made against appropriation "Arming and equipping Naval Militia."

An idea of the character of the material furnished under this appropriation may be obtained from the following:

Arms: Rifles, revolvers, bayonets, cartridge belts, and subtarget guns. Ammunition: For small arms and larger guns; saluting and target. Clothing: Navy uniforms, both dress and working.

Fuel: Coal for larger vessels and for steam cutters; gasoline for power boats. This item is one that quickly exhausts a State allotment when any considerable amount of cruising is done by an organization having a large vessel.

At times it has happened that during the latter part of a fiscal year a bureau appropriation has become greatly depleted through work on vessels of the regular service, in which case charges for repairs to vessels assigned to Naval Militia duty have been made against the Naval Militia appropriation.

Tools and supplies for vessels: Engine room and other ship department tools and consumable supplies are furnished under this appropriation. Many of these articles are required by the various Naval Militia for use on the vessels assigned to them, and such material very materially reduces a State's allotment, and frequently entirely eliminates an allotment before the new appropriation becomes available.

Books of instruction: Printing of blank forms for use by the Naval Militia in submitting reports, requisitions, etc., to the department as required; the printing of instruction pamphlets and books for distribution among the Naval Militia.

Care and maintenance of small boats: This takes into consideration the dingies, cutters, whaleboats, steam cutters, and gasoline boats which are loaned to Naval Militia organizations separate and distinct from the regular boat equipment of larger vessels; repairs to and overhauling of these boats; furnishing same with boat covers, sails, rowlocks, oars, gas engines, steam whistles, etc., when required to replace worn-out or lost articles, or when in excess of the original allowance of such articles; also the renting of mooring buoys, winter storage quarters for small boats, the hauling of such boats to and from storage, and the launching of same.

Purchase of mess tables and benches, etc.

Hire of mess gear.

Furnishing of flags and signal outfits, including combination running lights, when not part of a ship's outfit.

Mattresses, hammocks, blankets, bunting, manila rope.

Hose (cotton). Binoculars.

Navigating instruments, including binnacles.

Speed cones. Mooring lines, etc.

On the assignment of a vessel by the department to Naval Militia duty steps are taken to place aboard the necessary equipment, taking into consideration this special duty, and also four months' supplies, with sufficient fuel to take her to her Naval Militia home port. When such equipment and supplies are placed aboard a vessel so assigned, entry is made on the books of the department and on those of the general storekeeper at the yard at which the vessel is being fitted out, charging the cost of same to the several appropriations of the bureaus of the Navy Department, Title "O" (Naval Militia).

After a vessel has been turned over to a State, and it is found that additional articles of equipment are necessary to meet the requirements of the vessel under her particular special duty, such equipment is furnished and proper entry made on the books of the department, as stated above.

Quite a few States have not sufficient strength in their Naval Militia to warrant their asking for the loan of a vessel. To these States small boats, such as cutters, whaleboats, steam cutters, etc., are assigned as loans. Small-boat equipment is charged in the same manner as for large-boat equipment, as stated above, except that when replaced with new articles or when in excess of allowance the cost is charged against the appropriation "Arming and equipping Naval Militia." There are small boats, not portions of a ship's regular equipment, in the hands of a number of the States in addition to the ships which they have.

Worn-out or lost articles of equipment of a ship, when condition is shown not to be the entire fault of the Naval Militia through neglect or indifference, are replaced on charge against the bureau appropriations and not the Naval Militia appropriations.

The department has issued as loans to Naval Militia organizations for installation in their armories various detached articles of ship equipment to be used in necessary instruction in connection therewith. Signal outfits have been loaned when available and also 4-inch guns.

All articles of ship equipment, whether on a ship or installed in an armory, are issued as loans and are subject to recall at the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy.

Paint material is considered by the department as necessary in frequently touching up portions of the ships to prevent undue deterioration and to keep them at all times in condition for immediate service in the regular service, should occasion arise at any time requiring the department to recall one or more vessels from the special duty with the Naval Militia. For this reason paint material has been furnished to Naval Militia vessels on requisition submitted by the governor of a State, charge for which is made against the several appropriations of the bureaus of the Navy Department (Title "O") and not against appropriation "Arming and equipping Naval Militia," except for the care and preservation of small boats not attached to a ship as part of her equipment, in which case paint is charged against the latter appropriation.

When clearly shown by the Naval Militia that other material requested is to be used aboard the vessels to prevent undue deterioration in the same manner as paint materials, the department has furnished such material without charge to the appropriation "Arming and equipping Naval Militia," but has charged the cost of same against the bureau appropriations, as in the case of paint materials.

It will be seen that the major part of the expenditures under Title "O" (Naval Militia) covers charges for articles of equipment which are returnable to the department, and for this reason does not represent

an expenditure on Naval Militia. These articles are at all times the property of the Navy Department and are subject to recall at the request of the department.

Officers and men of the Naval Militia have been drilled on board battleships, cruisers, and other vessels, and the reports from captains are most encouraging as to the zeal, intelligence, and bearing of the organizations. Similarly the reports of the Naval Militia officers are to the effect that the opportunities thus offered for training are of the greatest value. This plan will probably always form a part of the summer exercises.

Certain vessels are assigned to States where they are unable to form part of any combined exercises, and therefore make individual cruises. These vessels are generally accompanied by a naval officer detailed by the Navy Department, who acts as advisor and reports on the cruise.

In addition to the annual cruise vessels assigned to the Naval Militia engage in short cruises as the opportunity offers.

PROSPECTIVE PLANS OF THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Working along the lines that have developed from the above exercises, and especially with the idea of establishing a system of progressive training, the department has directed the issue of a 4-inch and a subtarget gun to each armory of the Naval Militia and two 4-inch or 6-pounder guns to each Naval Militia vessel. Detailed instructions of the training of gun pointers are being printed, and systematic target practice will be held. This will develop the ordnance question thoroughly. Similarly, signal flags and codes are issued, and wireless telegraphy will be added. This will develop expert signalmen. The books now being issued are the latest of the instruction books used by the Navy. The department is able to report much progress and interest being taken by the Naval Militia.

The equipping of new organizations, the new departure in the essential matter of target practice, the increased steaming by the Naval Militia vessels involve more expense. But these expenditures are so essentially in the line of increased professional efficiency that it is believed the results will justify the expense.

It is estimated by the Navy Department that if this bill becomes a law the Organized Militia will rapidly grow to the strength of at least 10,000 efficient men capable of being on board ship in fighting trim on short notice. The benefit that would result, therefore, can scarcely be overestimated. In view of the fact that during the Spanish War it took six weeks to recruit 5,000 men in the regular naval service, a majority of whom were untrained, to a great extent, in naval warfare. The committee therefore recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

GEORGE EDWARD LERRIGO.

Mr. THOMPSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3419) admitting to citizenship and fully naturalizing George Edward Lerrigo, of the city of Topeka, in the State of Kansas. It is a matter of considerable importance. Mr. Lerrigo is now representing the Young Men's Christian Association in China, and he has no country behind him.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator one question. Was the bill a unanimous report from the Committee on Immigration?

Mr. THOMPSON. It was.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. As chairman of the committee I would like to state that it is a unanimous report. All objections to the bill were withdrawn.

Mr. LODGE. It is a very proper case, and the bill ought to pass. I happen to know something about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It provides that George Edward Lerrigo, the son of an American citizen, of the city of Topeka, in Shawnee County, State of Kansas, shall be admitted and declared to be a citizen of the United States of America and is fully naturalized as such citizen for all purposes from and after the taking effect of this act.

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

REPUBLIC COAL CO., OF MONTANA.

Mr. MYERS. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell or lease certain public lands to the Republic Coal Co., a corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SMOOT. Let the joint resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. The joint resolution was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, empowered, and directed to sell to the Republic Coal Co., a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of and doing business in the State of Montana, the coal deposits in and under the following described lands, situate in Musselshell County, State of Montana, to wit: Section 30, township 8 north, range 26 east; section 6, township 7 north, range 26 east; northeast quarter southeast quarter and southeast quarter northeast quarter and west half of southwest quarter section 26, township 8 north, range 25 east. In the event of a sale the purchase price thereof shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, and upon payment thereof the said Secretary shall issue to said corporation a contract providing the terms and conditions of said sale: *Provided, however,* That said sale shall be made subject to the legal or equitable rights, inchoate or vested, of any surface or other

entryman on any part of said lands, and subject to the laws now in force governing the sales of coal or other minerals where the surface lands and rights are reserved or have been previously disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MYERS. My colleague [Mr. WALSH] has some amendments to offer, and while he is getting them ready I will make a few remarks on the joint resolution. I will be very brief.

The joint resolution simply proposes to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell three or four sections of coal land in Montana to the Republic Coal Co., to sell at a price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, and at not less than the appraised value. He can not sell the land for less than the appraised value, but may put it at as much higher price as he may see fit.

The Republic Coal Co. is engaged in furnishing its entire output of coal to the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad, a transcontinental railroad which crosses the State of Montana. That railroad depends upon this coal company entirely to get its supply of coal for its route through a great part of Montana and North Dakota. It is the only feasible place for obtaining a supply of coal. This company does not enter into competition with commercial coal dealers or companies nor sell to the public, but its entire output is furnished to this railroad. The railroad takes all that it produces; it must have that and more, too.

The Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and the Director of the Geological Survey have all very heartily and unqualifiedly indorsed the joint resolution as a public necessity. The Interstate Commerce Commission was communicated with and asked whether or not there was any other feasible, adequate, and reasonable source for this transcontinental railroad to get its supply of coal for that part of its line in Montana and North Dakota, and it answered that there was no other feasible, adequate, or reasonable source of supply from which such coal could be obtained.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

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

Mr. MYERS. With pleasure.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask whence other consumers of coal in that part of the country derive their supply?

Mr. MYERS. From operators in the same coal fields. The circumstances are, I will go on and state in this connection, that this company, the Republic Coal Co., has a couple of sections of land in the same community, which it originally purchased from the State of Montana and which it is mining. Those sections are now about mined out; they are about to the end of their supply. There is only coal enough under those lands to last a few months longer. They want to buy three or four adjoining sections of land that are owned by the United States Government. Each alternate section of land in that part of the country is owned by the Northern Pacific Railway Co., because it came within the grant of every alternate section within 50 miles on each side of that road. Being a competing line, it will not sell any of the coal, nor any of its lands to this coal company. It is impossible for it to effect a purchase of any coal or land from the Northern Pacific Railway Co. The other alternate sections are owned by the Government, and it is impossible for a corporation, railroad or otherwise, to locate those lands. If individuals locate them, and afterwards sell them to a railroad company or to any other corporation, it is held by the courts to be prima facie evidence of fraud, with a criminal penalty attached. So there is absolutely no way for this transcontinental railroad company to compete with rival lines and to get fuel for its road through that section of the country unless this coal-mining company, the Republic Coal Co., can buy, at a price to be fixed by the Government, to be not less than the appraised value, this small area of coal land.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

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

Mr. MYERS. With pleasure.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I wish the Senator from Montana would state in his remarks that this joint resolution for the sale by the Government carries nothing of a fee-simple title; that it is simply for the sale of the coal.

Mr. MYERS. That is true. The joint resolution was recommended in committee to be so amended as to provide only for the sale of the coal under the land, and does not propose to sell any surface rights. According to the opinions of the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and the Director of the Geological Survey, the passage of the

joint resolution is an absolute necessity in the interest of the public.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, will he yield to me for a question?

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

Mr. MYERS. With great pleasure.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to ask the Senator if the lands contiguous to these sections are coal-bearing lands owned by private individuals?

Mr. MYERS. Some of them are.

Mr. VARDAMAN. What is the area of the coal-bearing lands privately owned there?

Mr. MYERS. I could not tell the Senator the definite number of acres.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Are those lands owned by private individuals or by the railroad company?

Mr. MYERS. Part of the land is owned by private individuals, part of it by the United States Government, and part of it by the Northern Pacific Railroad Co., a competing line.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Could not this railroad company, in order to make its purchases, buy these lands from private individuals, instead of, as you propose, the Government selling the lands to them?

Mr. MYERS. No; there is only a very small percentage of these lands owned by private individuals, and they are working them, getting out the coal, and selling it to the public.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Do they supply coal enough for the railroads?

Mr. MYERS. No. The individual supply there, the output, is not sufficient to furnish the needs of the railroad company.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Do I understand the Senator from Montana to say that the rival railroad declines to sell its coal lands?

Mr. MYERS. That is my understanding. This company has never been able to negotiate any purchase from nor deal with the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. for any of its coal lands.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, it strikes me as a rather radical departure from our policy to pass a special act directing the sale of coal lands to a particular company, which is restricted in its operations to furnishing coal for a single customer, and making no provision for the other customers for coal in that region. There may be special reasons why it is important in this case, but my own prejudices are very much against selling the coal lands of the United States. I would much prefer to see them leased. It is possible that the committee in this case, by the amendment it has proposed restricting the transfer of the fee, has gone far enough; but I should much prefer to see a provision brought in here for the leasing of the coal lands.

Mr. MYERS. I will say at this juncture that the joint resolution as originally introduced provided for the sale or lease of this land, but the majority of the committee are unalterably opposed to leasing. Upon a vote of a majority of the committee, the leasing provision was stricken out.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask why the majority of the committee was opposed to leasing?

Mr. MYERS. I do not know.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Why does the majority of the committee insist on an absolute sale at a present estimated value if the company are willing to accept a leasing proposition?

Mr. MYERS. I can give one reason, which I remember was suggested in the committee, and that was that if there was a leasing arrangement the Government would have to keep agents there on the ground to keep track of the amount of the coal output and to ascertain the royalty; that it would lead to confusion and trouble, and would be liable to lead to fraud.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Let me ask the Senator, would not the books of the coal company and the books of the railroad company show beyond any dispute just exactly how many tons of coal were mined?

Mr. MYERS. Well, Mr. President, as to that I can only say that, as the author of the joint resolution, it was immaterial to me whether it provided for the sale or the leasing of this comparatively small area of coal lands. The majority of the Senate Committee on Public Lands decided to recommend in favor of a sale only.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator please state what is the area proposed to be sold?

Mr. MYERS. As provided in the joint resolution it is:

Section 30, township 8 north, range 26 east; section 6, township 7 north, range 26 east; northeast quarter southeast quarter and southeast quarter northeast quarter and west half of southwest quarter section 26, township 8 north, range 25 east.

Three sections in all, I believe.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In other words, something less than 2,000 acres.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Has unanimous consent been given for the present consideration of this measure?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understood.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I did not understand that unanimous consent had been given.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I thought the joint resolution was read for the information of the Senate, but that the question as to unanimous consent for its consideration had not been put.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no reason, under the rule, of which the Chair knows, why an objection to its consideration could not be entered now.

Mr. NORRIS. I was going to suggest that, as I understand the rule, an objection could be made at any time.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It can be; but I simply did not want the debate and argument to proceed unless unanimous consent had been obtained. It is a waste of time.

Mr. MYERS. Has not unanimous consent been granted for the consideration of this measure, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understood. The Chair inquired if there was objection, and heard none; but under the rules an objection may be now entered.

Mr. MYERS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Has not unanimous consent been granted for the consideration of the joint resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

Mr. MYERS. May it now be withdrawn?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks so, during the morning hour.

Mr. JONES. I desire to suggest, Mr. President, that when the unanimous-consent agreement was made yesterday, I think it was made with, at least, the general impression that when the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] was disposed of, the agricultural extension bill should be taken up. I know the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] had the floor and was proceeding to address the Senate last evening. We have an agreement that at 2 o'clock we must take up the agricultural-extension bill under the 15-minute rule; so I hardly feel that I ought to consent to the further consideration of the pending measure if it is likely to take any considerable time. I do not like to object, but that is the situation.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I understood that the agricultural extension bill of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] was not to come up until 2 o'clock, and I supposed that we were in the midst of the morning hour until 2 o'clock.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I find, Mr. President, that there are Senators who would like to speak at once upon the agricultural extension bill; and, if the Senator from Montana would consent to wait until Monday, I would appreciate his doing so.

Mr. MYERS. I want to be accommodating. This measure has been waiting a long time, and the Calendar has not been called for weeks. I inquire if objection has been made at this time, Mr. President?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that it will take some time to discuss the joint resolution and to allow amendments to be offered, and perhaps it would take longer than 2 o'clock to reach a vote upon it.

Mr. MYERS. Then I withdraw the request, Mr. President.

COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7951.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7951) to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I will conclude all that I wished to say on yesterday evening when interrupted by some other matters which intervened.

The care that we have on behalf of this amendment is that there shall be such necessary safeguards as will insure to all alike in every State of the Union to which funds shall be distributed a just proportion of the benefits. The irrelevant matter that came into the debate was perhaps unavoidable. Naturally, those who have this matter under consideration will try to judge of the fairness with which these funds would be distributed by recurring to other matters affecting a large portion of the population of certain States. Out of that anxiety undoubtedly the author of this amendment drew such provisions as would insure a just use of the money.

A large part of the land susceptible of cultivation in many of the Southern States and now in actual cultivation is handled under a system of tenant farming. The figures read by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] indicate the very great economic advance of the negro. In the aggregate the vast amount of property now held by the colored race shows that they will make progress, become self-sustaining, well informed, and able to discharge in the future such duties as may come to them.

The system of tenant farming is not a good system, although it is better than none. Tenant farming is on an increase alarmingly in many of the Central, Western, and Northern States. Probably it comes from an entirely different cause than is responsible for this condition in other sections. It springs in the States last mentioned, in the older States at least, from the high price of land and the inevitable tendency of the titles to drift from the small to the large holder. This puts several thousand acres of extremely valuable land in the hands of one owner. In many instances it is let out on the tenant-farming system, and in others it is farmed through a foreman, so that the owner has a direct interest in the result as well as in the farm. The better plan is always to encourage by every possible means the holding in severality of small tracts, so that the man who works the soil and the owner of the freehold may be identical. Anything that will tend to increase this holding of smaller tracts of land, so that the tiller of the soil and the owner of the soil may be the same, ought to be encouraged. If there is anything that can be done by this Government to enable the negro who is now a tenant farmer to acquire title to the land he farms—a part of it at least, enough to give him an interest in the country and make him feel as though he had some stake in the future prosperity of the country—it ought to be done.

It is urged here very sincerely by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] that it would be a duplication of effort if two demonstrators in agricultural extension work were to go in a given locality and give instruction. I do not think that necessarily follows. Where there are two institutions in a State in which agricultural instruction is given the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] in substance provides that in a just way, after the facts are presented to the authority controlling, there shall be a division of the fund.

This anxiety I mentioned grows out of the fact that in former times there have been some rights, as we understand them, about which those of the Caucasian race in immediate contact with the negro have not been solicitous or at all times entirely just, from one viewpoint, in the preservation of those rights.

I do not want to raise at all, because I realize that it is somewhat irrelevant at this time, the question of occurrences of many years ago. I do not wish to discuss the question of political or social equality. Political equality is guaranteed by law. Social equality can not be guaranteed by law. No puny fiat of any human being can bring social equality. That is something that belongs to the personality of the race or races concerned. It can not be secured by any mere legislative enactment. Political equality can be.

It would serve no useful purpose to criticize any denial of political equality in the discussion of this bill. That properly belongs, at some other time or place, on some other measure that might be pending. We have only alluded to it here to show that in some of the States where money will go from the Federal Treasury under this bill, if it shall become a law, there is a substantial denial of participation in local government at least.

These are public funds, to be sent under the provisions of the bill to 48 States, or to so many of them as shall answer the requirements of the original bill. Sending these funds to those States is a governmental act. The money is drawn from every available source. Wherever the Government derives its public revenues, there the people who help pay those revenues are interested.

It would serve no useful purpose here to go into a comparative examination of the source from which these revenues are derived and what State or States contribute the greater amount of money to be handled under this appropriation. I only allude to political conditions here to show that the men who are tenant farmers in many of the States we have in mind are denied participation in public affairs. There is no self-government of that element of the population in those States. There being no self-government, no participation in their own government, by those people under existing conditions of local laws in their States, it seems to us that this amendment expresses a proper degree of care to secure for those people, thus denied local participation in affairs of a governmental character, a fair distribution of benefits in the expenditure of these funds that come from the General Government.

It is in that spirit that I approached this subject, and it is in that spirit that other matters that appear to be entirely irrelevant have been brought in. They have been brought in more than anything else to illustrate the necessity of this amendment if justice is to be done to this element of our population.

Having that in mind, we who favor this amendment think it ought to be adopted. We think it is a matter of justice; that it will lead to no waste of the public money; that it will guarantee in the terms of the act which provides the money that this part of our population shall have their share of the benefit. I do not go so far as to say that otherwise it would be denied in whole. I do believe, however, there would be a tendency to deny it in some places, in part, at least.

I wish to see the negroes of our country given an opportunity to have equal instruction with others, without any regard to a matter of grace or generosity on the part of the white people who are about them and who exercise governmental control.

If I could be entirely assured that this would be done, I should be satisfied. I am not assured of it. I am not satisfied. Consequently I wish if possible, as far as any effort of mine will tend to bring it about, to have the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington adopted.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I have opposed this bill for reasons that I have already stated. I do not believe it will be materially beneficial to the farmers. I do not believe there are a dozen Members of this body who believe it will be. If the bill is to become a law, as it certainly will, I am particularly anxious that the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] shall be adopted. It seems to me to be exceedingly unjust that the very farmers, in the South particularly, who need education if anybody does are going to be practically excluded from the benefits of this bill if it passes as it has been presented to the Senate.

It is unjust for another reason. The apportionment of the money to be appropriated under the bill is controlled by the rural population of the several States. In making the computation, of course the colored residents of the Southern States are counted. While that is so, and we are voting money for the benefit of the whole rural population under those conditions, a very large proportion of them will not be recognized as entitled to participate in the benefits of the appropriation.

Of course, the colored farmer may receive some benefit from this appropriation. He may look through the fence and see the demonstrations that are made on the farm of the white man, if they do not drive him away; but I imagine no demonstrations will be made on the land of the colored farmer for his benefit.

I should have assumed that it was not the intention of the bill as it came before the Senate to exclude the colored man from its benefits if it had not been for what has been said on that subject by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN]. Their statements have convinced me that that is the very purpose of leaving this matter to be determined by the legislatures of the several States, because Senators say—and I have no doubt in perfect good faith—that you can not educate the colored farmer; that he will not accept education along that line; that he is not qualified for and can not be made a scientific farmer. If that be so, Mr. President—

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAMES in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WORKS. I yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If the Senator means by his statement that the negro farmer can not be improved, if he means to say that I or the Senator from Georgia said that he could not be improved, that his intelligence could not be enhanced, he is doing us an injustice and he is mistaken. You can not educate anybody. You can give a man an opportunity so that he may educate himself, but you can not educate a man. You can not stick education on him. Education means the unfolding or the development of that which is in the individual. I maintain—and I think I know something about this question, because I live in a State where 59 per cent of the population is black—that the negro has been improved in this regard very greatly. He is not more faithful to himself, but he is more efficient if his work shall be done under the wise direction of the white man. You can not develop an idea, you can not discover a fact, you can not provide a method which unfolds the hidden resources of the soil in Mississippi or California or any other State without every citizen engaged in agriculture in those States being benefited by that discovery if he shall take advantage of the lesson taught.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I am not disposed to enter into a discussion of the subject of education in its broader sense. Whether or not I am doing an injustice to the Senator from Georgia or the Senator from Mississippi will be determined by what they have said, which appears in the Record. If I have misunderstood it or misconstrued it, that will be the correction of what I have said. I have taken what they have said as practically a declaration that it would be folly to appropriate this money for the purpose of attempting to educate the negro farmer, and I think their language carries that meaning. For myself, I do not believe it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. WORKS. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not wish by my silence to give approval to the Senator's construction of what I have said. I will not take up his time. I believe the negro farmer will be greatly improved by the way in which we will use this fund, and I believe he is now being greatly helped by the way in which we are spending \$50,000 a year of our State taxes in demonstration work.

Mr. WORKS. I am exceedingly glad to hear the Senators modify what I think they have already said on this subject. It was very clearly stated by the Senator from Georgia, as I remember, that practically the colleges were of no benefit to the colored man in the Southern States, because they would not accept the teachings of those colleges.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I know the Senator from California always means to be fair. He has not heard all I said on the subject.

Mr. WORKS. May I ask the Senator from Georgia if he did not say practically that?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; what I said was that the agricultural and mechanical school was not doing in agriculture what we had desired, because the students who go to it insist upon taking the mechanical instruction; that we have not done a great deal for them in agriculture because they elect a trade in preference to an agricultural pursuit; that the negro who advances in education goes into a different line of work entirely, and does not stay on the farm.

That was what I said, and that was what I meant to be understood as saying.

Mr. WORKS. Then the Senator from Georgia has proved just what I was contending—the injustice of the intention to withhold this teaching, or the benefits of this bill, from the colored man who can be benefited by its provisions.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. WORKS. I do.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Can the Senator from California point to a single State in the South, since he seems to be directing his attention that way, where there is any discrimination whatever between the races in the application or apportionment of the school fund? Can he point to a single State in the South where the money appropriated for school purposes is not distributed according to the population of the races?

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, that is entirely unnecessary. It has been demonstrated conclusively by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], by the figures he has produced here, that there has been the worst kind of discrimination as between the races.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In what State?

Mr. WORKS. In numbers of the States. The Senator from Washington has the figures. I do not know that the Senator from Alabama was here at the time they were stated.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I did not hear that.

Mr. WORKS. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that I have made no study of that matter myself.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Senator will permit me, I wish to say that I do know something about the conditions in Alabama, and I do know that as between the races the school fund in Alabama is apportioned to the school children according to population. The negroes get just as much per capita of the school fund in Alabama as the white children get, and they do not pay 3 per cent of the taxes.

Mr. WORKS. I have no doubt that is true.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then there is no discrimination in that.

Mr. WORKS. I have no doubt that is true in relation to the grammar and high schools. I have heard no question raised as to such schools; but the figures furnished by the Senator from Washington relative to the agricultural schools show directly to the contrary, and that is the matter we are now discussing.

I have no knowledge that the colored people have been discriminated against in any of the Southern States, so far as the distribution of the common-school funds is concerned. I am talking about the agricultural schools, and the proposition that is presented here for extending the work of the agricultural schools in that respect. The figures show conclusively to my mind that there has been discrimination as against the colored man; and there is an attempt made, I am sure, by the provisions of this bill to carry that discrimination into the bill that is now before the Senate. It is that against which I am protesting.

I am not going to take up the time of the Senate in talking about it. As I said a while ago, the fact that that sort of discrimination is intended has been proved by what has been said by the Senators I have mentioned. It is not necessary to go further, because they themselves construe the provision of the bill that the amendment attempts to eliminate as having that very effect. They give their reasons for it—in good faith, I have no doubt—but I think it is unjust. I think that provision of the bill should be stricken out. The colored farmers ought to be put upon an equality with the white farmers with respect to the benefits to be received from this proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Before we proceed to a vote, I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bankhead	Fletcher	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Brady	Gallinger	Oliver	Smoot
Brandeggee	Gronna	Overman	Stephenson
Bristow	James	Page	Sterling
Bryan	Johnson	Perkins	Sutherland
Burton	Jones	Pittman	Swanson
Chamberlain	Kern	Ransdell	Thompson
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Clapp	McCumber	Shafroth	Weeks
Cummins	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Works
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	
du Pont	Myers	Simmons	
Fall	Newlands	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] and to state that he has a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] is detained from the Chamber by illness. I will state that I am paired with that Senator for the day.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] is unavoidably absent on account of sickness.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. My colleague [Mr. TILLMAN] is unavoidably absent from the Senate. He is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

Mr. GALLINGER. I will announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. LANE] is unavoidably detained from the Senate on official business.

Mr. MYERS. I am authorized to state that the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] is absent on account of sickness, and that the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is absent on account of business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, before a vote is taken on this amendment I feel that I should say, in justice to the negroes of my own State, that so far as the farming population is concerned their record is entirely different from that presented by the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN]. In our State the colored population are among our most successful farmers. I remember distinctly a negro family that acquired 160 acres of fine land in the county in which I formerly lived. The father educated a family of children. One of the young men attended our State university and graduated with credit to himself, and was afterwards elected to a county office in his county and successfully performed his duties to the entire satisfaction of the people.

In another county, where a large delegation of negroes emigrating from Alabama and Mississippi many years ago had

settled, I was interested a few years ago in visiting that county to learn that one of the best lawyers in the county was a colored man, and that he had been nominated and elected county attorney on the Democratic ticket. He filled the office with credit, and I have been informed that he has been reelected a time or two.

We have elected a negro as a State officer in Kansas and he acquitted himself creditably. One of the richest farmers in Kansas to-day is a negro living in Wyandotte County. He has developed his farm until he is known now as the "Potato King of the Kaw Valley."

I speak of these gentlemen to illustrate that in Kansas the negro is a creditable citizen. He is successful in business and he is worthy of the esteem and confidence of his fellow countrymen. They are successful in the professions and trades and in every line of industry have reflected honor upon their race.

So far as the race as a whole is concerned, I do not think we should expect that those who emerged from barbarism but a comparatively short time since should be advanced in the arts of civilization as far as the Anglo-Saxon, who has been developing his civilization for at least 2,000 years. We should not compare the African race with the northern European races, because they have not had the same opportunity. You might as well say that because 2,500 years ago our Saxon ancestors were savage barbarians who were living in forests in a wild and uncivilized state and were inferior to the Latin races or the Semitic races, who had developed civilization centuries and centuries before our ancestors did, that we were of inferior origin. None of us would admit such a thing.

I think we should avoid, in dealing with the problems that confront us as a nation, the racial prejudices that seem to be inherent in the human family, and we should discuss the problems that relate to the races from a viewpoint free from any of the prejudices which naturally grow out of close racial relations.

I wanted to say these words before the vote is taken, because I felt it my duty to the negroes of the State which I in part represent.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a very few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Georgia will permit, the Chair will state that the Senate is now operating under a unanimous-consent agreement which provides—

That after 2 o'clock on February 7 no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes upon the bill or more than once or longer than 15 minutes upon any amendment.

The Senator from Georgia will proceed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] in its effect will provide that the demonstration work done in States where a large negro population is found shall for the negroes be done from the negro college and for the whites from the white college. That will be the practical operation of the amendment.

Mr. President and Senators, it would be unwise in any locality to have two colleges directing this work. If in any State more than one college directs it, then the territory of the State should be divided and the direction of a particular college should be exclusive in a particular part of the territory; otherwise you would have a duplication of work and confusion and you would not have an economic administration of the fund.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington would be a severe blow to the negroes of my State. I have explained to you that the negro agricultural and mechanical school, combining both mechanical work and agricultural, on account of the preference of the negroes who go to it has drifted almost entirely into mechanical work; that the teachers at that school are negroes and trained peculiarly for that kind of work, outside of the English course, but that the faculty of that school is not prepared to do advanced agricultural work.

The negro who advances in his studies does not go to the sciences. I do not know a negro chemist. I do not know a negro botanist. We put negro professors in the school in the interest of the race. We have done what we could to make it agricultural. There is not an agricultural and mechanical negro school in the South that could do advanced agricultural work.

Our State college of agriculture is officered by men the majority of whom were not raised in Georgia. I do not think that more than a fourth of them are native Georgians. We gathered them from all over the country on account of their skill and knowledge in the science of agriculture. They can analyze a soil. They can analyze a plant. They can tell you

the plant food in a piece of soil. They can tell you the plant food that a particular plant lives on. They study plant diseases. They give a large part of their time not to teaching in the college, but to traveling all over the State. They are mastering the entire soils of the State, the entire plants of the State, and the foods required by the plants, and the defects of the soil. They are holding meetings all over the State and at those meetings the negroes come. They instruct the negroes as they furnish information to the white farmer. They are working all over the State with the grown farmers without regard to race. It is any farmer who has a trouble and will lay it before them who receives their help. It is any farmer who will listen to whom they furnish information.

Who is it best for the negro of Georgia to have conduct the extension work? The agricultural and mechanical school of the negroes—officered by men who are not competent to do it, who are not trained to do it, who are really doing a different line of work—or the 16 to 20 professors at the State college of agriculture, who are masters of the subject?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Howard University is a colored university in this city, but they have white professors there. Could not these colored schools employ some of the scientists whom the Senator mentions?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We have conceded to them at their own request their own color in the control of their schools. When I was chairman of the board of education in Atlanta, at the instance of a large number of our best negroes, I joined in the passage of a resolution that excluded the competition of the white teachers. I do not believe you would find at the Howard University here a real student of agriculture.

Mr. GALLINGER. No, Mr. President; I did not make that point. The point I make was that they employ white professors, and undoubtedly the colored agricultural colleges would employ white scientists if they saw fit to do it. I assume that to be so.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; it could be done; but as all the students—

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I merely wish to suggest to the Senator from Georgia that it is the white scientists who propose to do this special work under the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There are white scientists in Georgia devoting themselves to the study of the agricultural problems of the whole State. Their work is not limited to the students at the college. As I have said, they give a large part of their time to the whole State. The dean of that college spends probably half his time away from the college, meeting the farmers without regard to color, teaching them and advising them.

When you have the demonstration work that is to benefit the negro presented by the ablest corps of high-salaried men that can be found in our entire land, from the agricultural colleges of the University of Wisconsin and the University of Missouri, will you let them direct it for all, with an absolutely equal showing to help the negro farmers through their direction, or will you turn the negro's part of the work over to a place that can not do the work? If we gather into that school scientists equal to those that we have in the other college it would be an enormous economic waste; there would be duplication of work.

When you turn the direction of this work among the negroes to the agricultural and mechanical schools you cut off the negro by your plan from the best agency that can serve him, and from the agency that to-day is serving him.

You might say that we cut Georgia out of our State agricultural college to a large extent, because over half the faculty were not Georgians or Georgia-educated men. Why did we do it? Because we went where we could find a man who had received the best training. We went to men already skilled and procured them. We did it not against Georgia but in the interest of Georgians. We were not discriminating against our own people when we took a dean of our college of agriculture from another State, and even from another country. We took him because he had had years of study in advanced agricultural colleges and had been a leading teacher in more than one agricultural college outside of our State, and we thought he could do the work better for the people of our State than any man we had in the State. Was it a discrimination against Georgians to go outside of Georgia and select for the head of the institution the ablest man we could find for the money we could afford to pay? It was a service to Georgians that we were rendering.

And when, Mr. President and Senators, we furnish the negro as well as the white man the benefit of the faculty of the State

college of agriculture to study his problems and to direct the agricultural extension work over the State, to carry what they have worked out with the college and the experiment station to his home, we give him the best. We give him what we give the whites. We would discriminate against the negro if we said we would simply give to him what was found in the negro mechanical and agricultural college.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia one question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. PAGE. Is the Senator aware that the agricultural colleges of the South that are for the benefit of the negro are protesting very loudly against what they call a discrimination in this bill?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. None of them have protested to me. I understood there was one from Alabama who protested.

Mr. PAGE. In the last three years I have received a great many protests from the colleges of the South devoted to negroes, and I received one this morning. It will only take a minute to read it, as the Senator may wish to comment upon it:

FLORIDA AGRICULTURAL AND
MECHANICAL COLLEGE FOR NEGROES,
Tallahassee, Fla., February 4, 1914.

Hon. C. S. PAGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I note the Lever-Smith bill is up in the Senate, and that an amendment was offered by our friends so as to have the negro agricultural schools become beneficiaries of the funds proposed by it.

This note is to make two requests of you: First, that you send me the records, if possible, giving an account of the debate on the bill, especially that upon the proposed amendment. I am anxious to keep a line on the discussion in detail, and also that you and those who think like you cease not in your efforts to have the bill so amended as that there will be no question that the negro agricultural colleges will become beneficiaries thereof.

I am sure there is not a State legislature in the South that would enact legislation making them beneficiaries unless it is made mandatory by the bill itself. Only those who are here know how hard it is to secure favorable legislation on any proposition looking toward the educational uplift of the negro people.

Trusting that you will be able to send me records covering the debate in question and that your efforts on our behalf will be successful, I am,

Respectfully, yours,

N. B. YOUNG, President.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, that is evidently based upon a misapprehension of what this bill does. The bill does not give a dollar to either of the colleges. It does not give any to the white college; it does not give any money to the colored college. It selects or allows the legislature to select the agency of greatest capacity and puts upon it the burden of doing the work, without regard to color, throughout the entire State. Not a dollar goes to the college. Not a dollar more salary do these men receive. As I said before, we are using it all over Georgia. When they discover a disease of a plant and carry the cure into a community both the colored and the white man have the benefit of it. It is simply a question as to whether you will use the most capable and the most proficient in behalf of the colored as well as the white man, or whether you will turn over the fund that is to help the negro where it can not do him any substantial good.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I wish to state briefly the reasons why, after a good deal of consideration, I have come to a conclusion in favor of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

I have thought that perhaps the object which that amendment has in view could be accomplished more simply and directly and better and in a way which would better agree with the views expressed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] and the facts which he states; but the form of the amendment is not anything new. It is designed to continue an existing policy of legislation, and the way in which the matter presents itself to my mind is as a question whether we shall abandon a policy which aimed to encourage the negro in his efforts toward economic independence and progress or whether we shall continue it.

The bill is a bill "to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," and it provides—

That in order to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same, there may be inaugurated in connection with the college or colleges in each State now receiving, or which may hereafter receive, the benefits of the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts" (12 Stat.

L., p. 503), and of the act of Congress approved August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. L., p. 417), agricultural extension work which shall be carried on in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture.

This is presented as a further step of progress in the development of the policy of the United States to aid agricultural institutions in the separate States. That is the basis of the bill; that is the authority for the appropriation. It is developing an established policy. Many Senators who would doubt seriously the propriety under our Constitution of embarking upon a new enterprise of this description are content to accept the long-established practice and policy of the Government, approved by time and usage, to apply the moneys of the National Government to work in these State institutions. So we must consider the subject not as a new subject, but as a development of the existing policy.

In the statute referred to, the act of August 30, 1890, was included this provision:

Provided, That in any State in which there has been one college established in pursuance of the act of July 2, 1862, and also in which an educational institution of like character has been established, or may be hereafter established, and is now aided by such State from its own revenue, for the education of colored students in agriculture and the mechanic arts, however named or styled, or whether or not it has received money heretofore under the act to which this act is an amendment, the legislature of such State may propose and report to the Secretary of the Interior a just and equitable division of the fund to be received under this act between one college for white students and one institution for colored students established as aforesaid, which shall be divided into two parts and paid accordingly, and thereupon such institution for colored students shall be entitled to the benefits of this act and subject to its provisions, as much as it would have been if it had been included under the act of 1862, and the fulfillment of the foregoing provisions shall be taken as a compliance with the provision in reference to separate colleges for white and colored students.

That same provision was carried into the act of 1907, taking a further step in advance in the execution of this policy; the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] proposes to carry substantially the same provision into this proposed act, taking a still further step; and the question, as it seems to me, is, Shall we depart from the policy which has been followed hitherto in the extending of this kind of aid to agriculture in the States by omitting from the provision which we make a requirement for a just and equitable distribution to be proposed by the authorities of the State and to be passed upon by a Federal officer of high rank?

Now, sir, I have been greatly impressed by the observations and the arguments made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] and by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. The spirit which they exhibit seems to me to be all that can be asked; it seems to be altogether admirable; and I should not for a moment hesitate to leave the good or ill fortune of anyone in whom I was interested in their hands, trusting with confidence to fair and just treatment in the spirit which they have expressed.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. ROOT. I do.

Mr. SIMMONS. If this bill provided for the appropriation of money for the agricultural colleges of the States, as do the two acts to which the Senator from New York has referred, that of 1862 and 1890, I believe, I would agree with the Senator; but I think the Senator fails to make the differentiation between the purpose of the appropriations made under the two acts to which he has referred and the purpose of the appropriation proposed to be made by this bill. The two acts to which the Senator has referred appropriated money for the benefit of these colleges, and provided, and justly so, I think, that it should be distributed equitably between the white and the colored agricultural and mechanical colleges of the different States. This bill, as I called attention to yesterday, and as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] has several times called attention to, does not propose to appropriate a dollar for agricultural colleges, but only provides for a certain character of agricultural work, and the agricultural colleges of the several States have nothing to do with that except to select the agencies which are to perform this work and to give them the benefit of any knowledge or information which they may have to impart to the farmer. I simply call the attention of the Senator to that difference. I do not know whether he has examined the bill with a view to considering what was the purpose of the appropriation.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I have examined the bill with great care and great interest, because I am very friendly to the bill. I think it is of great importance to the public interest that this system shall be developed, and developed along the right lines; but I do not think that the distinction which is mentioned by the Senator from North Carolina is a substantial one. This bill proposes to appropriate money to colleges; and

the distinction between the kind of instruction that is to be given under the bill and the kind of instruction which has been given under former laws seems to me entirely immaterial to the purpose we are now considering. Whatever money goes to any one of these institutions will serve to strengthen and improve and energize the institution, whether it is employed in one course or another, in one way or another.

I was about to say, Mr. President, when interrupted, that admirable as is the spirit and persuasive as are the arguments of the Senators from Georgia and North Carolina, I regret they can not speak for everyone. I confess that I found myself very widely differing from the views which were expressed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] yesterday; that I can not view the omission on the part of Congress to designate the direction in which this appropriation shall go as being the same thing if the omission is to be supplied by the Senator from Georgia or by the Senator from Mississippi. We have had within the last few months expressions from the chief magistrate of another State exhibiting an attitude of mind and of feeling toward the negro race which makes me unwilling to vote for an appropriation leaving to his discretion the benefits which we all agree ought to go to black as well as to white.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ROOT. I did not understand that the limitation of debate began until 3 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It began at 2 o'clock.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I think we are all anxious to help the negro race; that we are all impelled by the same desire; and, if we differ at all, it is a difference as to the method that should be adopted.

I do not wholly agree with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], although I acknowledge his superior opportunities to know the condition in his State. We have here about 10,000,000 negroes. They must always remain in this country—negro citizens. There must never be any such thing as amalgamation. The yellow race and the white race have lived contiguously to each other; there have been individual crossings, but never has there been such a thing as an amalgamation of the particular races. Yellow still remains yellow and black still remains black, and undoubtedly throughout the coming centuries that rule will hold good. You say that that is on account of race prejudice. I would hardly call it that, Mr. President. I would rather use the words "race affinity." We have no prejudice against the black race; we have no prejudice against the yellow race; we have an affinity for our own race; and that affinity is sufficient to keep the blood of the white race reasonably pure, and keep it from any contamination, if you may call it such, with the other races of the world.

Mr. President, how are we going to help the black race? I insist—and I speak from my knowledge of human nature rather than from a particular knowledge of this or that individual—that regeneration must come from within and not from without. No nation ever trod the pathway toward enlightenment through the tutelage of any other nation in the world. If a nation or people advance, it must be through some uplifting influence that is within the heart and soul of the people themselves, and there must be an opportunity and an incentive for the development of that impulse which will reach toward higher and higher attainments.

So, Mr. President, even though the negro instructor in the South is not as capable as the white instructor, even though it is probable that those sent out to teach agriculture from the negro colleges can not accomplish as much as those sent out from the white colleges, still I would be in favor of allowing the negro to do his own work. I believe that better results will be obtained in our own public schools where the negro child has a negro teacher; I believe that in our system of educating the two races each race should be educated by its own kind.

The negro must live as a negro; he must live as an American black man; ultimately he must have his own lawyers, his own teachers, his own preachers, his own doctors, and his own dentists; and while the Senator from Georgia indicates that the negro race have not as yet developed many individuals of that capacity, he must admit that the negro has had very little opportunity so far in life to do so. So, though the work may not be as well done in Georgia by the colored instructor among his own kind as it would possibly be done by the white instructor, I do believe that keeping open the door of opportunity and encouraging the colored man to become efficient and to become capable is the only way that you will ever raise the race from its present plane to a higher social condition within itself.

Mr. President, with that view I can not agree that we should always have only white instructors, and that the negro agricul-

tural college should not be given the hope and opportunity of developing its own young people so that they may carry on this work among their own race.

Our duty, Mr. President, is a solemn one toward the colored man. We know the conditions under which he was brought here; we know the conditions under which he must live here. Call it race prejudice, call it race affinity, yet the line of demarcation between the white and the colored races must ever remain just as it is; and it is the duty of the dominant, the more powerful race, to lend the assisting hand, not to do for the colored man what he ought to do for himself, but simply to assist him to help himself; and we never will assist him, in my opinion, by closing the door of opportunity to those of his own class.

As has been suggested by the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], when we adopted the old law, of which this is an extension, that was our view; and I believe, Mr. President, that we had better follow the old rule, inasmuch as it has worked well, or reasonably well, up to the present time, and to continue aiding the colored agricultural colleges with the hope somewhere for those people to advance through their own efforts. I shall therefore, Mr. President, support the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, it was suggested to the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] that possibly he did not appreciate the difference between the proposed legislation and that already upon our statute books. His answer was to the effect that he did, but to my mind his argument was not convincing of the fact that he did appreciate the difference. It is our duty, of course, to do what we can for the negro in this country; but, Mr. President, it strikes me that the enactment of such legislation as is proposed by the amendment is not to his true interest. The difference between the prior legislation concerning appropriations for agricultural colleges and the legislation now proposed, as I understand, is this: Recognition is had in the other bills—the act of 1862 and the subsequent act referred to—of the fact that there is segregation of the races in the agricultural colleges in the South. That is a fact admitted here and recognized by legislation. Therefore the National Government, in appropriating money for agricultural colleges, itself recognizing the fact that there is segregation, has provided that the money should be equitably distributed between the black and the white agricultural colleges. But, Mr. President, there is no segregation of the races themselves in the South. There undoubtedly is social segregation. There is not the recognition upon the part of the white race of the social equality of the black. Undoubtedly, whether or not it is recognized, there remains the fact that there is not political equality between the races in the South, but that there is no segregation of the races in the South in agricultural or commercial pursuits is, I think, generally admitted.

How did the negroes of the South acquire the enormous acreage of land which the statistics introduced here show that they now own? From the white men in the South. Has it been shown here that a white man declines to sell a portion of his farm to a negro neighbor and farmer; that he does not recognize him as a commercial equal or a rival? None whatever. The truth is that the negro lives upon his own land side by side with the white man in the South, and, in so far as agricultural pursuits particularly are concerned, they are living upon an exact equality. The negro markets his product at the same market reached by the white man; he markets to the same people who pay the white man for his products; there is no distinction whatsoever in the price paid because the one is a white man and the other a negro.

Now, this proposition is not one of segregation; but it is that through certain colleges in the South instructors shall be sent out into the rural districts for the purpose of assisting to instruct those engaged in rural pursuits, in agricultural work. Does any Senator here mean to say that in pursuing such work, with the white man owning a farm side by side with the negro, the negro will be precluded from obtaining the advantage of the instruction given in that way, as though he were segregated in the classrooms of the college? No. In the one instance the negro is taught by instructors of his own race in the college; in the other instance he receives the same benefit exactly from the instruction given in the rural districts that the white man gets.

There is no segregation, as I have said, in the South such as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] said here yesterday existed in his State. You do not find whole counties settled entirely by negroes in the South; you find no feeling there that the two races can not live together, really working hand in hand for the mutual development of their country. They do. The

negro is the best friend that the white farmer has in the South, and the white farmer in the South is certainly the best friend that the negro has in the South. It is to the interest of the white farmer that his negro tenant should be taught to raise two bales of cotton where he raised only one before, and if he can urge him and prevail upon him to attend such lectures as will be given assisting him to do this, certainly he will not seek to deprive him of the benefit of such instruction.

It strikes me, as I have said, that this is the difference: In the colleges there is segregation, and there always will be, because there there is social contact. The fact might just as well be admitted—there will be always segregation of the races in the South in the schools and colleges. Whether they are supported partially by the Government or wholly by the State, there is no question that that will be done.

In the uplifting of the race, in making, as I have said, two bales of cotton grow where only one was produced before, it is to the interest directly of the white man that the negro should be educated in that line, rather than to have him remain in a condition where he knows nothing of agriculture. In the actual demonstration work the negro will get just as much benefit as the white man; and I for one, Mr. President, am inclined to think that where the negro is compelled to live, where it must be his fate that he should remain, between himself and his neighbors should be left the problems of the race issue.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have not believed that the race question is involved in this amendment. There has been a great deal of discussion about the relation between the two races—the white and the black—but the real issue here, as it seems to me, is whether, in a bill of this character, we intend to withdraw from the General Government the power to determine or to assist in determining how the money, which all the people contribute, shall be spent. The laws passed heretofore have not provided for cooperative work, and I call the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the very significant fact that heretofore we have appropriated money for agricultural colleges, or for the States to be expended by the agricultural colleges, but we have not attempted to introduce the element of cooperation into the work that was to be done through the expenditure of the money.

I am rather sorry that this bill has undertaken to make the work a cooperative work, but I assume that it will pass in this form, and if it is to pass in this form the position now taken by those who have it in charge with regard to the particular matter under debate is entirely inconsistent with the general scope and purpose of the bill.

Allow me to call the attention of the Senate to the differences between the aid now proposed to be extended and the aid which has heretofore been granted. We appropriate this money for—and I now quote—

agricultural extension work, which shall be carried on in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture.

I rather favor the amendment that will be presently submitted by the Senator from South Dakota in respect to the clause I have just quoted; but I assume the bill will have in it when it finally passes the language I have just read:

Agricultural extension work, which shall be carried on in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture.

And then, further:

And this work shall be carried on in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the State agricultural college or colleges receiving the benefits of this act.

And still further:

That before the funds herein appropriated shall become available to any college for any fiscal year plans for the work to be carried on under this act shall be submitted by the proper officials of each college and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The clauses I have read from the bill establish a very close relation between the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural colleges which are to be in immediate charge of the work. If it were not for an exception in this bill—an exception that is in no other bill ever passed for the purpose of extending Federal aid to agriculture—there would be no necessity for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington. In the clauses I have read we give complete power to the Department of Agriculture to negotiate and to agree with the several agricultural colleges for the expenditure of the money and the carrying on of the work. If we did not introduce the exception which I shall read in a moment, the Secretary of Agriculture would have to be satisfied with regard to the channel of distribution in each State; and if the Secretary of Agriculture believed that a portion of the money should be expended by a college teaching colored people, then it could not be expended unless his views were followed.

Now, let us see what it is that introduces the whole difficulty in this bill and is at war with the very spirit of the bill itself. This is the exception:

Provided, That in any State in which two or more such colleges have been or hereafter may be established the appropriations hereinafter made to such State shall be administered by such college or colleges as the legislature of such State may direct.

Thus there is withdrawn from the supervisory power of the Department of Agriculture the selection of the colleges in the State, if there be more than one. It is the only respect in which the power which you give to the Department of Agriculture is not complete and comprehensive. If the Department of Agriculture is adequate and competent to assist in directing this work among the people, I should like to know why it is not also competent and adequate to assist in determining which of the colleges of a State shall be the instrumentality through which the money is to be used.

We either ought to leave the whole matter to the States, without any cooperation on the part of the Department of Agriculture, leaving the States to expend the money as they deem best for the welfare of their own people, or we ought to give to the Secretary of Agriculture or some other officer of the Government the power to require an agreement with him concerning the colleges in the State.

I should like to know why an exception of this kind is made with respect to this one aspect of the entire subject. I assume that a Secretary of Agriculture or a Secretary of the Interior, any high officer of the Government, in conference with the authorities of the State, would agree that the money should be spent in that way and by those colleges which would most effectually attain the object we seek. The whole difference of opinion which has been discussed now for days before the Senate has been precipitated and accentuated by attempting to withdraw from the General Government any supervision whatsoever concerning the instrumentality through which the money shall be expended.

Therefore I intend to vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington; and if that amendment does not prevail I intend to move to strike out the particular provision I have read, leaving, if the amendment should prevail, the selection of the colleges a matter of mutual agreement, as well as all other things pertaining to the expenditure of the money.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me for a question?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think there is a great deal of force in what the Senator has said. I should like to ask him whether he would accept, as a substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington, the following: Strike out the words "legislature of such State" and insert in lieu thereof "as the governor and the Secretary of Agriculture may direct," so that the paragraph would read:

Provided, That in any State in which two or more such colleges have been or hereafter may be established, the appropriation hereinafter made by such State shall be administered by such college or colleges as the governor of such State and the Secretary of Agriculture may direct.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no power to accept any suggestion coming from any Senator that would interfere with the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Would not that cover the objection the Senator has urged?

Mr. CUMMINS. So far as I am concerned, the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado is more satisfactory than the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, has the Senator from Iowa yielded the floor?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington. I will send it to the Clerk's desk, and after it is read, I should like to be heard upon it for a few moments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 14, it is proposed to strike out the words "legislature of such State," and to insert in lieu thereof the words "governor of such State and the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, the object of this amendment is to cover the exact position taken by the Senator from Iowa. There have been contending arguments made upon both sides of the Chamber as to the proportion which the colored people will get of the appropriations that are to be made under this bill. It has been contended upon the one side that they will not get any, because it is said that the legislature will designate a college from which they will get nothing. Upon the

other hand, it has been contended that there have been very liberal appropriations made in aid of the colored people of the South. All seem to agree that the colored people should get a fair proportion of such appropriations.

It seems to me that instead of the long amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington, if there be stricken from the bill the words "legislature of such State" and inserted in lieu thereof the words "the governor and the Secretary of Agriculture," it will serve the purpose of providing that the Government of the United States shall hold a restraint upon the inequitable or unjust expenditure of this money, and it can be used in accordance with the best judgment of the governor and of the Secretary of Agriculture. It is contended that the colored people in the past have been discriminated against in the expenditure of funds for agricultural colleges. If so, it was under a statute similar to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington. Then why not adopt the amendment I propose, which I believe will be directly in the interest of the colored farmer?

I want to say that the amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from Washington is not at all applicable. In the first place, it proposes that the Secretary of the Interior shall pass upon this matter. The Secretary of the Interior ought not to be the person to determine anything under this bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That has been changed.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Secretary of Agriculture is the one that ought to determine it. I can see how, under the old acts which were read by the Senator from New York, the Secretary of the Interior might be placed in the position of superintending this work.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONES. I changed my amendment when I presented it, so that it is "the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well.

Now, as to the question of a legislature determining these matters, I want to say that the agricultural colleges are in a formative condition as to numbers in many States. For instance, in my State there are two agricultural colleges—one of which has just started. Their proportions of whatever will be appropriated under this bill ought not to be determined by the legislature. The amounts ought to be changed from time to time as the executive officer of the State directs, because he knows the needs of the agricultural colleges of his State; and whenever he determines that it is to the best interests of the State that one college should have a certain amount or that the fund should be under the direction of two colleges, and certain portions should be administered by one college and certain portions by the other, it is a better judgment—it is a later judgment—than the judgment of a fixed act, which perhaps never could be changed.

You can readily see that in the formation of agricultural colleges, whenever one particular college is named by the legislature to expend the fund it becomes almost impossible to change it, because all the force and influence in behalf of that agricultural college will be used in holding every appropriation and every expenditure with that college. For that reason it is not fair to any new agricultural college that might be established. For that reason the legislature is not the proper body. The amendment says it shall negotiate with the Secretary of Agriculture.

The legislature is not a body that can very well negotiate with anyone. It passes acts. A committee of it may come to an agreement in some cases, and it may try to ratify the agreement, but it is a cumbersome body for that purpose, whereas the governor of a State can meet the Secretary of Agriculture and can agree upon matters in relation to the proper designation of the colleges to expend the fund, and also as to the amount of money that should be expended. It seems to me that would produce a much better condition than passing a legislative act, since it takes time—in some States as much as three or four years—before another legislative act could be adopted to change the law.

For these reasons, it seems to me, the fund ought not to be subject to the direction or agreement of the legislature of the State and the Secretary of Agriculture nor the legislature alone. Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture makes an approval of the college or colleges that will have the expenditure of this fund, it seems to me that is the check which the Congress of the United States is exercising and which it should exercise with relation to the expenditure of the money of the United States.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to suggest to the Senator that if his amendment is adopted, it seems to me it ought to be satisfactory to our friends on the other side, especially in view of the fact that in section 2, at the top of page 3, is found the provision:

This work shall be carried on in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the State agriculture college or colleges receiving the benefits of this act.

So that if the Senator's amendment is adopted, you would then have the Secretary of Agriculture acting with the governor in selecting the college, and you would have the Secretary of Agriculture acting with the college in carrying out the law.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It seems to me it would be a perfect safeguard with respect to the equitable expenditure of the moneys of the United States, and on that account it would be a mistake to have a legislature determine for all time, so far as we know—and it is difficult to get legislative acts repealed—what college or colleges should be designated. In some States, I understand, the legislature meets only once every four years, and no change could be made, however imperative, within that time. Consequently, it would be better to have the executive officer of the State the one who will determine the matter from year to year, if necessary. These changes ought to occur, just as I illustrated in my State the fact that we have two agricultural colleges. One, the older institution, has six or seven hundred students. The other has just been established. We would not know what to permanently apportion to that new agricultural college, but the governor can with precision determine each year the amount needed. In designating the college or colleges to receive this fund each year he would make no mistake. To contend that an act of the legislature should be passed with respect to this matter, and that for all time its designation fixed, is wrong, because our institutions are changing every year. Some portions of my State become vastly important in 5 or 10 years. Population streams to that portion of the State, and the result would be that this very little college which we have just started now may in time become as important as any, if not the most important, of the agricultural colleges of my State.

The governor of a State has the interest of all the colleges at heart. He desires to see that these funds shall be apportioned equitably between them. He is a person who at any time can negotiate with the Secretary of the Interior, and can agree, after a review of the situation, after a review of the facts, which college should be designated as the distributor of the funds. It seems to me that is far better than a legislature that has no head, that has no person that can bind the legislature.

Even if a committee comes to the Secretary of Agriculture and says, "We will designate this college," you do not know that it will be done until you go back to the legislature. Changes may take place; one portion of the State, if there are two agricultural colleges, may come in with a strong force and say, "We will not agree to that," and then you have a disagreement. You have difficulties which you do not have when you provide, as in this amendment, that the Secretary of Agriculture shall agree from time to time with the governor of the State. The check which is made upon not giving to the colored people their proper proportion of the moneys is in your own officer, and whenever he deviates from equity he is answerable upon an appeal as to what shall be done.

It seems to me that, in view of these facts, this amendment covers the situation just as it is and as the Senator from Iowa has indicated; my amendment, in only four or five words, covers the entire situation, and protects the colored people in the amount of money they will get out of the appropriations under this bill, and that in every way it will be to the advantage and interest of the legislation.

Mr. JONES. I should like to ask the Senator if he offers this as an amendment to the text of the bill?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I offer it as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I would suggest that the proper course to take would be to offer it to the bill. The Senator certainly can not offer a substitute for my amendment, which is itself in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; it covers the Senator's amendment, it seems to me. The whole object of the Senator's amendment is to prevent this very condition.

Mr. JONES. If the amendment of the Senator from Colorado were offered to the text of the bill, it would result in the perfection of the bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; but it seems to me it covers the very situation of the Senator's amendment. All the matters are safeguarded in other portions of the bill in every respect.

Mr. JONES. I am not disputing that proposition, Mr. President; I am just speaking from a parliamentary standpoint. It does not seem to me that the Senator, by offering something like that as a substitute for my amendment, can prevent a vote on my proposition. It is really in the nature of an amendment to perfect the text of the bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator from North Carolina indicated that he thought it ought to be acceptable to the Senator.

Mr. JONES. I am not discussing the merits of the proposition now. It is the parliamentary status in which I am interested just now.

Mr. SHAFROTH. This covers every fact that is contained in the Senator's amendment, except that his is in detail; that is all. It seems to me, therefore, it is a proper substitute for it.

Mr. JONES. It is a proper amendment to the text of the bill, but it is not a proper substitute for my amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It has reference to and covers the same subject matter. There are two plans of amending the bill, one covered by the amendment of the Senator from Washington and one by the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. The Senator from Colorado offers this as a substitute, and in voting upon the two, of course, we select whichever of the two we prefer. I shall vote for the substitute offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The clause as it now reads in the bill is as follows:

That in any State in which two or more such colleges have been or hereafter may be established the appropriations hereinafter made to such State shall be administered by such college or colleges as the legislature of such State may direct.

The Senator from Washington has moved to strike out the entire clause I have read, and to insert in lieu of it the matter which is contained in his proposed amendment, which has already been read. That substitutes an entirely new plan for that proposed in the bill. It contemplates, among other things, that the money which under the bill may belong to a particular State where there are colleges for white students and also for colored students shall be divided in some equitable proportion. Now, the Senator from Colorado moves not to substitute his amendment for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington in lieu of the entire matter which the Senator from Washington moved to strike out, but to substitute it in lieu of only a part of that matter.

The parliamentary inquiry I desire to make is whether the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado, instead of being a substitute, is not in the nature of an amendment to perfect the bill; and after that is done, may not the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington be voted upon? Presenting as it does a separate proposition, the Senate certainly ought to have an opportunity of voting upon it; but if it is proposed and voted upon and accepted as a substitute, then I understand the Senate would be precluded from voting upon it.

I ask the Chair for a ruling.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no doubt at all about the matter. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado is to the original bill, for the purpose of perfecting the text of the original bill. The amendment of the Senator from Washington goes further than that. The Chair thinks it is in order only because it is to perfect the original text, and it has the right of precedence in the vote before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Rule XVIII provides that it has precedence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That has been the invariable ruling of the Chair ever since the present occupant of the chair has been here.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH].

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Colorado that the phraseology should be slightly changed, so as to read that the governor and the Secretary of Agriculture shall do this from year to year; otherwise it might be a permanent designation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think if there is no limitation, that should be done; but I believe that one fixing should not determine it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Therefore that language ought to be inserted, to make it clear, ought it not?

Mr. SHAFROTH. "As the governor and the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time direct"?

Mr. POMERENE. "Annually."

Mr. SHAFROTH. I would not require it annually.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Whenever it is necessary.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Very well; "from time to time."

Mr. SHAFROTH. "From time to time;" yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment as modified.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 14, it is proposed to strike out the words "legislature of such State" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "governor of such State and the Secretary of Agriculture," and after the word "may" at the end of line 14 to insert the words "from time to time"; so that, if amended, it will read:

Provided, That in any State in which two or more such colleges have been or hereafter may be established the appropriations hereinafter made to such State shall be administered by such college or colleges as the governor of such State and the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time direct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

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

I wish to say that the amendment just adopted, proposed by the Senator from Colorado, is a very, very great improvement on the original bill. I am very much gratified that that much has been changed in the bill, and that step taken in the direction in which I think it ought to be taken. I prefer, however, the proposition I have submitted, because I think it meets the situation much more equitably and fairly and more completely than the proposition submitted and just adopted.

I will simply say it has been urged very strongly here that this money does not go to the agricultural colleges, and that is largely made the basis for objecting to the proposition submitted. I think that phase of it was met very clearly in a single sentence by the Senator from New York [Mr. Root]. This money is appropriated by our Government, it goes somewhere, and the bill specifically states that it is to be used for the inauguration of this system in connection with the agricultural colleges. The money that goes to the agricultural colleges now simply goes there for the employment of teachers who will teach in the colleges. It possibly may be used for other purposes. The money that is to be appropriated by this bill goes to the agricultural college not for the employment of teachers to teach in the college but for the employment of teachers or demonstrators to go out from the college and teach the people or to demonstrate to the people on the outside.

In other words, if this money is appropriated and a white college is designated there is a fund that is available in connection with that college, and it is not available in connection with any other college under which the authorities of that college can employ a demonstrator—a farmer who has shown himself competent to do this demonstration work, and send him out to do the work.

It seems to me that the money goes to the college just as much as it does when you employ a teacher to teach the students who come to the college. In other words, it adds to the prestige of the college. It gives it a standing before the people that it otherwise would not have. So the distinction which is attempted to be made between the application of the fund under this act and the application of funds under the other act it seems to me is not a substantial one.

As I said in my first explanation of my amendment, my main purpose is that when this fund is appropriated to the States we shall insure by our own act of legislation that a part of the money shall be available in connection with the work of the agricultural college to which colored students go, largely for the reason that it will be an inspiration and an incentive to the colored boys to attend that school and fit themselves so that they may be selected as demonstrators.

I do not think there will be any duplication of work. The white demonstrators will go out, and if the agricultural college for the colored people can fit somebody who can be sent out as a demonstrator he will be sent to another field. It is not necessary to send him to some field that has been covered, but he will be sent to another field, and he will demonstrate to the blacks and to the whites also, and they will get a mutual benefit.

There are some sections of territory where the population is almost overwhelmingly black, and, as was suggested by the Senator from North Dakota, if they do not secure a colored man who is as competent as a white man to demonstrate, if they can secure a colored man who is reasonably competent, I believe he will accomplish more in that black territory than if you sent a white man there.

In some of the States, as I think I demonstrated the other day, there are colored people who have shown their fitness for farm demonstration work. They can be secured, and if we

make it sure that a part of this money will go to the college for colored people, then the authorities of that college can go anywhere that they can find a colored man who has been educated and has shown his fitness. There are some who have demonstrated their fitness for work of this character, and they can employ them and send them out as demonstrators. That will show to the black people that the door of opportunity to those colleges is still open, and that if they will attend there and secure the education that is furnished by the college they can have the hope of being placed in these positions and be sent out as demonstrators.

I wish to say that that is a great incentive to the white man, and it would certainly be a great incentive to the black man.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. JONES (when Mr. BORAH's name was called). I desire to state that the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is paired with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. If the senior Senator from Idaho were present, he would vote "yea" on this question.

Mr. GALLINGER (when Mr. BRANDEGEE's name was called). I have been requested to announce a pair between the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON].

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], who is detained from the Chamber on account of illness. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. STERLING (when Mr. CRAWFORD's name was called). I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CRAWFORD] and to state that he is paired with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA].

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I am paired for the day with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. For this reason I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] and vote "yea."

In this connection I desire to state that the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] is detained from the Senate by illness.

Mr. KENYON (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE's name was called). I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] on account of sickness. Were he present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey (when the name of Mr. LEA of Tennessee was called). I beg to announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD]. Were the Senator from Tennessee present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON]. On that account I withhold my vote.

Mr. NORRIS (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES]. I therefore withhold my vote. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. OLIVER (when Mr. PENROSE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is unavoidably absent to-day. He is paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. TOWNSEND (when Mr. ROBINSON's name was called). The junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is absent on business of the Senate.

Mr. ROOT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and therefore withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. KERN (when Mr. SHIVELY's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SHIVELY] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON].

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], who is absent. On that account I withhold my vote. I will permit this statement to stand for the remainder of the day.

Mr. SHAFROTH (when Mr. THOMAS's name was called). I desire to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. THOMAS] and to state that he is paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT].

Mr. RANDELL (when Mr. THORNTON's name was called). I announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. THORNTON] on account of sickness. He is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE].

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when Mr. TILLMAN's name was called). I wish to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. TILLMAN], and also to announce that he is paired with the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. If he were present, he would vote "nay"; and if permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

In this connection, I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] on important business. He is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when Mr. WARREN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. WARREN] is detained from the Chamber by illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is detained at home by illness. He is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. If the Senator from Mississippi were present, he would vote "nay" on this question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am paired with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF]. I will transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and vote "nay."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] and to state that he is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT].

Mr. MYERS. I announce the absence of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] on account of illness and the absence of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] on account of important official business. This announcement as to both Senators may stand for the day.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. LANE] from the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—23.

Bradley	Gronna	Oliver	Smoot
Bristow	Hitchcock	Page	Stephenson
Burton	Jones	Perkins	Sterling
Clapp	Lippitt	Poinexter	Weeks
Colt	Lodge	Pomerene	Works
Gallinger	McCumber	Sherman	

NAYS—32.

Ashurst	Fletcher	Myers	Shields
Bankhead	Hollis	Newlands	Simmons
Brady	James	Overman	Smith, Ariz.
Bryan	Johnson	Pittman	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Ransdell	Smith, S. C.
Chilton	Kern	Saulsbury	Swanson
Cummins	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Vardaman
Fail	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Walsh

NOT VOTING—40.

Bacon	du Pont	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Borah	Goff	Norris	Stone
Brandegge	Gore	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Burleigh	Hughes	Owen	Thomas
Catron	La Follette	Penrose	Thompson
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Reed	Thornton
Clarke, Ark.	Lea, Tenn.	Robinson	Tillman
Crawford	Lewis	Root	Townsend
Culberson	McLean	Shively	Warren
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Smith, Md.	Williams

So Mr. JONES's amendment was rejected.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. On page 3 of the bill, line 1, after the word "on," I move to insert "without discrimination as to race."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 1, after the words "carried on," insert the words "without discrimination as to race."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, this refers to the demonstration work upon the farms. I am informed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], in charge of the bill, that it is the purpose to have that work carried on without any discrimination as to race. In apportioning the money to the various States the colored people are taken into equal account with the

white people, and this being true, and it being also the fact that those in charge of the bill intend to have it carried on without discrimination as to race, I presume there can be no opposition to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I offer a substitute for the bill, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from South Dakota modifies the proposed substitute by striking out the words "legislature of such State" and inserting "governor of such State and the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. STERLING. Yes; I desire to have the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] incorporated in the substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That will be done.

Mr. STERLING. I should also like to have incorporated in my substitute the amendment just adopted which was offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. I think the words were "without discrimination as to race." I am not sure where the amendment would be applicable in the substitute, not having the original bill as amended before me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proper place will be found and the words will be inserted. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] submits a substitute, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in order to aid the college or colleges in each State now receiving or which may hereafter receive the benefits of the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts (12 Stat. L. 503), and of the act of Congress approved August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. L. 417), in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same in inaugurating and carrying on college agricultural extension work, appropriations are made as hereinafter specified: *Provided*, That such college agricultural extension work shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics to persons not attending or residents in said colleges in the several communities, and imparting to such persons information on said subjects through field demonstrations, lectures, publications, and otherwise, and this work shall be carried on without discrimination as to race in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the State agricultural college or colleges receiving the benefits of this act: *Provided further*, That in any State in which two or more such colleges have been or hereafter may be established the appropriations hereinafter made to such State shall be apportioned to and administered by such colleges, respectively, as the governor of such State and the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time direct.

Sec. 2. That for the purpose of paying the expenses of said college agricultural extension work and the necessary printing and distributing of information in connection with the same, there is permanently appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$480,000 for each year, \$10,000 of which shall be paid annually in the manner hereinafter provided to each State which shall, by action of its legislature, assent to the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That payment of such installments of the appropriation hereinbefore made as shall become due to any State before the adjournment of the regular session of the legislature meeting next after the passage of this act shall be made upon the assent of the governor thereof, duly certified to the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided further*, That there is also appropriated an additional sum of \$600,000 for the fiscal year following that in which the foregoing appropriation first becomes available, and for each year thereafter for seven years a sum exceeding by \$600,000 the sum appropriated for each preceding year, and for each year thereafter there is permanently appropriated for each year the additional sum of \$4,800,000: *Provided further*, That before the beginning of each fiscal year projects setting forth the proposed plans for work to be carried on under this act shall be submitted by the proper officials of each college and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture before the funds herein appropriated shall become available to such college for that fiscal year. Such additional sums shall be used only for the purpose hereinbefore stated, and shall be allotted annually to each State by the Secretary of Agriculture and paid in the manner hereinbefore provided in the proportion which the rural population of each State bears to the total rural population of all the States, as determined by the next preceding Federal census: *Provided further*, That no payment out of the additional appropriations herein provided shall be made in any year to any State until an equal sum has been appropriated for that year by the legislature of such State or provided by State, county, college, or local authority for the maintenance of such college agricultural extension work.

Sec. 3. That the sums hereby appropriated for extension work shall be annually paid in equal semiannual payments on the 1st day of January and July of each year by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the warrant of the Secretary of Agriculture out of the Treasury of the United States to the treasurer or other officer of the State duly authorized by the laws of the State to receive the same; and such officer shall be required to report to the Secretary of Agriculture on or before the 1st day of September of each year a detailed statement of the amount so received during the previous fiscal year and of its disbursement on forms prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sec. 4. That if any portion of the moneys received by the designated officer of any State for the support and maintenance of college agricultural extension work, as provided in this act, shall by any action or contingency be diminished or lost, or be misapplied, it shall be replaced by said State to which it belongs, and until so replaced no

subsequent appropriation shall be apportioned or paid to said State, and no portion of said moneys shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings, or the purchase or rental of land or in college-course teaching, lectures in colleges, promoting agricultural trains, or any other purpose not specified in this act, and not more than 5 per cent of each annual appropriation shall be applied to the printing and distribution of publications. It shall be the duty of each of said colleges annually, on or before the 1st day of January, to make to the governor of the State in which it is located a full and detailed report of its operations in the direction of extension work as defined in this act, including a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures from all sources for this purpose, a copy of which report shall be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

Sec. 5. That on or before the 1st day of July in each year after the passage of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall ascertain and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury as to each State whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriation for college agricultural extension work under this act and the amount which it is entitled, respectively, to receive. If the Secretary of Agriculture shall withhold a certificate from any State of its appropriation, the facts and reasons therefor shall be reported to the President, and the amount involved shall be kept separate in the Treasury until the expiration of the Congress next succeeding a session of the legislature of any State from which a certificate has been withheld, in order that the State may, if it should so desire, appeal to Congress from the determination of the Secretary of Agriculture. If the next Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid, it shall be covered into the Treasury.

Sec. 6. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall make an annual report to Congress of the receipts, expenditures, and results of the college agricultural extension work in all of the States receiving the benefits of this act, and also whether the appropriation of any State has been withheld; and if so, the reasons therefor.

Sec. 7. That Congress may at any time alter, amend, or repeal any or all of the provisions of this act.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I think the substitute now offered includes all the amendments that have been offered since the introduction of the substitute on January 29. The substitute itself makes a material change in section 1 of the original bill, and merges section 2 of that bill into section 1 of the substitute.

The material change made is the striking out of the following words in section 2 of House bill 7951:

And this work shall be carried on in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the State agricultural college or colleges receiving the benefits of this act.

And the striking out also of the word "cooperative" wherever it occurs in the bill.

Mr. President, I can not better illustrate the proposition here involved than to refer to a statement made the other day when the bill was first before the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] in charge of the measure. This was the statement made on page 1889 of the Record for January 17. In answer to an inquiry I made, the Senator from Georgia said:

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Replying further to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], I wish to call his attention to the fact that this bill limits the employment of the force and the conduct of this work exclusively to the colleges of agriculture. The Department of Agriculture here will not employ a man, will not control the work, and will have no connection with the actual work done, but the State college will conduct the work. The only part the Department of Agriculture has is that when the representatives of the college get up their plan for the ensuing year it is submitted to the department here for its approval. That being obtained, the relation of the department to it ceases and the work is conducted exclusively by the land-grant colleges.

That was the construction put by the Senator from Georgia at that time upon House bill 7951, for which I have offered this substitute. When the Senator from Georgia thus explained the bill he seemed to speak with all the force of conviction and as though the bill reflected his judgment in providing that the control of this demonstration work should be solely under the agricultural colleges. If the bill itself, Mr. President, bore this construction, there would be no cause of complaint; but the fear is, and I can not help but think the certainty is, that it will bear no such construction. In order that there may be no doubt about it, that there may be no mooted question hereafter in regard to this and that this measure may accord with my ideas as well as with those of the Senator from Georgia, I have introduced this substitute, taking out of the bill the cooperative feature as provided in the clause which I read a little while ago, which provides that the work should be carried on as mutually agreed upon between the Secretary of Agriculture and the agricultural colleges.

Mr. President, because of the brevity of the time allowed here I have summarized some of my objections to this feature of the bill, and I sincerely hope that they may have, and I confidently believe the proposition here involved will have, the earnest consideration of Senators.

The effect of this provision is to give the Secretary of Agriculture more power in the control and disposition of this fund than I am willing to see conferred upon him, more than I believe Senators will be willing to confer upon him when they

consider the far-reaching effect of this measure and of this cooperative clause. It in effect gives him the power to demand as a condition precedent to the right of a State to share in the fund that he, the Secretary, be permitted to originate and initiate the plans to be followed by a State or a State agricultural college in its farm demonstration and home economics work.

Second, I am opposed to this so-called cooperative feature of the bill because of the State subordination and subservency involved in such a course.

The State will be put in this position: It will fear the loss of money which otherwise would be spent within the State in the employment of men there, in the paying of bills there, and, in common parlance, the "making of more business" within the State, and it will be induced to consent to methods and to the employment of men which under ordinary conditions would not meet the approval of the sober judgment of the people of the State and of the agricultural college and which the farmers themselves would condemn.

Third, I oppose this feature of the bill because in order to get the money the State may be required to consent that the work shall be carried on by men to be designated by the Secretary of Agriculture or some official in that department and by the department's present field force, without regard to the equipment of the colleges or what they have done or may do in the matter of training men for the same work or in procuring men from the outside.

That this is true is evidenced by the declaration of Dr. Galloway, the first assistant of the Secretary of Agriculture, who himself said in the hearings of the House committee that it was the plan to take the men now engaged by the Agricultural Department into the demonstration work and put them into this field and into the work contemplated by this bill.

Fourth, Under this tremendous power to insist upon and designate Government employees to do the work, which brings them in close personal contact with the individual farmer at his home, there lurks a grave political danger. To a party in power or to any administration of any party which is not at all sensitive to the demands of civil service it will give opportunity to make "agricultural experts" out of gentlemen whose highest qualifications are that they have been political experts. For that reason I am opposed to the bill as it stands.

Fifth, But, barring all partisan or political considerations, the policy proposed in this cooperative feature will result in a loss of efficiency and in consequent economic loss. The men who from their youth or boyhood have lived within the State, have worked on the farm there, have taken their agricultural college course there, and then, in addition, have been taught how to teach and demonstrate, in addition to being entitled to the first opportunity to engage in such work, are the men of all others best equipped for the specific work provided for in this bill.

The State would better adopt a policy of exclusion of all outside aid and forego the money benefits of this bill than to pay the dear price of neglecting its own resources of brain and brawn, of neglecting the development and use of its own men in order to get such benefits. The State by such a course would be better off in the long run if under this bill, as I believe its effect will be, the young men in the State who get their training at the agricultural colleges are to be supplanted or their work made unnecessary because of the men sent out by the Agricultural Department.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. STERLING. I should like to yield to the Senator, but, if he will recall, my time is limited.

Mr. SIMMONS. I had overlooked the fact that the Senator was speaking under the 15-minute rule, or I would not have sought to interrupt him.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I attribute to the Senator from Georgia the highest good faith in his advocacy of this measure as it is. The Senate and the country are indebted to him for the zeal and the ability he has shown in working for improved agricultural conditions. I appreciate the wise statesmanship of himself and fellow Senators of the South, which, recognizing agriculture more than all else as the basis of their prosperity, present and future, would bring the Southern States into their own by developing to the utmost this great, wholesome, and, more than all others, independent industry. I do not criticize them for resorting to every legitimate means, Federal as well as State, to accomplish their worthy purpose.

But as to the cooperative feature of this bill I have my suspicions, not of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, not of the Secretary of Agriculture himself, but knowing a few things,

and something of men and the motives which influence them, a man can divine a few things. The cooperative feature of the bill would never have been put there had it not been suggested or insisted upon by some official or officials, aside from the chief, in the Department of Agriculture. They have had some experiences; the employees of the department have not always impressed the farmers with a sense of superior knowledge on the part of the employee, or the demonstration "did not work," or the farmers of a particular locality were not enthusiastic, or were not in a receptive mood, and the people of the agricultural college were sometimes even less so; there has been some friction and some conflict of jurisdiction. To obviate all this and make the farmer take the dose "willy-nilly," it is proposed to compel him to cooperate.

I say such is the plain meaning of that particular clause of the bill which it is proposed shall be stricken out by the substitute, the clause which requires the Secretary of Agriculture and the college authorities to mutually agree upon the work to be carried on. There will be the tendency of the department to go to the limit in the exercise of its power. The Secretary of Agriculture, influenced by the report of some subordinate, might sit down with the president or dean of an agricultural college and say: "Gentlemen, I have here a plan, we have given it study, and we have determined to carry out this plan in your particular State. Are you agreed to it? If you are, the money is yours."

Cooperation is a fine word—a word to conjure with in our modern industrial life; but compulsory cooperation, unless under very special circumstances, is a contradiction in terms. There has been some friction between officials of the Agricultural Department and the men of the agricultural colleges and experiment stations—not much, perhaps, but some—even where cooperation was voluntary; but if you want real friction, friction that will start a fire and singe things, just make it compulsory as between supposedly free men or free institutions. But, Mr. President, more than all else, I object to this feature of the bill because it involves the extreme of paternalism. Nothing like this has ever been attempted in Federal legislation. Men objected to the Alaskan railroad bill because it meant Government ownership, and that means paternalism; but there is no comparison. The Government will not in owning and operating any railroad be in the business of fathering the enterprise and directing the conduct and work of the individual citizen.

When hog cholera was under discussion the misgiving was felt that the administering of the serum and the cutting off of the tail of the swine for the purpose of getting the infected blood was not a proper governmental function. But the paternalism involved in this bill is gross in comparison with that. Hog cholera is a scourge from which no section is immune. It is not local. The department, through its Bureau of Animal Industry, has the entire field before it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING].

Mr. STERLING. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I only desire to say a word. If the Secretary of Agriculture should undertake arbitrarily to withhold the fund from a State or to raise a point as to its use, and upon that point withhold it, the subject would come back to Congress for our consideration; and it can safely be expected that the representatives of the State in Congress will see that upon no frivolous ground is the money kept from the State. The fund goes to the State agent designated by the State legislature; and I still believe, as I said a few days ago, that under the bill the agents are to be designated by the State authorities; indeed, the Senate voted down a proposed amendment which undertook to add, after the word "manner," the words "and by such agents."

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] and in the explanation which he has been making of that amendment. I have not yet come to a conclusion in my own mind as to whether or not I should support it, and I should like to ask him in my time to complete the sentence and description of the amendment which he was giving to the Senate a few moments ago.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to ask that unanimous consent be given to the Senator from South Dakota to continue for 10 minutes longer.

Mr. GALLINGER. That can not be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That can not be done. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. WEEKS. I have asked a question of the Senator from South Dakota, Mr. President.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] and I also thank the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] for their kindness. I appreciate the force of the rule, and hence thought I should be able to bring my remarks within the 15-minute limit. Just a word or two further.

I think I was speaking with reference to those things in regard to which the General Government might naturally do certain work. I said with reference to the activity of the Government in the matter of hog cholera—and the same thing might be said as well with reference to other animal diseases—that the Government has its specialists and scientists, who make investigations and search for cause and remedy, and the people may well say, with reference to a disease like this, that they are entitled to the relief which the superior knowledge of those in the Agricultural Department have gleaned from the wide field over which their operations extend; but here I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts the pending bill will permit the enforced interference of the Federal Government in problems so commonplace, so everyday, so local, and so individual as knowing how to plow and plant and fertilize, and knowing how to cook and sew and having a care for cleanliness and sanitation. That, to my mind, is not an inspiring spectacle. It is contrary, as I view it, to the spirit of our institutions, to our dual system of government, under which the General Government must depend for its life and vigor on the vitality and strength of the several parts; and that vitality and that strength are best secured by leaving the solution of every problem here involved to the voluntary action and initiative of the States themselves.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from South Dakota for the great clearness with which he has answered my question.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, before we pass from the general subject comprised in this bill I think that a statement which the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] seems to have made in his speech of a day or two ago, to which I did not have the pleasure of listening in full, but which I find in the RECORD, should be modified and explained so far as it relates to the State of Delaware.

The Senator from Washington seems to have said that in Delaware we have no colored colleges and no colored teachers. I fancy he did not intend to make that statement, as it would seem an injustice to some very worthy colored men in my State, but that seems to be the purport of his statement, found on page 3192 of the RECORD.

I want to say to the Senator from Washington that we have a most admirable college for the colored people in Delaware. That college is administered by a colored president and a corps of colored teachers, all of whom are very good and efficient men in their departments. The president of the board of trustees of that college is our chief justice, and has been, to my knowledge, for a great many years. That college is very efficiently administered for colored people by members of their own race as teachers. I fancy the Senator from Washington did not intend to reflect upon these teachers or to make any such statement as seems to be included in his speech.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Delaware for calling my attention to the language to which he refers, because I certainly did not intend to reflect upon the State of Delaware or to convey the impression that there were no colored teachers in Delaware, or, in fact, in any other State. I think it appears clearly from what preceded the sentence to which the Senator calls attention that I was referring to the attendance of colored students and white students at the different agricultural colleges in the various States, and that the first part of the answer given there, to which I presume the Senator refers—

It is true in the whole 17 States—

has reference to the attendance of the colored students at the different agricultural colleges. Then, evidently, I started to refer to the question of the employment of colored teachers in the different States and was then interrupted, as is indicated here in the RECORD. I did not, as I have said, intend to convey the impression that no colored teachers were employed in Delaware or in any other State. Further on in my speech I named the States that I had in mind, and also gave the number of teachers, both white and colored, in the higher schools. I again thank the Senator for calling my attention to the matter, so that it may be made perfectly clear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING].

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Fletcher	Norris	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Gallinger	Oliver	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Hollis	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Brady	James	Page	Smoot
Bristow	Johnson	Perkins	Stephenson
Bryan	Jones	Poinceter	Sterling
Burton	Kenyon	Pomerene	Swanson
Chamberlain	Kern	Ransdell	Thompson
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Root	Townsend
Clapp	Lippitt	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Shafroth	Walsh
Colt	McCumber	Sheppard	Weeks
Cummins	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	Works
Dillingham	Myers	Simmons	
Fall	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. SWANSON. My colleague [Mr. MARTIN of Virginia] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. He is paired with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to again announce that my colleague [Mr. LANE] is unavoidably detained from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, without asking for the reading of the amendment, I wish to ask the Senator from South Dakota to tell me in a word just what the amendment proposes to do.

Mr. STERLING. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that the amendment simply proposes to strike out the feature of the bill which requires an agreement between the Secretary of Agriculture and the head of the agricultural college in regard to the work to be carried on.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Who is to have charge of it?

Mr. STERLING. The proposition involved in the substitute is that the colleges themselves shall take the initiative in proposing this work. The Secretary of Agriculture is to supervise the work, at least to the extent that he is left to approve any project for farm demonstration work that is to be carried on by the college, the same as in the original bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I wish to take just a few moments of the time of the Senate to explain to some of the friends of the original vocational educational bill, introduced by me, what has seemed to be an inconsistency on my part in supporting this measure.

I wish to say in all candor that I believe that the two provisions of Senate bill No. 3, introduced by me, vocational education and agricultural extension, should go forward as one measure. I think I should have supported the measure now under consideration under any conditions, because I believe it is one that will result in good to the American farmer, but, in my judgment, we are going at this work at the wrong end. We are seeking to advance the cause of agriculture by taking instruction to the adult farmer on the farm, without in any way taking into account the farmer's boy and the farmer's girl, or, at least, only in an indirect and minor way.

In my judgment, if we are to change the economic conditions of our country with reference to farm life, we must commence with the boy. The father will soon pass off the stage of action, and his place will be taken by his sons; and we must in some way or other convince the boy that farming as a business, as a vocation, can not only be made equally as pleasurable as other vocations, but equally as profitable.

There is no man to-day conversant with the conditions of farm life who does not know that the boy, as soon as he becomes able to look over the broader fields of life for himself, very naturally reaches the conclusion that there is some place where he can make money faster and where he can have an easier and more pleasant life than he can on the farm.

The colloquy which took place the other day between the senior Senator from Iowa and the junior Senator from California sought, as it seemed to me, to peer into the future to see, as they said, how this bill was going to work out—a very proper thing to do. If in all that we do here in the Senate which pertains to taking large sums of money from the Federal Treasury we should first insist upon being shown how the measure would work out, we should take a great deal less money from the Treasury. I think the measure at present before us, taken in connection with that part of what is known as the vocational educational bill, which I hope we shall soon pass, will work out well.

I have given that feature a great deal of study, and I think I can explain to Senators how, as one measure and in cooperation, the two would work out satisfactorily. My optimism, my respect for the ability of the junior Senator from Georgia, and my hope and my trust are so great that I am going to believe that in due time these two measures will go forward, one following the other, to be sure, but yet go forward in such a way that they will cooperate.

Let me first take up some of the features of the vocational education bill. If that bill is enacted into law, it will mean that in every agricultural section of this country, at least in every rural section where agriculture is a dominant work of that section, there will be an agricultural school. The teacher of that school will be a man fairly well versed in the ordinary branches of study, although not necessarily a superior teacher in the high-school branches. He will rather be a progressive, intelligent, up-to-date farmer. He will teach in the schoolroom during the fall and winter months that part of agricultural education which can be taught from books. He will be hired, not as the ordinary teacher is for the terms of school, but by the year; and in the springtime he will go out upon the farm and teach the boys, in actual practice, what they have been taught theoretically in the schoolroom. He will go to the fathers of the boys of his school and ask that he give them a plat of land to cultivate for themselves, a plat of land that shall be their very own, where they would understand that the products of their little plat should be theirs, and the funds derived from the sale of the crops therefrom be theirs to spend. That teacher would have in every important section of the town plats of land where he could do demonstration work, plats scientifically cultivated under his own supervision, where he might show to the adult farmers of the town that judicious, up-to-date agriculture would pay.

And now, Mr. President, we come to the work contemplated by the bill offered by the Senator from Georgia, now before us.

The farmer-teacher would have for his unit the town. His principal work would be to educate the farmer boys in his own town, but the man sent out from the college under the provisions of the bill before us would have the county as his unit. Under this bill, presumably, a man will be sent out from the college of higher class and of greater technical knowledge than the town teacher. He will supervise the educational work of the several town teachers and cooperate with them. When he goes into a town he will find, to speak figuratively, that the field has been plowed and harrowed and fertilized, ready for him to sow the seed when he comes.

I insist, Mr. President, that there can be no such benefit derived from the operation of this bill alone as could be had from these two forces to which I have referred working together. As I understand it, there is no feature of the bill before us that provides education for the farmers' sons and daughters. It is designed, at least primarily, to carry information to the adult farmer on the farm.

I do not like generally to speak from personal experience, but I think I may be permitted to say that I was a farmer's boy. I was brought up in my early life on the farm, and I speak from knowledge. I can remember that when I was a boy I used to like to go to the schoolhouse about half an hour before the school commenced, in order that I might play snowball with the boys or play "ring around rosy" with the girls. I rather think the latter was the more enticing to me. In order to do that I had to get up at 4 o'clock in the morning to do my chores. My father had what we called the "home farm" and the "hill farm." I used to feed the cattle, milk the cows, clean off the horses, clean out the stable at the home farm, and then go up to the hill farm, where we kept the heifers that were not giving milk. I have been up there time after time when the weather was 20° below zero, and not infrequently 30° below, with the wind blowing 30 or 40 miles an hour.

Every farmer boy knows that you can not drive a cow to water when it is very cold or very windy without a good deal of work. I had to go down to the spring, some 30 rods below the barn, and cut out the ice so that the cattle could drink, and then, with a good deal of difficulty, drive the cattle to the spring. I only wonder now, as I look back upon that life, that I did not have my feet and hands and nose and ears frozen. I frequently did have the tips of my ears touched by frost, yet as I look back upon that life I think I see that in it I laid the foundation for a constitution which I would not have otherwise possessed. I do not regret it, and yet when I reached the time of life where I was looking forward to see what I would do for a vocation I need not say that I thought there was probably some way in which I could earn a livelihood easier and with greater pleasure than by working on the farm.

Those conditions are substantially the same now. The boy on the farm sees that he has to work several hours per day more than the boy in the city or in the urban sections or at some trade. It is not difficult to see why, with this condition existing, the great body of the farmer boys, when they get through with the high-school, drift off to the cities and add to the already very congested conditions of the urban sections.

This must be changed. We can not materially improve the economic conditions of this country as they relate to farm life unless we can change these conditions; and they can only be changed by starting at the foundation—the boy—and so educating him that he will come to have a love for the farm and a belief that farming can be made as profitable as other vocations.

I am going to hope that Senators will look at this bill in this way and will conclude that whatever might be the result of this bill taken alone we are later on going to have agricultural extension and vocational education in cooperation, and that the results of the two taken together will be most beneficent and satisfactory to the agricultural interests of this country.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

Mr. WEEKS. There are six amendments on the memorandum which I send up, all of the same character. I offer the first one.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 7, after the word "colleges," it is proposed to insert "or departments or boards of agriculture."

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, my purpose in offering the amendment is that in Massachusetts we have an agricultural college and also a State board of agriculture doing work of this kind; and it seems to me that under such conditions there should be a possibility of turning this money over to either the college or the department of agriculture, whichever is doing the work which more nearly complies with the requirements of this law. As a matter of fact, the department of agriculture is doing exactly that kind of work. It has meetings of one kind or another during the year and has a much greater demand for expenditures along this line than the appropriation which is made by the State. I think in that way the money would be as wisely expended as if it were confined to the colleges.

I hope the Senator from Georgia will accept the amendment. If the first amendment is accepted, there are five other places in the bill where it should be included. I therefore suggest that I will offer the other amendments later if this one is agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I regret that I am compelled to differ with the Senator from Massachusetts. There may be several States in which it would be desirable at the present time to handle this fund, in part, through their organized agricultural activities outside of the college. After very carefully considering the matter, however, it was concluded that this is really a bill designed largely to carry to the people the knowledge that the colleges and experiment stations have developed. It is an extension of what is already a national activity. It was thought that to undertake to spread it beyond the colleges into a double agency of control in the States would be likely to lead to such trouble that it would be inadvisable to give it that direction.

Mr. WEEKS. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he thinks there would be any danger or any harm in leaving to the States the agency through which this money should be expended, either the agricultural college or the State department of agriculture?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have a great deal of confidence in the colleges of agriculture, and I really think it is safer to leave it there.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not know what the Senator's experience is, but I feel confident that in Massachusetts the money would be as wisely expended through the State department of agriculture as in any other way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I want to say, in behalf of the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, that this whole question of the control of money appropriated by Congress for Federal aid to education is one which has perhaps caused more debate and more contention than almost any other that came before us in working out the great problem of vocational education. In considering the main bill, the final conclusion reached by those who had the matter in charge was that the measure would not work out satisfactorily unless the States were allowed to have—subject to Federal oversight and supervision, of course—the control of the appropriations.

In regard to the general educational fund called for by Senate bill No. 3, it was provided that a board for vocational education should be appointed by the legislature of each State, and that this board, subject, of course, to the provisions of the bill, should have the power to say how this fund should be expended.

Let me say that I am not seeking to interfere in any way with the bill as introduced by the Senator from Georgia. I only wish to say, for his information and for the information of the Senate, that if there was any feature pertaining to the bill granting Federal aid for vocational education which provoked prolonged contention and discussion, it was as to what board should have control of the expenditure of the fund. I wish also to say to the Senator from Georgia that after months and months, and I do not know but I may say after years of investigation, I found that the only way in which this matter would work out satisfactorily to the States was by giving the disposition and control of this fund into the hands of some organization or body to be named by the legislatures of the States. I presume the results will work out all right as provided in the measure before us, but if the Senator from Georgia should write to all States of the Union and get their opinions he would find more divergence upon this point than perhaps upon any other in his bill.

The junior Senator from Georgia has worked, as I chance to know, largely in cooperation with the State agricultural colleges in the furtherance of his bill. The agricultural colleges have joined together and have, in a most powerful way, pressed the Smith-Lever bill, because under that bill they were to have the exclusive control of this great fund.

I did not expect to go into this feature of the matter at all, but perhaps I may properly say, for the information of the Senate, what has been done in behalf of the agricultural colleges. They have had a pretty good taste of money and are quite ambitious for more. Here is what the agricultural colleges are to-day getting:

In the first place, they have the benefit of the original Morrill Agricultural Act of 1862. Later, in 1887, Congress appropriated \$15,000 annually to each State for experiment stations. Then, by the second Morrill Act, of 1890, we gave them \$25,000 annually in addition. In 1906, under the Adams Act, we doubled the appropriations under the Hatch Act by giving an additional \$15,000 annually to each State for these State experiment stations. In 1907, under what is known as the Nelson amendment, we added another \$25,000 to this fund. These four appropriations, which supplement the original Morrill Act, give to each State agricultural college \$80,000 per annum, if I am correctly informed.

I have great respect for the agricultural colleges of this country. They are doing good work. The State experiment station in my own State is doing most excellent work. I regret to say, however, that there has been no one force that has fought the general bill for the promotion of industrial education like some of the agricultural colleges. They have an organization that is one of the most powerful in the country. Acting with this organization is what is known as the American Soil Fertility League. Mr. H. H. Gross, of Chicago, is the active executive man of this league, and he told me that he had at his disposal a fund of more than \$25,000 a year. I am quite sure he told me that five different railroads had agreed to pay \$5,000 a year for five years or more, and that he also had other funds at his disposal.

Mr. Gross, as the active agent of that organization, came to me after I took charge of the bill for the granting of Federal aid for vocational education and told me that he was thoroughly in favor of the Page bill, and that all I need to do was to help him get through this bill, and he would put his shoulder behind the Page vocational-education bill and push it to success. I declined to do it, not because I did not think his bill a good one, but because I did not wish to see my bill dismembered. After he found that I would not do his bidding he said: "I have changed my mind with regard to your bill. I think it is a very bad bill"; and he flooded this country with circulars, which I think every Senator received, setting forth in terms that I knew were unfair what he was pleased to say were the bad and unwise features of the Page bill.

I mention this in all good nature. I hope the Senator from Georgia will not think that in what I am saying I am trying to oppose his bill, because I am not. I want to see it passed. It is a good measure. I simply say that in my opinion there are a hundred reasons why the two bills should have gone through together and not one why they should not. But this is only my opinion, and upon this point he and I disagree. I yield to the inevitable, hoping that later on he will be as good to the balance of my bill as I have tried to be to his measure.

In closing, I wish to say to all my friends here who have stood by my vocational-education bill so faithfully that I hope they will all vote for this bill. I believe if they do the Senate and the country will later on stand behind Federal aid for vocational education with such vigor that when we get to that bill nothing can stop its passage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, when the Senate bill was under consideration I made a suggestion which the Senator from Georgia kindly acceded to, that section 3 should be amended, on line 19 of page 4 of this bill, by striking out the word "or" after "college," and inserting the words "or individual contributions" after the word "authority."

I trust the Senator will permit that amendment to go into the bill and go to conference, and then if it is not thought a wise thing to do it can be dropped out.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not object to it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then, I move that amendment on line 19, page 4, to strike out the word "or" before the word "local," and, after the word "authority," to insert the words "or individual contributions."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 4, line 19, it is proposed to strike out the word "or" before the word "local," and after the word "authority" to insert a comma and the words "or individual contributions."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will call the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the phraseology of section 4, "That the sums hereby appropriated for extension work shall be annually paid in equal semiannual payments on the 1st day of January and July of each year," and so forth. It is not important perhaps, but it seems to me the word "annually" there is a matter of supererogation and might well go out of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In what section?

Mr. GALLINGER. Section 4, the first two lines. My suggestion is to strike out the word "annually." I think it will be better language. That likewise can go to conference, and if it is desired it can be restored.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have no objection to that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 4, line 23, strike out the word "annually."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to call attention to page 2, line 8. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] has called to my attention the fact that there are two chapters on that page. So, after the words "four hundred and seventeen," I move to amend by adding "chapter 841," which is the chapter that we have under consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the words "four hundred and seventeen," in line 8, insert "chapter 841," so as to read: "Twenty-sixth Statutes at Large, page 417, chapter 841."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before that is done I should like to have read the amendment that was offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] and agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 14, strike out the words "legislature of such State" and insert "governor of such State and the Secretary of Agriculture," and after the word "may" insert "from time to time," so that if amended it will read:

The appropriations hereinafter made to such State shall be administered by such college or colleges as the governor of such State and the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time direct.

Mr. GALLINGER. I presume there will be no difficulty about it, but my suggestion would be that the word "jointly" might be inserted after the word "may."

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not think it is necessary, but I do not see any objection to it.

Mr. GALLINGER. It makes it a little clearer. If there is no objection, I would suggest the insertion of the word "jointly."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "may," in line 14, page 2, insert the word "jointly."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were concurred in.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 17, strike out the word "shall" and insert in lieu thereof the words "may in the absence of prior legislative assent," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That payment of such installments of the appropriation hereinbefore made as shall become due to any State before the adjournment of the regular session of the legislature meeting next after the passage of this act may, in the absence of prior legislative assent, be made upon the assent of the governor thereof, duly certified to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, the bill as now phrased requires the assent of the governor, even though the assent of the legislature now in session may be given to the provisions of the bill. There are a good many legislatures now in session, and there is no reason why the assent of the governor should be required if they assent to the provisions. It is merely a verbal correction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE]. The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was some question as to the title.

Mr. WEEKS. It will not be necessary to change the title on account of the adoption of amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The title will stand.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senate having passed House bill 7951, I move that the bill (S. 3091) to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate bill will be indefinitely postponed.

THE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a notice that I ask may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The notice will be read.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Indiana gives notice that on Monday next, the 9th day of February, 1914, at the conclusion of the routine morning business, he will move to so amend Rule XXV that the Committee on Naval Affairs shall consist of 16 Senators instead of 15 Senators as at present constituted.

Mr. CLAPP. I ask the Senator from Indiana if he will not defer that until Tuesday. Some of us have to leave Monday to attend the funeral of the late Representative BREMNER, and I should like to be here when the matter comes up.

Mr. KERN. I shall be very glad to accommodate the Senator from Minnesota. The notice may be changed to Tuesday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That modification in the notice will be made.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BRYAN. 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 6 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 9, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 7, 1914.

JUDGE OF MUNICIPAL COURT.

Edward B. Kimball, of Washington, D. C., to be a judge of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, vice Charles S. Bundy, term expired.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

George Weaver, of Colorado, to be receiver of public moneys at Durango, Colo., vice John H. McDewitt, jr., term expired.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Medical Inspector William C. Braisted to be Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy with the rank of rear admiral for a term of four years.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 7, 1914.

CONSUL.

Dominic I. Murphy to be consul at Amsterdam, Netherlands.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Percy W. Maer to be collector of customs for the district of Mobile.

POSTMASTER.

ARIZONA.

L. R. Bailey, Bisbee.

INDIANA.

Charles H. Havens, Kokomo.

IOWA.

Samuel A. Sumner, Dallas Center.

MICHIGAN.

Floyd A. Chapin, Fenton.

D. L. Kingsbury, Cassopolis.

Walter W. Simons, Coleman.

H. J. Tibbits, Ravenna.

MISSISSIPPI.

Walter L. Collins, Union.

T. H. Sharp, Columbus.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Henry Bourns, Ellsworth.

Joseph J. Campbell, Homer City.

William M. O. Edwards, Penciloyd.

Harry J. Harwi, Hellertown.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Joshua L. Young, Ware Shoals.

VERMONT.

Frank A. Burditt, Putney.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, February 7, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Father of truth, arouse in us the strongest indignation, the most righteous hatred, of all forms of sham and hypocrisy, in society, in business, in politics, in religion; that the term "whited sepulcher" may not be applied to any of us. To be clean without and foul within is the sin of sins, and aroused in the heart of the Christ the most scathing rebuke.

"The world is always in need of the man with courage and sincerity, who will say what he means and mean what he says." Make us that man. For Christ's sake. Amen.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LINDBERGH, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of the illness of his mother.

EMILY CHANCEY.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri offers a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 393 (H. Rept. 235).

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Emily Chancey, widow of John T. Chancey, late a special employee of the House, an amount equal to six months of his compensation as such employee and an additional amount, not exceeding \$250, to defray the funeral expenses of said John T. Chancey.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

NELLIE TAYLOR.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I also present the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri also presents a further privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 398 (H. Rept. 236).

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to

Nellie Taylor, daughter of Daniel Taylor, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to six months of his compensation as such employee, and an additional amount, not exceeding \$250, to William S. Riley, undertaker, to defray the funeral expenses of said Daniel Taylor.

Also the following committee amendments were read:

Amend. page 1, line 8, by striking out the words "Nellie Taylor, daughter," and insert "the legal representative."
In lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "William S. Riley, undertaker, to."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

NATIONAL CORN EXPOSITION, DALLAS, TEX.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following invitation, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1914.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The president and board of directors of the Sixth National Corn Exposition take pleasure in announcing to the House of Representatives of the United States that they will, on the 10th day of February, 1914, open the National Corn Exposition, at Dallas, Tex., which exposition is participated in by practically all of the States in the Union and by the National Department of Agriculture.

Said exposition will be open until February 24, and I am authorized and directed by the president and board of directors of said exposition to request the honor of the presence of the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States at whatever time it will be most convenient for them to attend.

Respectfully, yours,

HATTON W. SUMNERS.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report:

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 405.

Resolved, That the invitation of the officers and directors of the Sixth National Corn Exposition at Dallas, Tex., to attend said exposition be accepted, and that a committee from the membership of the House be designated by the Speaker to attend said exposition on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I did not hear all of the resolution read. Does it provide for an acceptance of the invitation?

Mr. SUMNERS. It provides for an acceptance of the invitation, but it does not carry any appropriation.

Mr. MANN. What is meant by an acceptance of the invitation?

Mr. SUMNERS. It means that the Speaker, if the invitation be accepted, will designate a committee from the House, from among the gentlemen who can do so, to attend as representatives of the House.

Mr. MANN. Does the resolution provide for the appointment of a committee?

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not expect that a committee composed of Members of the House is going down there at its own expense?

Mr. SUMNERS. I do expect it; yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman has not been here as long as I have.

Mr. SUMNERS. I know they are going down there, and I know who are going if the resolution is adopted.

Mr. MANN. I have heard that before under similar circumstances, and I do not recall any case now where subsequently we did not pay the expenses.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman permit? The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], who resides in Dallas, states as a Member of the House that the Congress will not be called upon to make any appropriation for the expense of this committee.

The idea of having it designated by the Speaker is that they may go there in a more or less official capacity, and that their absence from here may not be criticized by their constituents, because they are fulfilling a mission of the House. And I might say further to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that it is possible, if not probable, that the parties in charge of this exposition may assume the expense of this committee themselves. And I hope he will not object.

Mr. MANN. How large a committee is expected to absent itself from the House in order to go there?

Mr. GARNER. Well, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] would like to get a right nice little bunch of Representatives from the gentleman's section of the country to go down and see something of the State of Texas and of the corn produced in that section.

Mr. MANN. I ask my friend from Texas [Mr. GARNER] which he considers the most important, for Members of the House to go to Dallas, Tex., where they can be of no earthly use, or remain here in the House, where they belong and where they may be of some service to the Government?

Mr. GARNER. "The gentleman from Texas" does not care to go into that phase of the matter just at this time. I can see absolutely no reason why, if Members of Congress feel that they could be of service to the country by attending a national exhibition that has been indorsed or, rather, authorized by an act of Congress, there could be any objection to their going.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think we have three resolutions reported that are now on the calendar providing for the acceptance of invitations to attend conventions or something of that nature, all of which provide, with one exception, that there shall be no expense to the Government or no appropriation, one, I believe, fixing the appropriation at \$1,000.

I do not think I shall object to this resolution, but I am opposed to providing officially for the representation of Congress or of the Government to attend conventions without taking the responsibility of paying the expenses. I do not have a very high idea of a committee or delegation or representation which goes officially but which is not important enough to have its expenses paid. When these other propositions shall come up I am sorry to say now that if they come with a request for unanimous consent I propose to object.

Mr. GARNER. Question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman object? Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to this resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to inquire of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] as to how many Members he would like to have on his committee. Do not make them too many, because business is pressing.

Mr. MANN. Let the whole Congress go. Let us take a vacation. [Laughter.]

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Speaker, of course Dallas would be glad to have as many Members of Congress selected as can conveniently attend. We do expect to have about five or six Members attend.

And may I just state in this connection, Mr. Speaker, if I may do so with unanimous consent—and I shall be very brief—that as to this character of resolutions I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as a general proposition. The duty of Members of Congress is to be here. But this is a great national meeting of men who produce the grain of the United States, and I believe it is not a loss of time for Members of Congress who have to deal with the problems that concern agriculture to come in contact with the men who are leaders in agricultural production and in connection with the matters that have to do with that economic problem.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint the committee later.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. PALMER rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement for one or two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, the bill known as the Philadelphia judgeship bill, providing for an additional judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, is now on the Speaker's table in the shape of a conference report, disagreeing to Senate amendment No. 1, which strikes out what is known as the Cullop amendment to the bill, providing for publicity to be given by the President to the indorsers of the successful applicant for the judgeship. It was generally stated to Members yesterday that the bill would come up to-day.

I simply desire to say that Judge Cullop, who is the author of this amendment and is very much interested in it, has had a death in his family, which necessitates his absence to-day, and the friends of the bill have therefore agreed that it shall go over until Monday morning. While I do not agree with Judge Cullop's position, I felt it to be entirely fair, in view of the active fight he has made in behalf of this proposition, that the

conference report should not come up in his absence. I just desire to give notice to the Members that the conference report will be called up on Monday, immediately after the reading of the Journal.

RURAL POST ROADS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. 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. 11686) to provide that the United States shall, in certain cases, aid the States and the civil subdivisions thereof in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will inquire of the Clerk how much time was used last night?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Two hours and a half.

The SPEAKER. How much time is there left?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Four hours and a half.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent may I ask the gentleman a question? It is now about half past 12. Four hours and a half of general debate would run to at least 5 o'clock, and perhaps a little later. Is it the expectation of the gentleman to go ahead under the five-minute rule this afternoon?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have no preference whatever about the matter. I wish to accede to the wishes of the leaders of the House, who have the management of the calendar. I have no preference.

Mr. MANN. Of course the gentleman knows it is Saturday afternoon.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I have no desire to press the bill beyond the stage of general debate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the road bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11686, with Mr. RUBEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11686, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11686) to provide that the United States shall, in certain cases, aid the States and the civil subdivisions thereof in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am not at all well this morning and have not been for several days, and therefore I will not claim the attention of the House to discuss this bill at any great length.

This question is not a new question, but was recognized in the early history of this country. We all know that President Washington was greatly interested in the building of public roads and that the Cumberland Road was begun under the administration of Thomas Jefferson; that Henry Clay and John C. Calhoun also were active in their day on this great subject.

In the last platform of the Democratic Party, adopted at Baltimore, there is a distinct declaration in favor of Government aid to good roads. The declaration in the last national Democratic platform is:

We favor national aid to State and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads.

This, of course, is the last declaration of the Democratic Party on the subject, but it connects back with the work of the party, as I mentioned a moment ago, in the early history of this country.

I do not hesitate to say that, in my judgment, there is no question to-day before the American people in which the people themselves are more vitally interested. From every corner and part of this great Republic is coming the demand for this legislation; and we, as the servants of the people, owe no higher duty than to respond to the wishes of the people whom we represent, wherever their wishes are plainly and definitely known. That has always been my policy and my purpose since I have had the honor to be a Member of this House, and I expect to continue to speak and to vote the sentiments of my people so long as they continue to honor me by keeping me here as their Representative. The widespread interest in road

building is shown by the following table of expenditures in the States:

Estimated appropriations and expenditures, by States, for year 1912.

Alabama	\$1,123,421.22
Arizona	200,000.00
Arkansas	1,586,050.00
California	2,750,000.00
Colorado	1,469,690.00
Connecticut	1,250,000.00
Delaware	339,480.00
Florida	1,500,000.00
Georgia	2,750,000.00
Idaho	750,000.00
Illinois	7,000,000.00
Indiana	6,286,311.00
Iowa	7,500,000.00
Kansas	5,155,360.00
Kentucky	2,250,000.00
Louisiana	2,147,062.56
Maine	1,482,743.00
Maryland	1,000,000.00
Massachusetts	2,350,000.00
Michigan	4,300,000.00
Minnesota	3,000,000.00
Mississippi	2,000,000.00
Missouri	4,650,510.00
Montana	1,532,787.36
Nebraska	2,278,188.00
Nevada	100,000.00
New Hampshire	1,000,000.00
New Jersey	3,629,773.00
New Mexico	500,000.00
New York	6,938,694.00
North Carolina	2,333,942.00
North Dakota	1,023,569.00
Ohio	3,349,632.00
Oklahoma	4,105,299.84
Oregon	1,100,000.00
Pennsylvania	5,864,718.00
Rhode Island	281,775.00
South Carolina	750,000.00
South Dakota	1,250,000.00
Tennessee	2,000,000.00
Texas	7,269,592.00
Utah	500,000.00
Vermont	676,039.00
Virginia	1,500,000.00
Washington	4,059,508.87
West Virginia	1,042,353.00
Wisconsin	4,000,000.00
Wyoming	372,000.00

Grand total 120,298,505.35

This statement shows that every State in this Union is spending money for this purpose, and there is no purpose for which we can expend the public money that will, in my judgment, bring greater results to the people or contribute more to their happiness and their prosperity than the improvement of public roads. When we furnish the means of transportation or communication between the people in their neighborhoods and in their immediate communities and vicinities and, in addition, open up the highways that lead to the marts of trade and to the centers throughout this country, we carry to each and every man, woman, and child in this great Republic to some extent the prosperity, blessings, comfort, and happiness that exist in every part of this great Commonwealth.

In addition to that, there is no greater source of prosperity than to increase the value of the land in the country, because the land, as we all know, is the source of all prosperity, for from it must come the products that produce the wealth of the Republic.

It is well known to everyone present that wherever the good road has gone it has added to the value of the lands and brought them up to what they are really worth, oftentimes when they were priced below their intrinsic value by reason of the fact that the owners of the land did not have means of communication with the points of trade and with the centers where their products could be marketed.

In addition to this, good roads reduce the cost of transportation. I will give you a succinct illustration. When I was at home recently I sat in my office in the courthouse in the little city in which I live, and coming in around the corner of the courthouse yard I noticed 12 wagons, one behind another, with 2 ordinary mules hitched to each one of the wagons, and on each wagon there were 5 bales of cotton, 60 bales in all pulled by these 24 small mules. The average load for a pair of mules on the ordinary dirt roads in the wintertime in our section of the country is 2 bales of cotton. The increase in the number of bales which they were able to haul by reason of the fact that they had come in over a newly constructed gravel road which had just been put in operation was 36—that is, 60 bales instead of 24—for those 12 pairs of small mules, with a consequent reduction in the transportation cost of one of the great products of this country. [Applause.]

Before any Member votes against this bill let me remind him that it is intended to improve the post roads over which 42,000 rural letter carriers travel to carry the mail to 20,000,000 people

living in the country, and to improve these roads will help every one of these 20,000,000 people and thereby benefit all the people.

Let me further remind you that we have spent for rivers and harbors since 1875 \$592,395,000; for public buildings, \$213,376,000; for the Panama Canal, about \$375,000,000; and for various other objects enormous sums, and the farmers of this country have produced the wealth to sustain these enormous expenditures. Now, let us help them by giving them good roads. [Applause.]

I introduced a bill for good roads, proposing to appropriate \$20,000,000 a year for five years to cooperate with the States, counties, and road districts. I like that bill, but this bill contains cooperative features and is the consensus of the Committee on Roads after considering all bills on the subject; therefore let us put it through and enact it into law and commit Congress to the idea of road building, and if this does not in practice work out all right we will amend it at the proper time. Now is the time for everybody who favors good roads to stand together and present a solid front. Let there be no division, and victory will crown our efforts and good roads be assured. [Applause.]

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, while I do not think this is a perfect bill or that it will work out as successfully in aiding the farmer as its proponents believe, and while it is evident that the scheme of proportioning appropriations under it will eventually operate in favor of the States of larger area as against the States of greater population, I expect to vote for it.

The report of the Committee on Roads, showing the maximum amount of Federal aid to each State under the provisions of this bill, presents some interesting contrasts. Connecticut, with a population almost equal to that of Nebraska, because of a less amount of post-road mileage, would obtain under this bill a maximum appropriation of \$208,750, as against \$506,250 for Nebraska. It is assumed that Connecticut's road capacity is more nearly reached and completed than that of Nebraska, and that, therefore, future appropriations would operate more generously toward Nebraska than they would toward Connecticut. The same might be said of Pennsylvania and Texas, the former of which has about twice the population of the latter; for, while the mileage of the two States is given at 575,000 and 593,750, respectively, the presumption is that the expansion of post roads in Texas will hereafter be far greater than in Pennsylvania. Yet, as the committee presents the matter, Pennsylvania, by reason of both population and post-road mileage, would for the first year be entitled to \$1,623,750, as against \$1,126,250 for Texas. I assume, therefore, that the present favorable showing of the committee in apportioning what appears to be a large amount for Pennsylvania is not a fair indication of the relative size of appropriations in the future.

It is proposed to try on this new experiment with a total appropriation of \$25,000,000 the first year, apportioning it amongst the States that desire to participate by making appropriations in like amount, in proportions adjusted to the population and the total number of miles of rural post roads. Large discretionary powers are conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture not only to deal with State officials, but to designate roads and to determine the manner of construction and maintenance. All this is to be done subject to Federal appropriations, which are not to exceed \$15 per mile on ordinary dirt roads, \$30 per mile on shell or gravel roads, and \$60 per mile on macadam roads or others of higher grade. In addition, bridges and culverts along the line of these respective roads are to be improved and maintained within the rate fixed. It is evident that the highways of the cities will not derive any benefit from this bill; indeed, the act specifies "construction and maintenance of rural post roads" only. Whatever has been spent upon urban streets and highways may thus be counted as a charge against those who paid for them, nor is there any intent, though urban streets and highways be used as post roads, to provide in this act for their future construction or maintenance. The bill contemplates appropriations for rural post roads, and for rural post roads only.

Under these conditions the bill is not fair to all the taxpayers of the country, because it makes one set of taxpayers who have already paid for good roads join in the payment of good roads for others. The State which has already built its roads at State expense is expected to contribute to the construction and maintenance of roads in other States of larger area which have not been so fortunate. It must be admitted, however, that a long step forward has been taken in this bill in providing that

the Federal Government shall not appropriate any money for the construction of good roads in any State unless that State is first prepared to contribute a like amount. This cooperative feature is desirable and tends in a degree to turn back to the State of larger area at least an equal share in the responsibility of road construction.

An objection to the bill which has thus far not been satisfactorily explained in general debate is revealed in the apparent insufficiency of the Federal aid for road construction on the per-mile basis. It is palpably impossible to build macadam roads for \$60 per mile, plus a like contribution by the State, and it is extremely improbable that roads of a less grade could be built, with the maintenance of bridges and culverts included, for the amounts per mile set down in this bill. However, this and other questions may subsequently be cleared up in the discussion.

As I view it, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the inequalities of the bill, it is intended to improve our transportation facilities and to aid in the commendable work of bringing the city and the country closer together. If the city taxpayer is not to derive any financial benefit from the measure, he can at least content himself with the thought that an effort is being made to get the produce of the farm to the dinner table cheaper than before. If the bill brings about such a result, it will be a good thing for all of us, whether we live in the cities or whether we live upon the farm. I am not in favor of the Government ownership of railroads, and for the present I oppose the construction of Government railroads in Alaska, believing the \$35,000,000 which it is intended to expend there could better be spent upon internal improvements in the United States. But I believe it is essential that the Government should aid in every way possible the improvement of our transportation facilities. I strongly favor liberal appropriations for the development and maintenance of interstate waterways as free avenues for commerce. They do and will cheapen transportation costs. Government aid may therefore be consistently urged for public roads coming within the purview of the Constitution, more especially as they are corollary to both railways and waterways, and if united would materially reduce the general expenses of transportation.

By wagon roads, such as are contemplated in the bill now before us, the cost of carriage per ton-mile is generally quoted by experts at 25 cents. By rail the cost is approximately 7 mills per ton-mile, by water it is 1 to 3 mills per ton-mile, and on the ocean it is one-half of a mill. If the farmer primarily pays this tremendous wagon-road cost of transportation to get his produce to the railroad or to the river bank for transshipment, the consumer in the city pays it eventually, and his cost of living is increased to that extent. And so far as transportation charges are concerned, that increase in the cost of living in the city is likely to continue until we have improved methods of transportation via both the waterway and the good road. Therefore anything we can do to reduce the transportation cost of commodities by earth roads, rail, or waterway—the latter being the cheapest of all transportation mediums—will be of direct benefit to both producer and consumer. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD.]

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of any kind of reasonable legislation, State or National, which will result in permanent improvement of the highways of the United States. The question of Government aid in the construction and maintenance of post roads is no longer a mooted question. The party in power is pledged by its platform declaration to favor national aid to State and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads. The pending bill undertakes to provide Government aid to the rural post roads. It is not ventured to provide assistance for any road about which there could be a constitutional question raised. The Constitution of the United States provides for the establishment of post offices and post roads, and this by implication carries with it the right to construct and maintain such post roads. This is the first bill which has been presented providing for the aid in the construction of roads about which the constitutional question has not been raised.

I congratulate the author of this bill, my colleague, Mr. SHACKLEFORD, in his presentation of a scheme which avoids the raising of the question of his right under the Constitution to enact such a law. The pending bill is based upon the theory that the local community should cooperate with the National Government and provide at least an amount equally as large as that which is furnished by the United States Government. It is a very difficult thing to work out a scheme of cooperation which will be satisfactory to all the States, be-

cause hardly two States of the Union have the same system with reference to the construction and maintenance of their highways. In some States at present aid is given by the State to the county or civil division, while in others the whole burden of road building is borne by the local community. In some States there are highway commissions which control the building and maintenance of the roads of the States. In others there is a system of county supervision, with county highway engineers, who have supervision of the roads of the county. In other States they have both the State supervision and State highway engineer and county supervision with a county highway engineer, and each is expected to work in unison with the other. In order to meet all of these conditions it is impossible at present to provide a law with complete details, so as to fit into the conditions existing in the State.

It is usually conceded that primarily the State and local authorities have jurisdiction over the roads that have been located, and that the jurisdiction of the State should not be disturbed by any attempted control of the Federal Government; that whatever aid may be extended by the General Government should be accepted by the State, and no supervision should be assumed by the General Government which should in any way interfere with the local control by the State. In other words, it is not the purpose of this legislation nor of the party in control to so enact legislation as to in any way interfere with the State's jurisdiction over its own highways, but it is intended to provide a system of aid to the various States which are disposed to meet the conditions which are imposed by the General Government, none of which conditions will take from the State any of its jurisdiction over the roads of the State.

It is very difficult to frame a bill so as to make a proper distribution of the assistance that may be rendered by the General Government. The pending bill perhaps as nearly as any suggestion that has been made brings about an equitable adjustment of the aid that is to be extended. It provides that the money that may be expended by the General Government in any State in any fiscal year shall be determined in the following manner: One half is to be paid in the proportion which the total population of such State bears to the total population of all the States as shown by the next preceding Federal census, and the other half is to be distributed in the proportion which the total number of miles of rural post roads in use in any State bears to the total number of miles of rural post roads in use in all of the States as shown by the report of the Postmaster General at the close of the second quarter of the last preceding fiscal year. It will be seen by this provision that it is based one-half on population and one-half on the miles of post roads. On December 1, 1913, there were 42,961 rural roads, with an aggregate length of 1,042,477 miles. Of this aggregate number of miles it would be proper to make reduction of about 15 per cent for the number of miles that is traveled within corporate limits, where the roads are controlled by municipalities, and without corporate limits, where in making the aggregate length of a route there is a retrace over the same route or travel over another route. This would reduce the actual number of miles of rural post roads to about 870,000 miles.

There is an impression abroad that this bill will provide assistance for every mile of rural post roads; in other words, the 870,000 miles of road. This is entirely erroneous, as the bill only provides assistance to certain roads, which are classified by the bill into three classes: Class A, which is to embrace roads upon which no incline is steeper than is reasonably necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, well drained, with a rock track composed of macadam or other material of equal utility or cost, constructed and maintained in such manner that it shall have a smooth, firm surface; class B to embrace roads upon which no incline is steeper than is reasonably necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, well drained, with a road track composed of shells, gravel, or a proper combination of sand and clay or other material of equal utility but less expensive than macadam, constructed and maintained in such manner that it shall have a smooth, firm surface; class C is to embrace roads upon which no incline is steeper than is reasonably necessary in view of the topography of the locality, with adequate drainage and ample side ditches, with a roadway constructed so as to quickly shed water into the side ditches and kept crowned and compacted by dragging or other adequate means so that it shall be reasonably passable for wheeled vehicles. In other words, the three classes embrace, first, macadam roads; second, gravel or shell roads; and, third, earth roads; in each case the road to be well constructed and in good condition.

According to the latest report of the Public Roads Office in the Agricultural Department, there are at present 52,585 miles of class A, 161,790 miles of class B, and 222,513 miles of class C.

If no roads were added to any of these classes during the next fiscal year, then the amount that could be appropriated under the pending bill would be \$11,300,000. In other words, there are at present, according to the estimates of the Agricultural Department, only 435,888 miles of roads which could be benefited by the provisions of this bill, and about the same number of miles of post roads in the United States would not be benefited by the provisions of this bill, because the roads do not belong to any one of the three classes. I wish to impress this fact that under this bill a road, in order to secure the benefits of the aid proposed, must come within the three classes. It must be either a good macadam road, shell road, or dirt road before it is entitled to any recognition by the Federal Government. This is seriously objected to by some individuals, because they insist that all post roads should have assistance from the Federal Government. I am in full accord with the principle of this bill in that regard, because I believe that the local community ought to show interest enough to bring itself within the requirements of law before it should receive national aid. This feature, instead of being condemned as it is by many, ought to be commended, it seems to me, because it will have the effect of encouraging the local community to be more interested in road building and to place its roads in position to receive the benefit which this bill, if enacted into law, would give them.

This bill provides that all roads of class A, or macadam roads, may receive aid to the extent of not exceeding \$60 per mile, and that the roads of class B, gravel or shell roads, may receive benefit to the extent of \$30 per mile, and that the roads of class C, or the earth roads, may receive benefits to the extent of \$15 per mile. I am inclined to the view that there is too much disparity in these classes, or, in other words, where a dirt road has placed itself within the provisions of class C it ought to be entitled to more consideration at the hands of the Federal Government than that which this bill provides. I would be pleased to see it increased to at least \$25 per mile, but as I am advised this schedule of rates is a compromise and that no other schedule will meet as nearly unanimous support of this House, so that it becomes necessary to support this provision if persons are favorable to the legislation in general.

I called attention a moment ago to the fact that this bill did not provide that all rural post roads should receive the benefit of Government aid. The language of the bill is—

That certain roads in the States which are adapted to use by the United States as rural post roads shall be divided into three classes, to be known as class A, class B, and class C.

Certain roads. Now, that word "certain" is nowhere defined in this bill as I understand it. The word "certain" may, however, be explained by the Agricultural Department in the estimate which it has submitted of the miles that are found in class C. If there are only 222,513 miles in class C, then only about one-fourth of the dirt post roads are provided for, and many believe that this bill should provide for all dirt post roads. Now, if you will make the computation, you will ascertain that you can provide for all the roads, if that is the intention, provided the remaining roads all belong to class C.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. LLOYD. Certainly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. The gentleman comments upon the words "certain roads." Those words were intended to convey the idea that the roads to be embraced are the roads that are up to class A, B, or C, and is intended to exclude all roads that are not up to those classes. That is the purpose of those words.

Mr. LLOYD. If that be true, then I am trying to call attention to the fact that over 600,000 miles of dirt roads in the United States now used as post roads will not be provided for by this bill.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. If the gentleman will permit an interruption, I will assure him that he is mistaken about that.

Mr. LLOYD. All right.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. This bill provides that at the end of each fiscal year the governor of the State shall file a statement showing what of these roads have been brought within these classes. The fact which the gentleman is commenting on is that there is now only a certain mileage of roads in class C, but the purpose of this bill is to induce the people to increase the mileage of roads in class C, and at the end of the fiscal year they will have not only the roads now enumerated as being within class C, but all of the roads that have been brought within the provisions of either A, B, or C, as provided by this bill, will be reported as coming within the provisions of this act, and will receive compensation.

If it provided that only the benefits of this bill should go to the roads in existence, there would be no need for the bill. We want to encourage the construction of additional roads and the

improvement of those now in existence. The bill provides that all roads hereafter to be built that come within these provisions shall come within the benefits of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. LLOYD. The gentleman does not intend now to provide for all the rural post roads in the country; he only intends to provide for those specifically in class A, which amount to 58,000 miles; class B, 161,000 miles; and class C, which amount to 222,000 miles, and that hereafter, if the people of the United States actually construct roads and place them so that they may be classed as A, B, or C, they will be entitled to compensation under the bill.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. That is the purpose, that no part of the money should go for a road that was not improved up to the extent at least of class C. Every mile that is brought up to class C will, at the end of the fiscal year, be included in the compensation which is provided for here. If no road is under improvement, if it is a mud road, if it is impassable a large part of the year, and no money spent on it by the local community, it is not intended for this bill to be a pork-barrel proposition and furnish money for the keeping of bad roads. It is to stimulate the roads, to bring them up to the standard of class C, when they can receive compensation under the bill.

Mr. LLOYD. Under the provisions of this bill the State of Missouri, which we both in part represent, would hardly receive but a small per cent of benefit from this bill, because all of our dirt roads do not come up to the provisions of class C, as I understand it. I do not believe that 25 per cent of the dirt roads in Missouri will come up to this standard. The State of Indiana and like States, who have good roads, will be the States that will get the greatest benefit of this fund.

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

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I will yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LLOYD. Certainly.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to call my colleague's attention to the fact that this bill, while it says that it is for the aid, construction, and maintenance of post roads in its title, and purports to be carrying out the Democratic platform, promising aid for post roads, is not, when analyzed, found to apply to post roads at all. The only application to post roads in this bill is the definition that one-half of the money shall be distributed in the proportion which the total number of miles of rural post roads in a State bears to the total number of miles in rural post roads in all the States. There is no provision in this bill that these routes upon which the rental is to apply shall be used as post roads. It speaks of certain roads adapted to use as post roads, but it does not include all the post roads in the United States. If it did, they would have framed a different bill. It would have been placed under the Post Office Department instead of under the Agricultural Department. The post-roads proposition is named in the bill for the purpose of distributing the money, and there is no provision that the roads so used shall be improved.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to think that the bill is so drawn as to apply to post roads.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LLOYD. Certainly.

Mr. LAZARO. I would like to get the gentleman's idea of a dirt road which comes under class C.

Mr. LLOYD. I think the bill describes it.

Mr. LAZARO. But what is the gentleman's idea? He says that many of the dirt roads in his State would not come in under it.

Mr. LLOYD. The bill provides for roads under class C, as follows:

Class C shall embrace roads upon which no incline is steeper than is reasonably necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, with adequate drainage and ample side ditches, with a roadway constructed so as to quickly shed water into the side ditches and kept crowned and compacted by dragging or other adequate means so that it shall be reasonably passable for wheeled vehicles.

Mr. LAZARO. Let me ask the gentleman—are the roads in his State graded?

Mr. LLOYD. Not as they ought to be. I do not think they would come under this class. I believe that most of the roads in Missouri would not come under any of these classes.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. The Legislature of Missouri, at the last session, passed a law giving \$15 a mile for county and State roads, which requires them to come within class C. I have a telegram from the State highway commissioner saying that, from the 29th of March to the 1st day of October of this last year, 10,043 miles of road were brought within the provisions of class C and are now within the provisions of class C.

Mr. LLOYD. Well, 10,000 miles of road is a small part of the mileage of Missouri.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. But if 10,000 miles can be improved and brought within this class in 7 months, how many can you improve and bring within it in 12 months, after we give this added stimulation?

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to reach a conclusion at the present time as to the roads that are provided for in this bill. If all the post roads in the United States were improved in the next year, every such road in the United States will come under the provisions of the bill. At the present time I am calling the attention of the House to the fact that only a very small percentage of the dirt roads of the western country—the Mississippi Valley country—are within the provisions of this bill.

Now, I want to call attention to another matter.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LLOYD. Certainly.

Mr. DYER. Does that class include the Boonslick Road that runs through Missouri?

Mr. LLOYD. I think it would include a part of it. There are two ways of getting this money; one is through the State authorities in connection with the Secretary of Agriculture. The question was asked last night several times, Are you in favor of an interstate road, the great State highway? Nearly every man who answered said that he was opposed to an interstate highway. My colleague, Mr. BORLAND, was not present, and that accounts for the fact that we did not hear a discordant note. This bill, as I understand it—every dollar of the money that would go to the State of Missouri can be applied, if agreed to by the State authorities and the Secretary of Agriculture, to the construction of the road that our colleague, Mr. BORLAND, wants from St. Louis to Kansas City, the great automobile road.

This is not a perfect bill, and in many respects I think it might be changed so as to materially improve it, but it seems to be the very best that can be done at the present time. All legislation must necessarily be the result of compromise, and I am advised by those in charge of the bill that the best has been done that could be to reach a conclusion as to the provisions of the bill which would best satisfy the various Members of the House. Personally I do not oppose the interstate highways.

If the automobile people can secure their construction, the roads when constructed will be of great benefit to the American people. I do not oppose the great State highways extending from one large city to another. I am not in opposition to the inter-county highways which extend from county seat to county seat, as provided by the laws of the State of Missouri. I am in full sympathy with any kind of scheme, without unusual burdens either to the National Government or State or local government, that will result in material improvement of the roads of the country. I am more interested, however, in the improvement of the ordinary dirt road which leads into the small towns of the country than I am in the improvement of the great highways. But I do not mean by that I have any word of censure against those who are trying to secure great thoroughfares of the best macadam. The better the road is the better it is for the people, and while our people generally can not have macadam roads, yet I am anxious that they shall have the best possible road that can be secured for their localities. I would be pleased to see every post road in the United States a splendid highway that could be easily classed in one of the classes proposed by this bill. I am gratified to see awakening sentiment of the country on the subject of road building. I am proud of the fact that to-day no State has more of such sentiment than the State which I in part represent. The good-roads spirit prevails everywhere, and I am hopeful that in the near future it may be said that Missouri has the best roads of any State in the Union, but I realize to accomplish this result there must be a vast outlay of money and energy, for while Missouri is developing its roads it may be safely stated that other States will not want to fall behind in this march of progress. I am anxious to see good roads, especially for the benefit of the farmer, that he may be placed in touch with his schools, his church, his market, and in that way be identified with everything that is necessary for his material development and the prosperity and happiness of himself and the people of his community.

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

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON].

[Mr. DICKINSON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH].

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the Committee on Appropriations I found some men on that committee who were opposed to the improvement of Seventh Street in the city of Washington, and I find that now they are very heartily in favor of this committee bill or any other good-roads bill that may be presented to the House. When I asked those gentlemen why they favored the good-roads proposition as presented in this committee bill and opposed the improvement of Seventh Street in the District of Columbia, they replied that they did not have to run for Congress in the District of Columbia.

It is estimated that the cost of wagon transportation per ton-mile in this country is about 23 cents and about 9 cents in France, which would make a difference in wagon transportation in the United States of approximately 14 cents a mile.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman state what member of the Good Roads Committee it was who said that he did not have to run for Congress on Seventh Street, in the District of Columbia?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I will say to the gentleman that I will be very glad to have a conversation with him upon that subject in the cloakroom at some time. I do not feel that I care to use the name of the gentleman who made that remark, because it was made in the form of a jest.

Mr. BARNHART. I thought so.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. However, the statement is absolutely true as the gentleman knows.

Mr. BARNHART. I do not know anything about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I yield for a question; yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, how is it that the titular leader of the Progressives would go into a cloakroom to discuss a public matter, after he has advocated publicity in all things, caucuses, committees, legislation, and everything? I am surprised, and I am sure the House and the country will be surprised.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I really have not sufficient time to explain to my reactionary friend from Kansas why I would do that thing, but if he will listen to the falling of the ballots in November he will understand why we Progressives in this Congress, in response to a sentiment which we believe exists in the country, refuse to go into secret-committee hearings and secret caucuses, and I do not know that these cloakrooms are secret at all. I supposed they were open—at least to every member of every committee in the House, and I will say to my friend that if he will come into the cloakroom while the gentleman from Indiana and I are discussing this matter we will continue the discussion in his presence.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But this is a public place, and this is the place for the discussion of public questions, and not the cloakroom.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I do not wonder that my good friend from Kansas is a little bit anxious about secret committee meetings and secret caucuses. In fact, for any man who realizes and knows what the sentiment of this country at this time is, and who expects to test that sentiment in the near future, it is natural that he should be anxious about this subject. However, I desire to say a few words about the question of good roads.

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

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Iowa to yield me some more time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. America leads the world in invention, in railroads, telephones, and telegraph, and yet is at the foot of the class in the most important means of communication—the public road.

Less than 10 per cent of American roads are improved.

It has taken us 140 years to realize the extreme importance to the progress and prosperity of our country of road building on a national scale. The State of Illinois, which I have the honor in part to represent, has an area of 56,002 square miles; 90.7 per cent of the land in Illinois is in farms and 86 per cent is improved. Illinois has 94,141 miles of road, or 4.28 per cent of the total road mileage in the Union. Our rural population will average 22 per mile.

Our postal receipts are \$27,942,127.30, or 11.55 per cent of the total. In spite of all this, Illinois would get approximately \$112,000 on that basis if this bill becomes a law. This would be a mere pittance for our State; but because it is a step in the right direction I shall vote for the bill.

There are 2,300,000 miles of public roads in the United States. Everyone now believes that it is essential to the development of our country that these roads should be improved, but we do not by any means agree on the plan to be adopted. There are many sincere advocates of what is known as the "national-highway" plan. They contend the Government should build, pay for, and maintain national highways, and they argue that joint appropriations and joint control will not produce good roads, either in construction or maintenance, and they point to the fact that many States have given up the State-aid plan and adopted the State-highway idea. There are other equally sincere advocates of good-road legislation who believe in Federal aid or reward both for county, State, and national road building.

Doubtless every Member of this House who spent his boyhood days on the farm, and by reason of that fact knows what it means to a farmer to attempt to market the products of his farm at a distance of 5 or 10 miles over rough, muddy, or sandy roads, will favor almost any plan which tends to better such conditions, and would therefore be loath to vote against almost any of the many bills which during the last three or four years have been introduced by various Members of the House.

The bill under consideration, House bill 11686, while containing many excellent features, is not, in my judgment, in any way comparable to the bill of Congressman Woodruff, of Michigan, House bill 10404, which establishes a bureau of postal highways in the Post Office Department, and which provides that the bureau shall cooperate with the various States and Territories in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of permanent public roads which are now or may be hereafter utilized by the Government as post roads.

The Woodruff bill provides for a director of the bureau, who shall be a practical engineer of road construction, and also for inspectors of postal highways, not to exceed 50 in number, who shall be appointed after competitive examination, and requires them to inspect the roads which may be constructed and report to the director of the bureau of postal highways their findings as to each mile of road inspected; and, in addition to this inspection, provision is made requiring all rural mail and star-route carriers to inspect rural post roads and to report on blanks to be furnished by the Post Office Department once each month as to the condition of the rural post roads over which they travel in the discharge of their duties.

It is true that both of these bills are based on the theory of road construction by the Federal aid or reward plan. Those who favor the national highway proposition, in opposition to the Federal-aid plan, insist that if we want good market roads, and if we desire to remove this question from politics and the danger of graft, the Federal-aid plan must be dropped and the national highway theory substituted.

The good road draws to its neighborhood good farms and good homes. Good crops are worth while when they can be easily taken to market. The effect of good roads in any community is to lure the city boy into the country and to keep the country boy on the farm. It is a sign of culture, knowledge, and civilization in a county, State, or Nation. It has been well said that "if a country is stagnant the condition of the roads will invariably indicate the fact; if a people have no roads, they are savages."

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL].

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, the economic value of good roads and the necessity for building them are self-evident. They need no further argument. The statistical data and all phases of their value have already been discussed and unanimously indorsed by this House.

Everybody knows that in the United States it costs, on an average, twice as much to haul farm products from the farm to the nearest railroad station as it costs to transport the same products from that station to Liverpool, England. All of us know that the farmer in this, as in other matters, has received scant consideration by the Government, and that he deserves the best. But the value of good roads is not confined to the farmer. It mightily affects all classes of society, all lines of industry, and the stability and the perpetuity of the Government. The demand is immediate, unequivocal, and impelling. The administration has promised to inaugurate this far-reaching plan of service to the whole country. All political parties

seem glad to join in a movement that will improve the living conditions of every citizen and have a powerful influence upon the happiness and patriotism of all the people.

I am a Democrat in every sense of that word. I had some humble part in the election of the present great Democratic President. I am more convinced now than in that campaign that in the generations to come he will be numbered among the immortals of the Republic, because he has shown himself a man of no petty or ignoble passions, a man of unusual character and uncommon purity, whose lofty ambition is constantly flashing forth in the highest type of a patriot's love for the man on the ground, for the uplift and recognition of the great plain people of the country upon whom all others depend.

All political parties here recognize that this bill is in harmony with the spirit of service that permeates the life and purposes of this administration.

The same principles underlie this bill as are the foundation of public education and all other governmental enterprises for the common good of society and humanity. All the wealth of the country is taxed to pay for these enterprises and all the wealth of the country should be taxed for the purpose of building roads for the rich and the poor, for the city man and the country man, without reference to the financial standing of either. The progressive city man is as much concerned in building the country roads to the home of the farmer as is the farmer himself. The city man's property should be taxed to build the country road.

The recognition of this principle makes road building not only a State but a Federal question, and one that deserves and demands ready and liberal support by this Government. There is no competition between the city and the country. The rural and the urban citizen are to be the thoroughbreds of the centuries as they go hand in hand down the ages, each profiting by the prosperity of the other, and each gladly lifting the burden from the other, as they together work out the destinies of the Nation in establishing easy and universal communication among all classes of society, universal fellowship and brotherhood among men, universal love and willing service for humanity, and patriotic devotion by all the people for all American institutions.

Permanent public roads have been in all ages and are to be in this country the direct means of bringing all the people into sympathetic touch with one another for greater industrial activity and commercial prosperity; for a higher intelligence and a happier existence, finally culminating in that unified citizenship necessary for the perpetuity of the Republic.

These are the principles upon which this bill is founded. All agree that they are sound. The remaining question is the method of procedure. The general cooperative plan of the bill is correct, but if I had my way the amount appropriated would be a hundred millions instead of twenty-five. Every county seat in each State would have a permanent road connecting it with every other county seat in that State and lateral permanent roads would reach the farmers of the rural sections of each State and thus bring the farms into easy and harmonious communication with the cities and towns of the country. Why should not we spend millions at our doors when the demand is so urgent? We build roads and streets in Panama. We expend millions for the Panama Canal and for the islands of the seas, for railroads in Alaska, for the Diplomatic Service in foreign lands, for the Army and Navy, for pensions without number, and for a thousand other nonproductive enterprises. These expenditures may be defensible, but to neglect the people at home by failing to appropriate liberally for this great constructive work would be utterly indefensible. Let our first effort be for the people at home.

Let us no longer follow the example of the colt that drowned himself in an effort to swim the river to get a drink of water on the other side.

Although this appropriation for roads should be multiplied by 4, because it is so imperatively needed and because it is the one expenditure of the public funds that will reach every man, woman, and child in the country, yet I am heartily for this bill as it now stands. It is the best that can be done now, and opens the way by stimulation and encouragement to a new life, a new prosperity, and a new type of patriotic devotion by all the people to American institutions. I earnestly urge the immediate passage of this bill. It dovetails perfectly with the Louisiana road laws and will greatly encourage our people in their efforts for better roads. Louisiana is raising \$2,000,000 annually for roads, and has the best road laws in the land. For the benefit of other States I attach them herewith to this address.

Act No. 49—House bill No. 89.

An act to require the State board of engineers to assume control of State highways under certain conditions; to elect a State highway engineer; to define his powers and duties and fix his compensation; to authorize the construction and maintenance of highways by contract or by the highway engineer; to provide for the working of convicts on highways under certain regulations; to authorize the acquisition, by expropriation or otherwise, of rights of way for highways, drainage canals, or ditches; to provide a revenue for carrying out the objects and purposes of this act, and to provide for the disbursement thereof; and to require the parishes, cities, towns, and villages to contribute a certain proportion of the costs of constructing and maintenance of highways; defining a State highway; and repealing all laws or parts of laws in conflict with this act.

SECTION 1. *Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Louisiana,* That the State board of engineers, whenever called on so to do by the police juries of the parishes or the municipal authorities of cities, towns, and villages shall furnish the different road districts, parishes, cities, towns, and villages with plans and specifications for public roads, and such assistance and advice as will tend to create a uniform system of public roads throughout the State. In order to more fully accomplish this end the State board of engineers are hereby authorized and required to select or appoint a competent engineer and fix his compensation, which shall not exceed the sum of \$5,000 per annum, who is schooled in highway construction or engineering, to take charge of and construct public roads when authorized to do so by the State board of engineers or upon the request of any of the parochial or municipal authorities, as will hereinafter be provided.

SEC. 2. *Be it further enacted, etc.,* That such person thus selected as provided in section 1 of this act shall be known as the State highway engineer, and he shall, before entering upon the duties required of him by this act, and assigned him by the State board of engineers, take an oath to faithfully discharge the duties imposed upon him and execute a bond with solvent surety in favor of the governor of the State of Louisiana in a sum not less than \$10,000, which bond shall be approved by the State board of engineers. He shall hold his office during the pleasure of the State board of engineers. The State board of engineers shall appoint, in its discretion, such assistant engineers and such other help as may be necessary to the proper conduct of the work of establishing, constructing, maintaining, and repairing public highways with the bridges, culverts, drains, and other appurtenances and accessories incident thereto. The office of the State highway engineer shall be with the State board of engineers, and shall at all times be under its supervision, and the said State board of engineers shall provide such officer with suitable office rooms and with such clerical help as may be necessary to discharge the duties of his office.

SEC. 3. *Be it enacted, etc.,* That it shall be the duty of the said board of State engineers to hold meetings at such times and for such periods as it may deem essential for the proper carrying out of the provisions of this act.

It shall be the duty of the said board to consider at its meetings all questions relating to the general policy of the State highway system and for the conduct of the work in general; to receive and consider, at such times as it may select, the reports of the State highway engineer and to act in all matters relating to recommendations, estimates, and appropriations which it may be found advisable to submit to the governor.

SEC. 4. *Be it further enacted, etc.,* That the State highway engineer shall have charge of all records pertaining to the State highway system, same to be filed and retained in the office of the State board of engineers; shall keep a record of all purchases and orders relating to the business of his office; shall keep on file copies of plans and specifications and estimates prepared by his office. He shall cause to be made and kept a general highway plan of the State, and shall collect information and compile statistics relative to the mileage, character, and condition of the State highways and bridges in the different parishes, cities, towns, and villages of the State. He shall investigate and determine the methods of road construction best adapted to various sections of the State, and shall establish standards for the construction and maintenance of State highways in the various parishes, giving due regard to the topography, natural conditions, character and availability of road-building materials, and the ability of parishes, cities, towns, and villages to meet their portion of the cost of building and maintaining State highways under the provisions of this act. It shall be his duty in improving the highways of the State to pay special attention to the most important trunk roads, and where practicable to construct and maintain continuous lines of road for intra and inter state traffic. He may at all times be consulted by parish, city, town, and village officials having authority over highways and bridges relative to any questions relating to such highways and bridges. He shall determine the character and have the general supervision of the construction and repair of all highways improved under the provisions of this act, subject to the approval of the said board of State engineers. He shall report all the proceedings of his office to the board of State engineers at such periods as they may designate.

SEC. 5. *Be it further enacted, etc.,* That whenever the police jury of any parish, the mayor or governing authority of cities, towns, or villages of the State, shall decide that any main traveled road or roads in such parish, city, town, or village should be improved or constructed under the provisions of this act, they shall make written application to the State highway engineer for State aid in making the proposed road. Upon receipt of such application the State highway engineer shall send to the president of such police jury, the mayor, or other governing authority of cities, towns, or villages a blank form for the purpose of eliciting such information as may be desired concerning the proposed road improvement, which blank form said president of said police jury, mayor, or other governing authority shall fill out to the best of his ability and return to the said State highway engineer. If the said State highway engineer shall be satisfied that the proposed improvement will be upon a main traveled road or of public utility and convenience, and that the parish, city, town, or village shall be able to meet its portion of the cost of such improvement, the State highway engineer may approve the same and undertake said work of improvement with the approval of the said board of State engineers, in accordance with the provisions of this act, and said State highway engineer or one of his assistants shall proceed to view said road or part thereof proposed to be improved, and shall make all necessary surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost of its construction out of such materials as may be determined by said State highway engineer. For improvements to cost \$2,000 or less, it shall be discretionary with the State highway engineer, with the approval of the

board of State engineers, to execute such work of improvement himself or to allow the parish, city, town, or village to do the work, or to let the same by contract. Where the cost of the proposed improvements is to exceed \$2,000 it shall be the duty of the State highway engineer to advertise for bids to do the work, according to the plans and specifications prepared therefor, in one or more newspapers having a circulation in each parish, city, town, or village in which said proposed highway lies for a period of 3 weeks when such advertisement is in a weekly paper and for 15 days when in a daily paper, and such advertisement shall also be published in one or more daily papers of a general circulation throughout the State for a period of 15 days. Such advertisement shall state the place where the bidder may inspect the plans and specifications, the place where the bids will be received, and the time and place for opening the same. Every such bid shall be accompanied by a certified check of the bidder in an amount equal to 5 per cent of the amount of his bid, which check shall be forfeited to the State highway fund hereinafter provided for should the bidder to whom such contract is awarded fail to enter into a contract as required within 10 days after notice to do so from said State highway engineer. The checks of all unsuccessful bidders shall be returned after the contract is awarded and bond given. All bids so submitted shall be received at the office of the said State highway engineer, and shall be publicly opened and read at the time stated in said advertisement by him or in his presence. The president of the police jury of such parish, the mayor, or other governing authority of the city, town, or village in which said improvement is to be made and for which bids are submitted, shall be notified by the State highway engineer of the time fixed for opening said bids, and he or some other member of the said police jury, the mayor, or a member of the municipal board may be present at said opening of bids. The said State highway engineer shall have the right to reject any and all bids if in his opinion a good cause exists therefor, and may proceed to execute the work with his own force, employing such other means or agencies as are hereinafter provided, but otherwise he shall award the contract to the lowest responsible bidder, such award to be subject to the concurrence of the said police jury or of the mayor and council or other governing authority. The successful bidder shall be required to furnish bond of a surety company authorized to do business in Louisiana in a sum equal to one-half the amount of the contract awarded, conditioned that such work shall be performed in accordance with the plans, specifications, and the terms of the contract, and no party bidding for the work shall be accepted as surety on the required bond. When the contract is signed by the State highway engineer and the successful bidder with the written concurrence of the police jury, the mayor and council, or other governing authority a copy of the same, including the plans, specifications, and estimates of cost, shall be forthwith filed in the office of the said State highway engineer, with a like copy furnished to the said police jury, the mayor, or other governing authority, for filing in the office of such parochial or municipal board, and a copy to the successful bidder.

SEC. 6. *Be it further enacted, etc.*, That all work of construction, improvement, and maintenance of highways under the provisions of this act shall be under the supervision and direction of the State board of engineers and shall be performed by the State highway engineer in accordance with the plans and specifications and contract prepared and executed therefor.

SEC. 7. *Be it further enacted, etc.*, That the total cost of all work of highway construction, improvement, and maintenance under the provisions of this act shall be paid by the State treasurer upon the warrant of the State highway engineer, approved by the president of the board of State engineers, out of the fund hereafter created for the purposes of this act. The parish, city, town, or village wherein such work of improvement has been or is being performed shall refund to the State one-half of such total cost thereof. The portion of said cost to be borne by the parish, city, town, or village in which said highway improvement has been made shall be paid to the State treasurer by the treasurer of said parish upon the order of said police jury or by the treasurer of said city, town, or village upon the order of the mayor and council or other governing body. Upon the completion of any such contract for highway improvement the State highway engineer shall certify to the State treasurer and to the president of the police jury of the parish or the mayor or other governing authority of the town, city, or village wherein such work of improvement has been performed, the portion of the cost thereof to be borne by said parish or parishes, cities, towns, or villages, and if the portion of said parish or parishes, cities, towns, or villages, or either or any of them, shall not be paid to the State treasurer within 30 days after being so certified by the State highway engineer, then the portion of such parish, city, town, or village remaining unpaid shall be charged against said parish, city, town, or village, and no further State aid for highway improvement shall be granted said parish, city, town, or village until the amount due is fully paid, with legal interest from maturity, into the hands of the State treasurer to the credit of the State highway fund hereinafter created: *Provided*, That not more than \$50,000 shall be used or apportioned by the State board of engineers to the building of such highways in any one parish during any one calendar year if other parishes have pending applications for State aid in highway construction under the terms of this act: *And provided further*, That no parish shall receive an apportionment or expenditure of said funds for more than one year when other parishes are applying for said funds.

SEC. 8. *Be it further enacted, etc.*, That the State highway engineer may authorize partial payments to any contractor performing any highway improvement under the provisions of this act as the same progresses; but not more than 80 per cent of the contract price of the work as it is completed shall be paid in advance of the full completion and acceptance of such paid improvement: at least 20 per cent of the full contract of any such work or improvement shall be withheld until the work is satisfactorily completed, inspected, and accepted by the State highway engineer.

SEC. 9. *Be it further enacted, etc.*, That the improvement of roads under the provisions of this act shall be taken up and carried forward in the respective parishes of the State, as far as practicable, in the order of the date of receipt of the applications therefor from the presidents of the police juries of the respective parishes, mayors, or other governing authorities of cities, towns, and villages, or as the State highway engineer may determine; but no parish, city, town, or village shall be entitled to receive State aid as provided in this act unless and until it shall be first made to appear to the State highway engineer that the money with which to meet the proportion of said expense to be borne by the parish, city, town, or village is either already in the hands of the parish, city, town, or village treasurer or will be so in hand and immediately available upon the completion and acceptance of said work of improvement.

SEC. 10. *Be it further enacted, etc.*, That every contract for highway improvement to be made under the provisions of this act shall be made in the name of the State of Louisiana, signed by the State highway engineer and the contracting parties, with the written approval of the president of the police jury of the parish, or of the mayor or other governing authority of the city, town, or village wherein the work is to be done. No such contract for highway improvement shall be entered into by the State highway engineer, nor shall any such work be authorized under the provisions of this act, until the written concurrence therein of the police jury of the parish or parishes, or of the mayors or other governing authorities of the cities, towns, and villages, respectively, in which said proposed improvement is to be made, agreeing that such parish or parishes, cities, towns, or villages, respectively, will assume their proportion of the cost thereof, as hereinbefore provided, shall have been obtained and placed on file in the office of the board of State engineers.

SEC. 11. *Be it further enacted, etc.*, That whenever any road shall be constructed or improved in any parish, city, town, or village under the provisions of this act or has heretofore been so constructed or improved under previous statutes relating to road improvement under which State aid has been granted, the State highway engineer shall thereafter keep all such roads in proper condition and repair, and the total cost of such maintenance shall be paid by the State treasurer, the said parish, city, town, or village to reimburse the State its proportional share of such total cost—one-half thereof—such payment and reimbursement to be made in like manner and as provided in section 7 hereof for the original cost of such highways.

The State treasurer is hereby authorized to pay, upon the warrant of said State highway engineer, approved by the president of the State board of engineers, such sums as may be required for the repair of such roads. It shall be the duty of the said State highway engineer to organize a system of continuous repair and inspection of State highways, so that the same will be in good condition at all times.

SEC. 12. *Be it further enacted, etc.*, That no State highway shall be dug up or otherwise used for laying pipe lines, sewers, poles, wires, or railways, or for other purposes, without the written permit of the State highway engineer, and then only in accordance with the regulations prescribed by said engineer; and all such work shall be done under the supervision and to the satisfaction of said engineer, and all the cost of replacing the highway in as good condition as previous to its being disturbed shall be paid by the person to whom or in whose behalf such permit was given, or by the persons by whom the work was done. In case of immediate necessity therefor, a city, town, or village may dig up said State highway without such permit from said State highway engineer: *Provided*, That in such cases such highway shall be forthwith replaced in as good condition as before at the expense of such city, town, or village. No railway or trolley line shall be permitted within the right of way of any State highway except at crossings, and no trees on any State highways shall be used or be disturbed for the erection of electric lights, telephone, or telegraph lines. It shall be the duty of the State highway engineer, as far as practicable, to have State highways bordered by trees.

SEC. 13. *Be it further enacted, etc.*, That the State highway engineer, with the approval of the State board of engineers, may purchase for the State all rock crushers, steam rollers, and other road machinery, tools, and implements and draft animals that may be needed for the purposes of this act, and such machinery shall be managed and used under the direction of said engineer, who shall employ competent men to operate and keep them in repair.

Said State highway engineer may purchase all necessary materials and supplies and incur such other expenses as may be necessary in the operation, maintenance, and transportation of all such road machinery, tools, and implements. Upon the application of the police jury of any parish, or of the mayor or other governing authority of any city, town, or village, said State highway engineer may furnish for use such road machinery when convenient and practicable for use in building or repairing any road or roads in such parish, city, town, or village, all expenses incurred thereby to be borne by said parish, city, town, or village.

SEC. 14. *Be it further enacted, etc.*, That in all cases where it is necessary to acquire a right of way in constructing a new highway or changing the location of an old, the right of way thereof shall be acquired by the parish, city, town, or village, either by purchase, donation, or by expropriation under the general laws of the State relative to expropriation of private property for public purposes, in the event the owner of said property and the governing authorities of such cities, towns, or villages, or the State highway engineer should not agree upon the price thereof. In expropriating lands for the right of way the measure of damages to such landowner shall be double the assessed value of the property per acre appearing on the last assessment rolls. This measure of damages shall include the price of the land and all damages that may result to the owner: *Provided, however*, That if any improvements of the landowner or any crops upon the land are damaged or destroyed by the location of such highway, then he may recover additional compensation for the actual injury or destruction of such improvements or crops. After the State highway engineer has laid out a road over a certain tract of land, and actually commenced the construction of said highway thereon, the landowner shall not be entitled to prevent or retard the construction of the road by any legal process, but shall be remitted to an action for damages and recover such damages as is authorized under this act. All State highways shall be of such width as shall be fixed by the State highway engineer, and the rights of way authorized to be acquired under this act shall be of such width as may be designated by the State highway engineer as in his judgment is best suited to that particular locality. The State highway engineer shall also have the right and authority to have dug canals and ditches or drains sufficient, in his judgment, to properly drain the road being constructed through any lands of private individuals or corporations to drain the public roads. The right of way for such canals and ditches may be acquired in the same manner and for the same compensation as is herein provided for acquiring rights of way for highways. In the event the landowner should donate the right of way for the ditch or canal through his property then under such terms, restrictions, and regulations as may be imposed by the State highway engineer, he shall be permitted to drain into said ditch or canal. If, however, such private owner will not donate this right, it shall be left to the discretion of the State highway engineer whether he be permitted to drain into such ditch or canal under any conditions.

SEC. 15. *Be it further enacted, etc.*, That the said State highway engineer, with the approval of the State board of engineers and the president of the police jury, or the mayor or governing authority of any city, town, or village, may exchange such land or part thereof upon which any highway is now located for another location for such highway, or

he may sell such lands, when the highway has been abandoned, or may vacate any lands or part thereof or rights in lands which have been taken or acquired for road purposes under this act by executing and recording a deed therefor, and said vacation shall vest the title to the lands or rights so vacated in the persons, their heirs and assigns, who are named in said act.

Sec. 16. *Be it further enacted, etc.*, That the said State highway engineer shall have the authority to employ any and all labor necessary when performing a contract for the construction or repair of public roads or performing the preliminary work of surveying, or performing any other work necessary in connection therewith, and when such labor is employed by the day he shall only pay the reasonable and customary price.

That in order to further carry out the provisions of this act and provide labor sufficient to construct and maintain the public roads as herein provided, the convicts of the State of Louisiana may be worked upon the said public roads as authorized by the constitution of the State. Whenever in the opinion of the State highway engineer convicts can be profitably worked upon the public roads he shall apply to the board of control of the State penitentiary, who shall furnish such convicts in case they are available. The labor performed by the convicts shall be furnished free of charge, provided, however, that the cost of maintenance and operation shall be borne by the parish, municipality, or road district having the work performed, and paid out of the fund available for said work. The board of control of the State penitentiary shall at all times retain control and supervision over said convicts in the same manner and to the same extent as if they were upon the State farms or in the penitentiary walls.

Sec. 17. *Be it further enacted, etc.*, That in order to provide a fund for the carrying out of the provisions of this act, in the location, construction, or maintenance of any of the highways of this State, all surplus revenues received by the oyster commission of Louisiana and the board of commissioners for the protection of birds, game, and fish, or their successors in office, and all the proceeds of any special annual State tax that may be levied or collected for the purpose of constructing and maintaining the public roads and highways throughout the State, and the proceeds of any license tax on all vehicles kept for use that may be imposed by the General Assembly of the State of Louisiana, and all revenues or moneys which may be received under dedication herein shall constitute a State highway fund and shall be paid into the State treasury and there held as a State highway fund for the exclusive use and purposes of this act; and the treasurer is authorized to disburse same upon the warrant of the State highway engineer, approved by the president of the State board of engineers, for all expenditures authorized by this act.

Any portion of said State highway fund not expended at the expiration of any fiscal year shall remain in said fund and be available for expenditure during the succeeding fiscal year.

Sec. 18. *Be it further enacted, etc.*, That the term "State highway" so used in this act shall be construed to include all highways constructed under the provisions of this act, and all such highways heretofore constructed to which the aid of the State has been extended.

Sec. 19. *Be it further enacted, etc.*, That nothing in this act shall be construed so as to allow the highway commission created under this act to expend any funds of the State in the building or improvement of streets in incorporated cities or towns except in such cases where the streets connect two public roads constructed or improved under the provisions of this act.

Sec. 20. *Be it further enacted, etc.*, That all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

H. G. DUPRE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

P. M. LAMREMONT,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

Approved, June 29, 1910.

J. Y. SANDERS,
Governor of the State of Louisiana.

A true copy.

JOHN T. MICHEL, Secretary of State.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, this committee is to be congratulated upon its splendid work. The future alone can tell how much the country will owe us for the good work we have set in motion in this bill. If future Congresses will go forward with this important undertaking in keeping with its noble purpose, generations yet unborn will praise our names. This is not a perfect bill. It does not provide all that many of us would like to see it provide. It is a long step in the right direction and is the beginning of a policy that many of us have for years hoped and worked for.

FAVORED IT FOR YEARS.

For several years many of us have advocated national aid to road building and road maintenance. This bill starts the movement to that end.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM.

The platform adopted at Baltimore in 1912 pledges our party to the principle embodied in this bill. No room for doubt, uncertainty, or hesitation is left by the clause making the pledge, which is as follows:

We favor national aid to State and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads.

It is the plain duty of our party, now in control, to give the country legislation in keeping with this promise, and by so doing a wonderful impetus will be given to the movement for better roads. It will be a great forward step taken in the amelioration and improvement of rural conditions.

RURAL ROUTES.

As this bill is worked out on the basis of population and miles of rural and star mail routes in each State, it will no doubt be

of interest to call attention to the fact that there are 42,961 rural routes in the United States with a combined length of 1,042,477 miles; there are 12,257 star routes with a combined length of 156,457 miles; making a total length of both the star and rural routes 1,198,934 miles. In Georgia we have 1,677 rural routes with a combined length of 39,896 miles, and 150 star routes with a combined length of 1,461 miles. If the two are totaled, we have in star and rural routes a length of 41,357 miles in our State. The amount Georgia would get through this bill for its roads would be \$771,250.

The bill under consideration does not go as far as the bill which I introduced on this subject. My bill was somewhat similar to this one. The committee has reported this bill. I hope to see it speedily enacted into law. What we want are results.

GOOD ROADS A VITAL QUESTION.

One of the most vital questions which confronts the American people to-day is that of improving their public highways. This problem has been left by the National Government to be solved by the several States and their local political subdivisions in such manner as they may best be able. While this is a great burden for the States and smaller subdivisions to bear, and while the interstate nature of many of these public roads and of present-day traffic would seem to impose a part, at least, of this burden upon the National Government, yet these States and smaller subdivisions are assuming this burden in a manner becoming a great people, and great strides are being made in the direction of its solution. Evidence of this is afforded by the progress actually attained. The first authentic road census in this country was taken by the Office of Public Roads of the United States Department of Agriculture in the year 1904. This census disclosed the fact that we had a road mileage aggregating about 2,150,000, of which about 153,000 miles were improved. Our annual expenditure for road purposes that year amounted to about \$80,000,000. In 1909 a second census was taken. This second census showed that during the five-year period the mileage of improved roads had increased to about 190,000, or nearly 25 per cent. The expenditures for that year were not obtained, but according to figures recently compiled in the Office of Public Roads the road expenditures for 1912 approximated the enormous sum of \$163,000,000.

From these facts it is evident that the States and their minor subdivisions are putting forth a supreme effort to improve their highway conditions. It is apparent that they recognize the importance of this improvement and regard it of such pressing need that they are willing to spend their money and their energy in its accomplishment. This spirit of progressiveness should be commended. Not only should it be commended, but it should be rewarded by the National Government joining hands with the States and, through a spirit of wholesome cooperation, aiding and assisting them in furthering the development of a better system of highways throughout this entire country, as this bill proposes to do.

A PROGRESSIVE MOVEMENT.

Nearly every progressive undertaking looking to the advancement of our civilization is receiving some measure of aid or encouragement from our National Government. Laws have been enacted for the purpose of stimulating efforts in literature, the useful arts, and inventions by a system of liberal copyrights, trade-marks, and patents. Annual contribution is made to the education of the youth of every State in the Union. Large amounts have been expended for the improvement of our waterways. Lighthouses and danger signals are maintained along all navigable waters to safeguard their commerce. Donations of public lands, aggregating 197,000,000 acres, have been made for the purpose of promoting railroad development throughout the country, and at present the Interstate Commerce Commission is maintained to prevent the railroads from charging excessive rates for transportation. The United States Department of Agriculture, with its corps of well-trained scientists, is engaged in trying to teach the farmers of the country to adopt better methods of farming so as to increase their annual production, which has already reached the \$9,000,000,000 mark. But with all this, as broad as may seem the activities of our National Government and as liberal as may be its appropriations, it has not until now joined hands with the people in aid of the improvement of our highways, which are so vital to the welfare of our entire population, and particularly our rural population.

CITIES AND FARMS.

Consider for a moment the relative importance as great national economic factors of our farms and cities. Has it ever occurred to you that the American farm is the greatest known wealth producer and that our cities are almost equally famous as wealth consumers? Such is nevertheless the case. Primarily every city resident may be said to produce nothing. He is

merely engaged in the consumption, distribution, or manipulation of that which is produced elsewhere, chiefly on the farm. On the other hand, every inhabitant of the farm may be said to be a producer, large or small, the value of their combined annual production exceeding the sum of \$9,000,000,000.

Not only this, but a large per cent of the aggregate wealth of the United States is represented by farm property. Our total wealth at present is placed at about \$130,000,000,000. Of this more than \$40,000,000,000, or about one-third, consists of farm property. The yearly return on this investment in farm property is represented by our nine billions of annual farm production, which is about 22.5 per cent on the money invested. There is scarcely another class of property in existence which yields such satisfactory returns or plays so important a part in our commercial and industrial development. This readily appears from the fact that in 1910 our exports of farm products, exclusive of forest products, amounted to \$871,158,425, or 50.9 per cent of all domestic exports, while our imports of farm products amounted to \$687,509,115, or only 44.2 per cent of the total imports, leaving in our favor a balance of \$183,649,310.

ROADS AND COMMERCE.

But this vast wealth of farm products must be hauled over our public roads before reaching the other channels of trade and commerce. It must be transported on the highways an average distance of about 9.4 miles before being served up as food for our city population, or to provide raw material for running our manufactories or to swell the volume of our foreign commerce. It would seem, therefore, a duty of the National Government to help improve the highways over which these products must be hauled and thus facilitate their reaching the markets for further distribution. Exceeding care is taken and vast sums of money expended by the Federal Government to improve the channels of transportation through which they must pass after being removed from the farms. To promote this purpose donations of public lands aggregating 197,000,000 acres were made to the railroads, and the mammoth project of all ages is now being prosecuted in Panama where approximately \$500,000,000 is being expended in constructing the Panama Canal to afford a shorter route between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and to facilitate the commerce of the world generally.

Our people are progressive. They want to see our country in the fore front. They want all done that will advance the interest of our country and our people. However, if there are other projects of similar merit or equally essential to our public welfare they should receive equally as favorable consideration at the hands of the Government. An instance decidedly in point is the improvement of our public roads. It seems inconsistent on the part of our Government for it to expend such vast sums in order to facilitate the handling of our commerce and then not to take an equal interest in the improvement of the highways over which more than 50 per cent of the products which enter into this commerce must first pass. The originator and producer of this vast volume of commerce deserves some measure of consideration.

Another fact worthy of note in this connection is that the Government has expended nearly a quarter billion in the erection of public buildings in the towns and cities throughout the United States for the convenience of our city population. This was a large expenditure, yet its benefits only reach the approximate 47 per cent of our population living in the cities. Is it any more a duty of the Government to erect buildings in the cities to accommodate their population and add to their architectural beauty than it is to help build roads over which our farmers may haul their produce with ease and profit, and thus enable them to improve their farms and build more comfortable and attractive homes? It has been well said, "Tear down every edifice in our cities and labor will rebuild them, but abandon our farms and highways and our cities will disappear forever."

NO NEW MOVEMENT.

The necessity for this line of work was early recognized by the passage in 1806 of an act of Congress providing an appropriation for the construction of a great national highway from Cumberland, Md., westward. Appropriations of this character continued for a number of years, finally ceasing after reaching a total of \$14,000,000. At the time these appropriations were made they represented a larger proportion of the then total wealth of the United States than would similar appropriations to-day aggregating \$613,000,000, which is the total cost of the great French system of highways. The census of 1850, 12 years after the last appropriation for the old Cumberland road, placed the total wealth of the United States at \$7,135,780,228, which is less than the present annual value of our farm products. It would seem, therefore, if such appropriations could be made at a time when the national exchequer was at such a low ebb,

with the same principle and even greater reasons therefor now existing, that our National Government should no longer delay extending substantial aid to the cause of better roads.

ROADS NOW BEING BUILT.

Not only does it seem that these appropriations might be made, but they have been made within recent years. Not, however, for expenditure within our own territory, nor for the benefit of our citizenship, but to build roads in foreign territory. Since the War with Spain there has been expended from our National Treasury for road building in Alaska \$1,925,000; in Porto Rico, \$2,000,000; and in the Philippine Islands, \$3,000,000; making a total of \$6,925,000 thus appropriated for building roads outside of the continental United States.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF QUESTION.

Many protest against the constitutionality of national aid. Even among some Members of Congress a pronounced doubt seems to exist as to the constitutional authority for making such appropriations of public funds. But does it seem any more appropriate or a more rigid adherence to the letter and spirit of the Constitution for our Government to make such appropriations for the benefit of an alien population than for its own citizens? There is a very wise old saying that "Charity should begin at home," and it seems eminently applicable in this connection.

The Constitution is an instrument which we all revere. It has proven an anchor of safety in many a crisis, and if our ship of state shall always be steered in obedience to its mandates, our Republic will endure unto the end of time. We would not have a single clause or principle of that great instrument perverted, even if the doors of the Treasury would thereby be opened for the much-needed improvement of our highways. It is believed, however, that ample authority exists for Federal aid without the slightest warping of the Constitution. Paragraphs 1, 3 and 7, respectively, of section 8, article 1, provide as follows:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States. * * * To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes. * * * To establish post offices and post roads.

INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS.

Either of the foregoing paragraphs is sufficiently broad to afford Congress ample authority to make appropriations for highway purposes. The "general-welfare" clause in paragraph No. 1 has often been invoked as authority for various kinds of internal improvements. But the question may be asked, What constitutes an internal improvement? Well, in answer, it may be defined as an undertaking promotive of the public welfare, but of such magnitude as to defy individual effort.

The power of Congress to make appropriations for this class of improvements received considerable attention at the hands of Congress at an early date. In a speech in the United States Senate in 1830 Daniel Webster referred to this power of the Government in part as follows:

Under this view of things, I thought it necessary to settle, at least for myself, some definite notions with respect to the powers of the Government in regard to internal affairs, and I arrived at the conclusion that the Government had power to accomplish sundry objects or aid in their accomplishment.

In an able speech in Congress in 1817, on the power of Congress to apply public money to internal improvements, John C. Calhoun spoke in part as follows:

It is mainly urged that Congress can only apply the public money in execution of the enumerated powers. I am no advocate of refined arguments on the Constitution. The instrument was not intended as a thesis for the logician to exercise his ingenuity on. It ought to be construed with plain, good sense; and what can be more express than the Constitution on this very point? The first power delegated to Congress is comprised in these words: "To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises; to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." First, the power is given to lay taxes; next, the objects are enumerated to which the money accruing from the exercise of this power may be applied—to pay the debts, provide for the common defense, and promote the general welfare; and, last, the rule for laying the taxes is prescribed—that all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform. If the framers had intended to limit the use of the money to the powers afterwards enumerated and defined, nothing could be more easy than to have expressed it plainly. I know it is the opinion of some that the words "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare," which I have just cited, were not intended to be referred to the power of laying taxes, contained in the first part of the section, but that they are to be understood as distinct and independent powers granted in general terms, and are gratified by a more detailed enumeration of powers in the subsequent part of the Constitution. If such were in fact the meaning, surely nothing can be conceived more bungling and awkward than the manner in which the framers have communicated their intention. If it were their intention to make a summary of the powers of Congress in general terms, which were afterwards to be particularly defined and enumerated, they should have told us

plainly and distinctly; and if the words "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare" were intended for this summary they should have headed the list of our powers, and it should have been stated that to effect these general objects the following specific powers were granted.

IMPROVE ROADWAYS AND WATERWAYS.

The improvement of our waterways is an internal improvement on which the Government is now making expenditures. In the early history of our country appropriations for roads and rivers and harbors were classed together. The veto messages of Presidents Madison, Monroe, Jackson, and Pierce urged the same constitutional objections against appropriations for rivers and harbors as for highways. The principle involved in these two lines of work has not changed nor have the clauses of the Constitution which authorize them been amended.

It may be claimed that waterway improvements, in addition to the "general welfare" clause, find authority under the clause of the Constitution conferring upon Congress the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States * * *." Assuming that the authority is derived from this clause, is it not also applicable to roads? In the first place, what is commerce? Webster's Dictionary defines it as "the exchange or buying and selling of commodities." If, therefore, I live on a farm 10 miles from the market, railroad station, or wharf and have \$1,000 worth of produce which I wish to dispose of, at what time does that produce enter the realm of commerce? Is it when I load my wagon and drive away from the farm with it or is it not until I shall have delivered it at the market, railroad station, or wharf? Logically my produce would be just as much articles of commerce while in transit from my farm to the point of delivery as after reaching there, and the public highway over which I might perform the haul would be just as much a route of commercial transportation as the railroads or waterways which might handle it afterwards.

IMMENSE COMMERCE.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, there originated along the lines of our railroads 968,404,000 tons of freight. Did the constituent commodities which entered into this freight not become articles of commerce before delivery at the railroad station? During 1910 our exports exceeded \$1,700,000,000, of which 50.9 per cent was farm products, exclusive of forest products. Did the commodities represented by this vast sum not become articles of commerce until they reached the wharf for foreign shipment? Manifestly such is not the case. A commodity produced for commercial purposes becomes an article of commerce at the place of production, and it enters the channels of commerce the moment it is sold or exchanged or started in transit for sale or exchange. The vast tonnage of our railroads and water transportation routes consists largely of farm and other products originating away from the station or wharf, the initial haul being over our public roads. Therefore our public roads have as strong a claim on the Government under the commerce clause of the Constitution as do our waterways.

ANOTHER CONSTITUTIONAL CLAUSE.

However, there is yet another clause of the Constitution which affords Congress this power more clearly than either of the foregoing. This is the clause conferring the power "to establish post offices and post roads." The authority granted by this clause is specific, and inasmuch as the Government uses the public roads every day in the transportation of the mails it would seem proper and timely for the exercise of this power. The rural delivery of mails is made each day over the public highways, the average number of miles traveled daily by rural carriers exceeding 1,000,000, or nearly one-half of all roads in the United States. Being a daily user of almost one-half of all our public roads, and the condition of these roads being so vital to efficiency and economy in the administration of the Rural Delivery Service, it would seem that the Government should take a hand in the improvement of these roads.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD HELP.

No country has good roads except where the general government has shared the responsibility of building and maintaining them. All of the European countries which have improved roads have acquired them under a system whereby their national governments have borne a part of the cost and assisted in the supervision of their construction and maintenance. France is recognized as having the finest roads of any country in the world, but in the building of these roads the national Government of France contributed over \$600,000,000, and supervises their maintenance to-day. Road conditions in some of the more progressive European countries are worthy of mention.

FRANCE.

France has an area of 207,054 square miles, a population (1901) of 38,962,000, and the total mileage of all public roads is 516,000 miles. This gives practically 2½ miles of road for every square mile of area

and 75 people per mile of road. As compared with the United States, we have 2,200,000 miles of road, which gives an average of 0.74 mile of road per square mile of area and a population of 41 per mile of road. On the other hand, Massachusetts has 2.15 miles of road per square mile of area and a population of 195 per mile, while Ohio has 2.18 miles of road per square mile of area and a population of 54 per mile of road.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The movement in England since 1878 has been toward the consolidation and enlargement of highway districts and the power of the supervising officials. The first step in this movement really began in 1835, through an act of Parliament which gathered all existing statutes into one law and added certain clauses, among which was a permissive clause whereby several parishes could join together for road administration purposes. In 1862 the highway-district act was passed, which provided for the formation of highway districts consisting of several parishes and controlled by a highway board. The act was amended in minor detail in 1864.

The next act was the highway and locomotive (amendment) act of 1878. This provided for a more workable district and central authority and provided for taking over the disturnpiked roads. One-half of the cost of main-road maintenance was borne by the county and one-half by the districts and parishes. Ten years later (1888) the local government act threw the care of all main roads on the county councils and abolished the old highway boards.

The last act of epoch-making importance is the development and road improvement funds act, 1909, which provides for a road board, the members to be appointed by the treasury. The board has power, with approval of the treasury, to make advances to the county councils and other highway authorities in respect to construction of new roads and the improvement of old ones. The advances may be either in form of grant or loan. The revenues are to be raised from licenses on motor vehicles and certain licenses and excises on the sale, manufacture, and import of petrol (gasoline).

SWITZERLAND.

In general the public roads in Switzerland are divided into two main classes—cantonal roads, sometimes called State roads, and local or communal roads. With the exception of a few intermountain and other roads of national importance over which the National Government exercises supervision, the cantonal roads are controlled entirely by the Cantons. The Federal supervision of these roads of national importance is largely limited to the voting of annual indemnities to the four Cantons of Grison, Tessin, Uri, and Valais, which total about \$103,000. If the special roads are not maintained in proper condition, the Federal funds are withheld. The cantonal roads are generally placed under the direct charge of a highway department. Construction and maintenance are entirely supervised by this authority, while the funds are voted by cantonal government, usually under the budget system. In the new construction it is very customary for the Canton to pay a portion of the cost, while the remainder is assessed on the commune or parish. In the Canton of Vaud the proportion is 70 per cent by the State and 30 per cent by the commune. The Canton of Berne pays from 25 to 70 per cent, according to the financial condition of the commune, while the Canton of Tessin requires all new construction to be paid in full by the communes traversed. The maintenance of the cantonal roads, on the other hand, is in general all borne by the Canton. A few Cantons require the respective communes to transport the necessary road materials from the pits or quarries to the road. The maintenance of the cantonal or State roads is by roadmen employed throughout the year, as in France and Germany. The average length of section assigned to each man is about 3 miles. The annual salary of the cantonniers, or roadmen, varies from \$150 to \$200. In some Cantons the roadmen are also allowed the hay and pasturage along the roadside. Trees are only occasionally planted along the roadsides.

SWEDEN.

In Sweden every county is a separate community with regard to the construction and maintenance of public roads, bridges, and ferries. The county government board, appointed by the Crown, superintends the proper maintenance of the roads and bridges within the county. The orders of this board are executed by the superior sheriff (kronofogde), deputy sheriffs (landsmän), and assistant sheriffs (fjerdingsmän).

The roads of the county are inspected once a year by a board consisting of the deputy sheriff and two jurors. A schedule for the inspection tour is published in advance and full records are kept of the inspection. A full report is made to the road board, and such road maintainers or road managers as are found to have defective road sections are notified with detailed instructions of the necessary repairs. If these are not made within a specified time, fines are imposed, and the deputy sheriff may also have the work done and charge the expense to the road managers.

Until 1891 road maintenance was almost entirely "in natura," i. e., by the owners or tillers of the soil. Now, an additional revenue is raised from other taxable property than land, which constitutes a so-called "road fund."

The roads are divided into road districts, which are in turn divided into allotments to be maintained "in natura." These allotments are changed from time to time by the county government, but only on substantial evidence showing the need of such change. The road fund is distributed to the various allotments, and for the district in general in a somewhat complicated manner by a board or committee, in which both the county and district have a voice.

The Royal Board of Road Building and Water Works (Kongl. Vag- och Vattenbyggnadstyrelsen) has supervisory and advisory powers in matters concerning road construction, railroads, harbors, etc. This board is composed of officers who, besides being graduated in the departments at the technical high school, have also passed a military course in the fortification corps in the army.

In maintenance the Federal Government contributes to the road fund a sum equal to 15 per cent of the total cost, while in new construction the Government pays two-thirds and the road district one-third. The method of handling the funds and carrying out the work of construction is very similar to that already described for maintenance.

Great progress is being made in this country in the work of road improvement through the efforts of the States and local governmental units, but the progress being attained is not as great as the importance of this question should justify. In order to accelerate this progress, our National Government, following the example set by the National Governments of the pro-

gressive European countries, should lend its aid. Agitation looking to this end has been going on for a number of years, and a strong sentiment exists throughout the country in favor of such action. Not only this, but the number of bills which have been introduced in both Houses of Congress providing for some system of national aid indicates that a strong sentiment exists in Congress for participation in this work. Therefore it behooves this Congress to take action looking to this end, such as this bill proposes.

HAND IN HAND.

The improvement of the roadways and the waterways, as well as all other internal improvements, which are of so much interest and benefit to the people, should go hand in hand. We do not have to cut one wire of progress that another might be strung. We do not have to deny the people and the country one benefit in order to give them another. This country is big enough and strong enough to build her roadways, improve her waterways, and make such other internal improvements as are for the general good of our people.

THOMAS JEFFERSON FAVORED IT.

I wish to quote the language of Thomas Jefferson in favor of improving our waterways and roadways, which is as follows:

Shall it lie unproductive in the public vaults? Shall the revenue be reduced? Or shall it not, rather, be appropriated to the improvement of roads, canals, rivers, education, and other great foundations of prosperity and union under the powers which Congress may already possess or such amendment of the Constitution as may be approved by the States?

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM FAVORS IT.

As stated in the outset, the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore in 1912 declared in favor of roadway improvement. It also declared, as previous platforms had done, in favor of waterway improvements. Every Democrat is committed to both policies.

BETTER PRICES.

The improvement of our harbors means the bringing of the markets of the world to our door. More markets mean more competition for our products. Competition means better prices. Improved waterways mean cheaper and easier freights to our people. Couple with this improved roadways, which is another benefit the people should have, and it reduces the cost of putting our products to the railroads and the ports, which, of course, is another immense saving to the producer.

THIS CONGRESS SHOULD ACT.

The people want this legislation. They want this aid that will mean so much to the rapid development of our country. Many of us have worked hard and long for it. I hope this Congress will enact it into law during this session.

STATE CONTROL.

The committee report filed with this bill states that if this bill becomes a law the roadways of the country will still be left under State control, which meets the views of many of us in this regard. The States should retain control of their highways.

COMMUNITY ROADS.

We have for years had considerable aid through the Office of Public Roads in the Agricultural Department. That office has rendered much and valuable aid in stimulating road work throughout the country, and if this bill becomes a law the usefulness of that office will materially increase and will be able to give the people of the country what they have been waiting and hoping for, and that is a system of good roads in this country in a few years that will be a monument to those who have brought it about and a blessing to the American people. It will give them a system of good roads for practical purposes and uses. It does not contemplate any great highway, but a system of community highways that will result in inestimable value to the great masses and producing element of our citizenship. This bill carries \$25,000,000 as an aid to road building and road maintenance in the United States. This is a considerable sum, but it goes to the direct benefit of all the people and puts the burden upon the shoulders of the people living in the great cities, as well as the people in the country, to help build and maintain our highways. The money could not be put to a better purpose. It could not be spent for a purpose that would result in greater benefit to our whole country. It is a movement that deserves and should have the unqualified support of progressive and patriotic citizens in every part of this great country of ours. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some misapprehension as to this bill on the part of the gentlemen who have undertaken to criticize it. It is not the purpose of this bill to donate public money to be wasted on roads. On the contrary it is intended that the money afforded for this

form of domestic improvement shall be expended in such a way as to convert bad roads into good roads, or to maintain good roads in a condition of permanent excellence. It is a further purpose of this bill to stimulate good road making, and in addition to aid those roads, which the communities have brought up to such a standard of excellence that they may be regarded as thoroughly efficient highways.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] seemed to think that under the operation of this bill, Missouri would not receive, as compared, for instance, with Indiana, an adequate proportion of the road appropriation. I simply wish to call his attention to the fact that the failure of one State to qualify itself to secure its full quota of the general fund, will not enable another State to secure any sum, or amount, in excess of its ascertained quota, or proportion. For instance, if Indiana by reason of the fact that it has brought its dirt or other roads up to the standard provided in this bill is in a situation to receive every dollar of the quota ascertained for that State, such a situation will not affect the amount that would go to the State of Missouri, the State of Virginia, or to any other State in the Union, provided they conform themselves to the requirements of this measure. The purpose of this bill, as I have stated, is to bring about a universal improvement in the roads of the country. It is not a scheme of wasteful expenditure of money. On the contrary every safeguard against waste and extravagance has been provided. Any State desiring to avail itself of the benefits of this measure must meet the rigid requirements imposed. Under one section the State must maintain roads of a high standard of excellence, before it is entitled to receive any allowance. A State operating under the other section must afford an amount at least equal to the amount appropriated to be expended in that State by the Federal Government. My own State will operate under the section already cited, for the reason that our experience with the cooperative principle is altogether favorable.

It is not in contemplation or expectation that the dirt roads of any State, are in such a present condition or may be immediately put in such a condition, that they will be able to secure at the end of the present fiscal year the entire proportion of the quota allotted to that State.

This fact is not to the prejudice of any State. Each State must qualify itself by its own efforts to secure the amount to which it is entitled. Take the State of Virginia, for instance. If we are not willing by our domestic contributions to qualify ourselves to receive Federal aid, then to that extent Virginia will not enjoy the benefits of the bill. But to the extent that we qualify ourselves by our own exertions, we will be in a position to draw on the quota allotted to our State under the general scheme of distribution.

Taking the States of Missouri and Indiana, for the purpose of comparison, I notice that the proportion of mileage of post roads in Missouri, as compared with the proportion of post roads in Indiana is practically the same. This being so, the proportion, or quota that would be assigned to Missouri, on account of post-road mileage would be as great as that assigned to Indiana. But if Missouri does not undertake to improve her roads, or to meet the requirements of the bill, she will not be in a position to secure any proportion of her quota. Is that unreasonable?

We have not worked out a scheme to waste the public money. We repel any intimation that we have formulated a "pork barrel." On the contrary we have worked out a systematic, well-constructed plan, under which, not only will the present roads of the country be improved, but a stimulus is afforded for the construction of the most approved types of highways.

Some comment has been made on the fact that different amounts are provided for the maintenance of different types of roads. Such a distinction is inevitable, and is fair. It is less expensive to maintain a dirt road, than a costly concrete, or macadam road. Another thing we had in mind was, that the ideal to which we are working is a universal system of highways in the United States, one that will conform to the highest standard of improved roads. We know that the realization of this ideal is a long way ahead. We have no illusions about the matter. And while we are working to this end, we know that for the time being, and for many years to come the ordinary roads must be used, but, we hope, in an improved condition. In course of time, and with the influences now at work, supplemented as they will be by Federal appropriation we confidently expect that the United States will be supplied with a system of roads that will compare with the highest type of highways in use in the most advanced countries of Europe.

It is the purpose of this bill to stimulate the localities, the States, and the subdivisions of those States, to raise everywhere the standard of road construction. For this reason we have provided a greater allowance for an improved type of

road, than for the ordinary dirt road. The tendency in all the States is toward improved roads, and the distinction made by the bill, will encourage this tendency.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will.

Mr. PLATT. Have not the postal authorities got it in their power now to require any kind of road they want before they establish a rural-delivery route?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Suppose they have; what of it?

Mr. PLATT. They can do it without spending any of the Government's money, then.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Is it the gentleman's idea that the Federal Government shall not aid in this good work? If so, I do not agree with the gentleman. We could easily compel the States to do a great deal of work that is now being done by the Federal Government, by the simple process of declining to make appropriations for such improvements. The States would then be compelled to make these improvements, or do without them. It would be a sort of root hog, or die, proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] has expired.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. SAUNDERS. We are not compelled to appropriate a dollar to dredge out the harbor of New York, or to dig the Ambrose Channel for the benefit of that city. We need not appropriate a dollar for levees in the Mississippi Valley. We need not appropriate a dollar for reclamation purposes. The United States could sit back, as it were, and say to the respective localities, "Go ahead and make your own improvements." The Federal Government has jurisdiction to do these things, but it is not compelled to do them. Would the gentleman be willing to see the Federal Government withdraw from all work of this character, and leave it to be done by the localities most intimately and directly affected?

Now, I maintain that with reference to the greatest good to the greatest number, there is no form of Federal appropriation that will secure a greater measure of betterment of social and economic conditions, than an appropriation for an improved system of highways in the United States. [Applause.] If that be true, then it affords an ample justification for Federal appropriations in aid of post roads. Moreover the Democratic Party in the terms of its latest platform, is committed to this principle.

We have provided for no extravagant appropriation in this bill. Under the present system the entire cost of dredging a river, or a harbor is borne by the Federal Government.

But with reference to this much greater work, namely the work of improving the public roads, the Government says in substance to the localities to be affected: "I will not afford a dollar until, as a result of your own activities, you provide a corresponding dollar. In other words this is a half-and-half plan."

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. PARKER. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Is it not true that the United States Government has the entire control, for instance, of the harbor of New York, and that it is impossible for the State of New York to do it at its own expense?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; that is true. The Federal Government in the exercise of a Federal function dredges rivers and harbors, but it derives no benefit from the retention of jurisdiction over the completed work. The qualification of the improvement is the benefit to the entire country. There is ample authority for the appropriations contemplated by this bill, and the resulting benefits to the country at large will be far greater than any benefits that follow from any form of river, or harbor improvements. In this instance there is no occasion, or necessity to retain jurisdiction.

Mr. PARKER. But the gentleman, in answer to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT], brought that up as an illustration.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; I called the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that the Government has expended vast sums in the neighborhood of the city of New York, although the rest of the country had a very remote interest in those expenditures.

Mr. PARKER. That is true; but in your roads proposition the State itself has the control of the roads.

Mr. SAUNDERS. But if the benefit inures to the general public, the Government secures its return from that fact. There is no occasion for the Government to insist upon control of the roads, in return for the aid which it affords.

Mr. PARKER. That is true; but I was asking the gentleman why he used that illustration or that parallel.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I used that illustration for the purpose of showing that in the past the Federal Government has appropriated vast sums upon improvements of great interest to particular communities, but of remote concern to the general public. Of course as citizens of a common country, we are in a sense benefited by every form of public improvement. Under the scheme of Federal aid to roads proposed by this bill, the benefits of this appropriation will reach into, and affect the remotest localities in the United States.

Mr. PARKER. That is true.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I have ventured therefore to make a comparison between the benefits from river and harbor improvements, and the universal benefit that will ensue under this bill. I admit that in the one instance we retain jurisdiction, and in the other we do not. But what of it? How does the fact that the Federal Government refrains from claiming jurisdiction, in return for its aid, affect the propriety of making an appropriation that will confer such universal benefit?

Mr. PARKER. That is true; but does not that make the comparison illogical?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Not at all. Would my friend be willing to vote for this bill if we agree to demand Federal control?

Mr. PARKER. Over what?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Over the roads.

Mr. PARKER. Over the roads to be aided?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes. Would you be willing to vote for this bill, if the Government is given jurisdiction of all the roads that will be aided by the appropriation proposed?

Mr. PARKER. No.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Then the question of jurisdiction is not the stumblingblock with the gentleman.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. LLOYD. I think the gentleman from Virginia did not understand me, or I did not go far enough in my explanation to make it clear to him. The gentleman knows my time was very much limited.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. LLOYD. I am fully in sympathy with the gentleman's view of it and in sympathy with the purpose of this bill, and I believe that the money should go to the benefit of the man who builds the roads and not to the benefit of the other man.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes. If any gentleman thinks that this bill provides that any road, without regard to its condition, will receive aid from the Federal Government, then in the result that gentleman will be very much disappointed.

Mr. LLOYD. That is what I wanted to bring out.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Referring to the inquiry propounded by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT], is it not true that in the years preceding 1826 the Erie Canal was built largely by the General Government?

Mr. PLATT. No. It was built by the State of New York.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is absolutely immaterial. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PARKER] admitted that he would not vote for this bill even if the Government was afforded authority over the roads.

Mr. PLATT. I think if the State of New York is given control of New York Harbor it will do all the dredging that is needed.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I would be perfectly willing to agree to that, if you would pay back all that the Government has expended about New York, and maintain your harbor and approaches on the same terms as they are now maintained by the Government. Does the gentleman think that New York would agree to that proposition?

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

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, at the opening of the present Congress I had at my option either to remain a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I had been a member in the Sixty-second Congress, or be placed on the newly constituted committee, that on Roads. Believing that I could render my district and State greater service as a member of the Roads Committee, and having spent my life as a farmer, living out in a rural section of the country, and knowing something by actual experience of the needs of that class of our people, I

elected of my own accord to be placed on the Committee on Roads. I feel that by virtue of the fact that I have spent my entire life on a farm I am in a position to speak with some degree of knowledge as to the imperative need of better public highways.

In the consideration of this momentous subject there are three questions that present themselves to my mind. First, is there a need for the Federal Government to aid in the construction and improvement of public roads? Second, is it just and feasible for the Government to do so? Third, do the people desire this legislation?

As to the first proposition, the need of governmental aid, I shall discuss briefly the present condition of the roads of the country. There are, Mr. Chairman, about 2,300,000 miles of public roads in the United States. Of this amount only about 10 per cent, or 230,000 miles, are what may be termed improved roads. The other 90 per cent, or 2,070,000 miles, are still unimproved. Now, if it has required 140 years to get 10 per cent improved, will it not be too long to wait under the present system to get the other 90 per cent improved?

It is estimated by the Bureau of Good Roads of the Department of Agriculture that under present conditions it costs the farmers of the country \$1,600,000,000 annually to haul their produce to the market, to say nothing of the cost to these same farmers of hauling those things they purchase from the towns back to their farms. Improved highways throughout the country would reduce this heavy, burdensome transportation tax at least one-half, or \$800,000,000 per annum or \$8 for each person in the United States. These figures almost stagger the imagination.

We hear much from our city brethren about the high cost of living, but if they had to exchange places with those of us who live in the country they would, I have no doubt, speedily change their minds on this subject. I sometimes wish, when I hear this wail about the high cost of living, that these people had to live on the farms for a brief time. If they had to go out and clear away the forests, dig up the stumps, fence and ditch the land, plow the fields, face the piercing cold, the scorching sun, the blinding snow, and the drenching rain, and also had to endure losses caused by droughts, floods, winds, and storms, and on top of that had to contend with blights, crop pests of many kinds; had to rise at 4 in the morning and go until 8 in the evening, in order to produce a crop, and then after the crop was produced had to haul it from 5 to 25 miles to market over a hilly, muddy, country road, they would, in my judgment, decide that the cost of production was even higher than the cost of living. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, taking into consideration the many disadvantages and hardships which the farmers have to contend against, they do not get enough for the products of their toil.

The only just way, in my humble opinion, to justly and fairly reduce the cost of living is to reduce the cost of production and the cost of transportation and distribution. With improved roads, transportation charges would be materially reduced, and thereby the cost of living somewhat lessened, or, what would be fairer, the just reward of the farmer would be increased. With better roads and our parcel-post system extended to all parts of the country, the speculator and the middle man can be, in a large measure, eliminated, thereby bringing the producer and consumer closer together to the mutual benefit and profit of both. The man who lives in the country and the man who lives in the city are interdependent upon each other—that is, mutually dependent one upon the other—and the prosperity and happiness of the one adds to the welfare and happiness of the other. While the farmer could live in a way without the city, the city can not endure at all without the country. It has been truly said that if you destroy the cities and leave the farms, the cities will soon be rebuilt; but that if you destroy the farms and leave the cities, grass will grow in their streets evermore. Therefore the dweller in the city should welcome this opportunity to aid his brother in the country. The city dweller should realize that not only must he get his food and the material from which his clothing is made from the country, but that he must also depend upon the country for a fresh supply of pure country manhood and womanhood to revitalize the constantly degenerating city population. City life tends toward decay, morally and physically, and if the strain of pure, vigorous country blood was cut off from the city, the leprosy of degeneration would within a few brief years bring the cities to a pitiable condition.

Better roads mean better farms, better dwellings, better schools, better churches, better society, more time for study and recreation, less for hardship and drudgery, and consequently more prosperity, sunshine, and happiness. By thus

making country life more attractive a larger per cent of our strong, intelligent young men and women would be kept in the country instead of being lured to the cities by their attractions. By this means the country and city population would be nearer properly balanced, and neither would suffer from being overcrowded. So much, Mr. Chairman, for the first proposition; that is, the needs of and benefits to come from the better rural highways.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I crave the indulgence of the House for a few moments to speak of the justice and feasibility of the Federal Government aiding in the construction and improvement of the public highways of the country. Federal taxes are paid by all classes of our people, and simple justice demands that in the expenditure of the moneys thus collected equal consideration should be given to all classes of our citizens, both rural and urban.

The Federal Government aided in the construction of the trunk lines of railroad that opened up the great western section of our country to the amount of not less than 155,000,000 acres of valuable public lands. It appropriates \$50,000,000 annually for river and harbor improvement. It has spent \$400,000,000 at least in the last few years to build the Panama Canal. It expends annually \$100,000,000 for the support and equipment of the Army and \$150,000,000 for the Navy, making an annual appropriation of \$250,000,000 for the military arm of our Government. Many millions are also appropriated annually for the public buildings in the towns and cities, while the country people have no roads to travel even to see these public buildings they have been taxed to help construct. Yet in spite of all this, some have been heard to protest against the small sum of \$25,000,000 carried in this bill to help improve the rural highways of the country. Mr. Chairman, if I had my way, not another battleship would be built in this country until our post roads were all improved. Justice cries aloud for the speedy enactment of this measure. In fact, justice would say to expend many millions more, and thereby in a measure restore to our rural population at least a portion of that which they have been taxed for the exclusive benefit of those living in the towns and cities. I paraphrase the language of the Golden Rule, and say to you men who live in the cities, "As has been done to you, do ye even so unto us."

Now, Mr. Chairman, but a few words as to the last proposition—that is, the desire of the people for this legislation—and then I am done. Read, if you will, the platform of each of the three great national parties enunciated in 1912, and you will see that they all covenant with the people to enact this legislation if given the authority to do so. Does anyone doubt for a moment, if this question were submitted to a vote of the people of this country, what the verdict would be? No one can doubt it, and, my colleagues, if we fail to enact this legislation the people will rise up in their righteous wrath, as they should, and denigrate us "unprofitable servants" and retire us to private life. Then our eyes will weep and our teeth will gnash, but it will be too late. I am glad, however, to see a Nation-wide patriotic spirit manifested in the discussion of this subject. Many Members of this House who represent city districts have risen to a high plane of statesmanship and declared for its passage. Mr. Chairman, there is no partisanship in this measure. The demand for it comes from the North and the South, the East and the West, and I predict that it will pass this House by practically unanimous vote. When that is done, and it receives the approval of the other branch of the Congress and is approved by our great President, it will mark the beginning of a new era in this country. Light and hope will spring up in the breast of every country child, and justice will be done, in a measure, to those to whom it has been denied so long.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that \$25,000,000 will not go very far toward the improving of the highways of the country, but it will do to begin with. It will stimulate the States, counties, and local communities to greater endeavors. When this amount is supplemented by appropriations from all the States and subdivisions thereof, and when every man, woman, and child in the rural communities becomes an apostle of good roads, as they will, then will results be had that will benefit and bless the entire country and do us much honor. Then will that day arrive which the Hebrew prophet foresaw when he exclaimed, "And they shall build houses and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build and another inhabit; they shall not plant and another eat." [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I believe that the nearer the Federal Government gets to the people of the country in legislation the better will be the Gov-

ernment. I am heartily in favor of the Government helping in the building and upkeep of the roads of the country on the same principle that I favor and have so diligently worked to have the Federal Government rebuild and improve the levees of the Mississippi, so that it may be possible to reclaim the millions of acres of overflowed and swamp lands that are now in waste in the Mississippi Valley. Missouri alone has 2,500,000 acres of swamp and overflowed lands, useless and worthless to-day because the Government has not done its duty in protecting the levees and preventing these overflows and floods. If that land is reclaimed, as it can and will be if the Government gives the assistance it ought to give, it will mean many splendid and good farms all through the great Mississippi Valley. Not only will it restore to the people these 2,500,000 acres of land in Missouri, but some 77,000,000 acres in the entire Mississippi Valley. All of it can be reclaimed, with the necessary and proper attention by this Government.

I am also in favor of this proposed legislation for the dirt roads of the country, because it makes farm life happier. While my constituents, the people for whom I directly speak, do not specially need this legislation, since I represent a city district, yet I appreciate that the farmers of the country are entitled to the greatest consideration in this respect. The farmers need good roads for the purpose of getting to their towns and to their markets. They must have the ways and means of carrying their produce and products to the towns and to their shipping points in the interest of commerce. Good roads are as necessary to the farmer as good streets are necessary to the people who live in cities. The people of this country ought to be, and I believe are, in favor of assisting in good-road building such as this bill provides.

I am in favor of it again, because I know of its benefit to the city as well as because I know the necessity it is to the farmers. I am not in favor of it just because of the pleasure it may give to those who have automobiles and who want good roads built for that purpose, but for the farmers, in order that they may go to town in their wagons and in their buggies and get the use of these good roads. I know something of the conditions in the country. I was born on a farm in Missouri and lived upon it long enough to know that a bad road is a mighty tough proposition in many ways. Not alone on business, but socially as well. I am glad, therefore, as one Member of this House, to support the bill presented here by the Committee on Roads through its chairman, my distinguished colleague [Mr. SHACKLEFORD]. [Applause.]

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, under the leave granted me to extend my remarks I include the following article:

OPPORTUNITIES IN MISSOURI FOR AGRICULTURAL SETTLERS.

[By Prof. F. B. Mumford, dean State Agricultural College, Columbia, Mo.]

The highest priced agricultural land in America is located in the corn belt. The reason for this is that the area in which Indian corn may be grown successfully is limited. Not only in America, but the areas of land suitable for growing Indian corn in the world outside of the United States is very small. Sir John B. Lawes once said that Europe could never hope to compete with America in agriculture, because of the ease with which corn may be grown in this country.

Missouri lies in the center of the American corn belt; there are no corn lands superior to those found in Missouri. One man in Missouri grows more corn each year on his farm than is grown in the 9 States of Utah, Oregon, Washington, Arizona, Idaho, Montana, Rhode Island, Wyoming, and Nevada combined. Three counties in Missouri grow more corn than 19 other States, in which are included all of New England. These 3 counties grow more corn than is reported for the State of New York, or Maryland or West Virginia. Missouri grows three times as much corn as all of South America, three-fifths as much as all of Europe, and nearly one-half as much as is produced in the whole world outside of the United States.

The value of the corn crop in Missouri each year amounts to more than \$100,000,000. Her wheat crop is valued at \$30,000,000. Missouri is also one of the leading hay and forage States. In 1903 the hay crop alone for the State was valued at over \$30,000,000. This does not include the vast areas of blue grass, clover, and timothy pastures which in point of extent and quality are not exceeded by any State in the Union.

The above facts are evidence of the abundant resources and high state of fertility of Missouri lands. In Missouri land is to-day cheaper, considering its intrinsic value, than in any of the corn-belt States. Good corn land, which has already become scarce and so much in demand that it sells in some localities at \$250 per acre, is still to be had in Missouri for less than \$100 an acre.

Of all the corn-belt States Missouri has more unoccupied land than any other. Twenty million acres are unimproved. Large areas of this land need only the intelligent skill of the husbandman to add millions of dollars to the total agricultural revenue of the State. Much of this land is peculiarly adapted to the production of high-class fruits. Larger areas can be made into productive and profitable pastures for cattle, sheep, and horses. Some of the land adapted for grazing purposes can be purchased at from \$3 to \$10 per acre.

Missouri has more apple trees than any other State in the Union. She has the largest orchard in the world. In good fruit years the total apple product of Missouri exceeds that of many of the great apple States.

In the production of live stock Missouri has always rivaled adjoining States, which are more generally given to grain farming. More than \$1,000,000,000 is invested in farms, buildings, and equipment for carrying on the business of stock farming in this State. While Missouri is not generally regarded as a sheep-producing State, it is nevertheless true that she has more sheep than any adjoining State. The poultry product of Missouri is greater than that of any other American State.

Another reason for the remarkable productive power of Missouri crops and live stock is due to the favorable climate. Missouri is far enough north to escape the enervating heat of the South and far enough south to avoid the rigorous climate of the North. The Missouri farmer pastures his animals eight or nine months in the year and requires little expensive shelter for the mild winters. The rainfall is abundant and well distributed and hot winds are unknown.

The State of Missouri maintains for the aid of the prospective settler an agricultural experiment station, which is organized for the purpose of solving new agricultural problems and giving advice to all farmers in the State; outlying experiment fields in 20 localities are solving the local problems due to special soils or particular locations. The State of Missouri has, through the agricultural experiment station, demonstrated the efficacy of the serum treatment for hog cholera and is inoculating at the present time more than 10,000 hogs per month.

The Missouri State Board of Agriculture is organized to aid the farmers of the State by means of farmers' institutes, veterinary sanitation, thus safeguarding the health of Missouri live stock, and through its highway department to encourage the construction and maintenance of country roads. This excellent organization, appointed by the governor, has contributed largely to the development of the State.

The State board of horticulture likewise has accomplished through publications and public meetings great service to the horticultural interests of Missouri.

The State poultry board has contributed largely to the preeminent position of the State in aiding the poultry interests by publications, poultry shows, and, more recently, in the development of a poultry station.

The organized government of the State is through these various agencies protecting and aiding the agricultural citizens of the State. Probably no State in the United States has a more excellent series of State boards, appointed by the government primarily for the development of the agricultural, horticultural, and live-stock interests of the State.

[Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD].

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I know of no legislation which is of more importance and of more benefit to the masses of the people than good-roads legislation, and I desire to state in the outset of my remarks that we, in passing this bill, are carrying out another platform pledge of our party. The Baltimore platform says:

We favor national aid to State and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads.

This bill carries an appropriation of \$25,000,000 to aid the States in constructing and maintaining roads over which the mails are transported, and I want to ask why, if there is any reason, should we not aid the States in building roads for the people in furtherance of our program to improve the general conditions under which we live so far as legislation will accomplish that end? We have appropriated nearly \$400,000,000 for the purpose of constructing the Panama Canal. Every year we have appropriated large sums to improve the rivers and harbors of the country. We have appropriated millions of dollars of the people's money for the purpose of constructing post-office buildings throughout the country; hence, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that too long already have been deferred appropriations for construction and maintenance of good roads, the benefits of which would be directly felt every day in the year by every citizen of the Republic. This bill provides for a cooperative plan by which the States and the local communities bear a proper proportion of the expense, and United States Government, through the Department of Agriculture, meets the obligation we owe the people in this great undertaking.

Mr. Chairman, the tax known as the "bad-roads tax" is the heaviest burden borne by the American people to-day, and Hon. Logan W. Page, Director of the Office of Public Roads and our greatest road expert, tells us that—

Not less than \$250,000,000 is the tribute levied annually on the people of the United States by bad roads.

Mr. Chairman, this is an enormous economic waste, and we should relieve the people of our rural communities of this burden just as soon as possible. Lord Macaulay, in his History of England, says:

Of all inventions, the alphabet and the printing press alone excepted, those inventions which abridge distance have done most for the civilization of our species. Every improvement of the means of locomotion benefits mankind morally and intellectually as well as materially.

Statistics show that in States where there are good roads 85 per cent of the children of school age attend the public schools, while in States where the roads have not been improved only about 65 per cent of the children receive the benefit of the public schools. Statistics also show that a greater percentage

of illiteracy obtains in localities where they have bad roads than in communities traversed by good roads. Therefore this legislation will promote the cause of education in our country. Yes, Mr. Chairman, the question of good roads is one of the greatest questions confronting our people. One of the first bills I introduced in Congress was a good-roads bill, and I might add that the bill before the House to-day is similar in many respects to the bill I introduced nearly five years ago. The farmers of the United States in 1913 produced crops valued at nearly \$10,000,000,000, and in order to market this crop it was necessarily hauled over bad roads, and the Director of the United States Office of Public Roads tells us in his reports that because of these bad roads it cost the farmers, and, of course, the consumers ultimately, \$250,000,000 more to market their crops than would have been the expense with good roads; hence, you see that this is a serious and important question. We ought to eliminate this waste and bring the producers and consumers of the country into closer and easier communication.

The question of good roads goes to the very root of the cause of the high cost of living in this country—build good roads for the farmers and the present annual waste of \$250,000,000 will become an investment daily working a betterment of our economic conditions of life, and every fiber of our public structure will begin to strengthen and grow with new vigor from the hour Congress makes an appropriation giving our people Federal aid in the construction of their roads.

Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary that I should recall the many advantages to the people of this legislation, because they must be apparent to all. Now that we have the rural free-delivery system well established, with the rural telephones and the parcel-post system in operation, if we will but aid our people in building and maintaining good roads, we will make farm life in this country attractive and solve one of the greatest problems of our modern civilization. I hope this bill will become a law at any early date. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK].

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this bill, and thereby express my tribute to the Committee on Roads for the careful consideration it has given the subject, for the intelligence and extensive labors of its chairman and the author of this bill, Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I give this bill my support because I believe that the avenues through which the farm produce reaches the city consumer and by which our rural mail is transported to the farmer are of primary importance and properly the subject of Federal legislation and aid.

The appropriation of a maximum of \$25,000,000 is sure to stimulate and encourage the building of good roads throughout the entire country. I desire, in reminding you that this sum of money is to be taken from the fund paid by the taxpayers into our Federal Treasury, to call your attention to my farm-credit bill, H. R. 11897, and its clause providing a road fund.

This bill, if it should become a law, will provide this \$25,000,000 annually, and no tax or cost of any kind, to the extent even of one penny, will be charged against the people.

In my speech printed in the Record of September 11, 1913, I inserted, on page 5143, a table showing what the profit would be to the Government by lending money to the farmers upon only about one-half of the farm first mortgages now in force. This table reveals the rather startling fact that the annual profit on such loans would be more than \$25,000,000. This profit would accrue to the Government if it should borrow money at 3 per cent and lend it in this way at 4½ per cent.

Some of my colleagues are inclined to turn this profit over to a few private money lenders in a bankers' farm-credit scheme rather than to give the profit in good roads to the farmers who pay it. They are for good roads, very properly, but they are willing to neglect an opportunity to save this \$25,000,000 to the taxpayers of this country.

Some of these say that Government loans to farmers is class legislation, but are not against perpetrating the more drastic class legislation by exempting from all taxation a new class of banks in order that these bankers may make this profit of over \$25,000,000 per year with which to buy automobiles to ride in over these roads that the people are taxed annually this large sum to construct and maintain.

They claim it is class legislation for the Government to make this profit of \$25,000,000 per year in helping the farmers, but it is not class legislation for the Government to help the bankers make it by giving them exemption from all taxes.

Government loans are not new or novel. Every leading Government on earth lends money to farmers. We as a Government are now lending money to the Philippine farmers. We are doing for the brown men now, and have been doing it suc-

cessfully for six years, what I would like to have this Government do for the white farmers of this country.

Mr. Chairman, there is no necessity of giving special privilege to a new money power in the way of exemption from taxation or in any other manner. The Government of the United States can constitutionally and should lend money on farm first mortgages. It should not be paternalistic to a few bankers who desire to lend money to farmers. It can without any possibility of loss and with a certainty of profit take care of this great national policy itself. It should not turn this great purpose of the perpetuation of our food supply over to the mercies of private profit.

Later on, Mr. Chairman, I will take up the subject of private-profit farm credit, conducted by money lenders and a special kind of banking institution, but at this juncture I wish to review in some detail what other countries are doing in the way of Government loans to farmers. However, before beginning this review I wish to state concisely the theory and purpose of my bill, H. R. 11897. This bill is predicated upon the theory that Government aid and self-help should go hand and hand. I do not believe that anything can be accomplished by proposing only self-help to the helpless.

On this theory I propose in the bill that the Government shall borrow money upon bonds based upon farm first mortgages and guaranteed by the Government, pay a rate of interest not in excess of 3½ per cent, and lend the money at a rate not in excess of 4½ per cent.

The bill provides that this can be done directly to the farmer, or to the farmer through farm-credit associations. The latter provision would be the most effective encouragement to farmers' farm-credit associations possible, and I believe they would spring up in every county and the long waiting for any other plan to become effective would be avoided.

Thus, by the provisions of the bill Government aid going hand in hand with self-help would work out as follows:

In my county there are about \$800,000 of farm first mortgages upon farm homes. In this indirect lending on these mortgages the Government would provide that the farmers of this county should organize a farm-credit association with a capital of say \$10,000. This association, conforming to certain rules and regulations, would act as the agent of the Government in appraising, inspecting, and perhaps making collections on these mortgages. The association would indorse the mortgage notes. For this service the Government would pay it annually not to exceed one-half of 1 per cent on the sum of the loans. This would assure the success of the local farm-credit association at once and would leave it to employ its own capital in making short-time loans. Restrictions and limitations could be imposed upon it without the delay of enacting and repealing antagonistic State laws, which could be enforced by the alternative of losing this Federal privilege.

The mortgages would become the property of the Government, and, with the bonds, would be exempt from taxation, without conflict with the States, and the profit would redound to the benefit of all the people instead of to a very few. The great work of securing better credit facilities for the farmers on both long-time and short-time loans would begin at once in an effective manner, without the delays which surely will follow any private profit-sharing banking scheme.

The bill is not complicated, and a further review of its provisions seems unnecessary.

I now take up the subject of Government loans in other countries. I have gleaned this information from various sources which I deem official and authentic. I have secured the facts from the yearbooks of Germany, New Zealand, Australia, and other countries; the reports of the English estates commission, reports of the ministers of finance, and the laws of countries referred to; reports of the treasurer of the Philippine Islands and of the Philippine Commission; report of our French ambassador; the writings and reports of the delegate of the United States to the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome; numerous congressional documents, including Senate Documents 17 and 214.

GOVERNMENT AID IN GERMANY.

There are 16 institutions in Germany whose liabilities in the shape of mortgages, debentures, or obligations to depositors are guaranteed by the State or Province. It is the regular business of these institutions to lend to individuals on mortgage security, and the profits derived from this business revert to the Government. These institutions are managed, owned, and controlled by the Government. To make this plain, I will say that if the State of Ohio were to open a bank, supply its capital from State funds, guarantee all its obligations, and appoint an official

to manage it, Ohio would be doing about the same as is done by one of these Provinces of Germany.

These institutions have been established from as early as 1832 up to 1894, and the great importance of their assistance to agriculture can not be overestimated.

These 16 institutions up to the year 1909—a later report not being accessible—had loaned in round numbers \$485,540,985.

In 1895 the Prussian State Central Cooperative Bank was established as a State-endowed institution. This bank lends money in large sums to cooperative credit societies. It is stated by the Prussian minister of finance that this was found necessary in order to "steady the interest rate." The State of Bavaria followed suit with a central loan bank, endowing it with a capital through the issue of its bonds, amounting to \$1,000,000,000. In other words, this one State of Germany advanced for the aid of mortgage creditors its credit as a State a sum equal to about one-third of the farm-mortgage indebtedness of our 48 States.

The Prussian bank in the year 1907 loaned \$165,000,000; in 1911, \$187,361,883.

None of these institutions or banks are in the slightest sense conducted for private profit, are operated exclusively for the people, yet with a margin of profit on interest not much more than one-half of 1 per cent, in the year 1907 it paid upon its endowed capital of \$18,750,000 a dividend of 1.49 per cent.

There are numerous provincial-aid banks in Germany to which the Prussian Government for their foundation capital has issued in the last 50 or 60 years the sum of approximately \$1,700,000. The Prussian act of 1896 appropriated a sum approximating \$1,250,000 for the building of granaries in order to remove the middleman's excessive profit on part of the food supply.

Baron von Hermen-Schorn, former agriculture expert of the Germany Embassy, says:

The cooperative rural-credit systems in Germany were not carried on as effectively as they are now under Government assistance.

He also says that—

A system started by bankers and run by bankers could in no sense be a cooperative system and probably would not help the interest of farmers for any length of time.

Speaking of the public savings banks and various Government-aid institutions of credit in Germany, he says:

Private banks have been asked if they have ever felt any interference by the savings banks in their business, and they say they have not.

In this connection I wish to inform the committee that the commercial rate in Germany now is from 1½ to 2½ per cent higher than the land-mortgage interest rate. Also, that the bankers of New Zealand, who in 1896 opposed the lending of money to the farmers by the Government, stated afterwards that it did not injure their business but seemed to stimulate their business generally.

Mr. William C. Teichmann, United States consul at Mannheim, Germany, states that the increased facilities for securing loans has not resulted in the farmers going into debt to their disadvantage as "the farmer is careful and conservative."

During the 70 years that the Government Land Bank of Weisbaden has been in existence it has never lost a penny on land mortgages.

Of the section of country near Weisbaden, Mr. Reusch, councillor of Weisbaden, states that out of every thousand farmers 756 are without any debts.

The Land Bank of Weisbaden has 28 branches, and is a fair sample of Government aid in Germany. The Parliament, which meets every year, elects three members for life and three honorary members who manage the bank. The State guarantees the mortgages, guarantees the debentures, and guarantees every debt of this bank in Prussia. No official of the land can have an interest in the business of the bank. Each official has a salary and is prohibited from taking any part in the banking business. The profits go to the Government. If there is a large net profit, then the people in the Province pay less taxes, but often the money is applied to the maintenance of an asylum, the building and keeping up the provincial roads, and so forth, and Mr. Reusch says that the taxes upon the population are low on account of the profit made in lending money in this way. All the capital of this bank was originally borrowed upon bonds.

Considering the constant reference to the great success of Germany in establishing agricultural credit, these are instructive facts, and if we are to have no Government aid in the United States we should cease the use of Germany as a model.

ENGLAND.

In 1894 there was attempt made to transplant from Germany the Raiffeisen system of cooperative credit in Ireland. After 17 years the report shows that in 1912 \$282,720 was the total loan for that year. This is an illustration of the slowness

of self-help. Landlordism had for many years been fastening itself upon the Irish farmer. The power of wealth and the traditional rites of ownership had built up a system of oppression that no self-help could make way against and secure relief for the poor farmers. Perceiving that it was idle to talk self-help to the helpless, the British Government in 1903 enacted a law and authorized the expenditure of £100,000,000 sterling and established the English estates commission, which under this act up to the year ending March, 1911, had expended \$370,000,000. The borrower pays an annual rate, including interest and amortization, of 3½ per cent. The loan fund is borrowed by the Government on its certificates at 2½ per cent, redeemable in 30 years. A separate fund is provided from which in some cases expense for drainage, fences, stock, seeds, and implements are taken care of. The project includes the erection of about 25,000 farm cottages.

I quote from an address from Sir Horace Plunkett, president of the Irish Agricultural Organization Society, who, speaking of this as a "huge undertaking," says: "This, as no doubt you are aware, is now the accepted policy of all parties." He speaks of "the policy of strict abstention from any interference by government with the business of the people," as "withholding the kind of assistance which every other European government was giving to its farmers." Sir Horace refers to this failure to give assistance as the "laissez faire doctrine." He further states, referring to his studies respecting the agriculture future of America, "that while the state and the voluntary movement must advance side by side, and while the state must give its aid to the cooperative movement, it must seek to secure to that movement the greatest freedom."

FRANCE.

The Crédit Foncier of France was established in 1852. For the first years of its existence it was given a Government subsidy of 10,000,000 francs. Under the law of March 31, 1899, district agricultural credit banks were established and a lump sum of 40,000,000 francs and a yearly contribution of 3,000,000 francs placed at their disposal. This money was the tax placed upon the Bank of France as payment to the Government for its franchise, which was renewed in 1896. It has been stated that this was not Government money, but this is not true, as a tax had been collected for three years prior to its being contributed to the use of the agricultural banks. It is estimated that before the present franchise of France had expired that over 100,000,000 francs will have been contributed in this manner.

The result is in France that this action was an impetus to the establishment of agriculture credit societies of a cooperative character, which had never before been experienced in France, and which would not have been known except for Government loans.

A celebrated French writer, Maurie Dufourmantelle, who is evidently acquainted with conditions throughout Europe, says, speaking of Government aid, "Its action runs parallel with that of private initiative, each mutually completing the other."

Throughout all Europe, wherever self-help for the helpless has been permitted to drag its way over the obstacles interposed by an avaricious money-lending system, progress has been slow.

AUSTRIA.

Between the years 1869 and 1910, 669 public savings banks were organized in Austria. These banks had loaned on mortgages, in 1910, 3,763,345,000 crowns. This is taken from a statement made by the Austrian minister of agriculture. About 55 per cent of these loans were placed on farms.

There are 17 provincial banks in Austria, which have very little initial capital, but whose obligations, in fact all their liabilities, are guaranteed by the provincial or state governments. In 1910 these institutions had issued debentures, which were guaranteed by the governments, amounting to 1,537,819,000 crowns. Over 80 per cent of these debentures represented agriculture loans. Lending at a very low rate of interest, these banks in 1910 showed a net profit of 3,126,000 crowns. The minister states:

It has been demonstrated by experience that the provincial banks have never suffered losses in compulsory realization of their claims. The mortgages, the assets of the bank, and the Province with its taxes serve as guarantees for the debentures. * * * Agriculture prefers the credit of the provincial banks to all other sources of credit, because they offer the lowest and most stable rates of interest and because loans are amortizable in small annuities. * * * It is impossible for private parties to make amortizable loans for small amounts. * * * An excessive rate of interest is irreconcilable with amortization in agricultural transactions. * * * These institutions are characteristic of Austria, and merit the attention of countries where the greatest possible freedom of the individual and the vigorous development of the State as a whole are to be found working harmoniously together.

Speaking of the rise of price of land, which is a condition existing throughout all of Europe, and regarding the conjecture

of some that this increase of land values might be due to "increased credit to the farmers by reason of the land mortgage and Raiffeisen systems," the minister says:

It has nothing to do with the rise in price of land. The reasons are, increasing population and increase of consumption.

Dr. Moritz Weden, speaking of Government loans in Austria, says:

The cooperative movement, for the Government aid which has been rendered to it, has in turn rendered abundant cooperative aid to the Government.

RUSSIA.

In 1895 the Peasants' Land Mortgage Bank in Russia was given power to purchase entire estates from landlords, and was given special capital for this purpose by the Crown. Up to 1912, 53,000,000 acres of land had been thus purchased and cut into tracts averaging from 21 to 27 acres. The payments of the purchases of these small tracts run as long as 55½ years, and the annual payments, including amortization and cost of administration, amounts to about 4½ per cent. The Russian Government secures this money by the issue of its bonds. Both the institutions of the Raiffeisen and Schulze-Delitzsch type since 1895 have been assisted by Government funds, and their recent growth has been very rapid. The State Government of Russia has established central State banks, which lend a certain portion of the foundation capital to the credit societies at 4½ per cent interest.

HUNGARY.

The entire Hungarian agriculture policy is State endowed. Aside from performing every duty of Government in the direction of education, which is carried on in the United States and every other leading country, Hungary pursues a policy of substantial help through giving financial means to perform the work which it has taught the farmers how to do. The work is carried on mainly through the State-controlled National Small Holdings Land Mortgage Institute, the Central Hungarian Credit Cooperative Society, and the National Association of Hungarian Land Mortgage Institutions. Mortgage debentures are guaranteed by the Government. The outstanding loans on agricultural real estate in 1907 is estimated at over \$822,000,000. It is stated that when the cooperative movement in Hungary, and when discussions as to whether Government loans should be instituted, were under way that "the country banks left no stone unturned to prevent this movement which they believed seriously threatened their business." This belief proved to be later on manifestly erroneous. In fact a study of European private-bank conditions reveals the fact that their business is still profitably conducted in the presence of cooperative credit and Government aid for farmers. In many of the countries where the rate of interest on farm mortgages is as low as 4½ per cent, private joint-stock mortgage companies have gone into the business, conducting it at the low rate, and have paid substantial dividends. The largest joint-stock land-mortgage company in the world, located in Germany, has paid dividends for years averaging around 8 to 9 per cent, with a margin between the cost of money and the rate at which it was loaned of one-quarter of 1 per cent. None of these companies, however, have engaged in the business on this basis until Government loans and cooperation had led the way.

ITALY.

There are three public banks in Italy, namely, the Bank of Naples, the Bank of Sicily, and the Savings Bank of Milan. These banks have numerous branches which are increasing. They are entirely altruistic institutions, have no shareholders, and pay no profits except to the State. Under the 1907 law, by a special tax 4,000,000 lire was turned over to the Bank of Sicily. The rate of interest upon agricultural loans, including interest and amortization, is usually 5½ per cent. Formerly the rate of interest to farmers in Sicily was often as high as 60 per cent. The farmers of Sicily were no worse off than many of the poor farmers in the United States at the present time.

SWITZERLAND.

There are 23 banks in Switzerland which are furnished with capital of the various States or Cantons. This capital is either drawn from the Government treasury or by the issue of the bonds of the State. As an example, the Zurich Canton Bank was established in 1870 with a capital of 6,000,000 francs, taken from the public treasury. This capital has been since increased to 20,000,000 francs by the issue of Canton bonds. The Canton Bank of Zurich is governed by a board of directors composed of 13 members appointed by the Government. There are also private banks, joint-stock, and cooperative banks, but the rate of interest and terms are higher than that of the Government bank. One-half the profit of these public banks goes to the reserve fund and the other half to the State. These banks, in lending money on farm property, deal directly with the

farmer in his individual capacity. The interest rate varies from 4 to 4½ per cent and the terms as long as 50 years.

DENMARK.

The Government of Denmark since 1899 has loaned 25,000,000 crowns directly to the farmers of that country. It is increasing this loan at the rate of 4,000,000 per year, charging interest at 3 per cent. This work has been conducted on the theory that the main expenditure should be for the small farmer to help him build his own home and become independent. It loans up to 90 per cent of the appraised valuation of the property. Operating for 14 years on this plan, very few small loans have had to be taken over because of failure to meet the obligation. The total loss during these years amounts to only one two hundred and fiftieths of 1 per cent of the total amount loaned. This method of fostering small landowners has been of great advantage to the large farmers, because of the increase in country population and consequent increase of farm hands.

NORWAY.

In the city of Christiania is located the Mortgage Bank of the Kingdom of Norway. Its capital belongs to the State, which, under the agreement, the Government can not recall until after the bank has "fulfilled all its undertakings." All bonds issued by this bank are the obligation of the Government. Loans are made up to 60 per cent of the value of the property mortgaged for a term of 40 years at 4½ per cent interest. The administration of the bank is in the hands of a board of directors chosen by the Norwegian Parliament and nominated by the King.

NEW ZEALAND.

In 1894 New Zealand passed a law known as the advances act, which was put into operation in 1895. Up to this date it has loaned over \$60,000,000 at interest rates around 4 and 4½ per cent. The loan fund has been mainly produced by the issue of Government bonds, upon which an interest rate was paid running from 3 to 3½ per cent.

Prior to the passage of this law farmers were paying over 8 per cent interest, and the money lenders were contending that it was cheap enough. Since the law went into operation these same money lenders have continued to lend money, but at the rate given on Government loans. In 1911 the total expense of carrying on the business was fifteen one-hundredths of 1 per cent. In the year 1912 the loan department showed a net profit of over \$300,000. In the Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives of New Zealand for the second session a statement of profit and expenses for the year ending March 31, 1906, shows gross profits as—translated from pounds, shillings, and pence—\$193,175. The total expense of the advances department is given at \$22,193, which is about 55 cents for each \$500 of outstanding loans. The net profits were approximately \$170,236. The cost of management in 1911, which is given as the outside average, was 75 cents on each \$500 loaned. This is about fifteen one-hundredths of 1 per cent, and conforms very closely to the management cost reported from other countries. In 1911 the report showed a loss on one account amounting to \$265. It was also stated in the report that there was two securities on hand which were not satisfactory. For the 15 years of the operation of the plan a total of 32 foreclosures have been made out of a total of 16,005 loans.

The same opposition to Government loans which has been instituted in all countries by those who are lending money and thought their profits might be curtailed was waged fiercely in New Zealand. No political party in New Zealand now opposes the system. No political party in Germany or England now opposes a like system. In New Zealand Government loans have been of inestimable advantage to agriculture, and this is also true of other countries.

The United States consul to New Zealand says, in a report made in 1897:

The loans have been a great boon to struggling farmers, who were paying as high as 8 per cent on their mortgages. Immediately this money became available interest came tumbling down to 4 per cent for good freehold security.

Mr. Henry Demarest Lloyd, an English writer on economic subjects, says:

The world over one of the greatest obstacles in the way of the small farmer, and the large one, is the difficulty of getting capital. Often there is no money to be borrowed in the district where he lives, or if there is, it is in the hands of rich neighbors or banks, who know nothing but their bond and the pound of flesh. But in New Zealand the settler has only to go to the nearest post office to get into communication with a money lender, who charges no commission or brokerage, and no fees, except for actual expenses, never exacts usury, offers no cut-throat mortgages for signatures, will let him have any amount from as little as \$125 to as much as \$15,000, does not try to induce him to borrow more than he really needs, gives him 36½ years to pay the money back, and accepts it from him in small instalments on the principal with every payment of interest, so as to make it as little of a burden as can be; will allow him, if he happens to have \$25 to spare, to pay it at any time to reduce his indebtedness, and when it finds itself making a

profit out of its business, instead of accumulating a fortune, gives him the benefit by reducing his rate.

AUSTRALIA.

All of the six States of Australia make Government loans to farmers. The progress of these loans is well evidenced by the fact that total loans of the six States were \$25,869,555 in 1908, \$30,692,660 in 1909, \$35,337,870 in 1910, \$40,315,360 in 1911. The first laws instituting this system of loans were passed in 1896, and the total of loans given for these four years fairly represents the increase for the other periods. The total profit which had accumulated up to and including 1911 was \$958,600. About three-fifths of the applications have been accepted and the loans made upon them. The loan fund is provided throughout the States generally by the issue of Government bonds bearing interest of not to exceed 4 per cent. Much of this is borrowed at 3½ per cent, and a small portion at 4 per cent. The average rate payable on the aggregate indebtedness of the Australian States is a little less than 3½ per cent. The rate of interest to farmer borrowers is from 4 to 5 per cent, including amortization, and the running period of the debt is from 5 to 36½ years, with privilege to pay the entire debt under prescribed rules, which include a notice of such intention by the borrower of from 30 to 60 days.

SOUTH AFRICA.

The three States of Natal, Orange Free State, and Transvaal, for the purpose of more perfectly carrying out a system of Government loans, by the act of 1912 agreed to establish the Land and Agriculture Bank of South Africa. This bank took over assets and agricultural loan funds of these States. Funds are procured by direct appropriation, and by the issue of Government bonds up to the year 1909 amounted to about \$40,000,000. The average loans have been about \$1,700, which is very close to the average mortgage debt of farms in the United States. Since the act of August 19, 1907, the Transvaal has loaned about \$10,000,000 at rates of interest of 5 per cent or less. The net profit reported in 1912 in the inspector's report was \$280,000.

CANADA.

By act of May 3, 1912, in Nova Scotia, whenever a borrower could secure a loan for 50 per cent the Government was empowered to guarantee an additional loan of 30 per cent. The law permitted the Government to purchase farm land, subdivide it into farm lots, erect buildings and fences, and sell such parcels and lots to farmers on such terms as might be approved by the governor. The governor in council is permitted to make regulations for carrying the act into effect and borrow the money required on the credit of the Province.

A similar act for New Brunswick was passed April 20, 1912, and a farm-settlement board was empowered to buy, improve, and sell land to settlers. Buyers were required to pay 25 per cent of the price in cash and the balance in 10 years, with an extension clause.

Sir Arthur Hawks, commissioner of immigration, appointed by the Canadian minister of the interior, in 1911 said:

The financing of a settlement as a function of government seems now to be inevitable. It contains nothing revolutionary in principle. It would be difficult, for those dividends which are founded on Government guaranties and subsidies, to oppose application in Canada of a principle that is operated in the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand, and is about to be applied in South Africa. * * * The Government factor in the use of public credit is an object to be achieved and not the incidental advantage that may alight on an individual here and there.

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Under an act of March 4, 1907, the Philippine Government was authorized to guarantee for 25 years a yearly income of 4 per cent upon private capital invested in agricultural banks and to be loaned to the Philippine farmer.

The passage of the law was all that it amounted to. The same thing happened there that will happen to any private profit-making land-mortgage bank scheme in the United States in those localities where the rate of interest now brings a larger profit than can be made by lending money through this kind of a mortgage bank.

In those districts where generally the demand for lower interest is not great the banks will not be established, and many a poor farmer not so fortunate as others will have no assistance.

The prevailing rate of interest in the Philippine Islands was so high that a guaranty of 4 per cent did not attract private capital, and none came forward to invest in the new mortgage-bank scheme. The result was that this guaranty law brought no assistance to those for whom assistance was intended.

On June 1, 1907, by act No. 1865, the Philippine Government, on the advice of United States Attorney General Bonaparte as to the constitutionality of the proceeding, established a Government agricultural bank and provided it with a capital of \$500,000

from Government funds. This bank began operation in October, 1908. The minister of finance and justice in his 1910 report states:

One of the good results already accomplished consists in the decrease of usury in the Provinces.

In that report the bank shows a total net profit of 31,477.18 pesos. In 1912, the report stated that the profit was 52,950.87 pesos. The bank had 12 agencies in 1912. (See also 1913 report.)

On February 3, 1913, a law was enacted by the Philippine Legislature which gave a monopoly of land-mortgage banks to some prominent bankers. This law seems to have been devised to exclude the Government bank. These bankers were those who refused to accept the 4 per cent guaranty and who opposed the Government loans. The Governor General refused to approve this law and it did not go in force.

These bankers were willing to do the business at a reduced interest rate after it was forced upon them by the Government bank. This is a concrete illustration of the spirit with which any private bank will execute a government policy.

Their whole purpose is profit and they care nothing for the public welfare.

In volume 26, Opinions of the Attorney General, page 593, in a letter transmitted to the Governor of the Philippine Islands, Attorney General Bonaparte reviewed authorities and precedents bearing upon the right, under the Constitution, to establish a Government bank and lend Government funds to our little brown brothers. Some people are of the opinion that we should do as well for our white American farmer.

These sufficiently specific instances of Government loans as practiced in European countries, which have had longer and more experience than ourselves in the battle for sufficient food, are enough to demonstrate the practicability of Government loans in the United States. I have shown that the practice of lending money to farmers is world-wide, of long duration, and profitable. It seems that any additional evidence to prove that Government loans to farmers is not new or novel or that it is salutary in effect would be unnecessary. However, I will add the testimony of our United States commission, which recently made its report of its labor in Europe to this Congress. I quote from this report:

In every instance in Europe where Government capital has been granted to establish mortgage credit the results have been favorable to the agricultural interests of that nation.

It is strange to the uninitiated why these facts have not been more thoroughly dwelt upon by the many who have presumed to lead in the education of the public and our legislators toward the adoption of the right kind of farm credit system for this country. The first information officially promulgated in this country came from our French ambassador, Mr. Myron T. Herrick, who was instructed by President Taft to act as chairman of an ambassadorial commission investigating farm credit in Europe. In the ambassador's report much space is occupied by a quotation from a European writer known to be an antagonist of government loans. No space was given to the details of government loans which I have presented.

The ambassador, who is also ex-president of the American Bankers' Association, in speaking of what the American farmer needs and of Government aid, says:

Fortunately for this country, he does not need it, nor would he accept it.

Since the ambassador's report was published the American farmer has plainly expressed himself as knowing what he needs and what he would accept. The American Grange in its last convention, at Manchester, Vt., passed a resolution indorsing Government loans. The Farmers' Union and the Grange sent their legislative committees to Washington, and they went before the committee considering farm credit legislation and supported Government loans to farmers on farm first mortgages.

Some have tried to make it appear that Government loans to food producers would be antagonized by labor and other food consumers in the city. How thoroughly they are mistaken is made very plain by the indorsement of H. R. 11897 by the American Federation of Labor in executive council assembled at Washington in January.

In a review of the Moss-Fletcher bill printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 29, in the face of the above declarations expressed by more than 2,000,000 farmers of this country, we read that—

The farmers of the country do not desire any special privileges, and the idea of special privilege is, moreover, antagonistic to the spirit of our institutions.

It is true that the farmers do not ask for any special privilege, and it is also true that it is nearly time for all of us to learn that the farmers can tell us themselves what they do or

"do not desire." If they desire Government loans, they ask only a privilege now given to bankers.

This information of what the farmers "do not desire" comes in touch in the same review with a proposal to create a new system of farm-land banks and give to bankers the very extraordinary "special privilege" of exemption from taxation.

The authors of the Moss-Fletcher bill have strained the Constitution of the United States to the breaking point in an effort to remove the tax obstacle which must inevitably be a serious hindrance to the operation of any private land-mortgage bank.

A tax on mortgages of itself operates against a low rate of interest. Any tax upon the mortgage must be added to the interest rate. The injection into the scheme of bonds or debentures, necessary to liquefy mortgage security, creates a new taxable wealth and adds another factor tending to increase the interest rate. In other words, the tax on the mortgage plus the tax on the debenture must be added to the interest rate. In order to cure this difficulty these bills include in section 18 the most drastic demonstration of paternalism possible. It is distinctly special legislation for private profit.

For these so-called national farm-land corporations, which are private profit-sharing institutions in every sense, this section exempts from taxation their "capital stock and surplus therein and the income derived therefrom and the mortgages and deeds of trust and notes and bonds secured thereby held by said bank and the national land-bank bonds issued by the same."

This section repeals the income-tax law in its application to individuals who have income from these banking institutions and in its application to the income of the corporation itself. It renders nugatory the law of States which tax the capital stock of corporations. The tax exemption includes the profits of these banks and the profits of individuals who make their investments solely for profits, and who have no regard for the great national policy of conservation of agriculture and the perpetuation of our food supply.

These exemptions are totally without the warrant of a great national beneficence. The Nation might be justified in making these exemptions for the good of the whole people, but to make them for the benefit of a few bankers is special legislation of the rankest type.

If these tax exemptions are read into law, on what theory can this Government refuse to exempt the notes, bonds, income, and surplus profits of every other bank? The only theory upon which the assets of these private banks can be exempted from taxation is that they are instrumentalities of Government. The Supreme Court has long since declared the national banks are instrumentalities of Government. How can we refuse, then, to exempt them from taxation? The new banking and currency act has made these national banks more than ever the instrumentalities of Government and given greater reason why we may expect the national bankers to cry out for "equal rights."

If a private bank lending money to farmers in order to aid the production of food is an instrumentality of Government, is not the farmer who pays the profit on these loans and who actually raises the food also an instrumentality of Government? Why not exempt the farmers from taxation?

If the Moss-Fletcher bill should become a law, these banks will be permitted to receive general deposits, State funds, Government funds, may act as fiscal agent of the United States, and do "a general banking business as far as its current deposits are concerned."

The interest rate in these bills is uncertain. It will depend upon what the new class of debentures bring in the market. It is by no means sure that the rate will be lower than now. From 1886 to 1894 there were nearly 150 land-mortgage bond companies in the United States, and none of them are now left to tell the tale of mismanagement, dishonesty, and consequent low price of their bonds.

Suppose we take this great Government policy, of the utmost importance to residents of the city as well as of the country, and turn it over to private banking institutions, what will be the effect upon interest rates? What class of investors in these banking enterprises will have charge of the policy?

As a general class the money lenders of this country are responsible for much obstruction to agriculture. Many of them are the simon-pure shylocks of the country. These men know the open highways and underground routes to the money market. They know the lending game in all its sinister aspects and are further from being philanthropists than any other class of business men in all the world. They know the devious methods by which interest rates have been augmented by the cost of money and all the petty and tricky ways by which this cost has been increased to their profit. They know the laws for-

bidding usury have been circumvented in every State, and they know how to do it better than any other class of people.

From this class of people will come the investors in a private bank farm-credit plan if the bill suits them. They will be at the money counter, and their familiar faces will greet the farmer borrower wherever these banks are established. The main difference will be that they will represent themselves to their victims as possessing a brand of virtue duly certified and indorsed by the Government.

If the bill does not suit them and is not "for" them, they will not invest.

These people will care nothing for the Government policy intrusted to their tender mercies. Privately or as a part of the banking institution, they will be engaged in land deals and financing operations. Almost every financial institution having in charge the people's money is a center to which comes tempting prospects for profit to the persons who have the power to decide to whom loans shall be made, with the result that favoritism and the prosperity of the lenders, instead of the borrowers, will be the guiding factor in this decision.

What laws can we make that will prevent such a banker from telling an applicant that "the funds are all loaned up," regardless of whether they are or not, and turning the borrower into the clutches of one of these "side-line lenders" which are adjuncts of most of the banks of to-day?

What law can you make to prevent these bankers from forcing the borrower into the hands of certain surveyors, abstract makers, and lawyers where the same old game of raising the cost, if not the interest rate, will go on? If you can make such laws, an elaborate inspection force at the expense of our taxpayers must be bulid up in order to enforce them—to watch the profit makers whom we are to trust to carry out the Government policy.

If by any means a private bank farm-credit institution could be organized and so inspected and regulated that the rate of interest will be low, I am of the opinion that there will be few investors in such a bank. Particularly would this be true in those locations where money is now being let at a high rate where relief is most needed, but where lenders get the greatest profit. To make a law which will not entice investors means that all this Federal Government will have done to carry out this important national policy is the mere making of a law from which no action would follow.

It will be in the same category as our present banking and currency bill, which depends for its success upon whether or not the bankers will conform to it. It will be in the same category, but possessing less force, for the reason it can have no control over private individuals and may not inflict any alternative upon them whatever should they choose not to invest.

Shall we lure investors into these new banks by giving them special privilege in the matter of exemption from taxation?

If farm credit can be solely conducted for the purpose of carrying out a national policy, and is not associated with private business for profit, it would be another matter and "public policy" would be sufficient ground for removing the tax from bonds and mortgages.

If it is not class legislation and paternalism to exempt from taxation the stocks, notes, bonds, income, and surplus of a private bank, who will have the nerve to say that Government loans to farmers is class legislation?

In spite of the most rigid regulation and inspection, some of these banks will fail and their debentures drop in value. When that occurs in one State it will affect the value of debentures in every other State, and even if the public confidence is won at the outset of this plan it will require but one or two failures in the whole country to seriously impair this confidence. Even though we put these mortgages, the security upon which the debentures are based, in the hands of a public trustee, the question of management still enters as an important factor into their value. The public will not be reassured of the value of a debenture merely because some official may stamp on its face the statement that the mortgages which the debentures represent are in his hands. Either public confidence or suspicion will rest upon the question as to whether the management that appraised the land against which the mortgage is given is honest and efficient or not. The public knows that we have had national inspection of national banks and other safeguards, but it also knows that national banks have failed because of both mismanagement and dishonesty.

What glamour will be thrown around this new style of bank that will gain more confidence from the public for them than is given to national banks?

It will not materially improve the market value of these debentures to make them legally acceptable as trust-fund investments. No law can be made that will insure the value of any

investment, and to pass such a law for the purpose of upholding the value of these debentures is very liable to become a cruel imposition upon and loss to the widows and orphans throughout the country.

The private-bank plan of farm credit is not a thoroughbred. It is part public policy and part greed. It can be nothing but an abortive attempt to hitch altruism with avarice.

The way to carry out a national policy is for the Nation itself to do it as nearly as possible and not turn it over to private interests as much as possible.

As a foundation for any farm-mortgage loan plan we should have a power with stability unquestioned now; not one requiring a generation in which to gain the confidence of the people and make the remedy efficient against the evil we wish to cure.

Such a power can establish at once the best possible market for the bonds or debentures required to liquefy mortgage security. At once solve the problem of tax upon mortgages and debentures, at once institute a low rate of interest and decrease the cost to the lowest possible minimum, at once provide an adequate supply of money at the lowest possible cost, at once place mortgage bonds upon a footing with the very best security known in the world, at once begin the work of relief aimed at all over the country instead of in a few places.

This power exists and is none other than the Federal Government. This is the central authority of the people. It is the apex authority covering all the units of cooperative government. If we wish to institute an effective farm-credit system, why should we defer wholly to the unrelated efforts of these units? Why should we suffer the long waiting for these units to coordinate on this great purpose when the apex authority can do it at once? These various units are free to perform this service as they wish, but the Federal Government should at least so act that the waiting for State action shall be a season of accomplishment and not one of procrastination, that the country may be covered by the policy in a complete instead of a desultory manner.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS].

[Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, "This is the day I long have sought and mourned because I found it not." For years before I became a Member of Congress I was an earnest believer in and advocate of the principle of Government aid for the improvement of post roads of the Nation. As far back as 1904, the first time I was a candidate for Congress, I pledged my people that I would stand for this principle, and I rejoice to know that this pledge is about to be consummated in the enactment of one of the sanest, wisest, and most beneficent pieces of legislation ever written upon the statute books of the United States. I remember well that in the Sixtieth Congress a little band of us who were in favor of the principle were denounced upon the floor of the House as being Socialists and almost anarchists for standing for this principle, and I am exceedingly glad to see the wave of public opinion roll on and on until at last the appeals of a deserving class of people are about to be heard in the enactment of the pending bill. This but demonstrates the rapidity with which great movements grow when public opinion gets behind them; it moves onward and upward with an ever irresistible rush that no power on earth can check.

I became a Member of the Sixtieth Congress, and soon thereafter introduced a bill proposing Government aid for the improvement of post roads, and introduced a similar bill at each Congress thereafter. It has been a pleasure to do what I could to aid and further the pending legislation. The bill proposes to expend an amount of money not to exceed \$25,000,000 each year in "constructing and maintaining" the post roads of the United States, the States to share in it on certain conditions, one of the conditions being that the States must put a like amount of money into the improvement of the highways of the States. There are about 2,200,000 miles of post roads in the United States. To macadamize these roads, it is estimated, would cost \$45,000,000,000, a staggering and appalling sum of money. Of this 2,200,000 miles of post roads, Indiana has approximately 67,000 miles. No one contemplates for a moment doing this work at once, or even in the near future. We realize the huge task and undertaking that lies before us in the improvement of the highways and that we must approach the question slowly, conservatively, but surely, with a firm basis on which to stand. The bill is designed to stimulate the States in improving their roads and to aid them to some extent. This amount of money, large though it is, yet is a small amount as compared to the amount the States and civil subdivisions of the States will

put into the construction and improvement of their respective highways. It is hoped that the two working together, hand in hand, each putting a sufficient amount of money into the improvement of highways each year, in the course of the next decade or two we will see countless hundreds of thousands of miles of highway rocked and macadamized in the States.

Twenty-five or thirty years ago the State of Indiana recognized the necessity of improving its highways; it did not wait for Government aid, but boldly alone it launched upon this much-needed legislation. The legislature passed what is, in my judgment, the best road law to be found upon the statute books of any State in the Union, and I have read all of them. The board of commissioners in my State has charge and control of the highways, and under our law when 100 freeholders residing in the township petition the board of commissioners for the right to improve the highways in the township the board of commissioners refers it back to the people of the township; an election is held, and if a majority of the voters of the township declare in favor of the principle, then the law permits bonds to be issued upon the real and personal property of the township to the amount of 4 per cent of the value of the property. These bonds bear 4½ per cent interest, redeemable in from 1 to 20 years, and are not subject to taxation. Under this system the improvement of highways in Indiana has moved forward until to-day, in proportion as its population is to the population of the United States, and in proportion to its total mileage of rural post roads, it has more miles of improved roads than any other State in the Union. I recently addressed a letter to the Bureau of Good Roads in the Agricultural Department for data showing the total amount of bonds issued under our law during the last 20 years for the improvement of highways, and the total number of miles of improved roads in the State of Indiana, and their letter shows that Indiana has township and county bonds outstanding amounting to \$53,904,392, and of the 67,996 miles of post roads in the State of Indiana we have macadamized and gravel roads amounting to 24,956 miles, more than one-third of the total amount of post roads in the State improved by local taxation. The average cost of building macadam or gravel roads in the State of Indiana is approximately \$2,500 per mile. This has been a great drain and expense on the farmers of the State of Indiana, yet it has improved their condition more than any other legislation ever passed by the legislature of the State. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to enumerate all the good that will ultimately flow from this legislation. Time alone must write this chapter in the future history of our country. If this work be continued in the future as I hope it will be, posterity will rise up and call us blessed.

The letters referred to are as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1914.

Hon. W. E. COX,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 20, in which you request information in regard to bond issues for roads and bridges by counties and townships in your State.

We have just completed the compilation of information on this subject, and I therefore take pleasure in furnishing it to you, as follows:

Total bond issues by counties and districts.....	\$18, 072, 044
Total bond issues by townships.....	35, 837, 348

Total.....	53, 909, 392
------------	--------------

This does not include all the bonds that have been issued in Indiana, for the reason that the bonds have been paid off in many instances and in some cases there is no record, except for bonds outstanding.

During the year 1912 various counties and townships in Indiana issued \$2,385,143 for roads and bridges and during the year 1913 they issued \$4,705,797. These figures are all subject to error, as it is almost impossible to get accurate information on this subject. Most of the bonds above referred to have been issued during the past 20 years.

Very respectfully,

P. F. J. WILSON, Acting Director.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, D. C., January 28, 1914.

Hon. W. E. COX,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge your letter of January 26. Allow me to say in reply that the total mileage of roads constructed in Indiana from the bond issues mentioned in our letter of January 22—that is, \$53,909,393—can not be furnished by this office. Complete returns have been received from a number of counties and townships from which it is found that the cost of roads built by the bond issues averages between \$2,400 and \$2,500 per mile. These returns are from an expenditure of \$2,670,447 in 15 counties only and of \$2,562,880 in 21 townships only. If this total expenditure in counties and townships of \$5,232,827 at an average rate of about \$2,432 per mile is taken to represent the average expenditure per mile on the entire amount of bonds issued, there should have been constructed apparently a total of about 22,000 miles of roads. I inclose for your information a list of the county and township bonds above referred to.

Our records show that there were in Indiana in 1904, 20,582 miles of gravel road and 3,295 miles of stone road and in 1909, 20,509 miles of

gravel road and 4,308 miles of stone road. Revised figures for 1913 indicate 24,956 miles of improved roads in the State, with a total mileage of all roads of 67,996. It is quite probable that the figures of mileage for 1904 were too large. In any case, however, it would appear that somewhat more than 20,000 miles of gravel and stone roads may be taken as an estimate on the mileage constructed with the total bond issues.

With reference to the 4 per cent tax feature, I assume that you refer to the percentage of total valuation which must not be exceeded by all bonded indebtedness in any township, according to sections 7725-7732 of Burn's Annotated Statutes of Indiana for 1908 and amendments of 1909. Trusting that I have in some measure answered your inquiry and that you will call on me for further information if you need it, I am,

Very respectfully,

L. W. PAGE, Director.

Counties and districts giving complete mileage returns of roads built from proceeds of bonds.

INDIANA.

Counties and districts.	Total amount voted to Jan. 1, 1914.	Miles of road built and planned.			
		Gravel.	Macadam.	Bituminous macadam.	Total.
Adams.....	\$151,550	36.90	36.94
Allen.....	53,840	10.34	10.34
Boone ¹	223,260	104.50	105.00
Cass, districts 1 and 3.....	112,425	12.00	15.00	8.00	35.00
Davies.....	90,000	27.00	3.00	30.00
Delaware.....	100,000	20.00	10.00	30.00
Gibson.....	77,300	20.00	20.00
Hancock ²	273,500	76.50	.50	77.00
Henry.....	44,200	21.50	5.00	26.50
Jay.....	50,370	6.50	9.00	15.50
Martin.....	189,881	84.54	84.54
Miami.....	636,656	204.38	9.65	214.03
Morgan ³	341,200	273.00	75.00	348.75
Union ⁴	60,000	14.00	6.00	20.00
Vanderburg.....	266,196	60.00	60.00
Total.....	2,670,447	843.92	255.39	13.00	1,113.56

¹ 1/2 mile brick.

² Bridge bonds, \$25,000.

³ Brick road.

⁴ 3/4 mile.

Counties and townships giving complete mileage returns of roads built from proceeds of bonds.

INDIANA.

Counties and townships.	Total amount voted to Jan. 1, 1914.	Miles of road built and planned.		
		Gravel.	Macadam.	Total.
Bartholomew:				
Flat Rock.....	\$55,500	18.50	18.50
Wayne.....	35,240	17.00	17.00
Clay, Sugar Ridge.....	545,726	343.00	343.00
Davies:				
Reeve.....	21,000	5.00	5.00
Washington.....	913,988	295.62	295.62
Gibson:				
Center.....	48,400	13.0	13.00
Johnson.....	69,600	16.0	16.00
Montgomery.....	171,620	41.0	41.00
Wabash.....	21,000	6.50	6.50
White River.....	85,830	22.0	22.00
Hamilton:				
Fallcreek.....	25,931	20.00	20.00
Washington.....	65,691	35.00	35.00
White River.....	86,985	50.00	50.00
Henry, Franklin.....	14,000	6.00	6.00
Huntington, Jackson.....	32,425	8.00	3.0	11.00
Knox, Vincennes.....	189,360	50.00	50.00
Madison, Fall Creek.....	6,247	2.50	2.50
Marshall, Bourbon.....	28,500	8.5	8.50
Shelby, Shelby.....	126,097	33.50	33.50
Wayne:				
Franklin and New Garden.....	7,180	2.00	2.00
Green.....	12,000	2.5	2.50
Total.....	2,562,380	932.62	106.0	1,038.62

Prepared by Office of Public Roads, January 27, 1914. Subject to revision.

Mr. COX. The farmer has not besieged legislatures of the States, nor has he sought special favors at the hands of Congress. They have been content with their daily toil, and have gone on, moved forward, trusting these questions to their representatives. Living, in a measure, an isolated life, most of the time far removed from the great centers of population, they have been too busy devoting themselves to the cultivation of the soil to pay but little, if any, attention to the legislation pending here or in other legislative bodies throughout the Nation. Other interests have been diligent in seeking, and often procuring, special legislation inuring to their direct and immediate benefit. For half a century the manufacturers of the country sought and importuned Congress for a high protective tariff,

arguing and advocating the doctrine that they were unable to compete with foreign competitors unless their industries were "hothouse" and protected by high protective tariff; and in order to maintain this unjust and inequitable policy their representatives for half a century besieged Congress to protect them and their infant industries, as was shown by the startling disclosures in the recent Mulhall investigation, showing that tremendous sums of money were annually raised and a powerful lobby maintained at Washington at each session of Congress, especially when a revision of the tariff was under consideration; and I am sorry to say that Congress, yielding to these insidious arguments of the manufacturers, permitted to remain upon the statute books a law which gave to them direct and immediate benefits, increasing their profits and dividends upon their capital invested at the expense of the enormous class of people living in the country.

Special interests have been diligent in seeing to it that laws were enacted both by the legislatures of the States and Congress of the United States that would inure to their immediate benefit. This has ever been in rule in the past, and I fear will continue to be the rule; but through a master stroke of President Wilson, in uttering one sentence, "Lobbies—of course everyone knows there are insidious lobbies maintained at Washington"—from that day the business of the professional lobbyist has become unpopular, and, thank God, he has almost disappeared.

Special interests sought and procured aid in the building of great trunk-line railroads in this country in the past, and between the years 1864 and 1882 no less than 155,000,000 acres of land were given away to aid in the construction and building of trunk-line railroads in the West and Southwest which, if the people owned to-day, would be worth countless billions of dollars. This but shows how special interests, well organized, quick, and alert to look after their own interests, can forge ahead and profit at the expense of their less fortunate kinsmen who are unorganized, living remotely in the country, and paying no attention to legislation. It is now and has been for some years the custom of Congress to appropriate approximately \$50,000,000 per year to improve the rivers and harbors of the Nation, and yet the rivers and harbors would be useless as arteries of commerce were it not for the farmers' commodities to be shipped thereon.

We have now completed the Panama Canal at an approximate cost of \$400,000,000, the cost and upkeep of which will be a tremendous burden upon the taxpayers of the Nation for all time to come. I am not criticizing the building of the canal, but the country people have patiently borne their part of the cost of this great project, with only an indirect benefit in return. Each year Congress appropriates approximately \$100,000,000 for the maintenance of the Army and \$150,000,000 for the upkeep of the Navy. These tremendous sums of money must be paid largely by the farming element of the Nation, and can only be paid by taxes imposed upon them directly and indirectly. While taxation has fallen upon all the people, yet special interests, ever looking to their own welfare, have ever been on the alert in having a large proportion of the taxes appropriated in some way and some manner to serve their use and benefit. The argument is made, "We need an Army and a strong Navy to protect the trade and commerce of our Nation," and yet the trade and commerce of the Nation is largely made up of the farmer's commodities, raised by him upon his farm, and the system of levying taxes and making appropriations has gone on in some degree throughout the last century without a corresponding equitable distribution of the appropriation so made as to serve all the people as nearly equitable as possible. While the system of levying and collecting taxes has been on both sides of the ledger, yet I believe the system of appropriating the money has largely been on one side, and that one side represented by heretofore largely protected interests. This system has gone on in some degree for a century, and during this period of time our fathers and forefathers living in the country meekly and mildly submitted without a murmur or protest upon their part, and continued to pay tribute in the way of taxes for the support and maintenance not only of governmental functions, but in many cases purely private enterprises.

Is it not time that we turn and look to the interest and welfare of this class of people by aiding them in improving and maintaining their highways? To improve and maintain the highways of the States is a task too big, huge, and tremendous for the States to accomplish themselves, and they ought to have aid and assistance along this line from the Government. Each one that uses the highways in a State is taxed to maintain them, and as the Government of the United States uses these

highways as post routes six days out of each week, and every week in the year, it is but fair and just that the Government contribute a small part not only to the construction of these roads, but their maintenance as well. Mr. Chairman, if the rivers would cease to flow, and if the railroads were destroyed, so long as we had highways over which our farmers could haul their produce to market no one in the great centers of population would suffer the pangs of hunger for a minute, because the farmer, with his energy, thrift, and industry, would see to it that his produce was hauled there by wagons and teams. The farmers during the last decade have become prosperous, and I rejoice to know it, but they have not become prosperous as the result of legislation inuring to their immediate benefit, but they have become prosperous in spite of legislation, as well as in spite of conditions. [Applause.]

For a quarter of a century every campaign has been fought on the tariff question with occasionally an incidental side issue thrown in. I have believed for years that the real question in this country was and is the country-life question. I believe and have believed for years that this is and was the foremost question of the day. We are confronted to-day with a frightful if not dangerous condition of affairs in the Nation. We behold cities far outgrowing in population the country, a danger signal to any nation. Another danger, the boys and girls of the country, tired of isolation, tired of country life, desirous of improving their social welfare, are daily leaving the country and in streams pouring into the already overcrowded cities. How to overcome this, and induce the boy and girl to remain in the country upon the farm, and how to teach them to produce more of the necessities of life is, in my judgment, the supreme question of the hour and far eclipses, as an economic question, all the trust and financial questions combined. If we will look more to the country life, improve conditions among the farmers, induce the boy and girl to remain there, and make their homes in the country for the future instead of leaving it, and going to the cities, in a few years they will solve all the trust and financial questions of the country that need be solved by growing larger crops, bringing bounty, peace, happiness, and prosperity not only to themselves but to a grateful population living in the cities.

For quite a while great automobile manufacturers and automobile owners have conducted a strenuous campaign at a tremendous cost to induce Congress to build a great automobile road from ocean to ocean, and from the Lakes to the Gulf costing not less than \$200,000,000, on which the "idle rich" can spend their "idle time," and conceive plans and schemes whereby they can get more ill-gotten gains from the toiling masses of the people. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to this, under any and all conditions, and under no circumstances whatever would I ever vote one dollar for such a measure as this. The man I want to help, aid, and assist is the man wearing "blue overalls" and "brogan shoes," who, with his shovel, his hoe, and his plow, toils 16 hours every day in order to benefit not only himself but to raise bountiful crops, thereby alleviate suffering, want, and misery in the cities of the Nation. This is the fellow I want to help, and this is the fellow this bill proposes to help. Under it Indiana will get, if enacted into a law, approximately \$1,000,000 per year to aid in the construction of new roads and in maintaining the roads already constructed under the law of Indiana. Section 3 of this bill proposes to aid the States in the construction of new roads, while section 4 proposes to aid the States in maintaining roads already improved, and under the pending bill it will be up to the governors of the respective States to elect whether they propose to accept aid to construct new roads under section 3 or aid to maintain roads under section 4 of the pending measure, or he is given the option under the pending bill to select aid for the construction of new roads or for the maintenance of roads already constructed, or both. [Applause.]

If the governors of the States propose to accept, under section 4 of the proposed bill, all macadamized roads will receive \$60 per mile per year, and all gravel and shell roads \$30 per mile per year, and all dirt roads \$15 per mile per year for their maintenance. If enacted into a law, this bill will, in my judgment, go further toward overcoming dangerous conditions, and forces now at work in this country than any other legislation ever attempted by Congress. I believe it will stop, or at least have a tendency to check, the rapid decrease of population in country life, and induce the people to stay, and remain in the country. The farmers are to-day the financial masters of the Nation. This was demonstrated in the panic of 1907, when Wall Street, without a moment's warning, brought on a bankers' panic, and practically all the banks of the Nation suspended payment. This condition lasted until the farmers' crops went

abroad, and when they reached foreign soil ships could scarcely haul the gold back to this country, and when it reached America Wall Street immediately surrendered, and we heard no more of the panic.

The report of the Secretary of Agriculture shows that the total value of farmers' commodities last year was upward of \$9,000,000,000, a sum of money so large that no mortal mind can comprehend it. This sum represents ten times the total capitalization of all the national banks of the United States, nearly one-half of the total banking power of the United States, and nearly two-thirds of the total value of all the steam railroads in the United States. These commodities had to be hauled to market, the average haul being about 9½ miles, and they had to be hauled over highways many times almost impassable on account of mud; yet the farmers by their industry succeeded in getting their produce to market, but at a tremendous cost to them. The countries of France and Germany years ago recognized the necessity of improving the highways of their respective nations, and the Governments of these countries freely gave large sums of money to aid the rural people in improving their highways, and for this reason the highways of France and Germany far exceed in importance and usefulness the highways of our Government, although we have the richest and most powerful Government upon the earth.

The country constitutes God's great reservoir where the strong, virile, fighting men and women of the world live, and from which we must draw. Their very lives represent a spirit of independence and against dependency. The country man and woman have always maintained high ideals of life; they have been sound in thought and prompt in performance; they know no cunning treachery or trickery, but to them life is a stern reality, and everything cold facts. They can be depended upon at all times to do their duty to their country, their family, and their God. This class of people represents the great conservative element of the Nation, not moved off their feet by every will-o'-the-wisp, but coolly and deliberately they calculate from cause to effect, and it is to them this country must look for its future endurance. The history of the world demonstrates that the rural people never destroyed a nation that ever fell, and no nation in the past ever fell until the country became depopulated and the cities overcrowded, and as a Nation we are driving at breakneck speed to the danger signal along this line when we behold countless millions of acres of valuable land in this country lying unsettled, and untitled to-day, and, on the other hand, see the abnormal growth of the great cities of the Nation. There are so many questions entering into this subject that I am at a loss to know where to stop, but I will conclude as I began, that this marks the beginning of a new dawn, the era of a righteous awakening, the hearkening of a wise appeal, the listening to the voice of justice, in granting this small mite in the way of an appropriation to a deserving class of people.

I hope the bill will become a law. [Applause.]

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWNSEND].

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to diverge from the interesting discussion of good roads to present some facts of vital importance relating to industrial conditions in the country at this time. I do this because Members have lately risen in this Chamber to give prominence to alleged facts designed to prove, if they were indeed facts, that industrial and commercial conditions are suffering from effects caused by the operation of the new tariff law and by other laws passed by this Democratic Congress.

Mr. Chairman, there is not in the United States an important manufacturing city which is a better index of industrial and manufacturing business conditions than is the city of Newark, N. J., which I have the honor in part to represent. Its manufactures are greatly varied, and few of them produce articles which do not appear upon some of the tariff schedules. If the new tariff were to result in a diminishing product of manufactures, as has so emphatically been asserted by gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber, then in Newark, first of all the important manufacturing centers, that unfortunate result would have been observed.

Let me preface my relation as to that by stating some very significant facts concerning Newark's manufactures. In that city, Mr. Chairman, there is invested in manufactures more than \$160,000,000; there are employed more than 60,000 skilled operatives, who are paid more than \$45,000,000 annually in wages. The manufactures of Newark use raw material annually valued at about \$125,000,000, and they turn out finished products valued in the markets at over \$210,000,000. I have spoken of the variety, the great variety, of the products manufactured in Newark, and an idea of that is suggested by the

fact that in that city there are about 2,000 establishments using power and employing more than 10 hands, the units, I believe, used by the Census Bureau in classifying an establishment as a manufacturing plant.

One day this week the local press of Newark chronicled an unusual occurrence, the assemblage at the city hall of a crowd of unemployed, demanding employment of the mayor. This created the impression in some places that Newark manufacturers were laying off operatives, and comment based upon that assumption appeared in some newspapers hostile to the Democratic tariff. That was not the cause, but the cause was not far to seek. Newark is a pleasant abiding place; it has beautiful parks; it supports many excellent places of amusement; its people are kindly and generous, and for these and other reasons unskilled laborers laid off from employment in neighborhood work, which can not be conducted in winter weather, gather in Newark, as they do for similar reasons in other large cities during the winters.

But the impression having gone out that this gathering of the unemployed resulted from the discharge of operatives in manufacturing establishments, a local newspaper, the Newark Evening News, conducted a thorough and painstaking investigation to determine the facts.

Before giving the results of that investigation, Mr. Chairman, it is proper that I should state that the paper I have mentioned, although independent in politics, does not invariably honor itself by expressions of esteem for the political principles which I advocate.

I now read some very informing extracts from the paper I have named:

A canvass of the largest industrial plants of the city discloses the fact that whatever destitution may exist or is threatened is confined principally to the unskilled-labor class. This same inquiry also disputes statements made by leaders of the unemployed regarding the number of hands laid off in different plants.

It was declared before Mayor Haussling by Edward Redler, as spokesman for several hundred men out of work, that at the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co. employees were being laid off 200 and 300 at a time; that at the Splittorf plant, manufacturers of electrical appliances for the automobile trade, in High Street, 300 men were dismissed last week; and that no one could get a job at the Edison plant, in West Orange, if he were to get down on his knees and ask for it.

REDLER WAS MISINFORMED.

Investigation indicated that Redler was misinformed. In fact, the manufacturing plants of the city are working to their full capacity.

The superintendent of the Westinghouse plant said that business there was normal and that the season was not considered dull. About 2,000 employees are carried on the pay roll, he said, which means that the factory is working to its full capacity.

The business of the company is in no way affected by the tariff, and trade was said to be good.

At the Splittorf plant it was declared that the full force of the factory—1,000 men—were being kept busy and that business was normal. It was positively denied that any 300 men were laid off there last week. Not more than three or four have been laid off at a time, the superintendent said, and the period of nonemployment in such cases was short.

For the Edison Phonograph Co., in West Orange, the superintendent stated yesterday that there were 3,600 hands employed there steadily, and that from 20 to 30 new hands were taken on every day. Business is good, he said, although the company's product is a luxury. In the Edison storage-battery plant it was true, he said, that about 600 men were laid off a month ago during a dull season, but these hands are being taken back in large numbers and in another month they will all be back, it was said.

PLANTS IN FULL BLAST.

The leather trade in this city is being kept busy, according to reports from some of the leading manufacturers. While there may not be enough orders coming in to keep all the factories running up to their full capacity, none of the plants have laid off men, it was said, but have kept their full forces at work turning out leather which is stored away. There is every indication, it was said, that in a few weeks business will become so brisk that the trade will be overtaxed. It is to meet this anticipated demand that the manufacturers are storing their goods.

Johnston & Murphy, the shoe manufacturing concern, is working a full force full time, and it was declared at the factory that the other shoe manufacturers in this city and down East are experiencing a good season with brighter prospects for the future.

Weingarten Bros., corset manufacturers, are running on full time with a force of nearly 1,500 hands. Their sales for January were away ahead of those for the same month last year and they report that buyers from all parts of the country are placing big orders. Other concerns in the same line report business conditions to be good, too.

The hat business is reported to be good and no hands have been laid off in the big plants. Whitehead & Hoag, manufacturers of celluloid buttons and novelties, have between 750 and 800 employees on the pay roll, working full time, although this is the dull season. A year ago the force was much less.

This is the slow season also for the jewelry trade after the holiday months, but business is said to be normal for the time. Very few jewelers are out of work, although the time has been shortened in several places. In other plants that have no particularly dull season conditions are either reported up to the standard or better than usual.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SELDOMBRIDGE].

Mr. SELDOMBRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I would be indifferent to the needs and wishes of the district which I represent if I did not express my cordial support of this measure. I believe it will prove a powerful factor in developing the great agricultural sections of the country. It will not only stimulate growth of population, but it will also increase the development of farms and their production; it will also contribute greatly to the ease and comfort of rural life. The State which I have the honor in part to represent has within its confines a large area of public land which is still open to homestead and settlement. It is a State of magnificent distances, and it is necessary that the farmer should be brought into immediate and easy access to the markets for his products. I believe that this legislation will contribute very materially to the settlement of our public domain in the Western States, and that it will encourage the expenditure of State money in the development of roads.

The large and increasing use of the motor vehicle is doing much to focus attention upon the necessity for road development in all parts of the country. We have just begun to realize what an important factor the country road is in the distribution of our food supply and in the settlement of our farming areas. The time is past when we can expect American youth to embark in agricultural pursuits unless the comforts and conveniences of city life are in some measure realized. Well-built and properly cared for highways connecting cities, towns, and villages with the country population will do much to develop community interest. Not only will these provide the farmer with a larger variety of social life, relieving to some extent the monotony of farm employment, but it will give him that contact with friends and neighbors which is so necessary to stimulate thought and enterprise. The time is past when the farmer must live to himself. He should be thrown into constant fellowship with his fellow farmers; there should be a comparison of ideas and a stimulation of effort which can only grow out of association and intercourse. Given quick and easy means of communication, we will soon witness a noticeable development in agricultural wealth.

We rejoice as citizens in the splendid advance which our Agricultural Department has made during the past 25 years in the dissemination of information which means so much to the farmers. There is a widespread quickening of interest in all agricultural lines, and the farmer has learned that there is just as much brain as there is brawn to be employed in the proper conduct of his farm. This general distribution of agricultural information not only by the General Government but through the regular channels of the State agricultural colleges, while it has accomplished much of benefit to the farmer, yet vastly more good will be derived when this information can be practically demonstrated in its application. It is, therefore, quite essential that our agricultural population should be more and more thrown together for the interchange of ideas and for the consideration of questions directly affecting the output of the land and the economic welfare of our great farming population.

The good-roads movement is, therefore, a great economic necessity.

I confidently predict that no expenditure of money will yield so large a return to the Nation in practical benefit as the money which is being appropriated by this bill. The farmers of the Nation have been taxed for many years to deepen the harbors, to widen the channels, to construct fortifications, to build light-houses, and to provide in many ways for the development and enlargement of the trade of our great manufacturing centers and our seaport cities. Is it not, therefore, necessary and timely that the Nation should now devote a portion of her great revenue to the building up of our internal highways, stimulating the productivity of the land, and bringing to our vacant farms and unsettled areas a population that will be permanent and contented? The life of the farmer is a strenuous one at best. His income is affected by causes largely beyond his control. Drought, hail, and flood may visit him and wipe out the fruit of the toil of many months. He may see his market congested and the price of his product forced below its natural level through manipulation of speculators and gamblers. Should not more thought and attention be given to his material needs, and should we not seek in every way to protect and foster his interests?

The construction and maintenance of good roads will not only develop and enlarge the postal facilities of the Government, but it will bring the farmer into closer contact with his markets, and thereby increase the income of his labor. If we can in any way reduce the time that is consumed by our farming population in going to and from markets over public roads, and thereby increase the number of working hours upon the farm, is it not fair

to conclude that the product of the farm will show an appreciable increase?

I not only believe that this legislation will be of great benefit to our agricultural population, but it will also be of equal benefit to those living in the towns and cities.

It is only in recent years that many of the States have recognized the necessity for a more general treatment of the public-road problem by providing for the creation of State highway commissions and in the adoption of uniform systems of road extension and maintenance. This policy has required a larger outlay of public funds, and the people have willingly borne the increased amount of taxation for public roads, realizing the benefit to be derived therefrom. The time is past when the farmer should carry the larger share of this taxation, and it is now recognized that the burden should be equally distributed throughout the Commonwealth, and by this bill it is in some measure to be placed upon the Nation.

The farmer has not been the sole beneficiary of the good-roads policy. The cities have begun to reap the benefits of this movement. There is a widespread campaign throughout the entire country for better roads leading to and from the cities. To the extent that these roads are improved and the conveniences of travel developed, to that extent will there be a freer movement of local commerce. The better provision we make for quick and easy communication between the farm and the city, to that extent have we solved some of the food-supply problems which are now of great concern to those who live and labor in our cities.

Not only is the problem of city life affected by the character and condition of roads leading directly into the city, but it is also affected by the character and condition of roads which are far removed from the city and which only connect the country districts with the railroad shipping points. These roads, while they bear no direct relationship to the city and have no connection therewith, yet they have a vital relation upon the quantity and quality of the city food supply. This question is not a local question in any sense; it is national and general. It is in every way worthy of the attention of Congress.

So far I have considered this question from an economic viewpoint. I now desire to briefly refer to another phase of the good-roads movement, which I think is equally important. It is too early for us to properly value the benefit of the good-roads movement in its effect upon the health of those who live in our cities and who have the means to enjoy open air traveling over public highways. While it is true that this pleasure is given to only a limited number of our population on account of the expense involved, yet the motor car has taken many thousands out of the confinement and narrowness of city life to enjoy the freshness and invigoration which comes from out-of-door activity. It has also contributed to the growth and enlargement of suburban sections and has added much value to property adjacent to the large cities.

This movement has not run its course; it will grow with each passing year. Improved methods of road construction will be ascertained, and the time is not far distant when there will be great overland highways extending north and south, east and west.

The State of Colorado has been one of the first to realize the benefits that follow the construction of good roads. We have so much to give the tourist in the way of scenery of mountain, valley, and plain that we are beginning to appreciate the great asset which this scenery is to us. Our State highway commission is engaged in the development of a comprehensive scheme of road extension and construction. We offer to the tourist the most attractive and seductive journeys over our snow-clad summits and through our deep winding valleys and tortuous canyons. I covet for the membership of this body no greater pleasure than to afford them a journey over the plains and mountain roads of our Commonwealth.

In speaking as I have concerning our Colorado roads I do not desire to make any envious distinction in our behalf. I am sure that other Western States have much to offer the tourist and sight-seer along the line of well-constructed and properly maintained highways.

During the year 1913 the State of Colorado appropriated \$584,200 from the State road fund, to be expended among the various counties of the State as those counties expressed a willingness to participate in this fund by appropriating from their own treasuries. In addition to the amount above named the counties appropriated the sum of \$437,100. The State is divided into five districts, so that during the past year there was an apportionment made of \$1,021,300. Of the apportionment thus made there was expended during the year the sum of \$791,000,

divided as follows, according to the report of the State highway commission, which I append:

Work was in progress on 1,600 miles of State roads in grading and ditching, at a cost of about \$250 per mile.....	\$560,000
There has been 80 bridges constructed of all sizes, from 15-foot slab up to a 540-foot bridge, at an average cost of \$1,800 each.....	144,000
There has been 900 culverts of all kinds placed, at an average cost of \$30 each.....	27,000
There has been about 50 miles of State roads surfaced with gravel, shale, or sand clay, at a total cost of about.....	60,000

Making a total expenditure for the season of..... 791,000

There is a balance of \$136,799.92 remaining to the credit of various counties, and of this approximately \$36,000 will be used before the spring work opens in 1914, leaving about \$100,000 of State funds for work which some counties were unable to complete this season.

This gives \$447,400.08 of the State fund as expended this season up to November 30, 1913, and about three-fourths as much of the county funds, making a total expenditure of about \$791,000 this season on the State-road system.

The cost of administration of this fund was a little less than 3 per cent.

In order that some idea may be had as to the general character of work performed under the direction and supervision of our State highway commission, I attach the following extract from its report:

During the past season work has been in progress on the main passes, as follows:

On Berthoud Pass, in Grand and Clear Creek Counties, the road was improved.

On Tennessee Pass the road in Lake County is in splendid shape, and work is in progress on the Eagle County side.

On Independence Pass work has been in progress in Pitkin County, and this road in Pitkin County will be completed during this coming season.

On Monarch Pass work has been in progress in both Chaffee and Gunnison Counties.

The Poncha Pass Road is now open for travel and is in very good condition. This pass has had considerable work done on it this year in Chaffee and Saguache Counties.

Cochetopa Pass is practically opened in Saguache County, and will be completed from Gunnison by the end of this coming season.

Work has been in progress on the divide between Creede and Lake City, in both Mineral and Hinsdale Counties.

On Elwood Pass the road has been completed within 2 miles of the top on the east slope, and to the foot of the hill on the west fork on the western slope.

Work was in progress all season on the road from Silverton to Ouray, and also on the Durango Road, and a good part of the most difficult construction was completed.

La Veta Pass Road has been improved in both Huerfano and Costilla Counties.

On the north and south highway work was in progress in Larimer, Adams, Arapahoe, Weld, Douglas, El Paso, Pueblo, Huerfano, and Las Animas Counties, in fact, all along the line.

On the Platte Valley river road work was in progress in every county—Sedgewick, Logan, Morgan, Adams, Weld, and along the branches through Phillips, Washington, and Yuma.

On the Rainbow Route good progress was made on the piece of road between Cotopaxi and Parkdale, and the road between Gunnison and Montrose was opened over the Blue Mesa. Considerable work was done on the Black Mesa Road by Delta, Montrose, and Gunnison Counties.

Every county in the State, in fact, without a single exception, was busy with road improvement during the season, and an immense improvement is shown in the work.

Besides the work of preparing plans and specifications for the bridges, grading, and surfacing, and other work, surveys, maps, and profiles have been examined and filed; monthly statements of expenditures from every county in the State have been received, checked, and vouchers for the proper amounts issued to the State auditor.

Bulletin No. 3 has been written up and issued to the various counties. General letters have been sent to the counties concerning camping grounds, and the proper methods of keeping account of expenditures on road work and proceedings of the Road Builders' convention at Pueblo have been written up and will soon be issued in proper form.

In addition to the foregoing work the forestry officials have expended on roads in this State approximately \$20,000 of a special appropriation made by the last Congress. This work has been done in Saguache, Rio Grande, Clear Creek, Lake, Pitkin, Grand, and La Plata Counties. The forestry officials have acted in full accord and harmony with this department in all their work, and the State can receive additional assistance during this coming season from this same source.

The total mileage of all roads in the State of Colorado is 30,571.

Not only has the State recognized the value of good roads through legislation enacted and the appropriation of State funds, but the movement is being supported in our Commonwealth by the enthusiastic indorsement of civic and commercial organizations. Every community of any size has its board of trade and chamber of commerce in which the good-roads matter is most frequently and profitably considered. There has been a generous spirit of cooperation in all sections of the State, and there is every promise that, with the Federal aid afforded through this bill, that the roads of the State will be greatly increased in number and improved in maintenance. I desire to quote briefly from the issue of *The Motor Age*, published in Chicago, of November 14 last, concerning the attractions of a motor tour through the mountain regions of Colorado:

Volumes have been written on the scenic attractions of Colorado, but almost nothing said about these wonders in relation to the motor tourist. Thousands of tourists have seen Colorado by train and,

wonderful as some of these trips are, they can not be compared with what may be seen from the motor car. Of course, this statement will hold true in almost any section where it is possible for a car to go, but none the less the difference in Colorado is so marked that anyone who has had the opportunity of seeing the scenic wonders of that State from both viewpoints will agree that the train offers nothing more than a fleeting glimpse.

The number of canyons, passes, gorges, roads, etc., that are open to motor travel are almost unlimited, and the wonderful thing is that every one has some distinct feature that makes it almost entirely different from all others.

SURPASS THE ALPS.

Each day's journey will bring fresh and thrilling vistas. Nowhere, not even in the Alps, can the motorist view from his car canyons to compare with those of the Arkansas, the Gunnison, or the Grand, nor can he view snow-capped peaks to equal those of the Saguache or Sangre de Cristo Ranges. No other State has so much to offer the tourist in variety of scenery as has Colorado.

To those who have never seen the Rockies it is impossible to picture, even with the best photographs, the mountain landscape of the rocks with their tremendous heights and depths. To every true American the motto "See America first" should call to him above all else, and the car owner has an opportunity to see America which far surpasses every other means for tourist travel. There is something so big about these mountains of enormous heights with their snow caps that no one with red blood in his veins can see them and not feel the uplifting, inspiring influence. It has been truly said, once see the Rockies in all their grandeur and you will always feel them drawing you back.

Some people who have the best interests not only of Colorado, but all North America at heart wonder why it is that so many tourists flock abroad each summer, more and more of them in recent years making a tour abroad in their machines. The simple answer is accessibility and accommodations well advertised. These two features abroad have not only been well taken care of and advertised, but made an asset in every possible way. The tourist going through France or Switzerland finds not only wonderful road conditions and accommodations at frequent intervals, but that the people are catering to the tourist.

TOURING FACILITIES UNKNOWN.

If careful inquiry is made into the subject it will be found that these two reasons are the most important in drawing tourists abroad, whereas most people believe that the real primary reason is scenic attractions. Attractive scenery is what might be called the talking point to get people into any section. But this can not be used as an argument for Americans going abroad, as America has some of the most attractive and the greatest variety of scenery in the world. If this condition were admitted, then why the continued travel abroad? Simply because, as far as the motorist goes, the movement for good roads has made real progress, particularly in the Rocky Mountain States, only during the last 18 months.

Two or three years ago it would have been something of a stunt to drive an automobile from Denver to Grand Junction, Colo.; to-day there are two or three routes open to the tourist, and by next summer the needed improvement along these in certain sections will put them on a par with other good roads in America.

SURFACED WITH GRANITE.

Although not macadam, a considerable part of them are surfaced with decomposed granite or a hard shale clay, either one of which withstands wet weather remarkably well. Most of the cliff roads, i. e., roads literally cut out of the mountain side and almost overhanging a river anywhere from 25 to 2,000 feet below, either have turnouts at very frequent intervals or are made sufficiently wide to allow passing at any point.

There are a great many such roads in the State. Although they require careful driving due to their winding nature, which will not allow the driver to see very far ahead, and also on account of their short, steep grades, they can all be made by an ordinary car. No tourist who thoroughly enjoys mountain scenery will care to go fast because the view is changing every second. Some of the most wonderful and picturesque views of snowcaps are to be had while driving on a narrow gorge road and the view will suddenly open up at a turn of the road at most surprising times; one truly wants four pairs of eyes.

ROADS GENERALLY FINE.

Too much can not be said about the road conditions in Colorado as compared with other sections open to motor travel. Although not boulevards like some of the newly constructed roads in the East, the number of miles that are affected by wet weather is remarkably small. Furthermore, the rainfall in Colorado is almost a minimum, particularly during the touring months. On only two days of our whole trip did we go over roads that would have been anywhere near impassable in wet weather, and both of these sections will be materially improved for the summer of 1913. Everyone of our party on completing the trip unequivocally stated that he would rather make the trip from either Denver, Colorado Springs, or Pueblo for Grand Junction than travel over almost any other equal distance in the United States.

Another thing of vast importance to Colorado as a tourists' State is the climate. First, there is very little rain; this is particularly true between April and December. The number of clear, sunshiny days is almost the maximum. The atmosphere is wonderfully clear and, as nearly every one knows, the distances one can see are understood clearly only by those who have actually visited in the Rockies. Most of the nights in the hottest weather are cool, and way into late October the days are warm enough, except in the very highest altitudes, to travel in a machine without an overcoat. This is no doubt due to the dryness of the air.

TENNESSEE PASS.

In crossing the continental divide between Leadville and Glenwood Springs the motor tourist crosses from the Atlantic to the Pacific slope over Tennessee Pass, one of the lowest and most accessible roads over the Rockies, with an altitude of 10,276 feet. Although very heavy snowfalls may take place and block the pass to travel as early as September, this same snow very seldom stays more than a day or two until late October or November. Although the crossing here is at an altitude of nearly 2 miles, approaching the pass from Leadville one hardly notices the climb, as it is a gradual ascent of about 2,200 feet from Buena Vista. Members of the recent pathfinding trip who went through the pass found it to be one of the most interesting features of their most enjoyable trip through Colorado. The rugged scenery appealed to them strongly, while the roads were excellent.

The American tourist of to-day is not aware of the scenic fascinations of the great mountain sections of the West; he is not aware of the exhilaration that comes from weeks spent in the foothills of the Rockies, as well as crossing the main ranges through the various passes; he is ignorant of the boundless wealth of the great plateau land between the Rockies and the coast ranges, and he has not grasped the stimulating benefits that come from weeks of out-of-door life in this the great tourists' playground of the American continent.

Colorado has within her borders more of mountain scenery than all of Europe can boast of. The motorist refrains from touring in Colorado, because he considers the roads impossible and is not familiar with the hotel accommodations. The tourist who has spent weeks and traveled from 1,500 to 2,000 miles through the scenic centers of Colorado is amazed at finding the roads through nearly all of the mountain passes better than the roads of the Adirondacks or the White Mountains. This is true. The State of Colorado has, through its convict-labor system, accomplished wonders in road construction, building roads that are being as scientifically constructed as many of the famed highways through Switzerland; in fact, Colorado is aiming at equaling, if not surpassing, Switzerland by engineering road plans whereby it will be possible to travel through the heart of the Rockies and not encounter grades of over 6 per cent.

To-day it is possible for a tourist driving himself, and with a party of four, to spend three weeks in the heart of the Rockies; to travel during this period 1,500 miles, and to get more vistas of mountain scenery, fathomless canyons, and other formations consequent upon mountain ranges than he could obtain in a similar period in the Alpine sections of Europe.

The trouble with the American tourist to-day is that he does not know his own country; he does not know the mystic beauties it affords the motorist who seeks the far-away fields of western grandeur. Unfortunately, those States that hold in their lap the unexcelled grandeurs of the continent have not advertised these beauties as they should have. They have been content to let American tourists spend their tens of millions annually with the hotels and inns of Europe. To-day they are not awakened to the possibilities of turning the tide of touring from our big cities westward.

The roads are there, the scenery is there, the hotels, to an extent, are there; the directions for the tourist to follow are there; the signboards are more prolific than in New England. But the tourists are wanting. It remains for the citizens of Colorado, for the citizens of Arizona, for the citizens of Montana, for the citizens of Utah, and for the citizens of California and the coast States to unite and proclaim to the American tourist what they have to offer. Without this it is unnatural to expect that the tide of touring will turn to the West as it should.

"See America first" is the watchword that all of these Western States should keep constantly before them. Their messages must be carried to the cities of the Central West and of the Allegheny slopes. One announcement will not serve to change the course of travel; two will not suffice; a hundred may fail to accomplish the desired results. One thing is certain, namely, that if the great army of American tourists was aware of the phenomenal scenery of the sections referred to, and aware of the relatively good condition of the roads to-day, and was aware of the reasonable hotel accommodations afforded that there would be millions spent in the West Central and Mountain States next year which will, unless something is done, be spent in the various countries in Europe.

The entire country is not aware of the phenomenal strides that have been made in road building in the mountain sections of Colorado within the last few years. This road enterprise has not been confined solely to highways from city to city, selecting the shortest route; rather scenic roads have been engineered and built especially for the mountain panoramas which they afford. Through the deepest canyons the motorists' narrow stone road is now an accompaniment of the ever-present mountain river or creek and the pioneering railroad track. Practically all of the more important passes have improved roadways. It is true that these are narrow, but they are adequate. The owner-motorist, who is accustomed to driving his car over the varied roads of the country, will not have any difficulty in a two weeks' mountain trip. At times he will skirt apparently fathomless canyons, but there is no immediate danger. At other times he will be far above the timber line, but the roadway is as safe as through the cornfields of Illinois. In a two weeks' trip, if he has his car in rational condition, it will not be necessary to have to be towed in a single instance. He will find comfortable hotels and inns within reach nearly every day. He will have no difficulty in purchasing gasoline. He will have no difficulty in following routes from place to place; in fact, he will find touring in many of the most beautiful sections of the Rocky Mountains as easy as in the Central States and some parts of New England.

Secretary Lane deserves great credit for having developed the idea of advertising the attractions of American scenery to European tourists. We freely criticize the thousands of Americans who annually cross the Atlantic in order to enjoy the scenery of Europe. There is no reason why a stream of European travel should not be diverted to America to witness the great natural wonders that we have to offer the world. We can not estimate the millions of American money that annually finds its abiding place in European pockets. Is it not time that we should endeavor to secure for ourselves a return of European capital in the way of tourist travel to our shores? The progress in good roads throughout our country, especially in our scenic regions, will do much to turn this stream of European wealth in our direction.

I can not close my remarks without adverting to the employment of convict labor on the public roads in Colorado. In my opinion this employment has proved to be a most beneficent humanitarian agency. The prisoners, instead of being confined within narrow cells or limited to the exercise only possible within the grim walls of the prison house, are permitted to breathe the pure mountain air and to secure for themselves in some way a modified sense of freedom. Is it any wonder that those who are undergoing prison sentence strive, through observance of certain rules, to secure this privilege for out-of-door work and exercise?

Our State deals with its prisoners employed upon the roads in a way which is calculated to reform them and make them better members of society. They do not carry with them the traditional ball and chain—the badge of servitude and dishonor—nor are they compelled to wear the repulsive striped clothing. To a great extent guard surveillance is withdrawn and these men are put upon their honor. Space and time will not permit me to cite the success of this policy; sufficient to say that the confidence reposed in these men has only been abused in a very few instances. The counties of our State are vying with each other in their efforts to secure convict labor for their public roads. Under the Colorado system the convict is allowed 10 days off his sentence for each month of labor on the roads. This is in addition to the usual reduction for good behavior. It would be almost impossible to build many of our mountain roads if we were obliged to construct them by public taxation. Colorado is proud of the record which has been achieved in this direction under the direction of the warden of our penitentiary, Mr. Thomas J. Tynan, whose reputation as a leader in this work has extended far beyond the bounds of our Commonwealth. Let me quote what Mr. Tynan says in relation to this work:

The benefits in this or any other State from a broad and scientific system of convict road building can scarcely be estimated. Basing our figures on actual experience we are confident that we can construct in the next 10 years more than 5,000 miles of the very finest roadways for less than \$300,000, and this without adding anything whatever to the burden of the taxpayers.

During the period of 10 years the internal-revenue fund of Colorado should amount to \$2,000,000. After deducting \$500,000 for road construction, the remaining amount should be wisely expended in bridge building, road repairing, and for similar uses. Add to this the financial assistance from the different counties and it would enable us to construct not less than 10,000 miles. It can be done in Colorado. Why should not the same conditions apply to other States under more favorable conditions, where the roads are naturally better and where cost of construction would not necessarily be so high as in our mountainous sections.

To illustrate better the great saving to the taxpayers on this class of work and its possibilities, let me quote a few figures from one of our road camps. The number of days employed was 24½. During one month we worked 35 men on the road, not including the camp help. Each of these 35 men rendered to the State labor equivalent in value to \$2 and \$3 a day. The labor for each man cost the State exactly 23 cents per day. Had this number of men been employed at the regular standard of wages of, say, \$2 per day per man, the cost of wages alone would have been \$1,632.50. Each day's work thus represented a net saving of at least \$1.75 per man.

The total cost of all the work for the month, including salaries, care of stock, feed for teams, and cost of equipment, was \$515.15, or 47½ cents per day per man. When these figures are considered no one can doubt for a moment the economy of building roads with convict labor. The roads are carefully and thoroughly inspected by competent engineers, who testify to the completeness and high character of the work. What is the incentive for the men to create such great work? is a question often asked Coloradans. It is just this: The man who is allowed to leave the prison for the road camp has practically seen the last of prison life if he conducts himself properly. His food is better, his clothing is better, his self-respect is preserved, and he is taught self-reliance and sustained application. He earns an additional 10 days a month during the time he works, which very materially reduces his sentence. Eliminating the policy of armed guards, the men have been placed under skilled and competent overseers and guarded only by their word of honor not to run away. They remain faithful and loyal to their pledges. The success of such an honor system was instantaneous; the plan has worked out better than its originators expected. During the last three years we have had more than 1,000 individual prisoners in the convict camps. These men, without guards, some 300 miles away from the prison, have created a national reputation for loyalty. Less than 1 per cent have violated their pledges and made successful escape. Communities no longer fear to have our convict camps established near them. We have made manhood as well as money by this healthy, hearty outdoor labor. We have built the prisoners up both physically and morally. Men discharged from our road camps do not have the prison pallor, the physical weakness, and the hesitation and hangdog appearance of the typical discharged convict. They are bronzed, sturdy, healthy, efficient laborers and are in demand as such. About 80 per cent of those we have sent out upon the completion of their sentence have made good; the other 20 per cent have mostly found their way back into prison elsewhere.

In estimating with reference to the financial element in convict road building, Warden Tynan makes the following statement in his annual report for the year ending November 30, 1912:

Our largest item of labor performed by the convicts was, of course, the road work. The prisoners have been employed in the construction of roads in Mesa, Fremont, Larimer, Weld, Boulder, Jefferson, El Paso, and Pueblo Counties. They have built 157 miles of good roadway, and a great deal of this has been blasted out of solid rock, that in Mesa County being the most difficult and heavy work ever attempted by our men.

Owing to the fact that it was impossible to get from the various counties the cost of material—such as cement, lumber, steel, corrugated culverts, powder, tools, and supplies, other than actual labor, used in road and bridge building—we are enabled to give you only the labor cost to these different counties for the work of the men. This work has been done at an average cost to the different counties of 32 cents per day per man, and, as this cost includes Sundays and holidays, the cost of the labor of these men to the counties for the 2 years, or 731 days, would be \$36,725.44. We have worked 21 State teams, and the feed for these teams cost the counties \$20 per month per team, which would amount to \$10,080, making a total cost to the counties for labor of \$46,805.44. The average labor cost for the 157 miles was \$298.12 per mile.

It is hard to estimate the immense value of these roads, for the reason that the work in Mesa County alone would have cost, with free labor, not less than \$25,000 per mile, as the rock in places had to be blasted for 75 feet in order to get a proper roadbed. In this work it was necessary to drill holes 25 feet deep and to drill three depths before the roadbed was reached. So you can readily see the magnitude of this work. The work in Ute Pass, in El Paso County, was done through solid rock for 6 miles, all blasting.

The work in Salt Canyon and Parkdale Hill, in Fremont County, and Pingree Hill, Cherokee Hill, and Thompson Canyon, in Larimer County, contained a great deal of blasting. This necessarily would have been very expensive work had it been done with free labor, and the counties would have been forced to pay big salaries for drillers, blasters, powder men, masons, and cement workers. Not counting what the contractor's profits might be, and not including any skilled labor except blacksmiths, cement workers, and masons, and estimating the cost of free labor at \$2 per day, by eliminating Sundays and holidays we may count 132 men working 610 days at \$2 per day, which would give us a labor value of \$161,040. We have worked an average of 20 masons and cement workers, which would have cost the counties \$5 per day, and would have amounted to \$61,000. We have averaged five blacksmiths, whose labor is estimated at \$4 per day, and this would have amounted to \$12,220. Estimating the value of 21 teams, at \$2.50 per day per team, for 610 days, it would amount to \$32,025. At a low figure the value of the labor of these men and teams would be worth to the counties \$266,285. Add to this a depreciation of State equipment, \$2,000, and the interest on State equipment, \$2,000, and you can see that this labor has been worth to the different counties \$270,285. The difference between what the free labor alone would have cost the public—namely, \$270,285—and what the labor of our men actually cost them shows a labor profit of \$223,479.56. However, this labor did not compete with the free labor of the State, for the reason that the counties could not otherwise have afforded to do this work.

Surely the employment of convict labor on the public roads in Colorado is no longer an experiment, but has become a settled policy. It has demonstrated its effectiveness in the construction of many miles of road that could not have been built otherwise. It has solved the problem of prison labor; it has relieved the burden of taxation and it has contributed much to the health and physical vigor of our prison population.

I believe that the moral effect upon the convict of this out-of-door labor has been most salutary. It is difficult to secure statistics that will in any way reveal the after life of those who have been thus employed. I am confident, however, that many a man has faced the world with more courage and hope after having worked on this road construction than he would have under the ordinary conditions of prison confinement. It will possibly be found that the provisions of the bill under consideration are in many respects unsatisfactory when they are put into practical operation, but the proposition underlying the bill is beneficent and worthy of support. It recognizes the responsibility of the General Government to bear in some measure the expense of the construction of our post roads. This attitude of the Government will be reflected in all sections of the country, and I predict that intelligent and comprehensive attention will be devoted to this question as never before.

It is a matter of congratulation that this question is one concerning which there can be no partisan differences. It is one which appeals to the good judgment and support of citizens everywhere. It is not sectional but national. It will contribute largely to the prosperity and welfare of our entire country.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have been such an earnest advocate of good roads and have been so earnest in the promotion of legislation looking toward the Federal aid to good roads, and have expressed so fully my views on the subject to the committee on good roads, that I feel a large measure of freedom in expressing my views on this particular bill. I feel that there is no possibility of anyone at home or in this House mistaking my criticism of this bill for a lack of individual interest in good roads.

I am not in favor of the principle on which this bill is drawn. It does not carry out the pledge of the Democratic platform, which is that the Federal Government shall aid the States in the construction of post roads, nor does it carry out the views of the Secretary of Agriculture, that the smallest unit with which the Nation should deal should be the State. If the Government wants to carry out a plan for improving its post roads, its constitutional power is ample; but this bill is not confined to post roads, nor does it relate to post roads except incidentally. Its title refers to post roads, and the money is distributed one-half on the basis of the mileage of post roads, but there is no provision in the bill which restricts the improvement to post roads, nor is the operation of the bill put under the charge of the Post Office Department. On the other hand, it is not purely market-road plan, as advocated by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture advocated that the smallest unit with which we should deal must be the State, which should have ample machinery in the form of a State highway department, with full legal powers over the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads. This bill is neither a post-road plan nor a market-road plan. In other

words, in my judgment, it is neither fish, fowl, nor good red herring. I have two substantial objections to the theory of the bill. One is that it provides the means by which the Federal authorities can overlap constituted powers of the State government and deal directly with the several subdivisions of the State. It says in the very opening paragraph that the Secretary of Agriculture on behalf of the United States may aid the States and the civil subdivisions thereof.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, in that connection I would like to ask the gentleman if the bill also provides the manner in which it may do that?

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman knows what his bill provides. I was just about to come to that. In section 3 it says that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with the officers of the several States having lawful authority in that behalf in the construction of roads. That includes the township trustee, certainly, because he has lawful authority in that behalf in the construction of roads.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Is he an officer of the State?

Mr. BORLAND. Certainly he is an officer of the State under the constitution of the State of Missouri, and it has been so held. Every county official is an officer of the State. On page 7 of the bill it provides that the payments under this road-rental section shall be made to "such officers of the State" as the governor shall designate to be entitled to receive the same, which might be the county court in our State, or the township trustee or the county commissioner in some States, or a road overseer, or any one of a number of other local officials.

I do not see how any man who believes in State rights can divorce State rights from State powers and State duties. I do not believe in a form of Federal legislation which overleaps the constituted authority of the State and deals directly with any lesser political subdivision as a political subdivision. But if the Federal Government chose to exercise its paramount constitutional power to go in there and build the road as a post road, or a military road, or even, under the late decisions of the Supreme Court, as an interstate-traffic road, it would have ample power to do it.

So much for the violation of State rights. But the main objection I have to this bill is embraced in the road-rental feature. In section 3 and section 4 it purports to give an option, which the governor of the State may exercise, as to the form which the Federal aid may take. That option is left, not to the Federal Government but to the governor of the State, on the face of the bill. Section 3 provides that the governor, in conjunction with the Federal authorities, may by agreement make a special law applying to his State for the construction and maintenance of roads. If the governor does not do that—and, in my judgment, the chances are a thousand to one that he will not be able to make a satisfactory agreement—then he has the other option of having the money paid to his State anyway, under the road-rental proposition. I think the practical effect of that will be that the option will be nugatory, and it will be a road-rental proposition in the last analysis unless the Federal Government were clothed with the power to exercise the option, and not the State.

Now, it says roads shall be paid for at the rate of \$60 a mile for macadam roads, \$30 for shell and gravel roads, and \$15 a mile for dirt roads. That is to be paid not on the basis of the roads as needed for post roads or for any other purpose, not on the basis of what the Secretary of Agriculture or the Postmaster General thinks is needed as a road, but on the basis of what happens to exist as an improved road or to be brought into existence as an improved road by the local authorities.

Why are we having any road legislation at all from a national standpoint? If the local authorities had ample power and means and machinery to carry out a road program, why would they be asking for Federal aid? Is it a little \$15 or \$20 or \$60 a mile that is beyond the power of the State taxing power, and that is the only thing they need? Is that all? Can we, with \$15 a mile added to the taxing power of the State, work miracles? I do not think so.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Does the gentleman object to giving the States this election that the bill affords?

Mr. BORLAND. I do not think that election is any more than a nominal election.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Does not the bill expressly provide that the governor shall have that right of election?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; and if the gentleman had followed my remarks closely he would know that I tried to show why it was likely he would not exercise it.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I did follow it closely, and that is why I wanted to challenge it. It says that he shall provide the

election in conformity with the laws of the State, and it gives the State the right to have this election made.

Mr. BORLAND. I understand that was put in there for the benefit of the States that do not have State highway commissions and perhaps do not want to have them, and under those circumstances they would have the option, under section 3, of asking for the appropriation under another form. The State is supposed to be fined 10 per cent for not having a State highway commission. As a matter of fact, they will not be fined 10 per cent, for the bill states they can have a highway commission without saying what the powers will be. Any State can have a highway commission, if it is desired, in order to save a reduction of 10 per cent in the road fund. So I do not think there would be any question but that a majority of the elections, or possibly all the elections, would occur as in section 4.

I want to show you why I am opposed to the road-rental proposition as a solution of the road problem; and that, in my judgment, is the crux of the situation. If the road-rental proposition would solve this demand for improved highways in this country, I say that there would be no good-road question in Congress, for it is so trifling in amount and so easy of application in the last analysis that it adds to the plenary taxing powers of the State but a little more money in the form of a Federal distribution. That is said to be an encouragement to the State. Well, of course, it is an encouragement to the localities of the State that have already an ample taxing power, and it is not an encouragement to the localities that may need the roads worse and where the Post Office Department may need the roads worse but have not the taxing power.

Take, for illustration, my own county of Jackson, in Missouri, which comprises the fifth congressional district of that State. That county has a city of nearly 300,000 people. It has ample taxing power, and as the result it has 300 miles of improved rock roads. It does not need the Government aid, although that district, I will say, will be entitled to more road-rental money than any other district in the State of Missouri. But we already spend over half a million dollars a year in that country in the maintenance and building of roads, and the \$10,000 we would get by this bill would not be an encouragement for the construction of 1 mile of road in Jackson County.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. The gentleman is familiar with this subject and has given it great thought and consideration, and I would like to ask him if he considers that under the provisions of this bill a State is compelled to proportionately distribute the money received from the Federal Government?

Mr. BORLAND. I am going to reach that. I am glad the gentleman called my attention to it.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to his colleague?

Mr. BORLAND. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER. Speaking of the country roads in Jackson County and elsewhere in Missouri, I will ask the gentleman whether most of that work was not done as the result of and from the proceeds of money obtained from saloon licenses?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; from the dram-shop fund, raised in the county, including the incorporated cities. I may say that all these funds raised by taxation are in a certain sense a tax on the people. In any case the taxing power there is ample.

Now, there are other counties in Missouri where the taxing power is not ample, and where the road problems are increasingly great. In other words, in most of the sections of Missouri—and I think it is true in other States where the road problem is the most serious and where the need for road improvement is the greatest from the market standpoint and from the postal standpoint—the local taxing power and machinery are at the very minimum. In the localities in Missouri where the taxing power is great, and where the road problem has to a large extent already been solved, they have there a high-class road system, and that would take down a fair distribution of the money coming to Missouri.

Now, money appropriated to the needs of the roads is one thing, but if the money is appropriated in accordance with the accidental character of existing roads, it is an entirely different thing. Yet that is the theory upon which this bill is drawn. We do not go out and find where the roads are that need improvement for the benefit of the States and for the benefit of the Nation at large, but we are asked to find out where the roads, by the accidental accumulation of taxing wealth, have been already improved, and the minute they are improved they come under the highest class and demand the highest class of rental. That is the fault of the bill from a scientific standpoint.

Another great defect in the bill is that it gives the local authority no use whatever of the accumulated scientific knowledge and investigation as to the construction of roads, as to the

necessary drainage of roads, as to the grades at which roads ought to be built, as to the maintenance of roads in an economical manner, and as to any of this information that is collected by the Federal Government in the Office of Public Roads. The road boss is denied all that. He has never had it, and he does not have it in his reach. He is asked, unaided by any scientific knowledge of road building, to bring his road up to the point where he can get some of this Federal money.

These are the vices from an economic standpoint. But the vice from the political standpoint is a more serious defect. What does this mean when you go home to the people and brag to them that you have compelled the Government to pay rental for the roads in your district? I might brag to my people that I have brought \$10,000 or \$15,000 of Federal money to my district. Another man might say: "Oh, BORLAND did not do so much. If you send me, I will bring \$25,000 to be expended here as rental for the use of these roads." I might say: "I, too, will bring \$25,000." But whichever one of us got here, we would find ourselves shoulder to shoulder with a large number of other men who have made similar pledges to increase the amount of road money. We would have to join together and get each of us the \$25,000 that had been promised. It is the biggest log-rolling proposition that was ever passed. There is no end to its possibilities as a machine-politics system.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. If that were to be done, does the gentleman think it would subtract anything from the possibilities of building a road, for which the gentleman himself has introduced a bill, from New York to San Francisco? Would our so-called log rolling in any manner interfere with the securing of funds to build that joy-riding road from New York to San Francisco?

Mr. BORLAND. I should think, sir, leaving out the epithet as to joy-riders—and it falls perfectly harmless upon me—that this would be the greatest blow to the good-roads movement that could be attempted.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. What is the "good-roads movement"?

Mr. BORLAND. Because in less than five years' time it would involve Congress in a scandal as to the expenditure of that road fund. We would have expended from \$100,000,000 to \$150,000,000, and the people would begin to say, "Where is that \$150,000,000 that you have pretended to put in the roads?"

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. Does not the gentleman think that the States would wisely expend one-half of the amount paid by the Federal Government? Does the gentleman think that the States would expend that money foolishly?

Mr. BORLAND. I am not saying that.

Mr. HOWARD. Does not the gentleman think that in his State and in my State the money would be beneficially expended?

Mr. BORLAND. If the States had solved the road problems for themselves, this bill would not be here. There is no doubt in the world about that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. BORLAND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the gentleman think the scheme provided in this bill is infinitely better than for the National Government to build a road from one ocean to the other, as has been suggested here, for the benefit only of those who live near it?

Mr. BORLAND. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. These roads go through all the country, do they not?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Every State in the Union is represented here.

Mr. BORLAND. I will say to the gentleman a little later, if I have time left from these inquiries, what my views are as expressed before the Roads Committee.

I want to call your attention directly to what I believe to be the political vice of this distribution of road money in the form of road rental. I do not think there is any limit to it. I do not think it is directly connected with the improvement of roads or with the solution of the road problem. I think it perpetuates an element of waste and extravagance in the road problem that is already unavoidably present in that class of legislation.

One of the greatest enthusiasts about roads and one of the greatest road experts in this country is Gov. Hodges, the present Democratic governor of the State of Kansas. When he was in the Legislature of Kansas he was the good-roads man in that State, and he ran for governor on a good-roads platform. He published some statistics in which he shows that 80 per cent of the money now paid by the taxpayers for good roads never went on the roads at all, but was lost in one way or another in the process of administration. He showed that every time you appropriated a dollar under your existing system of isolated local control you discounted your dollar 80 cents the minute you passed your appropriation bill; and, in my opinion, that condition of affairs will be aggravated and perpetuated by this bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Will the gentleman yield for a question in that connection?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; I yield to the gentleman. I may have to ask for more time.

Mr. SAUNDERS. If there is any merit whatever in these statements of Gov. Hodges, do you not realize that the system under which these funds will be administered will correct that situation, because this fund is to be administered jointly by the road department of the Department of Agriculture and the road commissions of the States? Does our friend think when those two great departments—one representing the State and the other the Federal Government—are administering this fund in order to secure the highest results in the way of improved roads, they will waste it and squander it and bring about scandals?

Mr. BORLAND. My dear sir, I know no more reason why these scandals should be avoided in the future than they have been in the past, because they are inherent in the system itself, and this bill is drawn upon the idea of continuing and perpetuating the system which, in my judgment, has produced the present road problem of the United States. We have had isolated local control of roads for 150 years, and that has resulted in the demand for national legislation. I interpret the demand to mean that we must find a more scientific way of constructing good roads than the present existing system. This proposes simply to add a little more money to the money that has been spent by the present road bosses, and is not a solution of the problem.

Mr. SAUNDERS. If the gentleman will allow me to ask one more question, I will not interrupt further.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes. I will ask the gentleman to secure more time for me.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Let us take class C:

Class C shall embrace roads upon which no incline is steeper than is reasonably necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, with adequate drainage and ample side ditches, with a roadway constructed so as to quickly shed water into the side ditches, and kept crowned and compacted by dragging or other adequate means so that it shall be reasonably passable for wheeled vehicles.

We all admit that the road that comes up to that standard will be a good road, and the Government is not going to put a cent on that road until it comes up to that standard, and the agents of the Government are to determine when it reaches that standard and therefore determine when the Federal proportion of the money shall be paid. Where is there room for scandal, waste, or extravagance in that?

Mr. BORLAND. Now, mark how your question has answered itself. You have provided for the improvement of 2,240,000 miles of road in this country.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I just wish to say that we are not providing for anything of the sort.

Mr. BORLAND. You are hoping to do that.

Mr. SAUNDERS. No; we are hoping to improve the post roads of the country, the mileage of which is nothing like the figures the gentleman has given.

Mr. BORLAND. You are not confining it to post roads.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; we are.

Mr. BORLAND. You are giving every road the right to participate, if it comes up to the standard of class C.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, no.

Mr. BORLAND. You certainly are, and when you are doing that you are not providing the Federal machinery by which the Secretary of Agriculture could tell whether the roads even in the District of Columbia had come up to that class, not to mention the rest of the Union. You have not provided the inspectors, and you could not provide the inspectors to determine that question within the time necessary to make the annual payments. You have no machinery at all except the machinery for getting the money out of the Federal Treasury into the hands of the road boss. And that is not the worst of it. I want to say in answer to my friend from Colorado [Mr. SELDOMBRIDGE] that the bill does not even provide for an equitable distribution of

this money after it gets into the hands of the State. It holds out an invitation to some governors to build up a political machine. It says that the governor shall have the right to tell the Treasurer of the United States into whose hands the money shall be paid. I do not need to comment on that before a body of men of wide political experience like this.

Now, I believe that the solution of the road problem is infinitely deeper than paying \$15, \$20, \$30, or \$60 a mile in addition to the amount raised by the taxing power of the State under the pretense of rental. Of course we know it is not rental. I do not believe that is a solution of the problem. The great trouble in the solution of the good-roads problem is, first, that we have been working under a system of isolated local control and construction of roads, a system that we adopted from Great Britain at a time when Great Britain was a hermit nation, with her forests full of outlaws, and with 99 out of 100 of her young men going out of the country for an education. She has long since abandoned that system, and no other country ever adopted it. For 200 years we have tried to adapt that system to the construction of highways of a great country 3,000 miles in extent, whose great, burning need is the development of its internal resources. We can not do it.

The experience of every nation should teach us that the building of highways is a scientific proposition, that more than 80 per cent of the traffic of roads goes over less than 15 per cent of the roads, and will do so under any circumstances, whether the roads are improved or unimproved, in a country thickly settled or not. It necessarily tends that way, and we must have a scientific classification of roads in accordance with the traffic they bear. Nearly every progressive State in this country has come or is coming to the system of a State system of highways. What does that mean? It means that the State selects certain trunk lines. You may say that "I am against this thing if it does not go by my door." That is a narrow way to look at it. You may say it is a joy-ride proposition, but solid business men in every State have come to the idea of selecting a State highway commission clothed with legal power to classify roads as to the character in which they ought to be improved and maintained, and, secondly, not to improve any roads at all until ample power is given for the maintenance of those roads in the class to which they belong.

Those are the two problems to which we are to address ourselves, to get a scientific classification of the roads that must be improved to the highest degree, a classification of the secondary roads that are feeders, that must be improved to a secondary degree, and a third classification of roads that are local roads purely, and can be left in a more or less unimproved state.

Mr. HOWARD. You admit that all the trunk lines you speak of leading through your State and mine carry with them rural routes necessarily?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman made a statement a minute ago that 80 per cent of the travel was done over 15 per cent of the roads. I think that is a mistake. The Agricultural Department says that 90 per cent of the travel is done over 30 per cent, or, rather, not travel, but 90 per cent of the tonnage is hauled over 30 per cent of the roads. That is not the same thing, of course, because it means that the farmer in the sparsely settled country does not carry as much tonnage, but they use the road as much in carrying to the market their produce as they do on the roads where more tonnage is hauled.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, we have got to solve this problem on a different line from what it has been solved in the past, otherwise there is no solution of the problem. The road rental proposition will not solve the problem. Whether it is 30 or 15 per cent of the traffic, the gentleman from Georgia has indicated the same scientific judgment I had on the matter, that it would be foolish for us to try to improve or to induce to improve or to pay for improving, unless it was determined that the amount of traffic and the relation that it bore to the markets and to the proportion of the Postal Service would justify that improvement. It is not a question of how the roads might be brought to-day under improvement or in the future by the encouragement of a little money. It is a question of where the roads are needed, and they might be needed in a section where they now have the least chance of being built. That is where the rural man comes in, and the city man can count himself out except to contribute his share of the taxation. The roads are going to be built in most sections; not in sections where good roads would be built, but where they ought to be built for the purpose of commerce and market and getting the crops to the market from the country.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield again?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. BORLAND. I will.

Mr. HOWARD. Does the gentleman maintain by his argument that the improvement of public highways does not help the city at all?

Mr. BORLAND. No; I said we could count ourselves out as to the distribution of the road money.

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman said that the city could count itself out except to pay its proportion of the taxation. I hope the gentleman does not mean to convey the idea that the building of good roads will not help the cities as much as it will help the country, because the city is dependent on the contiguous country for its livelihood.

Mr. BORLAND. No; Mr. Chairman, I did not say anything of the kind. I said where the good roads may be needed most the taxing power or conditions are such that there is less likelihood of their being built than there is in other sections where the taxing power is greatest. But roads may be needed most both in behalf of the country and the cities and in behalf of the Postal Service.

Mr. SAUNDERS. And this bill will enable such roads to be built. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. BORLAND. I think not. If I thought so, I would be here advocating the bill instead of opposing it. [Applause.]

[Mr. BORLAND obtained leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

SUBSTITUTE BY MR. BORLAND.

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to expend an amount not exceeding \$25,000,000 in any one year in cooperating with the States of the Union in improving, constructing, and maintaining rural highways available for use by the United States for post roads, military roads, and interstate-traffic roads. Such funds shall be apportioned among the several States as follows: One-half in the proportion that the mileage of the post roads within the State bears to the total mileage of post roads in the United States, exclusive of star routes, and one-half in the proportion that the commodities produced within the State bears to the total production of commodities in the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of improvement, construction, and maintenance, the rural roads of the country shall be classified into three classes on the basis of the amount of traffic which the roads carry or are capable of carrying. Class A shall embrace interstate highways connected with a general system of highways throughout the United States; class B shall embrace State highways, main branches, and feeders for the interstate highways, which shall extend into every county within the State; class C shall embrace county highways and local post roads connected with a market town and with a main interstate or State highway.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture shall, with the assistance of the office of public roads of the Department of Agriculture, establish standards and specifications as to grades, drainage, bridges, culverts, roadbeds, and the surfacing of the various classes of roads, having in view the topography of the country, the character of the soil, the climate, the kind and accessibility of road material. The office of public roads of the Department of Agriculture shall continue the investigation and classification of scientific information upon the proper location, grading, drainage, construction, and maintenance of rural roads, and shall at all times furnish to State highway departments or highway engineers expert advice and assistance on such subjects.

SEC. 4. The governor of each State may make, under his hand and the seal of the State and file with the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, a statement setting forth: First, that the State has a highway department or a highway engineer with full legal powers to improve, construct, or maintain rural highways; second, the road or roads within the State to be improved, constructed, or maintained under each of the classes hereinbefore specified; third, the amount of funds available within the control of the highway department or highway engineer of the State for such improvement, construction, and maintenance, which shall not be less than double the allotment to which the State is entitled from the funds of the United States under the terms of this act; fourth, the amount and character of the work which the State will do within the next fiscal year, and the use which is desired to be made of the funds allotted to the State by the Secretary of Agriculture under the authority of this act. Such statement may be filed at any time after the approval of this act, and an annual statement showing necessary changes for the ensuing fiscal year shall be filed on or before the 20th day of January of each year. All subsequent statements after the first statement filed by the governor shall show in detail the amount of the improvement, construction, and maintenance of roads accomplished by the State in the prior fiscal year, together with the specific use which has been made of the allotment from the funds of the United States under the terms of this act. The Secretary of Agriculture shall examine said statement and determine: First, whether the State has a highway department or highway engineer clothed with full legal powers over the improvement, construction, and maintenance of rural roads; second, whether the work to be done by the State is feasible and practical within the estimate, and of a proper engineering character to bring the roads within the class or classes designated; third, whether the State under its constitution and laws can cooperate with the United States in the improvement, construction, and maintenance of the roads; fourth, whether a proper fund is provided for the maintenance of the system of roads within the State as constructed or proposed to be constructed. If the Secretary of Agriculture be satisfied on these points, he shall adopt the location and classification of the roads as specified by the governor of the State and shall allot to the State its proportion of the road fund created by this act for the fiscal year next ensuing. If the statement as filed by the governor shows a larger amount of improvement, construction, and maintenance of roads than the funds available, including the allotment from the funds of the United States, will be sufficient to accomplish, the Secretary of Agriculture shall withhold the funds until the estimate is reduced. If in any subsequent year after the allotment to a State of funds from the United States the statement

of the governor fails to show improvement, construction, or maintenance of roads reasonably approximate to the estimate made, subject to the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture, he shall withhold the allotment of money under the terms of this act until the proportion of road work in the State is brought up approximately to the estimate submitted, having in view climatic conditions, increased cost of material, or any unforeseen events or factors.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make rules and regulations for the purpose of carrying into effect this act, which rules shall include reasonable provisions for the proper scientific maintenance of the roads of the various classes as the same may be constructed. He shall not approve any estimate for the improvement or construction of roads without adequate provision for the maintenance of the roads so improved or constructed in the class to which they belong. The governor of the State may, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, in any annual statement change the classification of particular roads.

SEC. 6. All acts and parts of acts in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY].

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of gratification that there is no question of the power of Congress to enact this legislation. The Constitution of the United States settles that question. The terms of the bill come within the power conferred on Congress "to establish post offices and post roads," and the only question here is whether or not it is necessary and proper for Congress to pass this bill in the interest of the people of the United States. Power often exists when there is no necessity for its exercise. I am more than glad to state that in the matter of this bill I indorse the principles contained in it and shall vote for the bill.

Next to religion and schools, the most important question confronting any country is that of transportation. Without adequate facilities to move its people and its products, it can not reach the highest degree of civilization. Life in an isolated community is of necessity circumscribed. A place whose products can not be taken to market without undue difficulty and to which the trade and life of the outside world do not penetrate is always slow in being developed. The railroad system has done more than any other one thing in opening up this country. The development of the West during the last 50 years is one of the most remarkable facts of history, and both its development and its prosperity are due almost directly to the railroads. The country's prosperity depends to a large extent upon the railroads, its arteries of commerce, which are necessary to carry the products of its farms and factories from the point of production to that of consumption. The railroads, in turn, must be fed with products brought from the farm, and these products must, in nearly all cases, be hauled in wagons to the place of shipment. The state of the country's roads therefore has a direct bearing on its commerce, and in particular does it affect the prices received by the farmer for his crop. It is the great farming class, the main dependence of this country, which will receive the greatest benefits from improvements made on the roads, and I am glad to vote for any benefits which can legitimately be conferred on this class.

Of the 91,972,266 people in this country in 1910, the rural population amounted to 49,348,883. It can thus be seen that the present bill directly benefits over half the people of this country. The greatest piece of legislation, perhaps, and the one which has revolutionized life in the country, is the establishment of rural mail service. By it news of the outside world is brought to the country community. If good roads were built, the life of the outside world would also find its way there and a check would be given to the movement, so general to-day, of emigrating to the larger towns and cities.

It has been said many times that the pioneers who came to this country were home builders. In building homes they built up the civilization of this country, and if there is one evil to-day that threatens more strongly than any other the permanency and high standards of our citizenship it is the breaking up of the homes in the country. It is true in my section, and I believe generally throughout the United States, that when a man has achieved a competency on the farm, although he may have the very best surroundings to be had in any country, he leaves the farm and goes to the city. I believe that the principles embodied in this bill will result in keeping that class of people in the country. With our improved facilities for delivering the mail, with the telephone, with good roads, the time will come when the country is much more thickly populated than at present; and the question I asked of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] will be true—that with a population twice as great as it is now, with good roads everywhere, with rural carriers able to make their deliveries by automobile, there will be in many localities more than one delivery a day. [Applause.]

Better roads would also enable the farmer to sell his goods at market prices. The farmer of the present day is often unable to take advantage of the prevailing prices offered for his products by reason of his inability to get them to market,

except at certain times when he finds that the roads can be traveled.

No other country to-day has as many miles of highway as has the United States. Also it must be added that no other country has as many miles of bad highways as has the United States. In this country, of the 2,199,645 miles of highways, only 190,679 miles are improved. The mail is carried on rural routes over 1,038,113 miles of roadway. At the present rate of improvement the day when all the roads will be put in good condition is too far distant for any of us to hope to see it. Even with Federal aid the task is too stupendous to be undertaken at one time. The present bill, however, contemplates the improvement of only a limited number of miles each year, in cost not to exceed \$25,000,000 per annum. This will improve only a small part of the country's highways, but it will prove a stimulus to the States and communities to carry on the work, so that in time we may hope to see a network of improved roadways reaching over the entire area of the United States.

I am always glad to support a bill of such general benefit to all classes of citizens. However, it may be that I shall wish that some of the provisions of the present bill be clarified. One of them, I think, is substantially clear enough, but there seems to be some doubt about it. On page 5, line 3, embracing the roads in that class, it reads:

Class C shall embrace roads upon which no incline is steeper than is reasonably necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, with adequate drainage and ample side ditches, with a roadway constructed so as to quickly shed water into the side ditches and kept crowned and compacted by dragging or other adequate means, so that it shall be reasonably passable for wheeled vehicles.

Mr. Chairman, this is substantially the requirement of the Post Office Department for a road before they will inaugurate a rural delivery service. I do not mean that it follows word for word, but it is practically the same as is required by the regulations and rules of the department. I am of the opinion, in reading that provision of the bill, that it comes in any fair sense up to what is required by the Post Office Department before a rural delivery service is established, and that such requirements are substantially the same as the provisions of class C, as provided in this bill.

I will add that if there is any doubt about it, I shall offer an amendment that all roads over which rural delivery is maintained shall, unless the contrary be shown, come within that class. If that is done, it will give more miles of public highways that can be improved. Of course we may not improve these highways in one, two, or five years, but this bill is intended to be a beginning. It is hoped that it will stimulate road building in this country, and I believe the good that will come from it will be far greater than any of us can estimate at the present moment. I am heartily in favor of the bill, and shall vote for its passage.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the road question is not one that calls for eloquence, but for cool, careful, and businesslike deliberation. For a good many years the people in my home State have been much interested in good roads, and we have more improved roads than any like area in this country. One of the reasons, probably, that our roads are more generally improved than others is the convenience of good road-building material. Other States may not be so fortunate in that respect, but nevertheless an interest is being shown in road improvement throughout the country that is taking precedence over every other public question.

The business men's organizations, the farmers' institutes, the agricultural colleges, and the short-course farmers' schools are all devoting time to the consideration of the road question. Some weeks ago I sent out a letter calling the attention of the president of each farmers' institute in the district I represent to the fact that a road bill was pending in Congress and asking him to take the subject to his institute and set apart a half hour or so to consider it. I have had 11 replies from those institutes, and in every single instance the report has been in favor of a proposition whereby the State and the Government may enter into a half-and-half undertaking of improving and maintaining our roads on which mail is carried.

One of these reports is from a farmers' meeting at Winona Agricultural College. It says, in part:

MY DEAR MR. BARNHART: Your letter which had been sent out especially to farmers' institutes for expressions of opinion came to us here, as the institute was held in the assembly rooms of the college. We felt it to be an exigency, and so called a special night session, at which about 100 people, men and women, were present. There were leading farmers, college students, and business men here, so that the crowd was as cosmopolitan and representative as probably will ever be called together. I believe all were actuated by the best motives and that no one had an ax to grind. They were about equally divided in politics, and

on the votes, which were taken after full discussion, there was not a single dissenting voice, so far as I could find, and I presided.

1. The proposal "that the Government build and control certain main highways across the country, from coast to coast or from big city to big city, etc.," looked to us like only a scheme of the automobile racers. We could not see how it could possibly benefit the ordinary farmer or city man of small means, because he does not have the time to use such a road even when he has the means.

2. "That the Government cooperate with the States by furnishing from year to year an amount of road fund, to be equaled by the people, for building and maintaining mail-route roads." This would be an acceptable scheme, but until the States themselves get their own road laws in better working conditions it would not be practicable.

3. "That the Government pay a stipulated amount per mile each year toward the upkeep of mail-route roads, if they are constructed according to specifications for first-class roads of their kind." This was approved with the further recommendation: "That the roads so drawing such money be built and maintained at all times according to the standards adopted by the United States Bureau of Public Roads." It was felt that unless some such restriction were placed upon the expenditure it would be a waste of public money. The money should not be spent indiscriminately nor given to most local authorities without wise reservation concerning its expenditure.

Very respectfully,

MILLARD CRANE, *Chairman of Meeting.*

Here is another one, from one of the most populous and prosperous agricultural counties in Indiana. It says:

Be it resolved, That we, the citizens of St. Joseph County, Ind., in farmers' institute assembled, do hereby ask the Hon. H. A. BARNHART to use his influence to effect a national law in conformity with the second proposition set forth in a letter from said BARNHART to this institute, viz: "That the Government cooperate with the States by furnishing from year to year an amount of road fund, to be equaled by the people, for building and maintaining mail-route roads."

WILLIAM O. CULLAR,
Chairman County Farmers' Institute.

The farmers of Elkhart County in their meeting resolved—

That the National Government cooperate with the States by furnishing from year to year an amount of money for a road fund, to be equaled by the State, for building and maintaining rural-route roads.

In Kosciusko County the farmers' institute resolved—

That the Government cooperate with the States in furnishing from year to year an amount of road fund, to be equaled by the people, in keeping up the mail routes and public highways, and do not favor the coast to coast roads, as that will be entirely too much for a special class of automobile owners.

Seven other farmers' meetings passed similar resolutions, and were the reports all in from the many winter meetings of the farmers and business men I have no doubt but they would all read practically the same.

This morning a man who is somewhat interested in another line than building roads gave me some figures that appeal to me as very remarkable. He says the experts of the Agricultural Department say that it costs, by horse and wagon transportation, on the average road in the United States, 23 cents to move a ton of produce or freight a mile. In England, where the roads are practically all improved and where they use many more auto-trucks than we use here, the average cost per mile is 7 cents. On the railroads a ton of freight transportation costs about 7½ mills per mile, and by the Erie Canal about 3 mills per mile. On this basis \$1 will send a ton of ordinary freight by horse and wagon on our average road a little more than 4 miles, and in England about 15 miles. By railroad—carload rate—a dollar will send a ton of freight nearly 133 miles, by the Erie Canal about 233 miles, and by European canals about 500 miles. Also if a horse can move a ton of freight on a level road, it will require two horses to move that ton on a 10 per cent upgrade, four horses to move it on a 20 per cent upgrade, and eight horses to move it on a 33 per cent upgrade. We all recognize that upgrade is resistance, and if our improperly constructed roads contribute the same resistance, and they surely do, which we discover in the ascent of a road incline, the importance of improving our roads in order to contribute to the least cost of resistance in highway traffic is beyond question.

So far as I am personally concerned, I am locally interested in what is known as a cross-country highway—the Lincoln highway. I had a letter this morning from a banker in my home district, who urged me to vote for a hundred-million-dollar proposition to build a concrete road from New York to San Francisco. I wrote him, in answer to his letter, that first of all I thought it was my duty as a legislator to see to it that the largest possible number of people should be provided with at least ordinary roads for transportation before we spend millions for trunk lines. You say the automobilist wants a cross-country road. So some do, but the average automobilist does not. The average automobilist is a man who lives out in the country or in country towns, who is interested in driving hither and thither in a business or pleasure capacity, and not from New York to Chicago, nor Chicago to St. Louis, nor St. Louis to Denver, nor Denver to San Francisco. A coast-to-coast roadway would be a good thing principally for the comparatively few who could afford to take cross-country pleasure trips, but nine hundred and ninety-nine out of each thousand, or possibly more, of those who would help pay for such a road,

if it be paid for with national funds, would never see it nor use it, and therefore the public would get little or no benefit. Of course, if the automobilists who want a long touring route, and the people who live adjacent to such route, want to build it, I am heartily in favor of such an enterprise, and this bill proposes to help such in the same proportion as other improved roads. But I can not believe that it would be just to build such an extensive driveway by Government aid and compel the other important highways of the country to wait.

Besides, Mr. Chairman, the country people have been helping to build river and harbor and public building and military and naval improvements in the big cities ever since the beginning of our Government, and in return for these Government taxes paid in we have been giving them an occasional package of garden seeds and now and then a farmer's bulletin, with promises of helpful legislation. But at last the Congress is beginning to give them the legislation they have so long deserved, and this bill is part of it.

Our transportation, as has been shown here, consists overwhelmingly of vicinity traffic, and I want to call attention especially to the importance of improving post roads—roads over which United States mail is carried. Nothing has contributed so much to the progress of the country, to the dissemination of general intelligence everywhere—and I think everybody agrees to that—as the delivery of mail to the rural communities. I speak advisedly when I say that with proper roads a mail carrier who now consumes 8 or 9 or 10 hours in making a trip over his route will make it in from 3 to 4 hours. Then the farmer will have his mail delivered to him as early in the morning as the business man, and no man in this country depends for his well-being more upon daily market reports than does the farmer. He is isolated and can not easily call up a market, but when he receives his morning paper he is as well advised as any other man, whether that man lives in city or country.

The rural carrier is also entitled to some consideration. He does not get a large salary. I think he is fairly well paid for his services, because I find there are many, many applications pending all the time from intelligent and enterprising young men who are anxious to take these rural-carrier jobs, but he ought to have a good roadway; he ought to have facility for getting to the patron of the rural mail as readily as possible. Then, too, with the parcel post the Government is going to become a sort of freight carrier, and because of that also we ought to have first-class mail-route roads. We are not confining this bill to the rural routes alone, but to all post roads; and after we have improved these, partly by the contribution that the Government is to make, partly by similar funds raised by the States, and partly by the inspiration this law will inaugurate in better road making, we will have rural route and post roads built up everywhere in splendid condition and the cross-country automobilist will find that instead of donating immense road-building funds by subscription, as he now expects to do, the people will build good roads according to this bill, in compliance with specifications that will be properly drawn, and there will be only short gaps here and there all over the United States which it will be necessary to build by private enterprise in order to give the automobilist continuous highways, not only from coast to coast but from north to south, and here, there, and everywhere as well.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. HULINGS. The gentleman said that the estimate he gets from the Agricultural Department is 23 cents per mile for moving a ton of freight by horsepower over a country road?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. HULINGS. And, then, that there was a great difference in the cost owing to the grade of the road?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. HULINGS. Does the gentleman know what the estimated grade of the road is on the average road which costs 23 cents per ton-mile?

Mr. BARNHART. I said that was the average cost; that is, up and down hill and on the level—the average cost per ton per mile under all reported conditions.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman kindly tell us how the department arrives at this conclusion—what they take into consideration, and how they figure this cost?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I only know what I received from the officials by means of a telephone inquiry. I did not ask anything further than if they knew, and was told that the average cost had been estimated at 23 cents per mile. And

I take it, gentlemen, that it is a reasonable estimate. I know that in my own country if a man drives 10 miles to market and takes a ton, it is considerable of a load and a large haul for \$2.30.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not consider that request. The apportionment of time is in the hands of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. BOOHER. I would like to make further inquiry of the gentleman.

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

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARNHART. I am profoundly grateful for this privilege, for I have more to say upon this important subject. And one of the things in my mind is the need of skill in road building. It is just as important that a road overseer have a technical knowledge of draining, grading, graveling, and finishing roads as any other overseer of important building improvements that require efficiency and permanency, because of large expenditure of money. The people of every community have seen much money and labor wasted through unworkmanlike road making, and this bill will remedy this by its provision that the State and Government road-making officials shall set forth how roads shall be constructed and kept in repair.

I quote from seeming reliable authority when I say that \$250,000,000 are wasted on bad roads in the United States every year. Added to this the loss on haul, on storage, and extra food rates make a total expense of a billion dollars per year. This means a tax of \$12.50 annually on every man, woman, and child in the country. Maybe these statistics are right and possibly wrong, but no statistics from anywhere or under any circumstances argue for bad roads. And quoting further along this line of argument, do good roads concern you? If you are one of the 30,000,000 people who live on farms in the United States, it is a fairly safe guess that you know something about bad roads. But if you are a city man, whose use of highways consists chiefly of the street railway, does the good-roads movement concern you? That question is best answered by asking another. When the prices of your table supplies go up as a result of scarcity in your market and you see prices paid the farmer but little changed, then you are vitally interested in good roads. Take wheat, for instance. Do you know why it is possible to corner the market in wheat? First of all, because wheat is scarce—the demand growing faster than the supply; but secondarily, because, owing to the condition of the roads, it is possible for the speculators to get possession of the whole year's crop of wheat. The West is the great granary of the wheat supply to-day; and in the West the wheat must be rushed to market in the clear, dry autumn days when the roads are hard. If the farmer held his wheat over, past the dry weather, in most counties he simply could not deliver during late autumn rains or early spring break-up when roads are a churn of mud. The result is for three months after each crop there is a glut of wheat at elevator, railroad, and water front. Thereby a large proportion of the crop goes into the hands of speculators. These storage charges and speculators' profits are added to the actual worth of the wheat, and both you and the man who raises the wheat must pay for the bad roads which necessitate marketing of the crop all at one time and whereby the speculator reaps his harvest at your expense.

As a matter of fact, America's country roads are so bad that it costs more to haul a ton of wheat from farm to market than to ship that ton from New York to Liverpool. You, Mr. Townsman, and you, Mr. Farmer, pay for the unnecessary waste of those bad roads; the townsman by the extra cost of what he eats, the farmer by lessened price for what he sells.

Oh, but you city chaps who want great boulevards built across the country say this is a "pork-barrel bill." Well, you may call it what you please, but "pork-barrel" legislation that directly and indirectly benefits everybody who pays Government taxes, as this bill does, and denies justice to nobody, is honest and fair and universally helpful and needful legislation, "pork" or no "pork." It will make farm life more profitable and more attractive; it will increase the profits to the man who grows our food and clothing, and reduce expenses for those who must buy them, as it will obviate the great loss

in transportation and middleman speculation, which must fall on the shoulders of both the buyer and seller.

So much for the profit-and-loss features of this subject. And, now, just one or two more observations and I will have finished.

We read lots of editorial opinion and hear lots of talk on the importance of checking the drift from farm to city life. They tell us this ever-increasing abandonment of the peaceful and safe pursuit of farming for the city job is due to the dreariness of the country and the bright glare of the city. Is this due to the neglect of conveniences and comforts and beauty of the country and the profuse expenditure of money in cities to make the glow that attracts? Is it possible that we have neglected helping public improvements in the country and centered our appropriations in helps for cities? Might it be that country people are beginning to feel that most of the taxes they pay find their way to the upbuilding of cities, and in order to get their money back they quit the farms and go to towns, where life looks more pleasant because of superior improvements and conveniences?

Whatever it is that causes the drift from farm to city, every boy who leaves the farm contracts the possibilities of food production just that much, because the farm must produce less for loss of a husbandman and an additional city mouth is dependent on the diminished supply. Prices increase because fewer acres are tilled, or are so tilled as to produce less, and the increasing horde in town and city must reap although they have not sown.

The redress? Keep the boys and girls on the farms and out of the sweatshops of parasite dependence. If "he who maketh two blades of grass grow where one grew before is a public benefactor," then he who causeth but one blade to grow where two grew before is a reckless despoiler. But there is not enough attraction in the commonplace vocation of making two blades of grass grow where one grew before to hold the average boy and girl safe from the city glare which attracts like the bright flame allures the moth. And if the glamor and novelty and activity of city life is the magnet which draws the boys and girls from larger possibilities on the farms, there must be counter efforts to hold them in the rural homes.

And so, Mr. Chairman, we are brought face to face with the stern realization that we need more contented and prosperous farmers for the betterment of mankind generally. For many years we have been legislating in favor of city welfare and letting rural interests take care of themselves. But we are seeing things differently now. This administration has taken a long step toward taking the burden of Government taxes off the necessities of life and placing them on the luxuries and the wealth. It has lowered tariff taxes on the tolling masses and added them, by the income-tax law, to the responsibility of the wealthy who ought to pay their full share of public expenses. It has passed the Lever bill, which provides for more general education of farmer boys and girls. It will pass a law making it possible to borrow money on such terms that many who can not now do so may own farms. And it will pass this bill which will send millions back to the country people, who paid the money in, to help improve the public roads so the farmer and the city man may have more economic means of handling the necessities of life and also make rural life more inviting, more advantageous, and more prosperous. And they deserve this from a Congress which is obligated to help those who help themselves, rather than continue the long-established policy of enriching him who already hath by taking from another that which is rightfully his.

Mr. Chairman, the city man who votes against this bill thereby strikes at his own best interests and denies to the farmer the fair share of public favor which belongs to him, because he has paid his money in taxes for it. Surely there will be few to deny this act of modest justice to the millions.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I suppose there is no greater civilizer than good roads. Few things contribute more to the comfort or prosperity of a community than good highways. In the building of good roads we have not kept pace with the progress of our country in other directions and in other lines of activity. It is a fact that we have bad roads all over the country, and the recognition of that fact is responsible for the demand from every part of our country for remedial legislation. I regret exceedingly that this bill does not meet that demand. I have studied this bill carefully, and I have great misgivings with regard to many of its provisions. I very gravely doubt whether it will accomplish, in any marked degree, any of the things which its sponsors claim for it. It is, indeed, very unfortunate that so worthy a cause should be carried in such a dilapidated vehicle. The result of the enactment of this bill, so far as the advancement of good roads is concerned, is questioned by many of the Members of this House.

One of the difficulties in the way of securing good roads throughout the country to-day lies in the fact that the various States have not enacted proper laws for the building of roads. With but slight changes in the laws for building highways, many of the States have been going on for a century under the old and antiquated methods of road construction. The result is that it too often happens that the funds collected for building roads have been foolishly expended, and that much of the work done upon our highways left them in a worse condition than they were in before the work was performed. The difficulty has been that no scientific standards for the building and repairing of highways have been established in this country. The only wonder is that our public roads are in as good condition as we find them to-day when we consider the haphazard methods that have been employed to improve them.

Mr. Chairman, the enactment of legislation upon this subject should mark a new era of highway construction in the United States. A good-roads measure should provide for scientific standards of road construction and repair and businesslike methods established for enforcing these standards in all work upon public highways. But instead of establishing such standards and providing such a scheme the bill before us recognizes the same low standards of road construction, as well as the old methods of working the highways, which have resulted in the most deplorable condition in which we now find our public roads. At the beginning of such an era we should, it seems to me, favor Federal aid only for the construction of permanent highways, leaving temporary construction and repair solely to the local authorities.

Section 4 of this bill attempts a classification of public highways for which Federal aid may be given, in which the roads are classified into three divisions; but it is especially provided that each division shall embrace roads "upon which no incline is steeper than is reasonably necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality." Any schoolboy can see at a glance how foolish it is to establish such a standard for the construction of highways for which the Government is to expend annually \$25,000,000, instead of providing that the highways for which Federal aid may be given shall embrace only those roads where the grade does not exceed a certain per cent. In fixing the standard, so far as grade is concerned, by providing that no incline shall be steeper than is reasonably necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, it will be seen that if a road extended up the side of the Ozark Mountains the grade might be 45°, and the natural topography of the locality would make it reasonably necessary for such a grade.

Again, this bill makes provision for Federal aid for macadam or concrete roads at the rate of \$60 per mile; for shell or gravel roads, \$30 per mile; and for ordinary dirt roads, \$15 per mile. One of the counties in the State which I have the honor in part to represent on the floor of this House by actual experiment last year determined the actual cost of building roads such as are designated in class C and found that the actual cost was less than \$30 per mile.

It is a matter of general knowledge that a good, well-constructed macadam road will cost from \$3,000 to \$6,000 per mile, and that a concrete road costs from \$6,000 to \$15,000 per mile. Keeping in mind the cost of these different types of roads for which it is proposed to grant Federal aid, let us examine the provisions of the bill to ascertain whether or not the Federal aid proposed is properly and equitably distributed so as to produce the best results, so far as the building of good roads is concerned. For roads that cost from \$6,000 to \$15,000 per mile to construct, it is proposed that the Government shall contribute for each mile of road so constructed the sum of \$60. For the class C road, or the ordinary dirt road, which costs not to exceed \$30 per mile, it is provided that the Government shall contribute toward the construction thereof \$15 per mile, or one-half of the entire cost of the road. The proposition resolves itself, therefore, to this: The Government will pay from one-half of 1 per cent to 1 per cent toward the building of concrete or macadam roads, the very best and highest types of highway—a permanent highway—but will contribute 50 per cent of the cost of the construction of dirt roads, or the poorest type of highway. This, too, in view of the fact that the dirt road is not permanent and the work must be done every year or two.

Mr. Chairman, my contention is that this principle is entirely wrong. Bad as this principle is, however, it is not the worst feature found in the bill. I am strongly in favor of good roads, and I favor the proposition of the Federal Government contributing toward the construction of good, permanent roads, but the proposition provided by section 4 of this bill makes it possible for the various States to take from the Treasury of the United States \$25,000,000 in a single year, and expend not a penny of it upon the highways of this country.

Section 4 provides that before the 1st day of March each year the governor of any State may file a statement with the Secretary of Agriculture, setting forth the number of miles and the locality of roads in such State which he claims to be in each of the three classes—A, B, and C. Thereafter the Secretary of Agriculture shall consider such statements and determine which of the roads therein mentioned are in such respective classes.

That at the end of each fiscal year the United States shall pay, on account of roads so determined to be in classes A, B, and C, as follows: On each mile in class A, the sum of \$60; on each mile in class B, the sum of \$30; and on each mile in class C, the sum of \$15. * * * That such payments of money made by the United States, as hereinbefore provided, shall, during the ensuing year, be applied to the construction, maintenance, or extension of the respective roads for which paid; * * * that if such sums are not so expended upon the construction, maintenance, or extension of said roads, respectively, during the ensuing fiscal year, then at the end of such fiscal year nothing whatever shall be paid by the United States on account of any road upon which there has been default in such expenditure.

This is the only instance where the Government of the United States does not see that something of value is received for an expenditure. In fact, this is the only instance that I can recall where the Government pays in advance for any public work or improvement, but here it is contemplated to pay out \$25,000,000 for work to be performed, as the bill states, during the ensuing fiscal year, upon certain roads which the governors of the various States shall designate as being in one of the three classes. In view of the fact that this is the only exception to the general rule that Government work shall be paid for when completed, what safeguards have the committee thrown around this fund to insure the United States that this money will be expended upon the highways for which the payment was made? By turning to the bill we find this language:

That if such sums are not so expended upon the construction, maintenance, or extension of said roads, respectively, during the ensuing fiscal year, then at the end of such fiscal year nothing whatever shall be paid by the United States on account of any road upon which there has been a default in such expenditure.

Instead of a provision that the money shall be returned to the United States it is proposed that \$25,000,000 per year be paid out on an estimate to improve certain roads during the ensuing year, and that if the money is not so expended, then nothing will be paid on account of the identical roads for the next year. The proposition is so framed up that the States can fool the Government once and secure \$25,000,000 for work on certain roads, and then not do the work; but in order to get \$25,000,000 for the next year it will be necessary for the governors of the various States to file with the Secretary of Agriculture a different list of roads, and the only limit that can be placed upon such a draft on the Federal Treasury is that there is a limit to the number of miles of highways in the United States. And all this is proposed in the interest of good roads.

Mr. SAUNDERS. May I interrupt the gentleman? He is under a misapprehension about that, and I will point it out to him in a minute. The right to receive that money, so far as the State is concerned, has already accrued by reason of the fact that for the preceding year it has kept those particular roads up to type; and this is just a requirement that the money it has earned by keeping the roads up to type shall be put into road improvement next year.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman is mistaken. The bill provides that at the end of the fiscal year the Government shall pay certain sums of money on account of roads that it intends to construct and maintain the next year.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Not at all.

Mr. GOOD. The entire structure of this bill—

Mr. SAUNDERS. Will the gentleman point to that feature of the bill which he thinks conveys that meaning?

Mr. WOODRUFF. The gentleman is pointing simply to section 3.

Mr. GOOD. I do not think that section 4 is capable of any other construction.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Will you point out the section of the bill that carries that meaning.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will turn to the latter part of section 4, he will find that it provides that on the 1st day of March of each year the governor shall file a statement with the Secretary of Agriculture, and that thereafter the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine the number of miles of road of each class it is proposed to build or improve.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The operations under section 3 are entirely distinct from the operations in that section of the bill from which you are reading. They have no relation whatever.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I have been reading from the bill and I do not see how any other conclusion can be drawn.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will say to the gentleman that he read from the portion of the bill that relates to expenditures under

classes A, B, and C type of roads, and which does not relate to expenditures under section 3.

Mr. GOOD. If my statement to the gentleman was that I was reading from section 3, it was in error. I have no contention with the committee with regard to section 3. It contains the best provisions found in the bill. What I am complaining about is the provisions found in section 4, and in order that there may be no misunderstanding with regard to what section 4 contains—for I contend that its provisions are not only foolish but even vicious, opening up the road to gross frauds on the Federal Treasury—I propose to insert in my remarks section 4 of the bill. It reads as follows:

SEC. 4. That certain roads in the States which are adapted to use by the United States as rural post roads shall be divided into three classes to be known as class A, class B, and class C.

Class A shall embrace roads upon which no incline is steeper than is reasonably necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, well drained, with a road track composed of macadam or other material of equal utility and cost, constructed and maintained in such manner that it shall have a smooth, firm surface.

Class B shall embrace roads upon which no incline is steeper than is reasonably necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, well drained, with a road track composed of shells, gravel, or a proper combination of sand and clay or other material of equal utility but less expensive than macadam, constructed and maintained in such manner that it shall have a smooth, firm surface.

Class C shall embrace roads upon which no incline is steeper than is reasonably necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, with adequate drainage and ample side ditches, with a roadway constructed so as to quickly shed water into the side ditches and kept crowned and compacted by dragging or other adequate means so that it shall be reasonably passable for wheeled vehicles.

That on or before the 1st day of March in each fiscal year the governor of any State may file in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture a statement setting forth the location and the number of miles of roads in such State which he claims to be in each of classes A, B, and C, respectively; and if such State have a State highway department then his said statement may be accompanied by a report from such State highway department showing the total number of miles of roads in such State in each of classes A, B, and C, the location of such roads, a description in detail of their physical features, the material, manner, and, as far as may be, the cost of their construction and the manner and cost of their maintenance.

That the Secretary of Agriculture shall consider such statements and determine which of the roads mentioned therein are in class A, which in class B, and which in class C, and make a report of his said determinations to the respective governors, filing such statements, on or before the 20th day of the following June.

That no charge shall be made for so considering and determining such statement of any governor if the same shall be accompanied by a report from the State highway department of such State as hereinbefore provided; but in all other cases there shall be deducted 10 per cent of the amount which shall be payable on account of the roads in such State under the provisions of this act.

That at the end of each fiscal year the United States shall pay on account of the roads so determined to be in classes A, B, and C, as follows: On each mile in class A the sum of \$60, on each mile in class B the sum of \$30, and on each mile in class C the sum of \$15: *Provided*, That if in any State the aggregate of said sums would exceed the amount which for that fiscal year has been apportioned to such State under this act to be expended under the provisions of this section, then said sums per mile shall be reduced pro rata so that their aggregate shall not exceed said amount.

That nothing whatever shall be paid by the United States under the provisions of this section for any road which does not clearly come within the requirements of class A, B, or C, as hereinbefore defined.

That such payments shall be made, to such officers of the respective States as the governors thereof shall designate as being entitled to receive the same, by the Treasurer of the United States upon warrants drawn upon him by the Secretary of Agriculture.

That such payments of money made by the United States as hereinbefore provided shall, during the ensuing year, be applied to the construction, maintenance, or extension of the respective roads for which paid, and that in addition thereto the State or civil subdivisions thereof shall, during said ensuing fiscal year, expend in the construction, maintenance, or extension of said roads an amount equal to the amount so paid by the United States; that if such sums are not so expended upon the construction, maintenance, or extension of said roads, respectively, during ensuing fiscal year, then at the end of such fiscal year nothing whatever shall be paid by the United States on account of any road upon which there has been a default in such expenditure; that the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine whether such expenditures have been so made, and to aid him in such determinations that the proper officers of the State shall make such showing as he shall require.

I do not see how anyone interested in the real forward movement for the building of good roads can look with favor upon this section of the bill. I do not believe that section 4 will be retained in any good-roads law that is enacted by Congress.

It is a mistake to assume that by the enactment of a law granting Federal aid for highway construction our good-roads problem will be settled. The enactment of this or of any statute granting Federal aid will not solve the problem. Indeed, more will have to be done before good roads will be built throughout the country. Unpopular as it may seem, I firmly believe that good, permanent roads will only be a reality when the land adjacent to or in close proximity to good, permanent roads is assessed for a proportion of the benefit which the building of such roads will give to such land. The local authorities can not and will not alone build good, permanent roads in any State. The National Government can not and should not alone embark upon such a project; but I believe the final solution of this ques-

tion will be the joint action by the Federal Government, the State or local authorities, and the owners of the land that lies in close proximity to the permanent roads constructed. By such joint action we can eventually build a system of good roads throughout the country that will meet the demands of commerce and will be responsive to public sentiment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, when the question was first up as to paying money out of the Federal Treasury for good roads I was very much opposed to it; but my cooperation in favor of such legislation was always based upon the theory that we were going to lay down a fundamental law under which the States of the Union were to be given an opportunity to cooperate with the National Government in the construction of good roads. My belief was that we were going to propose a law that would work automatically and would prevent the States from getting money out of the Federal Treasury unless they really performed work. This bill, in my judgment, does not do that; and I could not under any circumstances vote for this bill.

This bill provides for the payment of the Federal money to the State treasurers before the States do any work whatever, and it does not require them to do the work at all. It only imposes a penalty to the extent that it refuses to pay the money in the succeeding year if they fail to expend the money that is given this year.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Does my colleague mean to have us understand that the Government of the United States shall appropriate a certain sum of money, to Illinois, for example, supposed to be for road purposes, and that the State of Illinois can use that money to pay for its militia or some other purpose?

Mr. MADDEN. It need not use it for any purpose unless it chooses, according to the terms of this bill. All that that State or any other State of the Union will be required to do under the terms of this bill will be to make available an amount equivalent to the amount paid by the Federal Treasury. The mere making of the amount available by the State does not require the State to expend what is available in order to get the money out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the construction of good roads, and I want to see them constructed all over the Union, and I would like to see the Federal Government cooperate with the States, but I want to see the Federal Treasury protected while the Government of the United States is cooperating with the States.

This is really a pork-barrel bill. It can not be considered in any other way. I have always feared that in the enactment of a law for Federal cooperation with the States in the construction of good roads we might reach a stage where political scandal would ensue; and if this law were to go into effect, nothing short of a political scandal from one end of this country to the other would ensue from its operation.

What we ought to do would be to lay down a principle with which every State must comply; and that principle ought to involve the expenditure of money by the State before the Federal Government cooperates. I assume that perhaps this bill will be amended in some such particular before it is enacted into law. But under no circumstances ought it to be enacted unless it is amended.

Why, I am astounded to think that these men who have been working so assiduously and patriotically for the purpose of building up the country by the construction of good roads, and the cooperation of the Federal Government to that end, have so far forgotten their duty to the people of the United States as to provide for the payment of money out of the Federal Treasury to the extent of \$25,000,000 in a single year without requiring the States to which the money is to be paid to expend one single dollar of that money in the construction of roads.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield to me again?

Mr. MADDEN. Surely.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Who places this money in the Treasury? Is it not the people of the respective States? Are they not getting back their own?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I had not considered it in that sense at all. If you are going to appropriate money for a given purpose it ought to be applied for that purpose and for no other purpose, and there is no excuse that can be made that will justify the payment of Federal money out of the Federal Treasury to the treasury of any State in the Union unless the provisions of the law have been complied with.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Previously complied with?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; previously complied with.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I am with you on that.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARTON] is recognized.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I am not at all surprised to see the Members representing city districts oppose this measure; neither am I surprised to hear it referred to as a pork-barrel measure. My experience here teaches me that a pork-barrel measure is a measure that distributes the people's money and benefits generally and uniformly throughout the country and a statesman's measure is one where just a few big cities get the direct benefits of the expenditures; and, quite naturally, the press representing these cities do not let a chance go by to emphasize the definition.

I did hope for once these Members would look over the high wall of provincialism that they have erected along their corporation lines and see the broad fertile country that feeds them, but of course am disappointed.

In the distribution of the revenues of the Government of the United States those living in the cities receive substantially 85 per cent of the appropriations made by Congress, while less than 15 per cent is appropriated for the direct benefit of those living in agricultural States, notwithstanding that at least half of the revenues of the Government is contributed by the people who live in rural districts.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] seems to see a great injustice in comparing the amount that will be received by Nebraska and Connecticut, their population being quite similar, Nebraska being apportioned \$506,250 and Connecticut \$218,750. I would direct his attention to the fact that the Government uses in Connecticut 6,437 miles of post road and in Nebraska 33,320 miles. To make equal and just apportionment for the roads actually in use by the Government, if there has been discrimination, it has been against rather than for Nebraska.

The road is a public highway, open to the world. The Government uses it to do its business. The joy rider from the city cranks his automobile and spins over mile after mile of the public road praising it here and condemning it there, but roads do not come without effort no more than do orchards, fields of grain, and other artificial improvements. Some one must do the work to build them and keep them in repair. This is and has been done in my State solely by the farmers.

When the railroads were pushed through this country subsidies were granted, which means that the entire people donated to build them, and we are to-day paying these same roads \$52,000,000 per annum to carry the mail; possibly this sum is not at all out of reason; but, sir, is it out of reason, if you please to so call it, to the farmers of this country to help them in their road building so long as the Government uses this mileage every day for her mail carriers?

Good roads benefit everybody. They not only make adjacent property more valuable but they enable the farmer to get his produce to market at a lower cost. They bring the city and country districts into closer touch with each other and more nearly than any other appropriation benefit the entire people.

Good roads and road building is one of the live subjects of to-day. Some of our States have already expended millions of dollars to keep in step with this march of progress, and the people of these States are proud of the improvements and achievements. Some contend that road building should be done solely by the States, but these same people would not advocate that States must take the entire financial responsibility of deepening adjacent harbors and dredging rivers. Their argument in its narrowness can only apply to roads which more directly afford benefit to the farming community and whose expense of building and upkeep has been solely by the farmer. These same advocates cry for a railroad in Alaska and for intercoastal waterways with an appropriation far in excess of this appropriation, but by all means this must not be made as the direct benefit is with the farmer and not with the favored classes. The Steel Trust will get none of this business; the big shipbuilders will not have a chance to figure on getting a big percentage; there will be no chance for the railroads to get a slice of the appropriation; the Army or Navy can neither one profit through this expenditure; big contractors will not be enriched; these benefits will go direct to the farmer. That is why I am for it.

I believe there are Members enough on this floor who are in favor of improving rural conditions to pass this measure, and while we know that the appropriation is small, the method primitive, we also know the appropriation is large enough to stimulate road building in the States, and when the matter is

presented each State will map out a plan that will ultimately result in a good-roads system throughout the Nation.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the principle of national aid to public roads, and am earnestly supporting House bill 11686, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri, Hon. D. W. SHACKLEFORD, chairman of the Committee on Roads, on January 16 of this year.

Eight years ago I introduced a bill providing for an appropriation by the Federal Government for this purpose. I thought at the time, and still think, that bill the most practicable one yet introduced on the subject. I desire to have it read at the Clerk's desk.

A bill (H. R. 146) to distribute the surplus in the Treasury of the United States to the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia for the sole purpose of improving the roads therein.

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury at the end of each fiscal year to take an account of all the funds in the Treasury of the United States, and after deducting from said sum the amounts required by law to be kept in said Treasury, the remainder, if any, shall be declared a surplus.

Sec. 2. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to immediately provide for the distribution of said surplus, not exceeding \$25,000,000 annually during the continuance of this law, on a per capita basis, to the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, to be computed from the last general census taken by the national authorities, and shall prorate the same accordingly for the sole purpose of improving the postal roads in said States, Territories, and District of Columbia, under such rules and regulations as the States, Territories, and District of Columbia may provide, and said Secretary shall immediately notify the governors of said States and Territories and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the amounts due each, and that the same will be paid over to such person or persons as may be duly authorized by said States, Territories, and the District of Columbia to receive and receipt for the same.

Sec. 3. That it shall be the duty of the governors of the several States and Territories and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make a full and complete report to the Secretary of the Treasury on the 15th day of November of each year what legislation, rules, and regulations have been adopted for the expenditure of said funds upon the postal roads, the manner in which the same has been spent, and the results accomplished. And it shall be the duty of the said Secretary to submit said reports to Congress on the first day of each regular session.

I have introduced this bill in every Congress during the past eight years. During the last session of Congress the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], and others made a study of all the bills that had been introduced on this subject, and as a result the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] introduced a bill very similar to the one now pending. The pending bill has received the strongest support of any measure of the kind yet brought before the House, and as it embraces the principles of the bill I have advocated for so long, and starts the work of national aid to public roads, I am heartily in favor of it.

Virginia will participate in this appropriation under section 3 of the bill and will receive \$591,250 annually. This section is as follows:

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with the officers of the several States having lawful authority in that behalf in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads; that between the 1st day of February and the 30th day of June in each fiscal year the Secretary of Agriculture and the officer or officers of each State having lawful power to act for the State may jointly consider and determine the roads in such State which, under the provisions of this section, may be constructed and maintained during the next fiscal year, and the material, character, and manner of such construction and maintenance; that such construction and maintenance shall be conducted under such supervision as shall have been previously agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and said officer or officers of said State; that in no case shall the United States bear more than one-half of the cost of the construction and maintenance of any road under the provisions of this section; that the Secretary of Agriculture shall not commence such joint construction of any road in any State until the portion of the cost thereof which is to be provided otherwise than by the United States has been made available.

Every argument is in favor of this proposition, and no substantial argument can be urged against it.

Undoubtedly the power of the Government to make appropriations for this purpose is ample and can be defended.

The power is expressly given to Congress by the Constitution "to provide for the general welfare," and the general welfare of the country demands at this time nothing so imperatively as it does a good system of public roads—a thing which we can never have without the aid of the Federal Government.

The exercise of this power to aid in the building of public roads is more than 100 years old. As far back as Jefferson's first administration Congress made provision for a national road from Georgia to New Orleans, which was completed during Jefferson's last term and of which there is a map in the Library of Congress.

In 1816 Henry Clay made a speech in advocacy of the construction by the General Government of an extensive system

of turnpikes and canals. He was ably seconded by John C. Calhoun.

At the next session of Congress, in 1817, Calhoun took the lead in advocating a bill to set apart and pledge the bonus of the national bank and the shares of the United States as a permanent fund for constructing roads and canals and improving the navigation of water courses.

In 1818 Clay made another speech on the subject of internal improvements, in which, after an elaborate argument upon the constitutionality of the subject, he discusses the great benefit of canals and turnpikes to the country. His remarks would apply to turnpikes at the present time. He said:

I think it very possible that the capitalist who should invest his money in one of these objects might not be reimbursed 3 per cent annually upon it, and yet society in various forms might actually reap 15 or 20 per cent.

And again he said:

Of all the modes in which a Government can employ its surplus revenue none is more permanently beneficial than that of internal improvements. Fixed to the soil, it becomes a durable part of the land, itself diffusing comfort and activity and animation on all sides.

Mr. Clay was an untiring and strenuous advocate of the Cumberland Road—the great national pike to extend from Cumberland, Md., to St. Louis. The bill for the first section of this road passed Congress March 29, 1806, which authorized the President, Mr. Jefferson, to appoint three commissioners to lay out the road from Cumberland to the Ohio River. This road had many ups and downs during successive administrations, but by the time railroads had begun to loom up it had been completed to Vandalia, Ill., at an expense to the Government of nearly \$7,000,000, a sum which meant then many times to the Government what that amount of money would mean now.

In the Eighteenth Congress Thomas H. Benton fathered the bill to lay out a road from the border of Missouri to the boundary line of the United States, and thence, with the consent of Mexico, to the frontier of New Mexico. In his 30 years in the Senate he attributed the waning interest in the subject to the application of steam to boats and railway trains. He uses the following language:

The progress of events has drawn the whole subject—the subject of a system of national internal improvements, once so formidable and engrossing the public mind—from the Halls of Congress and discussion of the people. Steamboats and steam cars have superseded turnpikes and canals.

Even great works accomplished by Congress at vast cost, after long and bitter debates, and deemed national at the time, have lost their character and sunk into the class of common roads. The Cumberland Road, which cost \$6,700,000, and was a prominent subject in Congress for 34 years, from 1802, when it was conceived, to 1836, when it was abandoned to the States. This road, once so absorbing the public money and public attention, has degenerated into a public highway and is entirely superseded by the parallel railway.

There is no real distinction, so far as the public good and welfare is concerned, between the aiding of public roads and the aiding of waterways, and yet our waterways and harbors have been aided to so colossal an extent as to dwarf and finally eclipse our equally valuable highways.

There can be no question of the popular demand for this legislation.

I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read a set of resolutions adopted by the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, of Cumberland County, Va., that well expresses the popular feeling on this subject.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOOD ROADS.

We, your committee on good roads, beg to report—
First. That we believe this to be the most important problem that confronts the people of the State to-day.

Development is what the State of Virginia needs above everything else, and we can not do this without good roads. This pressing need of the agricultural interests of the State demands prompt and heroic action.

Second. And whereas the National Government is using a large portion of our roads for handling the mails we earnestly solicit its aid in building the roads over which the mails are carried and urge that the National Government furnish liberal aid to the State and the subdivisions thereof.

Third. Resolved, that we heartily indorse the efforts now being made by our Representatives in Congress for said aid, and, further, that we will indorse and support only such men as are willing to do all they can to aid rural Virginia in securing better roads, and we also urge every possible aid to our highway commissioner in his efforts for the betterment of our roads.

Fourth. Our Government is founded on the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number of citizens, and since our Government has expended many millions of dollars on our rivers and harbors, of which we are justly proud, we now urge that some of these millions be turned into the good-roads channels, that the great mass of our people may be directly benefited thereby.

Our order is built and maintained on the one idea—cooperation—and we urge each and every member of our union to cooperate with the county, State, and national authorities in bringing about this consummation so devoutly desired.

And last, but not least, we urge our governor and the General Assembly of Virginia to use their good offices in formulating and enforcing laws for the building and maintaining all the roads of our Commonwealth in such manner as their local needs may require; and we further

urge that only competent men be employed in building and maintaining our roads, to the end that the public may get value received for its money.

A. B. JENKINS,
Secretary Cumberland County Union.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The importance of good roads is so apparent it will not be questioned by anyone.

The necessity for better roads in many parts of this country is the greatest need of the hour. The States and counties can not build them. The right kind of roads can only be built, and will only be built, when the National Government lends a helping hand. If we are ever to have a system of roads in this country to compare with those of the other enlightened nations of the world, they will have to be built by the aid of the Federal Government. If the agricultural communities of this country are ever to be thoroughly developed and made desirable as places of abode during all seasons of the year, it can only be done when the Federal Government has determined to aid in the construction of proper highways and turnpikes.

The cost of transportation is the vital question in all modern commerce. With the world's markets in which to dispose of our products, our success and prosperity is largely dependent on costs of carrying our products to these markets. The cost of carrying a ton 100 miles in England is \$2.35; in Germany, \$2.25; in France, \$2; in the United States, 72 cents, the cheapest freight rates in the civilized world, and we have very properly regulated them. On the other hand, the cost of moving our products from the farms to the railroad stations is from two to four times as much as it is in France or Germany. This part of the cost of transportation to the markets of the world is just as vital to our success and the development of our foreign trade as is the railroad freight.

All the progressive nations of Europe are giving national aid to their highways, while our Government is following the example of the South American nations, thereby imposing a burden of millions of dollars annually upon our producers; and a glance at the condition of the South American countries ought to convince us of the error of our ways. That land, so prodigal in its resources, is still more affluent in the number and availability of its waterways, and yet some of its important nations have burdened themselves with debts for railroads, which have weighted them down, while their domestic commerce is largely transported upon the pack-saddle.

What a different picture has been presented by the countries of Europe. A splendid system of roads has been inaugurated by those countries. The great Napoleon, following the example set by the Roman Empire, built an extensive system of roads through France, and now millions each year are expended by the French Government in keeping up these roads and making new roads. This work employs thousands of persons, and now they have 350,000 miles of well-paved roads. The central Government of England began to improve the roads in that country in 1835, and now \$15,000,000 is being expended yearly upon their roads. Macaulay, in writing of the condition of the public roads in England prior to 1835, gives a description of them that is applicable to our roads nearly 75 years later. He says:

The fruits of the earth were sometimes suffered to rot in one place, while a few miles distant the supply fell short of the demand. One general cause of the badness of the roads was the defective state of the law. Every parish was bound to repair the roads which passed through it, and thus a sparse and impoverished parish was often compelled to maintain highways between rich and populous towns.

The farming element in the country constitutes about 35 per cent of its population, and it is not fair or equitable to expect it, unaided, to build and maintain the public highways of the country. It creates the wealth of the Nation, which largely finds its way into the pockets of other people, and yet has been required, unaided, to maintain the highways of the Nation. It has produced an amount of wealth within the past 10 years equal to one-half of the entire national wealth, and though but little more than one-third of the population, it has contributed more than two-thirds of the amount needed to support the Government; and yet up to this time its just demands for aid in building a good system of thoroughfares has gone unheeded.

Let the farmer withhold his hand from the plow for two seasons and the grass will grow in your thoroughfares, barnacles and bilge water will rot your ships as they lie idle at your docks, cobwebs will festoon your counting houses, owls and bats will usurp your warehouses, your children will clamor to you for bread, and we will gather in this Chamber with pallor in our faces.

Who are the most trustworthy guardians of the Republic? Why, sir, those whose activities cluster around the home, whose virtues are those of the family, and whose patriotism springs from and is fostered by the rooftop. Such men are not blown about by every wind of doctrine, but are the ultimate and supreme hope for the conservation of our institutions.

It is but just that a class of our population which furnished so much of the greatness of the Nation and to the support of the Government, and hitherto has gotten so little from the National Government, should receive all the aid that can be given to it constitutionally.

While the country has advanced in area, in population, and in wealth, and along all lines of science, trade, and industry, no advancement has been made in the condition of our roads in many sections of the country during the past 100 years.

The statement of the average cost of transportation from the farm to the railroad which I made a few minutes ago demonstrates what an immense financial advantage a good system of roads would be to the farmers of this country. And of vital and pressing moment to the national welfare is the fact that a good system of roads would check the tendency of the people to leave the farm and go to the city. The drift has taken from the farm much of the bone and sinew essential to a successful carrying on of our agriculture. It is producing an unhealthy congestion in large centers of population. The problem of getting young men to go back to the country from the cities and those already there to remain in the country is growing graver every day. The State and Nation alike have been wisely contributing to the advantages of the country as a place of residence. A more extensive system of schools is being inaugurated each year. Circulating libraries are doing much to add to the comfort of country life; the rural free delivery of mails and the parcel post make a great and permanent inducement to such a life. How these advantages would be enhanced by a system of good roads every intelligent man can see. Every mile of turnpike would secure to the farmers on both sides what political economists call "the unearned increment" just as the proximity to the railroad or the church or the schoolhouse does; and with the main permanent thoroughfares in good condition more time and heart would be given to the farmer to improve the plantation road. The wear and tear of his team, which is his capital, would be greatly lessened. The increase in value of his land would be greatly increased. The development of a neighborhood with such thoroughfares would proceed in geometrical ratio.

Our great cities are augmenting their population in an accelerated ratio. Some day, without warning, they may tell a tale of disaster, and then there will be no escape or refuge save in the immunity, the stability, and the conservatism of the country.

Let the General Government foster this great enterprise not only at the behest of justice but of wisdom. For whatever confirms or strengthens the agricultural interests performs the same for every other interest. Upon the strength and security of the farmer rests the integrity and security of the Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, five minutes is not a very lengthy time in which to discuss this bill. I am very much interested in the subject of good roads, but I do not see that this bill is going to do anything toward the accomplishment of that object. It appropriates \$25,000,000 out of money that is not in sight. We had a deficit in the revenue last month of \$12,000,000, and the deficit is likely to be a great deal more than that at the end of the year. But even if we had the money, I think it would be simply throwing it away to deal it out under the provisions of this bill.

We have expended in our State altogether some \$125,000,000 in recent years in State, county, and town in the construction of highways, and we have spent the most of it to good advantage.

It is true that in the last three years there has been some graft, amounting to \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000. That perhaps does not count in the present administration of affairs, under which our State has been laboring for three years. It is a small percentage on the \$125,000,000. A good deal of it has been spent to good account. But, Mr. Chairman, it costs from \$6,000 to \$12,000 a mile to build a good road in our State. We have been spending that money for the trunk lines. The automobile has created a great deal of interest in the construction of roads, and it is most destructive to good roads. We have found that we have had to spend about as much more money per mile in from three to five years in repairing the good roads that we have already built. We have had some good results by county and town cooperation in good roads. When we got the proper sort of a man to give his personal attention to it, even the old turnpike, such as they used to build, has been improved upon, and it answers very well if you can keep the automobile off from it, and the farmers now have a good deal better show to get

to market. I do not know but \$60 a mile would amount to perhaps one-hundredth part of what these good highways cost, and might be a drop in the bucket, but it would be a mere drop. I understand the object of this bill is to create an interest where there is no interest in roads, and I understand that a great part of the country has little or no interest in roads, but they want to get in and ride the National Government to build highways. They are always willing to do something at the expense of the National Government.

I remember when we had irrigation before the House they were to spend in each State in irrigating an amount equal to the amount that accrued from the sale of Uncle Sam's lands within the boundaries of that State. If we adopted that rule, New York could get quite a sum out of this bill. Instead of a million and three-quarters we would get some seven or eight millions. That would help a little in the construction of our highways, but it would be only a drop in the bucket. We are not asking the country at large to build our roads or to do things for us. When we want a highway we build it. We commenced nearly 100 years ago with the Erie Canal, and we have spent \$200,000,000 on it. You may say, "You spent it for yourselves." No; we did not. Every farm that can get its produce to the Great Lakes system of waterways is benefited by our Erie Canal in the way of reduced freights and has been for years past. [Applause.] You say, "We are spending money to improve your rivers and harbors." Well, you are spending very little in New York compared with its immense commerce. Take the Hudson River, with more commerce than any other river in the United States for the same length, how little you spend upon that. If you will give us the rivers and harbors in the State of New York, and keep out of them and let us have them, we will pay you back all the money you put into them, and we will go on at our expense and improve these rivers and harbors and we will save money by it, because we will get good rivers and harbors then instead of dividing up the money among the congressional districts. That sort of legislation is the vice of this bill. Gentlemen think because they will get a few paltry dollars for their districts that it is going to help somebody in the next election, and there are so many people in Congress who are hanging on by the gills that, of course, it is no use to talk against such a bill as this. It is breath uselessly wasted; it is time spent in vain. I know how you will vote. I will not say that these words of mine are like casting pearls, or anything of that kind, because that would be a reflection upon the House or upon some individual.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I suppose so. I have only five minutes. I understand that there are very few of us who are opposed to this sort of thing.

Mr. FESS. I understand the gentleman to suggest that we are voting for this bill because it will assist us in our election. I wish to inform the gentleman that my district went against the Ohio good-roads proposition last year two votes to one.

Mr. PAYNE. I think, then, if \$50 or \$60 a mile, spent on any of the roads in that district, will help to create some enthusiasm there for good roads, perhaps it may do good in that district. [Applause.] It may help to educate the people in that district, and the Lord knows they need education if, in this enlightened day, they are voting against the good-roads proposition.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman does not want all my time. I will yield again for a question.

Mr. FESS. The district in which I live may need education, but we have seven colleges in that district.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman does not ask any question. He simply states a proposition and interrupts. I think that is hardly fair, when I have only five minutes in which to talk about this great question. There is no doubt that it is a great question in this country. It will do the people an immense amount of good to have good roads. I am in favor of good roads. I should like to see some sensible way of getting them.

We have come to the conclusion in our State that we can not make roads that will not need repairing, replacing, and rebuilding, at a cost equal to the first expense, in five years, and we have got to cover them with brick or some other hard substance that the automobiles can not break up and that heavy loads with narrow tires can not break up, in order to have a durable road. How many of them are you going to build with a contribution of \$60 a mile or \$15 a mile, or any such sum as that? Of course, the proposition is preposterous. Why, you have spread this thing out so thin that the design of it is too apparent to every man in the district. When they see that you are putting into roads \$60 a mile, they will say, "How many

votes are you going to get on that mile of road with that \$60?" [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I do not like graft. I do not like to accuse anybody of graft. It is not graft. I know how people are led into it. They want to come back here, and they want to do things that are popular. Why, we have never been able to break up this appropriation for seeds, because gentlemen thought it helped to elect them. I have always voted against it, and I have gone into my district and told them so; and some of my colleagues here have asked me how I dared oppose the appropriation for seeds when people wanted them. I told them I hoped there was not a voter in the district who could be bought with 10 cents' worth of seeds. I told the people in the district that, and they thought that was right. They do not like this petty graft. They do not like this petty sort of business. If we are going to build roads, let us build roads. Let us face the proposition. If we spend \$125,000,000 in New York and we have not yet got the roads, but have only got fairly started, how many billions are you going to spend in the United States? Face the music. Face the proposition, and do not begin with a \$25,000,000 appropriation from a bankrupt Treasury.

A revenue law! A revenue law that does not produce revenue, which is the usual sort of a Democratic revenue law. There was a Wilson bill of 1894, and now we have the Wilson bill of 1913, all operating in the same direction. Oh, but they say they are going to make it up out of the income tax. Under the law of 1909 we were getting more than half as much as you expect to get under the income tax, and you have simply continued that tax on corporations as a part of your income tax.

Gentlemen, have a care. Listen to what my colleague the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, says about your voting these enormous expenditures. In addition to having a deficit in the Treasury do you want to make it heavier? In addition to a deficit in the revenue do you want to extend it by voting larger appropriations? How are you coming out at the end of the year? Have a care, gentlemen, \$50 or \$60 a mile may not compensate for the deficiency you will have for the present year. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] or any of us on this side need be disturbed with regard to the sources of income for these proposed expenditures. We are not responsible for the condition of the Treasury. If there should be a shortage, it can not be charged to us.

Mr. Chairman, when the proposition contained in section 4 of this bill was before the House some time ago I voted against it. I have always had very serious doubts as to the advisability of the Federal Government going into the work of constructing or helping to construct roads in the States. I have very serious doubts in regard to the matter now; but I am convinced that, no matter what I or other gentlemen think about it, the people of the country have made up their minds that they are going to have more aid than they have had hitherto from the Federal Government in the matter of internal improvements. Many think that the people want us to build railroads in Alaska, and will so vote. Larger appropriations for rivers and harbors and for the Mississippi River, not only in the interest of navigation but for the protection of the lands along that stream, will be asked and granted.

The sooner we face squarely that feature of the proposition as regards the Mississippi the better it will be for our consciences if not for the Treasury. I am inclined to think that we ought to do these things for the valley of the Mississippi.

Whether we deem it wise or not, the people are going to insist that the Federal Government shall in some way or other assist the people of the States in the construction of highways. I am going to vote for this bill, amended as I hope it will be, with some mental reservation, in view of my belief that the people generally demand legislation along the line of Federal aid in road building.

I have no doubt that the bill is faulty in some of its details, and if it has such faults as have been pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois and others, I think those faults can and should be remedied. It seems to me, however, that we must put some faith in the honesty and integrity of the State officials in whose hands the money is to be placed. It would not take long to remedy the situation if in any given instance it was discovered that the moneys were not being used and expended for the purpose contemplated.

I think, however, the bill ought to be amended in some respects, to which I wish to call attention in addition to the possi-

ble need of amendments that have been suggested by others. At the proper time I shall propose an amendment, beginning on line 9, page 1, and extending to line 6, page 2, inserting in lieu of the language stricken out the following:

One-third in the proportion which the total population of such State bears to the total population of all of the States; one-third in the proportion which the total number of miles of rural post roads in use in such State bears to the total number of miles of rural post roads in use in all of the States; and one-third in the proportion which the total area of such State bears to the total area of all of the States.

This is the paragraph that fixes the basis on which the moneys are to be apportioned. The bill now provides that the money is to be apportioned one-half on population and one-half the length of the rural mail routes. My proposition is one-third in proportion to population, one-third in proportion to miles of post roads, and one-third in proportion to the relation that the total area of each State bears to the total area of all the States in the Union.

An amendment of that sort will give some of the States having very difficult road problems at least a sum sufficient to make a beginning. If the gentlemen will read the estimated apportionment under the bill as it now stands as given by the committee in its report, they will notice how utterly inadequate and ridiculous is the sum that some great Commonwealths would receive under the bill unless it is amended.

I shall also propose an amendment after the paragraph ending on line 9, page 4. This paragraph, which the proposed amendment follows, is the paragraph that provides that the States shall pay half of the expenditure. My amendment is as follows:

Provided, That States having within their borders public lands, reserved or unreserved and untaxed, shall only be required to pay such proportion of one-half of the cost of construction as the lands in private ownership in such States, and taxable, bears to the total area of the State, and the remainder shall be paid by the United States.

There are States in the Union in which only 20 to 25 per cent of the lands are in private ownership, where the citizens of the State must build roads over mountain ranges and country of difficult construction and secure the funds for such construction by the taxation of less than 20 per cent of the area. There are roads in my State, many miles in length, that pass over public lands almost exclusively.

If one will note how little the great public-land States would secure under this bill, he will understand the propriety, the necessity, and the justice of some such amendment as I have suggested. We should not be required to pay for the construction of the roads over and adjacent to the lands which we can not tax. When the National Government is proposing to assist in road construction, the General Government, which is proprietor of these lands, should, it seems to me, bear its fair proportion of the amount required. I shall propose these two amendments at the proper time, and I hope that they will be adopted. If they are adopted, it will greatly benefit States like California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Arizona, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, Wyoming; to a lesser extent States like Arkansas, North Dakota, Wisconsin, and Minnesota; and to a still smaller extent a number of States that I have not mentioned. The effect of the last amendment I have suggested would be to increase the amount which my State would receive—about \$35,000—and even then we would receive of the \$25,000,000 proposed to be appropriated less than \$80,000 to be expended in an area of nearly 90,000 square miles, containing several mountain ranges, over which our roads must be built.

The first amendment I have proposed is one that would give us the amount of the appropriation which the great extent of the Western States entitles them to, and would increase by a large sum the amount due a State such as I have the honor to represent here. If both amendments were adopted we would be in position to build our needed roads rapidly.

It will be necessary to amend the bill in some such way as I have suggested, if in its operation it is to be at all fair to any of the great public-land States, and even as thus amended it will not put the mountain States on a parity with the other States of the Union, because of the very great cost of road construction in such States. It will at least put those States in much better position than they would be under the bill as it now stands.

By unanimous consent leave was granted to Mr. MONDELL to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ANSBERRY].

[Mr. ANSBERRY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, when the resolution came to the Rules Committee for the establishment of a

roads committee, I remember that I took the opportunity to state that I believed that proposal was in contradiction of the fundamental principle of the Democratic Party; that such internal improvements are beyond the scope of the Federal Government and should be made by the States. Objection was taken to that statement by a number of Democrats, but I believe all will admit that there is in this proposal an instance of the contradictory principles of the party at the present time. The Democratic Party in its history has shown that it is opposed to a system of internal improvements by Federal authority, and that it believes in the National Government keeping its hands off every effort of a similar nature. The Republican Party might fundamentally be in favor of this proposal, and yet that grand old party leader, that grand old man from the New York State [Mr. PAYNE], has taken the floor this afternoon and has bitterly opposed this proposition. It seems to me the people of this country have a right to demand a consistent policy from their political parties. They have a right to say that parties shall be built on principles instead of on interests. When the Democratic Party is divided on the fundamental idea of this proposal; when the Republican Party is divided on it, it looks to me as though the people might well refuse to follow such leadership. Parties have been in favor of it, in their platforms, from expediency, but at the present time there is a sharp division between party members. The Progressive Party has taken a stand on this proposition as a part of its fundamental principle that this Nation is an entity, not a group of sovereign States, and that the Federal power is the agency of all the people to be used in promoting the common welfare.

Therefore the Progressive Party can rest on a fundamental principle and say that it favors national authority over the highways of the Nation. Good roads are necessary for the common welfare, as every one has admitted in this debate. There are two and a quarter million miles of roads in this country, and only 10 per cent of that number is improved. The cost of transporting a ton of freight over them is 23 cents a mile, according to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART]. I have figures that it costs the average farmer of this country on an average load of a ton over an average haul of 12 miles \$3, which is a little more than 23 cents a ton-mile. It has been proven that that cost can be cut down from \$3 to \$1 by improving the roads of this country. That would mean a saving of \$375,000,000 on the 250,000,000 tons of farm products that are hauled over the roads every year. That means a saving of at least \$20 for every family in the entire Nation, a clear saving in the cost of living of \$4 for every man, woman, and child by an improved system of good roads. So the good-roads question enters into the great problem that is before the Nation, a problem that is greater than any issue, and that is how the average man can make his income equal his expenditures for the necessities of life, with the very best possible margin left for his improvement and culture and development. The proposal in this bill to improve roads by Federal aid is good, without doubt, but it seems to me that the bill introduced in the House by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], House bill 10401, would much better meet the public will. The principle of that bill is that the Post Office Department should have charge of this, with rural mail carriers made the inspectors of the roads and commissioned to report as to their construction and maintenance.

Mr. Chairman, any plan adopted should be simple and practicable. It should be such as will induce the local authorities to assist in construction and maintenance and it should provide for an equitable apportionment of funds among the States. These requirements are met by the Woodruff bill to a much greater degree than this measure under consideration. I hope that the features of the Woodruff bill may be incorporated into this legislation, and I shall take pleasure in supporting amendments with that end in view.

If that can not be done at this time, this bill should receive hearty support, for its purpose is right and its tendency is right. It means improved roads for the Nation, and, as Emerson says in his essay on "Civilization":

When the Indian trail is widened, graded, and bridged to a good road, there is a benefactor, there is a missionary, a pacificator, a wealth bringer, a maker of markets, and a vent for industry.

Good roads may, perhaps, be a benefit to the farmer primarily, but anything that benefits the farmer in this country benefits everybody. I believe that I can voice the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the people of my district, one of the great centers of population, when I say that they favor a system of good roads throughout the country. The tremendous tonnage of the Pittsburgh district—168,000,000 tons a year—is larger than that of any other four ports in the world. It is largely traffic over railway and waterway, but the people there

know that there is another highway of commerce just as important as either, and that is the roadway. They favor any just step which will bring the necessities of life to the consumer from the producer, with the least possible expense and with every unnecessary burden removed. Good roads will help to do that in a very large degree, and for that reason this measure is commendable and worthy of support.

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

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT].

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, this bill, in all its complications, brings up the question of what are proper subjects for Federal expenditure and for what purposes we should raise Federal revenue. One party comes in promising economy in Federal expenditure; another party comes in with a similar appeal; meanwhile we have decided that we ought not to extort by an oppressive tariff or other indirect methods of taxation burdens which, levied by the Federal Government, shall be heedlessly disbursed. We believe in leaving a man's earnings in his own pocket, except as the National Government and the national defense shall call upon him for contribution; for other contributions his State or its suborganizations should make the charge. We all believe in good roads and know the economic benefit accruing from easier hauling, and therefore from cheapened distribution, but whether this bill provides a sane, coherent system of road building and as to whether road building should be initiated by the Federal Government, these are questions to be considered here and now.

Under private tenure of land good roads primarily mean the enhancement of land values. Everyone knows that whenever anyone plans a subdivision and puts in street improvements he does it with the object of raising the price of the land and of making a profit not only on the land but upon the improvements. Such improvements are frankly for his personal profit and not for the public welfare. In the same way most of the money that the Federal Government might expend for good roads under this bill would inevitably go to the benefit of the landowner. It may be well to benefit the landowner; it is doubtless a good thing to cheapen hauls; but, in my opinion, we ought to go carefully and slowly and determine whether or not this vast expenditure will not inevitably become vaster and vaster as time goes on; whether, once started, it will not be a perennial grab bag, an increasing pressure on candidates for office. There is no end to the ultimate amount of it, and we should be more than careful to determine when and how or if at any time we should aid any State, county, city, or town in conjunction with private interests to assist in road building. We should carefully consider whether Federal aid should be extended to regions where the Federal Government is the chief landowner, as in the State of Wyoming, and in such event should pay the Federal portion, just as we should require the individual landowner under private ownership to pay his portion.

We are brought to a consideration whether under our ideas of municipal charters and municipal home rule and under county charters and under our doctrine of State rights such a bill as is proposed is more than a cheap waste of public funds, a negation of corporate self-respect. It seems to me that this money thus to be appropriated will be wasted, will be thrown in the air and allowed to blow where it will, will be sown broadcast in scatteration and inefficiency, to the disgrace of Congress and all of its Members.

In one way the bill is better than the bill which was introduced in the last Congress. It provides two alternatives—one that there must be the cooperation of the States; and then, in section 4, we find that cooperation is not essential; and we also find that an appropriation may be made out of the Federal Treasury and not necessarily expended at all. It is a frank case of local graft, a proposition to hand over to local authorities a Federal subsidy without any certainty that the money will be properly applied, and with the absolute assurance that the amounts are utterly inadequate to the alleged purposes for which they should be applied, without sufficient reference to the question of who owns the lands, who is the real beneficiary, or as to the jurisdiction under and by whom the money shall be spent for road purposes.

To my mind this bill will furnish a supreme test of the courage of the House. We all know that the hope of this tangle of financial chaos and indiscriminate subsidy for unorganized mud and dust rests in the breasts of Congressmen who look for reelection to the thoughtless among their constituents. It is not a good-roads bill; it is a bill for Federal subsidy to private and local interests.

It is a pork-barrel bill, pure and simple, promising limitless areas of future bacon. No man can vote for it without a vision of an adversary who will outpromise him, and so on till the receivership of the Republic.

I hope when the time of test comes that the Sixty-third Congress will prove itself braver than the Sixty-second Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS].

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this bill is any particular test of courage. I think it is rather a test of common sense. [Applause.] If there is one question before the whole country to-day that is of huge public interest, it is that the country have good roads. [Applause.]

Now, it seems to me that this bill, in giving the option to the States as to the method in which this proposed appropriation shall be expended, is very wise. If you should talk in our State of Pennsylvania about spending \$15 or \$20 a mile on the roads, it would be considered impractical nonsense. For four years I tried to get the State commissioner of highways there to adopt a brick road. Finally we persuaded him to build a short section of that kind of road, and it has been so thoroughly tested out that now there is a very large sentiment in favor of brick roads, which cost anywhere from \$12,000 to \$20,000, perhaps, per mile.

This bill, as I understand it, avoids all questions of sectionalism. There is no room for questions of States' rights or Federal control, as has been suggested. The Federal Government admittedly has the constitutional right to carry the mail, and this implies, of course, the right to build post roads, and the plan of joint expenditures by State and Federal Government is plain business common sense. That would be one of the first things a business man would suggest. The Government can, under section 3 of the bill, make this expenditure in concert with the State authorities. Up in Pennsylvania, I understand, we would get about \$1,500,000 out of this appropriation, which would not be required to be expended, under section 4 of the bill, at the rate of a few dollars per mile, but the engineers of Pennsylvania and of the Agricultural Department could get together and adopt a plan of improvement of roads, and expend that money in whatever way they wished, either for the improvement of the dirt roads or by building brick or macadam roads. This could be done at the option of the State under section 3.

Now, in my opinion, the improvement of the dirt roads—the township roads—is of far more importance than the building of great boulevard turnpikes, and the improvement of the dirt roads, where a small sum of money—\$15, \$20, or \$30 per mile—expended by the Government, the State expending an equal amount, would improve those roads greatly.

And I do wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that, having studied the bill H. R. 10404, introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], I think the method advanced there of improving the dirt roads is really a great improvement over the bill introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD]. It seems to me so thoroughly well thought out, and meets so many of the objections that have been presented here as to the operation under section 4, that I believe it would be preferable.

Mr. SAUNDERS. May I interrupt my friend? That very system that you refer to could be put in operation in the State of Michigan under section 3 of this bill.

Mr. HULINGS. I was going to say that under the laws of some of the States that could be done, and I am satisfied that section of this bill could in some places be put into operation with many of the advantages of the Woodruff bill; and I am sorry that this House does not have the privilege of considering a bill that meets all the objections raised here, and which is of itself a fine tribute to the intelligence and the broad mind of its author, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]. But I am in favor of this bill, Mr. Chairman, not because I think it is the very best bill that could be devised, but for the reason that it is a step in the right direction, and especially because under section 3 there can be such joint effort between the State and Federal authorities as to the kind of road and the manner of building as they in their joint wisdom may decide.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DERSHEM].

Mr. DERSHEM. Mr. Chairman, if there is one subject that we should be more interested in than another, it certainly is good roads, and I believe that nearly everyone is interested in this matter. Until recently, probably ten or twelve years ago, roads were built by the townships and counties in Pennsylvania, but a

few here and there were at one time constructed and maintained by the State. However, most of the supervision and building of the roads in Pennsylvania was left to the townships and counties, with the result that very little, if any, improvement in methods of road building was made for many years.

The State highway department of Pennsylvania was established in 1903 by an act of the general assembly approved April 15, which was reenacted, with amendments, by an act approved May 1, 1905, which authorized the department to co-operate with the several counties and townships, and with boroughs in certain instances, in the improvement of public highways and the maintenance of improved highways, and provided for the application to the department of counties and townships for State aid in highway improvement and maintenance, and also provided for the payment of the cost of highway improvements made under the provisions of the act by the State, the counties, and townships. Further amendments were made by an act approved June 8, 1907. These acts and amendments were repealed and the department reorganized by the act approved May 31, 1911, which act authorizes a system of State highways to be constructed and maintained at the sole expense of the Commonwealth, and also a system of State-aid highways, in the construction of which the State cooperates with the counties and townships, and in certain instances with boroughs, the State paying fifty per centum and the county and township twenty-five per centum of the cost. The State will maintain all State-aid roads and collect fifty per centum of the cost thereof from the respective township or borough in which the road may lie.

This plan embraces about 8,000 miles of roads in Pennsylvania, which are to be constructed and maintained entirely at the expense of the State, and it has been said that the cost would be about \$150,000,000 when the 8,000 miles of roads are completed.

The State has taken over a large portion of these 8,000 miles of roads, and is now maintaining them, but the money has not been provided for their improvement, as had been anticipated.

An amendment was proposed to the constitution, providing that the State borrow \$50,000,000 for the building and maintaining of permanent roads. This was defeated at the last general election, not because the people did not believe that this plan was feasible or because they did not want good roads in Pennsylvania, but because they were opposed to the State going into debt, and for various other reasons, which I need not mention here, the amendment was defeated.

Now, I am heartily in favor of the Shackelford bill, not because of the financial assistance it will give to Pennsylvania in the building of roads, but because of the encouragement that it will give to the good people looking toward the betterment of their public roads.

I would like to say the master of our State grange, Hon. William T. Creasy, is strongly in favor of this bill. The Pennsylvania department of agriculture has gone on record as favoring it by passing resolutions, a copy of which have been forwarded to me, together with a letter, signed by N. B. Critchfield, Secretary State Board of Agriculture, which are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Harrisburg, Pa., February 2, 1914.

Hon. FRANK L. DERSHEM,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Inclosed find copy of preamble and resolutions passed by the Pennsylvania State Board of Agriculture, in annual session in this city January 28-30, which is self-explanatory.

Anything that you will be able to do to assist this proposed legislation will meet the approval of this board and, I believe, the approval of the agricultural interests of this State.

Very truly, yours,

N. B. CRITCHFIELD,
Secretary State Board of Agriculture.

The following preambles and resolutions were adopted by the Pennsylvania State Board of Agriculture, at its regular annual session held at Harrisburg, Pa., January 28-30, 1914:

Whereas Pennsylvania, at the last election, clearly demonstrated that she believes in a system of business roads leading from the farm to the market town, railroad station, school, and church on the "pay-as-you-go" plan; and

Whereas a bill now in Congress, known as the Shackelford road measure, provides aid for the various States for the improvement of roads by granting \$60 per mile for macadam, \$30 per mile for gravel, and \$15 per mile for earth roads, yielding annually over \$1,000,000 as Pennsylvania's share: Therefore,

Resolved, That we urge that each individual Congressman and Senator representing the Keystone State support by their vote the passage of the Shackelford road bill.

Resolved further, That we indorse the action of Congressman DERSHEM and others in the loyal support they are giving the measure in their Committee on Public Roads.

Resolved, That the secretary be directed to forward copy of these resolutions to the Members of each House of Congress from Pennsylvania.

In the latter part of the fourth section of the Shackelford bill you will find this provision:

That such payments of money made by the United States as hereinbefore provided shall, during the ensuing year, be applied to the construction, maintenance, or extension of the respective roads for which paid, and that in addition thereto the State or civil subdivisions thereof shall, during said ensuing fiscal year, expend in the construction, maintenance, or extension of said roads an amount equal to the amount so paid by the United States.

My understanding is that, by this provision, a township, borough, county, or the State will receive national aid for the maintenance and improvement of roads or streets by complying with certain conditions, thereby giving us better roads without additional cost to the local community.

The vast possibilities in the development of good dirt roads traversing the rural districts, an important factor in our rational scheme of development, are virtually neglected. It is vital that, while search is being made for a durable type of expensive construction, experts should learn how to maintain economically the dirt roads, which must carry a traffic as important to the public as that of the main arteries of travel.

Gradually there has been an awakening, not only to the need of good roads in this country, but also to the fact that millions of dollars are being wasted every year in having untrained men direct the work of highway improvement. We are coming to understand that dependence upon scientific principles is as necessary in the construction of even our earth roads as in the construction of the great bridges, buildings, and machinery which mark the progress of our civilization and prosperity.

We know that a good surface is not the only requirement for a good road; and, furthermore, in this country macadam roads, although common, constitute less than three per centum of the total road mileage, owing to the comparatively high cost of construction. Until recently a road appeared to be a very common, ordinary kind of structure, and not worthy of much forethought and experience in its design, either as to grades and alignment or to drainage and surfacing, but to-day good road building is a science.

There are over 2,000,000 miles of unimproved roads in this country. It can not be expected that the United States Government will itself undertake the immediate improvement of all these roads, but it is certain that the Government must lead the way. The expenditures necessary to improve all these roads will be enormous, and therefore it would be the work of the Government highway engineers and scientists not only to direct the improvement of a certain proportion of these roads, but also to devise methods of building highways more economically and with better surfaces for the future to an ever-increasing degree, so that the farmer may have easy communication between the farms on one hand and the towns and railway stations on the other, that he may market his crops at less expense, and the dweller in the towns and cities may get from the farm products more easily and at less cost. For this reason, if for no other, a general system of roads radiating from the towns and railway stations out among the farms would be of advantage to all.

Mr. KENT, Mr. GOOD, Mr. HULINGS, and Mr. WEAVER, by unanimous consent, were granted leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in the first place, I wish to say that in my judgment the people of the United States who are interested in good roads owe a debt of gratitude to the chairman of this committee [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] for his untiring efforts to bring about this legislation. [Applause.]

There is no doubt but that this bill is somewhat crude, and probably contains some inconsistencies, and that it will perhaps be difficult to administer and perhaps will result in some mistakes of administration. But the subject of good roads is a great subject, and to write a law on the subject that would be perfect is, I think, beyond the power of any man in this Congress. I want to say frankly that I attempted, with my feeble ability, to draft a good-roads bill and I soon found that it was a most difficult task, and one which I gave up, at least for the present.

I am in favor of legislation of this character, and my principal reason for favoring such legislation is the fact that the Federal Government is reaching out and usurping all the fields that are possible from which to gather revenue. Not being content with levying duties upon imports and collecting such money as might be raised from internal revenue, the Federal Government has proceeded to levy taxes upon the corporations

of the country, and now we have an income tax, and I presume the next thing will be an inheritance tax. It is very evident that the Federal Government is making an attempt to gather all the money that is possible from taxation into the Federal Treasury, and in my judgment, in justice to the taxpaying public of the respective States of this Union, the people are entitled to a return of a portion of that money, that will be expended in such a way as will result in benefit to the people of the respective States. [Applause.]

Unless this is done, unless we get some of the money back with which to construct highways and other things that are essential for the welfare of the people of the States, and unless the money gathered here is to be expended on other objects than increasing the military strength of the country, increasing our Navy, and increasing the number of officeholders and squandered in that way, leaving the burden entirely upon the shoulders of the people to pay the money that is raised by direct taxation upon their visible and tangible property, the time will soon come in this country when the burden of taxation will be so great that revolution will be the ultimate end of the matter.

But if the Federal Government will treat the States justly and the people from whom they collect this money with equity and justice, so that the people derive some benefit from it, I am satisfied it will meet with general approval.

This money that is going back, as I suggested to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]—this money that is gathered in the Treasury and sent out to the respective States to be expended on the highways—is their own money. They have put it into the Treasury, and why should they not have a part of it expended in their interests and for their welfare?

I think, Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say at this time.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FRANCIS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FRANCIS] is recognized.

Mr. FRANCIS. Mr. Chairman, it would be futile to undertake to discuss a momentous question like this in the short period of time that is allotted to me; but I want to say this: That we have here a bill which seeks in an equitable manner to distribute to the 48 States of the Union a part of the revenues of this Nation, which will do more good to more people than any other expenditure of money attempted by this Government. [Applause.]

Our State of Ohio has taken the most advanced grounds for the improvement of highways of any State in the Union, and great credit is due to our good-roads associations, State administration, and the press, and especially to that excellent publication, *Better Roads*, edited by Mr. Jesse Taylor, of Jamestown, Ohio, which has done so much to pull Ohio out of the mud.

We have already provided for the construction of good roads. We have authorized the levy of one-half mill on every dollar, to be expended in the construction of market roads, and have raised an annual fund of about \$3,500,000. The amount which this bill will give to the State of Ohio is \$1,295,000. Our State has therefore practically provided for its public highways; but I feel an interest not only in the highways of the State of Ohio, but in the establishment of a uniform system of highways for all the States of this Union. [Applause.]

This bill proposes to extend Federal aid to each of the States of this Union in the building and maintenance of public post roads. We have built roads in our Territorial possessions, Alaska, the Canal Zone, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, and we have now come to the conclusion that we should benefit the people at home by extending aid to the roads which are being used and established by the Postal Department of our Government in the carrying of rural mails; and we all agree that this will have a direct effect to benefit the farmer and rural communities, by improving their condition and agricultural advantages and by advancing the interest of the church and the school, upon which so much in our Republic depends, in preparing and fitting post roads for the delivery of packages and parcels, and in the dissemination of knowledge to the farming and rural communities by the delivery of rural mails.

The unanimity with which this bill is received by the House, by all political parties, seems to me more of a ratification meeting upon this subject than anything else. The people from every corner of the United States have been urging and advocating a system of good roads. We have over 5,000 good-roads associations in advocacy of the principles we stand for, and there seems to be no contention as to the benefits which will be derived from them; and there is no longer any contention as to the Government's right under the post-roads clause of the Constitution, to construct or maintain them.

We are following the express terms of the Democratic platform as adopted in its last two national conventions, where we

declare in favor of extending Government aid to the States for good roads.

The enthusiasts for good roads have been advocating three principles for their construction. The first, and what I would call the most reasonable, is to extend Federal aid to the roads used for the carriage and transportation of United States mails, namely, rural routes; the second, is to extend Federal aid to the construction and maintenance of roads radiating out from a common center, to be known as market roads; and the third, is that advocating a system of roads of principal thoroughfares, or roads leading from ocean to ocean.

When we carefully consider this bill, its terms ought to satisfy any enthusiast on any of these propositions, so far as his theory is practical.

This bill provides for the expenditure in any one year not to exceed \$25,000,000 for the construction and maintenance of post roads, and it expressly provides an equitable manner of distributing this, which shall be calculated from two very reasonable bases. The first is half the sum of money that any such State receives from the Government shall be computed in the relation its population bears to the whole population of the United States; and the other half shall be computed from the relation the miles of rural roads in any such State shall bear to the whole number of miles of rural roads in the United States. These, added together, shall constitute the amount that any State shall receive under this plan in any year.

Section 3 provides, among other things, that this sum may be expended in a half-and-half plan; the State to which it is given shall contribute at least, and have ready for its use, half of the money to be expended in this way upon its highways; but this expenditure shall be limited to rural-route roads, and this money, or any part of it, at the option of any State, may be expended under the provisions of section 4, which defines the different classes of roads and fixes a standard for their construction and provides a payment of a certain amount for each class at the end of each year, providing they have been kept up to that standard.

When we consider the amount which may be thus paid to each State, it is easy to see that it will amount to about the sum that each State would pay into the United States Treasury by direct and indirect taxation and that we are giving them out of the United States Treasury nothing more than they are supplying to it; and therefore this bill, when analyzed to its finality, has no more effect than to systematize and standardize the post roads of the United States and to induce and compel a construction by a uniform system.

It occurs to me that this bill should be amended in one particular. Last year when the good-roads bill came up for consideration in the House there was a great question which committee of the House had authority to report the bill, and it was brought upon the floor by a special rule. The Agricultural Committee assumed to have this authority, and to avoid any further contention in the present Congress and in order to satisfy the great demand for road legislation we deemed it necessary to formulate a committee known as a Committee on National Highways.

In reporting this bill the committee has based its authority on the post-roads clause of the Constitution, and are extending the aid to post roads alone; but instead of controlling the same within the Postal Department of the Government this bill gives the Agricultural Department the whole supervision of the system.

Now, if this is a matter solely within the Agricultural Department, surely the Agricultural Committee would have been the proper committee to retain and report such bills; but I think it is very patent to anyone here that inasmuch as the whole authority is derived from the post-roads clause of the Constitution, and that the roads to be aided, improved, and maintained in order to facilitate the Postal Service is additional cause why the Post Office Department should make and manage such roads. From this it follows that surely the Postmaster General should have the authority to control the detail work required under this bill and to control the expenditures of this money, and I think the bill should be amended so as to conform to this idea.

As I have shown that in the working of this bill it gives nothing to the States that the States have not already contributed to the General Government. I think it will occur to everyone here that some direct means other than those already known should be devised for the raising of funds for the construction and maintenance of post roads, for their maintenance and upkeep is a more serious and important question than their construction. Every public expenditure of the Government is upon the theory that the public receives in return some benefit, directly or indirectly, in proportion to the amount contributed, and on

this theory the present bill has more direct benefits to the people than any other that could be proposed.

We are just now considering the advisability of the Government taking over and operating the telegraph and telephone companies of this country, and it has been demonstrated that it would be impractical to take either one of these without taking the other, because they are used jointly and their wires are performing the same service; that while we are using the long-distance telephone there may be transmitted a telegram over the same wire at the same time; and therefore if we should take over the one we would be obliged to take over the other also. These corporate privileges have been extended to telegraph and telephone companies by the State governments, and the effect of them has been to purloin from the Postal System in an indirect way almost all the advantages it had in the matter of carrying the lighter mails; that is, letters conveying information. These companies perform exactly the same service as does the post office in the carrying of intelligence and information from one person to another. This has been practically the cause of driving the post office into the carrying of heavier matters so that it might subsist, while the cream of its business has been absorbed by the telegraph and the telephone; for every telephone message is simply a 2-cent stamp exacted from the Government, because the communication would have been transmitted by mail were it not for this new and more improved service. We have therefore licensed by corporate charter a system which has had the direct effect to undermine the Postal System at the expense of the public. This is something that the people should own and have the full enjoyment of.

I see no reason why these great rural post roads of our country and our post offices should not be made a means of conveying this information by telegraph and telephone, so that the people might get the full benefits of what is justly due them. The highways will be a right of way for the lines and our post offices for the operators. The profits arising from them, at a fair charge, would build and improve all the highways in the country required by this bill. It would give rural communities the advantage of the cheap service, and every farmer, mechanic, and laboring man in the United States could have a telephone at a nominal cost, and the cry of "back to the farm" would lose its empty sound and an inducement be held out for man to return to that industrial sphere for which he was created, "to till the soil."

We have just passed in Congress the Smith-Lever agricultural extension bill, aiding States in establishing and maintaining agricultural colleges for the advancement of the farmers' interests.

We are now considering the enactment of a rural credit system whereby our agriculturists and small home owners may be permitted to borrow money at the lowest possible rate of interest and without exaction. These are matters which have been urged by many of our agricultural societies, granges, and farmers' unions, and we can see in this the hope for the future prosperity of our Republic.

Our great cities are incidents of the greatness of our agricultural resources only. Our gold mines furnish a medium of exchange for these products. Factories change these products of the field and forest for the comfort of man. Our railroads and other transportation companies carry the products from the farm to the factory and back to the people; but back of all this progress and prosperity stand the broad acres of 48 States of the Union, and the sheaf of wheat, shock of corn, and bale of cotton are the fountain sources of our national prosperity and wealth.

Good roads will reduce the cost of transportation on the highways from 28 cents per ton per mile to 8 cents, will add untold wealth to farm values and facilitate the transportation of the farmer's products, and result in the dual benefit to the producer and the consumer, the farm and factory. The interest of the farmer, miner, and manufacturer are interdependent. The laborer, in whatever capacity, will be benefited by the enactment of this law.

Do you want to assist our farmers and rural communities to educate their children? Then remove that lake of mud which lies in the children's road between their homes and the schoolhouse. Do you want to assist our rural churches? Then take a few millions from battleships and in the interest of "peace on earth, good will toward man" give it to the farmer's road, so that his family can have a pleasant Sunday morning's ride to church instead of wading through the mud.

Do you want again to see the cattle upon a thousand hills, plains, and vales, and the grain waving in the summer sun? Then aid the farmer in better roads and he will again take his place in the field—back to the farm—and rise up and call this Congress blessed.

Owing to the wretched condition of some of our country roads there are women and children who are veritable prisoners in their country homes, mud bound for months at a time. Is it any wonder that they desire a change from this situation and seek the conveniences of city life?

We are glad to see that a ray of hope for them is seen in the present Congress, and that the rural mail routes will be improved so as to develop civic pride throughout the Union.

The heavy burdened rural carriers and star-route carriers must have roads brought up to such degree of perfection as will meet the requirements of the great service they are performing. We have by legislative enactment changed their work from mail carrier to mail and freight carrier without increasing their compensation to meet this increased burden which we have put upon them. We must help them in this matter to better pay on a scientific basis and by building roads which will not be a disgrace to the Postal Service and to our country, for, in the language of the poet philosopher—

A fierce and bitter storm's abroad; it is a bleak, midwinter day, and slowly o'er the frozen sod the postman's pony picks its way. The postman and his horse are cold, but fearlessly they face the gale; though storms increase a hundredfold, the farmer folk must have their mail. The hours drag on, the lonely road grows rougher with each mile that's past, the weary pony feels its load, and staggers in the shrieking blast. But man and horse strive on the more; they never learned such word as fall; though tempests beat and torrents pour, the farmer folk must have their mail. At night the pony, to its shed, drags on its cold, exhausted frame; and after supper to his bed the wearied postman does the same. To-morrow brings the same old round, the same exhausting, thankless grind; the journey over frozen ground, the facing of the bitter wind. The postman does a hero's stunt to earn his scanty roll of kale; of all the storms he bears the brunt—the farmer folk must have their mail.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

[Mr. FOWLER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that some gentlemen who favor this bill are frank enough to advocate it as a scheme for the distribution of the public revenue in their districts. In fact, this scheme of appropriating \$35,000,000 for Federal aid to roads in all parts of the country is one of the most preposterous schemes for looting the Treasury of the United States ever devised. It out-porks any pork-barrel proposition ever before propounded, and its possibilities of future pork are limitless. How many miles of roads have we in this country? Something like three or four billion miles. That is the chief reason why almost everybody is for it, an incidental reason being the strong advocacy of certain manufacturing and contracting interests. Gentlemen say this bill is in the interest of the farmers. Of course it is, if the farmers do not mind being robbed of a few millions more than the benefits can possibly amount to. I have heard gentlemen argue with every appearance of entire sincerity that a boulevard from Montreal to Miami would be in the interest of the farmers, and that an asphalt road from New York to San Francisco, which could be built at some such trifling cost as a couple of hundred million dollars, would be in the interest of the farmers. I suppose that now and then a farmer could be found bold enough to venture on such a road after having taken out a special accident policy.

Mr. Chairman, there has been more "bunk" uttered on the floor of this House for home consumption "in the interest of the farmer" and more humbug advocated "in the interest of the farmers" than there have been crimes committed in the name of liberty, and that is perhaps one of the chief reasons why farming has ceased to be a highly profitable industry.

Of course gentlemen will say, and have said, that this bill is not a scheme for building asphalt pavements or macadam roads exclusively. It is ostensibly a plan to help the construction of post roads—roads over which the rural-delivery carriers have to travel. In my opinion, if a portion of the money were appropriated for justly earned increases in the compensation of the rural carriers, they would get over the roads all right.

To carry and deliver the mail is a function of the Federal Government—

Says the report of the committee which has this bill in charge—

and it is the duty of the Federal Government to provide itself with the facilities necessary to a proper performance of this function, such as postmasters, post offices, and post roads.

Quite so. And our Democratic friends are now endeavoring, with a good deal of heartburn, to provide the postmasters. That sentence in the report furnishes the clew to the whole scheme. Not everybody can be appointed postmaster, but nearly every locality can get a little slice of this \$35,000,000; and what an

army of inspectors will be required for the purpose of finding out whether the roads are up to the standard! How many disappointed post-office aspirants can be taken care of in this way!

Mr. Chairman, I shall be accused of being in opposition to this so-called "good-roads" proposition because I represent a district in the State of New York. Well, I think that would be sufficient reason for opposing it if there were not other better reasons. New York has one-tenth of the population of the whole country, and will receive about one-twentieth of this fund. New York pays about one-third of all the Federal taxes of this country, something like two hundred million and odd dollars, and will receive under this bill the paltry sum of \$1,700,000. New York has good roads now and is entirely capable of taking care of them without asking any aid from the Federal Government.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] in answering a question has compared the building of roads by the Government to the dredging of the Ambrose Channel in New York Harbor. It has been pointed out by my colleague [Mr. PARKER] that the States control the roads and that the Government controls the harbor, and it has also been said by my colleague [Mr. PAYNE] that if New York is given full control of New York Harbor and its revenues it will do its own dredging and pay back to the United States every cent ever expended on its harbors or rivers for the past century inside of a single year.

Mr. SAUNDERS. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. PLATT. Certainly.

Mr. SAUNDERS. What revenue does the Federal Government get from New York Harbor or the Ambrose Channel?

Mr. PLATT. It gets several hundred million dollars revenue collected at the port of New York.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That revenue could be collected elsewhere. New York does not pay that revenue.

Mr. PLATT. If the vessels could be induced to enter some other harbor, the revenue could be collected elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is entirely unnecessary, because the people everywhere are awake to the advantages of good roads and need no help. If the National Government wants to raise the standard of post roads, it has only to insist upon better roads as a condition precedent to the establishment of rural or star routes and the response will be immediate.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with some of the others who have spoken, that the bill introduced by my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is fairer and safeguards better the distribution of the pork than this bill, but I see no necessity for distributing any pork. If the States can not take care of their own roads without help and dictation by the Federal Government, the time is pretty nearly at hand for the abolition of the State governments as useless and expensive encumbrances on the taxpayers. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I believe that whatever provision this bill makes for State aid it should provide for the turning over of the revenues and having them expended, under Government supervision, through the regular organizations of the State. I believe it would be a mistake for the National Government to undertake to take over the control of these roads, for the reason that should the Government fail to make appropriations the local organizations which had learned to depend on the Government would be left helpless, without funds for maintenance.

The maintenance of these roads is more important and difficult, in fact, than the securing of funds to construct them in the first place. The old National Pike is an example of the neglect of the Government to maintain a road after it had constructed it. As soon as the Government ceased to make appropriations for that purpose the States permitted this great highway to go into decay. It seems to me it is absolutely important that the local road organizations keep full control of these roads and of this fund and that the work be done under Government supervision.

I am heartily in favor of the provision in this bill for aid to dirt roads, because I believe that in the Western States, where the territory is extensive and the population sparse, it will be impossible to secure permanent highways, and the small appropriation that the Government will make for the purpose of encouraging these local organizations in maintaining these roads will be an immense stimulation to them for that purpose.

It seems scarcely necessary any longer to make an argument in favor of permanent wagon roads. We have passed that stage of the subject, and the only question now is to agree upon the method of construction and maintenance. The question is, Shall the local road organizations bear the whole burden, or shall the State and Nation lend a helping hand? The public highways belong to the people—all the people—but as a matter of fact

they have generally been paid for by the landowners living contiguous to them. There is no good reason why the burden of constructing and maintaining a public highway should fall wholly upon the people living within its immediate neighborhood. All the people are directly or indirectly benefited by the road. The State should pay a large part of the road tax by way of State aid to counties, and counties, in turn, should either take over the roads and maintain them or employ a road engineer to supervise their maintenance through local road districts of the county.

The States should aid counties, for the reason that the large corporate industries of the State that live directly off of the products of the farm should bear their share of this burden. The great railroads, packing companies, grain companies, and so forth, of the State of Nebraska all deal almost exclusively in farm products, and at the present time they bear little of the burden of maintaining public highways. It would be a good investment for them to have better wagon roads, and they know this and are ready to pay their share of the taxes. The farmer has not generally favored State aid to counties because he has not quite understood it. He has felt it meant more taxes for him to pay, when, as a matter of fact, it means that a portion of the burden the farmer now bears will be shifted to the corporations, that now pay little, if any, road tax.

The National Government should aid the States in road building and maintenance, because there are hundreds of thousands of people who are directly benefited by good public roads who have no opportunity under our present system of taxation to contribute to them. But when the Government aids the States for this purpose every man pays his small share to the support of the roads of the country over which his foodstuffs are now moved. In fact, his road tax may turn out to be an investment instead of a tax, because the cost of marketing will undoubtedly be decreased, and as the cost of marketing is decreased production will be stimulated, and in the end the small tax paid by the individual indirectly in the form of tariffs may reasonably be expected to be offset by the decreased cost of marketing and increased production.

The National Government has given many millions of dollars to cheapen water transportation by improving rivers and harbors. It has given hundreds of millions of acres of public domain to aid in building railroads, all in the interest of cheaper transportation. The last big project, the Panama Canal, costing \$400,000,000, is about completed. Congress was right in doing for the commerce of the Nation what individual enterprise could not do, and when it takes up the matter of Government aid to States for good roads it will have taken a step it should have taken long ago.

The Alaskan railroad may be and probably is an undertaking for the National Government, but I submit that to appropriate \$40,000,000 to build a railroad in frozen Alaska for the benefit of fifty or sixty thousand people before we give aid to a hundred million people at home is not good practice. We have built permanent roads for the barefoot peoples of our island possessions, a canal for all the world, and now propose a \$40,000,000 railroad for Alaska. The first two projects I had no opportunity to vote upon, but the Alaskan project will certainly not get my support at the expense of the good-roads bill. This Shackelford road bill provides for \$25,000,000 to be expended for the benefit of a hundred million people. The Alaskan project calls for \$40,000,000 to be expended in building a railroad in a land that has been frozen 200 feet deep since the dawn of time, and only about 60,000 people, half white, living in it. It may be worth the investment, but I am insisting upon the needs of the people who pay the taxes being attended to first, then if we can develop Alaska profitably no one should object.

It is true that the small sum that the National Government appropriates to the States will not go far in itself to build roads, but will do wonders in stimulating the States to action, and as the States act they in turn will stimulate the smaller subdivisions, so when the money appropriated by the National Government finally gets down to the road district it will have grown to be a tremendous amount in the aggregate for the whole United States. It will be the first step toward a perfect system of roadways throughout the farming centers of the United States, and with these roadways will go better schools, better churches, higher grade of citizenship, and greater food production. In fact, good roads are inseparable from a high order of citizenship. A country without good roads is invariably barbaric. Which is the cause and which the effect I do not know, but history proves that they always go together.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. JACOWAY].

[Mr. JACOWAY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY].

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of this bill Federal aid in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads is to be extended to the States and their civil subdivisions. We on this side of the Chamber who champion its passage are not unmindful of the fact that this is a reversal of the policy of the Democratic Party. The immortal founders of that great party opposed Federal aid for internal improvements. Parties, however, like people, change with changing conditions. The Federal Government has constantly widened the field from which it gathers its revenues until literally it may be said that a taxgatherer now stands at every man's door, and the people demand that some returns be made to all the people for these vast revenues collected. Commerce and manufacture have for more than a century received benefits from the Public Treasury in the way of aids in transportation, and the farmer, who has been a liberal producer, should share at last in the benefits. The Federal Government should not extend its aid to the people engaged in trade, manufacture, and mining and deny equal opportunities, aid, and assistance to those engaged in agriculture.

You who oppose the bill have assigned many reasons for your opposition, but in fact only three have been advanced that challenge serious consideration. First, you deny that the General Government under the Constitution has the authority to make the appropriations. The answer seems obvious and clear. Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution grants to the Government the power to establish post offices and post roads, and with that grant unquestionably goes the power to appropriate money for that purpose, and this we take to be an expressed warrant for our advocacy of this measure.

The second objection, that it is unjust to a part of the citizens, namely, those who reside in cities and larger towns, and who, by the expressed terms of this bill, are prohibited from participating directly in its benefits, are unjustly dealt with; that this is class legislation. If this charge be true, the bill is indefensible, because every citizen of this great Republic, rich or poor, white or black, is entitled to exact justice. He should not be compelled to bear burdens for others. No tax should be laid upon him simply that a revenue might be produced to favor other classes. No one admits this more readily than I.

Briefly, let us examine the facts to see if this charge is well founded. For a hundred years appropriations have been made from time to time from the general revenues to improve the navigation of rivers and for the construction and maintenance of harbors along the lakes and sea, in aid of commerce and trade, so that people engaged in manufacture and trade might have a cheap and secure method of transporting their goods and wares from the initial points to the place of consumption. The beneficiaries of this have justified the Government's action by saying whatever adds to the general prosperity of the country benefits all the people thereof. We have accepted in good faith these declarations, and no one has seriously complained that the Government has extended this aid. From time to time discriminations have been made in favor of American shipping, in order to encourage the building of ships by our people, and to induce them to engage in trade and commerce across the seas. Under the same theory that it adds to the general wealth of the people, grants of millions of acres of lands and millions of dollars of public money have been made to railroads to induce their construction and operation so that commerce and development might be carried on in all parts of the Union. Certainly the farmer enjoys least of any the benefits to flow from this policy, because in a peculiar way his transactions are local and his trade confined to a narrow circle. Now, for the first time in the history of this country some substantial recognition is taken of the peculiar problems that are his, and governmental aid is proposed to be extended him hereunder that has been due him, but long delayed. Why, it has been asserted here on the floor of the House during the discussion of this bill, and not denied, that the cost of moving a ton of produce over the ordinary country roads is 30 cents a mile, and that with improved highways this cost would be reduced to less than 10 cents a mile.

In other words, more than two-thirds of the cost of marketing the products of the farm and the forest can be lifted from the shoulders of the farmers by the improvement of country roads. Certainly no other appropriation, for any purpose whatever, has carried such great benefits in proportion to the amount of money actually required to make the improvements. Nor will this benefit be entirely his own. If it would, it might be unfair to extend it, however great the necessity, because it would be unjust to tax all the people that a benefit might be conferred upon any particular class or portion of the people.

And, as said before, the people of the cities and larger towns are expressly precluded from any direct participation in the benefits of this measure, but indirectly they certainly will receive benefits from this appropriation, because the people of the cities and towns are dependent upon the farmer for whatever they eat and wear; and, therefore, whatever cheapens the cost of production or transportation of these necessities of life will necessarily be shared in by the people who consume the articles produced or transported. Without question one of the causes of the high cost of living, of which we now hear so constantly and so much, is due to this very problem of transporting the products of the farm to the communities that consume them. Therefore, is it not apparent that the charge of injustice and discrimination lodged against the measure is without foundation, and that this is not class legislation?

The third objection, and, in my judgment, the most serious one, is as to the best method of extending aid, granted the Government has the authority and owes the obligation so to do. The greatest criticism has been leveled against this feature of the measure, and the greatest criticisms of all have been aimed against sections 3 and 4 of the bill. One gentleman, in giving notice of his intention to seek to amend these sections, and especially section 3, said that States like his own State of Kentucky, that had no State authority for dealing with highways, but left each county to pursue whatever policy it might choose, would be denied any help under the bill, unless the counties or civil subdivisions of the State might be granted the power to deal directly with the Federal Government. If that contention is true, the measure should be defeated, because I take it that no one who loves his State and believes that the States are independent sovereigns, as I do, can ever consent that the General Government shall be granted the power to go within the State and deal with lesser subdivisions thereof. To concede the Federal Government this right would be to legislate the States out of existence. It would be a surrender of the last vestige of the right of the State, a deathblow to its sovereignty. I shall never accede to this doctrine, and if Federal aid to public highways must come only by the surrender of this right, I prefer to have no Federal aid for this cause whatever. But, in my judgment, a careful reading of these sections, especially section 3, will show that no such condition or necessity can arise. To me it seems perfectly apparent that the provisions therein contained make it plain that the State may act for any subdivision and secure for the subdivision that part of the appropriation to which it might be entitled under the provisions of this bill.

Of course I realize, and I hardly think anyone else entertains a different opinion, that no State—and I know this is true as to my own State—will be able to procure the maximum amount authorized under this provision immediately. In fact, the bill intends to promote the construction and maintenance of good roads, not alone by Federal assistance and Federal construction, but by stimulating the localities to be benefited to act in their own behalf and to urge the States themselves to put forth greater activity in order that larger and ever-increasing contributions may be obtained from the Federal Government. This is both just and wise, for if all its benefits might be derived by a State, or the subdivisions thereof, without making any effort upon its part, the result would be perhaps a tendency toward inaction and neglect upon the part of the State, and finally the Government would become the sole contributor toward the construction and maintenance of public highways. Many have expressed the belief that the Government should take over the highway system of the country, ignoring the States; that the Federal Government should be the owner and operator of all the highways. No greater misfortune, I think, could ever occur, and I oppose it, and shall continue to do so. I commend this bill especially, and the chairman of the committee that drafted it, for leaving with the States all the right and authority over their highways. I am willing that my own people, and shall insist that people of other communities, shall bear a part of the expense and enjoy the full control of this great blessing, and the framers of this measure have wisely so constructed it to stimulate the localities in building and caring for their own roads.

Another feature that strongly commends the measure to me is the fact that under its terms Federal aid will not be extended in the construction of one or two interstate highways useful principally to the owners of automobiles and to tourists, but of practically no value to the people of the State. On the other hand, it looks to the improvement of local roads; to the building and maintenance of highways that are actually used by the farmer in reaching his market with his produce. It seeks to build up in every section of the country practical roads for the people of that particular locality, and while the amount appro-

priated is not large, nor all of that will be available under the present condition of our roads, yet it is a sufficient fund to encourage permanent road building, and I hope within a few years it will be followed by larger appropriations for this purpose.

The maximum amount under this bill that my home State could receive would be \$388,750 annually, or a little over \$5,000 for each county therein. Under the present development of our roads that it would receive even a half of this amount is hardly to be expected. I do believe, however, that, stimulated by its provisions, in a short time we would be entitled to enjoy the maximum benefits of the bill. I think the measure should appeal to the sense of fairness, the love of right, and the desire to be of assistance, of every Member of the House. I shall vote for it, and trust it will pass.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BALTZ].

Mr. BALTZ. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss for a few minutes the question of good roads which is proposed in House bill 11686 and which is now before this House, and which I think is of great importance to the well-being of the people of our whole country. This important subject needs no argument, as it is self-evident. It is the universal demand of the people of this country that the Federal Government give aid for the building and maintenance of good roads.

Federal aid for good roads in the various States of the Union is directly in line with the policies recently inaugurated by Congress and the administration. In my opinion, nothing will tend to the betterment of conditions, especially in agricultural communities, as much as improved highways. It is needless here to recount the advantages which will accrue from the enactment of this bill. The efforts already put forth by the States themselves in this direction are living evidences of the benefits derived, and with Federal aid these benefits will be doubled. I believe the people have the right to expect that the Federal Government will assist in movements such as this, which are of nation-wide importance and which virtually have taken on the dignity and the scope of interstate movements. Nothing of recent times has so impressed itself upon the favor of the people, and one of the great departments of the Government has investigated the subject from every standpoint, and by voice and pen has urged the construction of these highways and encouraged the people to believe at least by implication that the Congress took an active interest in the movement. Such being the case, I am surprised that any opposition whatever should show itself to this bill. The measure is drawn on correct lines. It shows no favoritism to any State, and is just in every particular.

The hand of the National Government thus extended to its people is an encouragement to greater patriotism and greater effort on their part. The knowledge that our Government stands behind us in all good works and is willing to see that our efforts are furthered and assisted will cause us to realize that to be an American means something and that behind that term stands a tremendous force willing not only to accept our aid and our strength but to lend to us its help in all good works.

I have heard it intimated here that this bill is in the nature of "a pork barrel." It is no statesmanship which creates such a charge nor is it patriotism which sounds it. Were this measure to be defeated on this indictment, what then would become of our public-building policy or our river and harbor improvement? Any law making appropriations for the country at large or for certain sections of the country has been subject to this criticism and probably always will be, but not from the fair and open minded. There have been abuses to some extent in these bills in the past; there will probably be some in the future, because favoritism and political expedience will in rare instances overbalance the judgment of those who have in charge these measures. But the general results attained have added not a little to our prosperity and our growth, and most of the appropriations extended have been born of necessity and relieved situations which justified them.

The measure now under consideration and for the enactment of which I appeal, is not one which will justify suspicion in any regard. It is so drawn that no favoritism can be shown so far as the Government is concerned. If abuses grow from it, those who abuse it will be answerable to their State governments, not to us; therefore I favor this bill. I hope and believe it will pass this House with little opposition, and I believe its enactment will benefit the people of this country more than any like measure ever written on the statute book. This measure has my hearty support, and I shall vote for it in the consciousness that my action will meet with the approval of my constituency. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty sympathy with the Shackleford good-roads bill and support it with great satisfaction. My vote for the Sherwood pension bill and the vote I expect to cast for the Shackleford good-roads bill will be the two votes of which I will be most proud as a Member of this body.

Mr. Chairman, I have long been an advocate of good roads. I am not a recent convert. My record on this question is well-known in my district, and especially in my home county. I have the good fortune to be possessed of a farm back in Ohio, and I am glad to say it is the farm upon which I was born, and still more pleased to say the farm upon which my father was born and has always resided upon. I want to give notice now that I expect to absent myself to attend the ninetieth birthday celebration of my good old father on that old Buckeye farm on the 19th day of this month. [Applause.] I am now paying special assessments on my farm for three pikes, which I gave my best influence to secure. I pay these taxes cheerfully, because I am a believer in good roads and am willing to help pay the freight.

Ohio is giving much attention to the building of pikes and the improvement of the highways. Some portions of the State are now practically all piked. This bill, in my opinion, will be a great incentive to not only the people of my State, but to every other State. It is what the people have been demanding for years, and the people are at last getting recognition. Why this Government can appropriate thirty to forty million dollars annually for rivers and harbors, as it has been doing for many years, and then deny Federal aid for post roads on the grounds that it is unconstitutional I could never understand. If we have the right under our Constitution to appropriate for one purpose, then we have the right to appropriate for the other. The same argument is as good for one as it is for the other. More than 75 Members have already spoken in favor of this bill during this general debate, and I am glad to say none of the constitutional experts have so far raised their voices in opposition on that ground. The light is breaking in at last.

This bill provides:

That the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, may aid the States and the civil subdivisions thereof, in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads in an amount not exceeding \$25,000,000 in any fiscal year; that the portion thereof which may be expended in any State in any fiscal year shall be determined upon the following basis, to wit: One-half in the proportion which the total population of such State bears to the total population of all of the States, as shown by the next preceding Federal census; and one-half in the proportion which the total number of miles of rural post roads in use in such State bears to the total number of miles of rural post roads in use in all of the States, as shown by the report of the Postmaster General at the close of the second quarter of the last preceding fiscal year.

Upon this basis Ohio will receive as its share of this appropriation \$1,295,000. Ohio has 2,538 rural routes, with an average length of 23.80 miles, or an aggregate length of 60,406 miles. In addition there are 171 star routes, with an average length of 6.76 miles, or a total of 1,155 miles. The grand total is therefore 61,561 miles traversed by the rural and star routes in Ohio.

In all of the States there were in operation on December 1, 1913, 42,961 rural routes, with an aggregate length of 1,042,477 miles, or an average length of 24.27 miles for each route. At the same time there were 12,257 star routes, with an aggregate length of 156,477 miles, an average of 12.76 miles for each star route.

The estimated number of miles of highways in the United States is 2,250,000 miles, of which 416,888 miles are used as post roads. This bill divides these post roads into three classes, to wit:

Class A. All waterbound macadam roads or roads with a more expensive of more durable surface, 52,585 miles.

Class B. All roads built of gravel, shell, or proper combination of sand and clay, 161,790 miles.

Class C. All improved earth roads with adequate side drains, compacted, with crown smooth surface and well maintained, 222,513 miles.

Class A will be entitled under this bill to \$60 per mile per annum, class B to \$30 per mile, and class C to \$15 per mile. Objection has been made to this bill because the best improved roads are to receive the most money. I believe the bill is right. The people who have expended the most to improve their highways should receive more encouragement than the less improved roads. Federal aid along this line will be an incentive to build more of class A roads.

Mr. Chairman, this is legislation in the interest of the class who contribute more to the support and prosperity of our country than any other class and have received less—the farmer. Of the billion or more dollars appropriated annually by Con-

gress very little of it filters back to the farmer. The establishment of rural delivery of mail I admit was a great boon to the farmer. But the city folks had long enjoyed this service, so why should not the country folks have it? They have been simply placed on equality. Besides, the Postal Service is self-supporting; the people foot the bill for this service, and all should be treated alike.

Better road means cheaper transportation. Cheaper transportation means cheaper foodstuffs and living. The farmer feeds the people. What benefits the farmer benefits those who work in the factory, the shops, the thousands and tens of thousands who live in towns and cities. Why improve the rivers and harbors and not improve the great highways of the land over which must be transported the wheat, the corn, the cotton, the cattle and hogs, and every article we eat and wear? The Government collects its revenues from all of the people and all of the people should receive the same fair consideration and return.

I voted for the tariff bill last summer, although I was not in full sympathy with some of its provisions. I voted for it because it had more good in it than bad. I could not afford to vote against an income tax. That provision alone meant more to the people than any injustice that may have existed. I either had to swallow it whole or reject it. My opinion was then, and is now, that the farmer was discriminated against. The Shackleford bill will be simply giving the farmer his just dues and will square the account in very decent fashion.

Besides, Mr. Chairman, when we pass this bill we will simply be redeeming a party pledge made in the Baltimore platform. We declared in favor of "national aid to State and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads."

We have a President in the White House who proposes to see that the Democratic Party redeems all of its platform pledges. There is but one thing, therefore, for Congress to do, and that is to pass this bill. The only objection I have to the bill is that it does not carry a larger appropriation. But I content myself with it as a starter. My prediction is that to the end of time every future Congress will appropriate for good roads and the amount will grow larger and larger. France, England, and Germany and other nations are far in the lead in good road building. There is no question in this country in which the people are so generally concerned as the improvement of our highways. Why, then, should not this Government be required to pay something toward the maintenance of the roads used every day by the Postal Service and interstate commerce?

Mr. Chairman, before concluding I want to say "honor to whom honor is due." Who is entitled to more credit than any dozen Members of this Congress, yes, more possibly than all others combined for this \$25,000,000 entering wedge of Federal aid for public highways—the chairman of the Committee on Roads, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD]. It took a Gen. SHERWOOD to get the pension bill through the Sixty-second Congress. It required a DORSEY W. SHACKLEFORD to get this good-roads bill so near a law. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] has long been the foremost advocate in Congress of this legislation. When the Committee on Roads was created at the beginning of this Congress, he voluntarily stepped out of the Ways and Means Committee with the full consciousness that in the Sixty-fourth Congress he was almost certain to become the chairman of the greatest of all committees—the Ways and Means Committee—and accepted the chairmanship of the new Committee on Roads with uncertain future. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] preferred to be a "dirt-roads statesman" and give his energies to good roads rather than be chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Every farmer, every advocate of good roads in our land should tip their hats to "good old SHACK" for the splendid service he has given the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that I will vote for this bill with great satisfaction and will vote for legislation of this kind every time I have an opportunity, and the good people back in the seventeenth district of Ohio who are opposed to Federal aid for public highways should vote for some one besides me to represent them here. [Applause.]

I have just received the following telegram, which I will insert in the RECORD, and is further evidence that I voice the sentiments of the people of my State:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, February 7, 1914.

Congressman WILLIAM A. ASHBROOK,
Washington, D. C.:

Having considered the various road bills that have been introduced in Congress, we believe that the Shackleford bill is the best suited to present conditions, and would respectfully and most urgently request that you cast your vote for the Shackleford bill in the House without any amendment. In making this request we are confident that we speak authoritatively for each and every good-roads enthusiast in Ohio, nearly all of whom are members of this federation.

OHIO GOOD ROADS FEDERATION,
ARCHIBALD H. HUSTON, Secretary.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE].

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, judges have written in their decisions, statesmen have proclaimed in this forum, and economists have written in the books that the two great questions in government about which all others cluster are commerce and transportation. We are coming more and more to understand that rapid transportation is a necessity in our present development. One reason why this bill should be supported is that the expenditure is sure to bring quick and substantial returns upon the investment. One of the heaviest items of cost to the producer is charged to the marketing of a crop. Poor, undeveloped roads retard development of rural communities, depress profits not only of the products of the farm but of the farm itself. We do business profitably nowadays when the volume of production is large and exchanges quickly made.

The central West is beginning to realize the great importance of that statement. The last report made by the Secretary of Agriculture showed Indiana to be the third State in the Union, on a percentage basis, with improved highways. She was only led by Rhode Island, with 49.14 per cent, and Massachusetts, with 49 per cent of her highways improved, while Indiana had 36.7 per cent. Rhode Island only had 2,120 miles of public highways and Massachusetts 17,272 miles, while Indiana had 67,996 miles. She had 24,000 miles of improved highways—more than all the roads of the two States named, both improved and unimproved. We are just awakening to the necessity of good roads as an element in our industrial and State growth. In the district I represent, five years ago there were more than 1,700 miles of improved highways. In one county in my district there are now pending before the board of county commissioners 43 petitions praying for the right under the township road law to construct macadamized highways. I refer to this simply to show the interest taken in this important subject. All over the State there is great activity among the farmers in organizing to secure better highways. The direct result on the price of farm lands is shown from the fact that improved farms abutting on crushed-stone road have advanced in price from 25 to 40 per cent because of that fact alone. The bill ought to be supported for another reason. The improvement contemplated in this bill will enable the Postal Department to increase by at least 50 per cent the standard length of rural routes and permit the postal authorities to reduce the cost of the delivery of the mail at least 33 per cent because of the facility with which the mails can be delivered by the carrier to a larger patronage. The bill is right for another reason. It tends to produce a stronger and better social sentiment in the rural communities. It makes communication easier and tends to a better social status. Frequency of public gatherings fostered by a quick and comfortable assembling of the people is an auxiliary to a higher and better social condition.

There is an equitable proposition also involved in this bill in favor of its passage. It benefits the largest possible number of people directly. It is a matter of simple justice to the great interests of the country that for many years have willingly contributed to the improvement of coast cities and rivers and harbors. It is idle to say that the farm reaps an indirect benefit in the expenditure of such immense funds in the improvement of rivers and harbors and coast cities. Take the upper Mississippi Valley, the great bread and meat basket of this country, where 11 States, with more than 37,000,000 of people, produce 90 per cent of the food products for all the people. They do not complain of the taxation they have heretofore stood for that has been distributed in the border cities of the United States, but in return demand for that willing payment that they shall be permitted to expend a part of this taxation now in the interior of the country. There is another feature I call attention to. The postal business of the country is self-sustaining. The rural communities that contribute thereto ought not to be asked to go into their pockets to build the highways and keep them in repair for the Federal Government to transport the mails over without some compensation. Upon what basis can the Government justify the payment of immense sums to the railroads of the country for providing a way to get the mail to the cities and towns and then refuse to contribute to rural communities for performing the same service? The payment by the Federal Government of a small amount of the necessary cost in keeping improved highways in repair is money well expended. Under this bill, if it passes, Indiana will receive \$1,016,250. There is no comparison, Mr. Chairman, between the benefits that the expenditure of \$25,000,000 will produce when applied to the maintenance of a million miles of post roads as compared with the same amount invested in battleships. Considering the immense revenue that the Government now receives through all its sources of taxation, there

ought to be no hesitation in expending the comparatively small amount indicated in this bill when the results will be so far-reaching and so beneficial. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

[Mr. LANGLEY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON].

[Mr. NORTON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to help enact this road bill, because I can hear in it the rattling of the bones of the old extreme State rights idea, with a chance of development along the line of a Federal Government that means something.

I am glad of our Union of States, and I do not want to destroy the sovereign rights of the States along some lines, but I have become so tired of the continued opposition of State-rights men to every proposition of advance that it pleases me to help enact legislation that throws the bright light of noon-day athwart the "twilight zone."

I lived in Louisiana until 10 years ago, and, of course, have faith in the State establishment, and want to see our system preserved. But there is not now the same necessity for State jealousy that once prevailed. We have become one great country, one Nation, one people, involved alike in world problems and in great national undertakings.

When the Constitution was adopted the States were the real home of democracy. The people held their government in the States, or Colonies, in their own hands—offices and courts. No court under early State constitutions could, or, at least would, have been permitted to declare a statute unconstitutional. Legislative authority was supreme. In most of the States the judges were selected by the legislature. The right and procedure of removal of a judge was simple. So those States were jealous of their rights as separate Commonwealths.

A temporary union of the Colonies was brought about only as a military necessity during the Revolution. Federal Governments in that day were monarchical and absolute; democracy could be found only in local governments. These colonists had fled from that kind of government. They knew its rigor and its injustice and inhumanity.

The framers of the Constitution had the job of their lives to put over a Federal Government as the Constitution provided. When they met to frame the great charter they went into executive session and the people were locked out. Members were not even permitted to copy any part of the proceedings. They had met ostensibly to amend the Articles of Confederation, but they took upon themselves the authority to present a complete Constitution. They made the Federal Government just as strong as they dared. They put no more of popular government in it than was necessary to make it pass the public scrutiny and secure adoption.

The Constitution was made almost impossible of amendment. The judiciary was given a power which enabled that arm of the Government later to assume the right to declare executive and legislative acts void. The Senate was placed as far from the reach of the people as possible, and an electoral college was provided to name the President. They had to put State rights into the proposition, however, or it would not pass. If they had been more liberal on democratic features, there would not have been so great necessity for States protecting their rights.

THE WHOLE PLAN NOW CHANGED.

But the whole plan is now changed, except as to the power of the judiciary, and the patriotism and good sense of the American people will soon solve that problem. The electoral college has been outlawed of its power by public opinion. The Senate is now elected by the people. We have learned how to amend the Constitution, but we will make that much more easy very soon.

The sovereign right of the Union was created by the judgment of the Civil War, not by the Constitution itself; although the framers of that instrument would have written it into the Constitution if they had not known that the people would not stand for it at that time.

Of course every patriotic citizen is glad the judgment of the Civil War was written as it was in this regard; and since the principles of democracy are being restored to our National Constitution, why hug so fast to the shores of the twilight zone? Let us sail some on the broad sea of Federal authority and power. The Senate no longer is the rich man's club. Senators must come before the people for their election. We will soon take from Federal judges their life tenure and require them to come before the people for approval or rejection every four or

six years. We can trust the people of the whole Nation. We are one great family. We have got to stand or fall together. So I say I am glad of this bill because it rattles the bones of the old State-rights skeleton. Yes; let us have Federal aid for roads. We have lavishly expended our treasure for railroads to be owned and made a system of tolls by private corporations. Why not aid the ordinary public road, which no private greed can capitalize into profits?

I went to the memorable battle field of Gettysburg on the anniversary of that great battle last July by automobile in company with my colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. FALCONER], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT]. Every few miles, so long as we were in the State of Maryland, we were held up by some turnpike company to collect toll for the privilege of passing over the road. That I am glad to know is an exception to the rule. It is a pity that any American State will permit such a condition. I do not believe any aid should be given to any State in which the public does not own the highways of travel.

I long for the time when this Government will own all of the means of transportation in this country, the railroads and the roads, and the means of getting from place to place, and we will then be able to carry our mail and transport our people and freight on our own lines, and that will be a time when the Government will be able to do something that will be worth while along those lines.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. When that time arrives does the gentleman think a Member of Congress will have very much independence of action?

Mr. BRYAN. Some will and some will not. Some will be so afraid to move that they will not dare to speak up; but a man who stands for a substantial, definite, do-something kind of a government will then be able to speak and will not be ashamed of himself when he does speak.

Mr. McKENZIE. He probably would speak only once, would he not?

Mr. BRYAN. He would speak often enough. I know the gentleman himself would speak as often as he felt like speaking, and would say the right thing, too.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYAN. Under this bill the State of Washington will be entitled to receive \$262,500. This is a very small sum when considered with relation to the sum necessary for road construction in my State. The voters of Washington will be called upon in the near future to vote at least \$15,000,000 of bonds for roads. The State has an efficient highway commission and has been fortunate in having men who have made it their business to look after road construction and to create road sentiment at great personal expense and sacrifice. The people are awake to the situation, and we are building good permanent roads.

Mr. Samuel Hill has given hundreds of lectures, illustrated with lantern slides. His engagements have taken in legislatures in session, Young Men's Christian Association meetings, brotherhood dinners, commercial clubs, women's clubs, chambers of commerce, lodge meetings, street gatherings, and any and every place where he could find people gathered together. At his own expense he has traveled over the State time and again demonstrating by his splendid fund of information the benefit of good roads. He has views from all over the world which, taken with his own remarks and figures, furnish most convincing argument for taxes for roads—real permanent macadam roads.

Judge J. P. Ronold, of the superior bench at Seattle, has devoted much time to creating good-road sentiment. The Pacific highway has especially engrossed his attention. This road extends from British Columbia on the north, through Washington, Oregon, California, and to Tijuana, Mexico, on the south. It will later be continued to Panama, if present plans are carried out. One can now travel north or south the entire length of this highway without asking questions as to the way to go. More than half of this highway is paved with some hard surface material. It is to be finished by 1915, and thus become the longest paved highway in the world. We have been having an annual good roads convention in the State of Washington, and it is gratifying to have some Federal aid. You can not frame a bill so the State of Washington will be cut out unless you cut all the other States out. We can and will come in on any plan.

Another citizen of the State of Washington who has devoted special time and attention to good roads is Mr. John P. Hartman, a leading attorney of Seattle. In a recent letter to me in reference to Federal legislation, Mr. Hartman said, in part, as follows:

The whole trouble with the roads situation in the United States is that we have too much machinery. That is, too many people talking about it and too few building. In our own State we have lost years of valuable time because of the constant friction between the State and the county authorities. If we shall now introduce the Government into this, then we increase the friction and lessen the efficiency of any one of the several bodies. More than that, we would finally find that the Federal Government, right or wrong, must have its way.

The only practical plan, as I view the situation, is one by which the Federal Government shall build its own roads. They should be the great trunk thoroughfares from ocean to ocean, and then let the State build the mid-thoroughfares and the counties the laterals. This scheme is embraced in both the Warburton and the Bourne plans. The Warburton, by the way, I think is the best plan that ever has been devised. Congressman Warburton and Senator Bourne have done themselves proud in this work. When I see a good plan I prefer to follow it rather than try to hew an uncertain way.

Yours, truly,

JOHN P. HARTMAN.

I have already inserted in the RECORD a letter from Hon. Ernest Lister, governor of Washington, on this subject.

I am quite sure the Government later will go further into the construction of roads and will be ready for such a comprehensive and far-reaching plan as is referred to by Mr. Hartman.

The plan under consideration, the Shackelford bill, is a splendid beginning, and I gladly support the bill. There are many features of House bill 10404, by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], that commend themselves to me. That bill and the comprehensive plan it presents will force itself for future consideration when this matter comes up for subsequent legislation.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES].

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, in my first race for Congress I incorporated in my platform a good-roads plank, advocating national aid to State roads. I have advocated that proposition from that hour to the present, and I am heartily in favor of the present bill. I wish to say that the third congressional district of Georgia is represented by one of the most distinguished Members of this House, the brilliant young CRISP, of Georgia. Previous to the time when Georgia was redistricted I had the honor of representing the third congressional district. It was a great agricultural district, and I had been a warm advocate of good roads for many years. Consequently, I was exceedingly anxious that the 15 counties composing that district should inaugurate at the beginning a systematic, scientific plan of building public highways. Therefore I wrote a letter to each of the boards of roads and revenues in these counties and suggested they make a request of the Government for an expert to start them off in the proper economical construction of their roads.

For reasons sufficient unto themselves there were 14 of those boards who failed to make that request, but one county did, and that was the county of Sumter, in which Americus is located. The expert went down to meet those people and superintended for them the construction of a model road. They followed this scientific demonstration. What was the result? It was that that county inaugurated one of the best systems of roads in the State of Georgia, and as soon as those roads were completed there were seekers of rural homes throughout the county who purchased and located there. Land went up 33½ per cent in value, and that which benefited that county will benefit in the same proportion any other county in Georgia or any other county in any State in this Union.

There is a great interest in the effort to retain the boy on the farm. In my opinion, good roads is a potent factor to consummate that end. Good roads eliminate distance, they bring the country and the town in close contact, and, as has been stated on the floor of this House, good roads reduce by perhaps 300 per cent the cost to the farmer of moving his products to the markets.

I hope this bill will pass, thereby vastly benefiting transportation for the great producers of this Nation—the farmers.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I represent a district of rural constituency—farmers—a section of the country a part of which a few years ago was regarded as as poor a country as Alabama contained. These people, with the limited means they have had and the interest that they have taken in the improvement of their roads, with the tireless energy of the men who inhabit that mountain section of the State, have developed it until it begins to blossom as the rose, and there is no section of the country that is more interested in this question. I have collaborated with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], who has labored for years on this matter. I have worked in connection with gentlemen from my own State who were in the good-roads fight, and I believe that if this bill is passed, if we cut off a few million dollars from battleships and big navies and big armies and apply the money to the development of the roads of the country, we will convince any who are enemies of America that our people, by their system of good roads, can reach transportation lines in time to meet and defeat any enemy that may confront us; and as a precaution against war itself, against any menace that any country may bring to us as well as for the development of the country, I am in favor of this bill. The friends of a big Navy are constantly raising the cry "Beware of the Japs," and yet that little nation spent last year less than \$50,000,000 on their Navy, while we spent nearly three times that amount.

I have no doubt but that honest gentlemen favor a big Navy for what seems patriotic reasons to them, yet it appears to me that if they will stop a moment to reason about the matter they will see that it would be far better to spend the \$30,000,000 that two battleships will cost on the construction and improvement of our public roads.

The bill is so guarded that our local and State authorities will have the actual supervision of the construction and upkeep of our roads. This is as it should be. I would be unwilling to turn over to the General Government the absolute right to control the construction and improvement of the roads. The best feature of the bill is that which requires the Government to pay for the use of our roads by its star and rural-mail carriers. We pay the railroads for the use of their cars and their tracks over which the mails are transported; then, for the same reason, is it not right that we should pay our people for the use of the public roads over which these same mails are carried?

It would cost an enormous sum for the Government to undertake to build the million miles of roads over which rural mails are carried, but this appropriation of \$25,000,000 will go a long way toward improving the roads that we have. The bill divides the roads into three classes—A, B, and C—according to their width, character of construction, and so forth, and requires the Government to pay the sums of \$60, \$30, and \$15 per mile, respectively, for the use of these roads in the transportation of its mails.

The people in every county of my district have within the past few years devoted much attention to the improvement of their roads, and they have hundreds of miles even now that will fall in class C and some that will reach class B. When a road is placed in good condition an industrious farmer with a good pair of mules, a large plow, a split-log drag, and a few other tools can keep up 10 or 15 miles a year without hardly missing the time that he would lose. One of the best results of this bill will be that it will encourage our own people to improve their roads, so as to meet the requirements and get the benefits of this appropriation, and I confidently predict that if this bill passes and we continue the appropriation for 10 years, our whole country will be a network of splendid roads.

Good roads will mean more rural mail routes, and rural routes will mean more newspapers and periodicals for the people in the country districts, and a wider spread of education among them. The great automobile interests would like to divert Government aid from rural routes to great trans-State and transcontinental lines in order to foster and promote their selfish gains. I have consistently set my face against any such gigantic schemes, because if we enter upon the exploitation of such projects we will not have any money to spare to the roads that are traversed by the people in the rural districts. Two years ago, in a speech that I made on this floor in behalf of a similar bill, I also urged the adoption of a proposition for a parcel post that was in the Post Office appropriation bill, in which the good-roads bill was also embraced. A Democratic House passed that bill with both the good-roads and the parcel-post propositions in it, but a Republican Senate struck out the good-roads feature of the bill. Now, with both branches of Congress and the Chief Executive Democratic, I believe that it will fare much better. We have only tried the

parcel post for one year, but it has proven a success far beyond the hopes of its most sanguine advocates, and I understand that it is much more than paying its way.

Many of the merchants of my district wrote me letters of protest against its passage, predicting all kinds of disaster to the country and small-town merchants on account of competition with the mail-order houses. I went on and supported it with speech and vote, and now these very merchants are loudest in their praise of the beneficent results of the parcel post. With the inauguration of the parcel post the loads of mail that have to be carried by our rural and star-route carriers have greatly increased, and with it has increased the importance to the Government of better public roads, and with that importance has increased the duty of the Government to aid in providing these improved roads.

For years I have labored in this good work, and I am delighted that the realization of our desires seems now in sight. I feel that my work and the work of Judge SHACKLEFORD, who has led this fight, will not be in vain. I here insert a letter from our leader, Judge SHACKLEFORD, as evidence of the part which it has been my privilege to take in this great movement:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ROADS,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1914.

Hon. JOHN L. BURNETT, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BURNETT: The Rules Committee has agreed to report a rule as soon as the immigration bill is disposed of by which it will be in order to take up the good-roads bill.

Knowing the great interest that you have always taken in legislation for the improvement of our public roads, I write to urge you to make a speech on the bill during the debate on the same.

I am sure the bill which we have reported from the committee will meet with your hearty approval, as it embraces all of the provisions which were contained in the excellent bill which you introduced in the last Congress.

Your friend,

D. W. SHACKLEFORD.

This is a progressive administration, and the good-roads movement will no doubt receive an impetus at its hands. Our platform declares for it, the people demand it, and I hope the bill will pass. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, may aid the States and the civil subdivisions thereof in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads in an amount not exceeding \$25,000,000 in any fiscal year; that the portion thereof which may be expended in any State in any fiscal year shall be determined upon the following basis, to wit: One-half in the proportion which the total population of such State bears to the total population of all of the States, as shown by the next preceding Federal census; and one-half in the proportion which the total number of miles of rural post roads in use in such State bears to the total number of miles of rural post roads in use in all of the States, as shown by the report of the Postmaster General at the close of the second quarter of the last preceding fiscal year; that on or before the 20th day of January in each year the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare and file in his office a statement showing the amount which under the provisions of this act may be expended in each State during the next fiscal year and the proportions thereof which may be expended under section 3 and section 4 of this act and transmit by registered mail a copy of such statement to the governor of each State on or before the 31st day of said January: *Provided, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1914, the Secretary of Agriculture shall so prepare and file said statement and transmit copies thereof to the governors of the respective States within 60 days after the final passage of this act.*

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RUBEY, 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. 11686) to provide that the United States shall in certain cases aid the States and the civil subdivisions thereof in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR TO-MORROW.

The SPEAKER designated Mr. BARTLETT as Speaker pro tempore for Sunday, February 8, 1914.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] is recognized.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on House resolution No. 22, to appoint a committee on equal suffrage, and also generally on equal suffrage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the question of equal suffrage.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if he intends to publish any pamphlets or addresses or articles by persons not Members of this House?

Mr. RAKER. No, sir; I expect to do all this myself. What I am going to print is my own view of the subject.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, unless it has already passed—

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent has not yet been given.

Mr. DONOVAN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if such a resolution has been before the House?

Mr. RAKER. It has been introduced.

Mr. DONOVAN. It has not been before the House for action, has it?

Mr. RAKER. Not yet. Of course, it is one of those things we hope to get up.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of doing a kind act to the Member from California and putting him in the position of avoiding an error and violating the dictate and dictum of the Democratic caucus as passed by a two-thirds vote, I am going to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut objects.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD very briefly on a matter wholly nonpolitical.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on a subject which is wholly nonpolitical.

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois what the subject is?

Mr. MANN. I wish to insert a memorandum concerning Miss Wilson's wedding gift.

Mr. BARNHART. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3546. An act to extend the time for constructing a dam by Rainey River Improvement Co. across the outlet of Namakan Lake at Kettle Falls, in St. Louis County, Minn.; and

S. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to continue in effect the provisions of the act of March 9, 1906 (34 Stat. L., 56).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ROBERT GUNN BREMNER, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join a committee appointed by the House of Representatives to take order for the superintending of the funeral of Mr. BREMNER at Passaic, N. J.

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

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate adjourn.

In compliance with the foregoing the Vice President appointed as said committee Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. VARDAMAN, Mr. HOLLIS, Mr. CLAPP, and Mr. STERLING.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

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

S. 3546. An act to extend the time for constructing a dam by Rainey River Improvement Co. across the outlet of Namakan Lake at Kettle Falls, in St. Louis County, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 832. 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. 833. 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. 834. 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; and

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution relating to supervision of the Lincoln Memorial.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 10084. An act to authorize the changing of the names of the steamships *Buckman* and *Watson*;

H. R. 9574. An act to authorize the Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River near the city of Hannibal, in the State of Missouri; and

H. R. 9317. An act to regulate the payment of postal money orders.

RETURN OF BILL TO SENATE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resolution from the Senate, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 3625) "to authorize the Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River near the city of Hannibal, in the State of Missouri."

Mr. MANN. What is the request?

The SPEAKER. To return a bill authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River near the city of Hannibal, Mo.

Mr. MANN. To return it?

The SPEAKER. Yes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman who objected to my request to extend my remarks in the RECORD will withdraw his objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the question of equal suffrage. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from California if he contemplates discussing the distinction between woman suffrage and equal suffrage in his remarks?

Mr. RAKER. Well, I have always stood, and stand now, for the question of equal suffrage, and if it applies to women, all right. Of course, I shall dwell quite extensively on the fact that women have rights and, therefore, should be treated equally with their brothers.

Mr. MANN. I understand the gentleman desires to insert an apology for the action of the Democratic caucus?

Mr. RAKER. Me? Never!

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not stand for the Democratic caucus?

Mr. RAKER. Not on that.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman desires to insert an apology for the Democratic caucus?

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. MANN. I was hoping he did. But if not, all right.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I believe, in all fairness to the gentleman from California, that any Member has a right to extend his remarks on any subject he may deem proper. This is a very important question to the gentleman from California and his people. Whatever the outcome of his efforts to get his resolution considered may have been, it would seem to me but fairness on the part of the House that he be permitted to extend his remarks. He says that they will include nothing in the way of pamphlets or extensive literature, and I hope there will be no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Sunday, February 8, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of Commerce submitting an urgent estimate of deficiency in appropriation for tabulating machines, Bureau of the Census (H. Doc. No. 714), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4019) to authorize the Tug River & Kentucky Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near the mouth of Blackberry Creek, in Pike County, Ky., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 238), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GORDON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8479) to repeal section 3 of article 110 of section 1342 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, enacted July 27, 1892, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 233), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 3742) to authorize the Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation to construct a bridge across the Hudson River in the State of New York, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 237), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 3454) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to lease to the city of Port Angeles, Wash., certain property, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 234), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TOWNER, from the Committee on Education, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2494) to investigate illiteracy among the adult population of the United States and the means of eliminating or reducing the same, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 232), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

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

A bill (H. R. 2577) granting a pension to Celsus G. Gross; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3625) granting an increase of pension to Robert Watson; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5551) granting a pension to Robert Strong; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6088) granting a pension to Bridget Gaffney; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8022) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca M. Gaunt; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9815) granting a pension to Zachariah W. May; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10770) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth H. Hyde; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11768) granting an increase of pension to P. T. Christensen; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12136) granting a pension to Leif F. Devine; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12708) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Jewitt; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12987) granting an increase of pension to Sylvia Collins; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9952) granting an increase of pension to Harriet K. Ballie; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 13085) to enlarge, extend, remodel, etc., post-office building at Rockford, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 13086) providing for the sale to the State of Oklahoma of the unsurveyed islands in the bed of the Arkansas River within the boundaries of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 13087) providing for the payment of pensions monthly by means of the annual issue of 12 coupons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 13088) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one cannon, with its carriage and cannon balls, to the city of Wathena, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 13089) to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the Hudson River, N. Y., at the city of Hudson and points south; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PETERS of Maine: A bill (H. R. 13090) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the Grand Army Post of Clinton, Me., one condemned cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 13091) to provide for drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 13092) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 13093) to establish marketing departments in agricultural colleges in the several States of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 13094) to amend section 20 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended by an act approved February 25, 1909; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 13095) to provide for the removal of what is now known as the Aqueduct Bridge, across the Potomac River, and for the building of a bridge in place thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13096) for the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOWDLE: Resolution (H. Res. 403) requesting the Secretary of the Navy to furnish information as to the number of enlisted men who are disobeying the orders of courts requiring them to pay money as alimony or otherwise for the maintenance of wives or children whom they may have abandoned; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. POU: Resolution (H. Res. 404) to amend section 6 of Rule XXIV of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Resolution (H. Res. 406) to pay to Helen L. Bremner, clerk to Robert Gunn Bremner, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey, compensation at the rate of \$125 per month from and after the date of the death of the said Robert Gunn Bremner until his successor is elected and qualified; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ROGERS: Memorial from the Legislature of Massachusetts, requesting the Secretary of the Navy to award the contract for the construction of supply ship to the Charlestown Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 13097) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13098) granting an increase of pension to Emma Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 13099) to place the name of George M. Noble upon the unlimited retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 13100) granting an increase of pension to Albert Rine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 13101) granting an increase of pension to Michael Gannon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FALCONER: A bill (H. R. 13102) granting a pension to Thomas Baxter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13103) granting a pension to John F. Simonsen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 13104) granting a pension to William F. McRill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13105) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Treese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13106) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 13107) granting a pension to David P. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 13108) for the relief of George H. Hammond; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 13109) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13110) granting an increase of pension to Paul Stang; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KORBLY: A bill (H. R. 13111) granting an increase of pension to William W. Grim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13112) for the relief of the heirs of Bernhard Strauss; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 13113) granting a pension to Vernie Agey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13114) granting a pension to Martin O'Brady; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 13115) granting a pension to Oscar S. Thornton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13116) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13117) granting an increase of pension to James P. Hayman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 13118) granting an increase of pension to William E. Sands; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 13119) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACDONALD: A bill (H. R. 13120) to correct the military record of James A. Cooper; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 13121) granting an increase of pension to Orange Hoyt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 13122) for the discharge of Raymond T. Rice; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: A bill (H. R. 13123) for the relief of Charles H. Rayfield, alias Charles H. Czarnowsky; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13124) granting an increase of pension to Tolbert J. Robison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: A bill (H. R. 13125) granting an increase of pension to Stephen M. Harmon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 13126) granting an increase of pension to John T. Burriss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 13127) to appropriate a sum of money to pay to the heirs of Myra Clarke Gaines for certain lands in Louisiana; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 13128) granting a pension to George Casseboom; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 13129) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Ingersoll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

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): Petitions of the Polish National Alliance of Chicago, Ill.; Mount Zion Lodge, No. 576, and other lodges of the Order of B'rith Abraham of Boston, Mass.; and the Workmen's Circle of New York, protesting against the passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of the Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry Branch of the American Continental League, of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of the Boston Fish Bureau, protesting against the passage of the McKellar cold-storage bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of the twelfth congressional district of the State of Massachusetts, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN: Memorial of the Knights of Equity Branch of the American Continental League and Andrew Jackson Branch of the American Continental League, both of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Richard Keer and 42 other citizens of Newark, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, papers to accompany special bill (H. R. 12313) for the relief of Leo Bluebaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Switchmen's Union, favoring the passage of the Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of West Bros. and 11 other merchants of Uhrichsville, Ohio, favoring a change in interstate-commerce laws relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the German-American Alliance of Reedsburg, Wis., representing 51 American citizens, protesting against House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, or any other prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the German-American Alliance of Antigo, Wis., representing 107 American citizens, vigorously protesting against House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, or any other prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER: Memorial of Wisconsin State Union, American Society of Equity, relative to pending antitrust legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of Lazarus Davis Lodge, No. 548, of Boston, Mass., against House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DALE: Memorials of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, relative to the deepening of the channels in the East River, and Berger & Wirth, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Ransdell-Humphreys bill for flood control; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of the Curtis & Co. Manufacturing Co., of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petitions of the Hudson County Building Trades Council, American Federation of Labor, of Jersey City, and Hoboken (N. J.) Third Ward Democratic Club, favoring increased pay for mail carriers on account of parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorials of Robert Fulton Social and Literary Society, of New York, and Division No. 27, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of New York, against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the New York Development League, favoring deepening of St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Morris Bloch Lodge, No. 547, Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, of New York City, against House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Order of Railway Conductors, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, opposing the Federal workmen's compensation law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the District of Columbia Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, opposing woman suffrage; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Merchants' Association of New York, against House bill 1873; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Chicago Federation of Labor, favoring investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of the second congressional district of the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 12957) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Greeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KORBLY: Petitions of citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., favoring the passage of House bill 5892, relative to pensions for the United States Military Telegraph Corps who served in the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Petition of citizens of Multnomah County, Oreg., against House joint resolution 168; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petitions of the joint executive committee of labor organizations on the Isthmus of Panama, relative to back pay, longevity, etc., for laborers on the Isthmus; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Order of Railway Conductors and Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, protesting against Federal workmen's compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the twenty-seventh congressional district of the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of W. M. Terhune and 24 others, of Bristol, Conn., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. P. Brats, of Albany, N. Y., favoring Government ownership of express companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Capitol City Lodge, International Association of Machinists, No. 356, of Hartford, Conn., favoring legislation providing for payment of back longevity and overtime pay for the labor men in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., against Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of the Missionary Society of the First Presbyterian Church of Madison, S. Dak., favoring constitutional amendment relative to polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT: Petitions of officers and members of the Sacketts Harbor and Hope Church Auxiliaries of the St. Lawrence Presbyterian Society of Home and Foreign Missions, favoring the antipolygamy amendment to the National Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, relative to the deepening of the channels in the East River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. NORTON: Memorial of the Larimore (N. Dak.) Commercial Club, favoring the plan of Hon. Jonathan Bourne, jr., for Government aid for good roads; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Larimore (N. Dak.) Commercial Club, favoring legislation establishing one price to all on trade-marked and branded goods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'LEARY: Petitions of the Workmen's Circle of New York City and Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, of Jamaica, N. Y., protesting against the passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Merchants' Association of New York, protesting against the passage of the Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of the Knights of Columbus, favoring an investigation of the publication called *The Menace*; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of voters of the county of Seneca, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of James W. Nolan, of Auburn, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Petition of citizens of the fifth congressional district of the State of Wisconsin, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of James C. Shays and F. C. Donaghy, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring an investigation into the charges against the publication called *The Menace*; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of Richard Wollner, A. L. Hall, John P. Knopf, and Fred Wolfe, all of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the passage of the Hamill bill, which provides for the retirement of aged civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petitions from merchants of Memphis, Miami, Electra, Paducah, Quanah, Childress, Esteline, Canyon, Hedley, Clarendon, Plainview, Tulia, Higgins, Glazier, Panhandle, Canadian, Amarillo, Goodnight, Claude, and Chillicothe, all in the State of Texas, favoring the passage of House bill 5308; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: Petition of the Utica Association of Credit Men, Utica, N. Y., favoring legislation for the control of floods; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the New York Wholesale Grocers' Association at Utica, N. Y., relative to the right of the manufacturer to make the resale price on goods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the National League of Commission Merchants of the United States, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: Petition of A. W. Metzger and others, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of sundry citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 4981, prohibiting the misbranding of certain articles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, relative to the deepening of the channels in the East River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of officers of Company H, Second Reserve, New York State Division, United Boys' Brigade of America, favoring an amendment to Senate bill 3777, relative to uniforms similar to United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, February 8, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by Mr. BARTLETT as Speaker pro tempore.

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

Father in heaven, let Thy spirit descend copiously upon us as we thus assemble in memory of the departed; men who by their nobility of character, intellectual attainments, and patriotic zeal won for themselves the confidence of their fellows who selected them to be their representatives in this body, to enact into law the things which make for good government; an honor which challenges the respect of men and has secured for them an enviable place in American history.

Their work is done; their souls have passed into the realm where character will be their passport into the larger fields of endeavor prepared by the Giver of all good gifts. We thank Thee for their lives, for their work, for their example. May we work and faint not, trust and doubt not, and be ready when the summons comes to pass on into the larger life, prepared for whatever awaits us; in the spirit of the Master. Amen.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the Journal of yesterday and that the same be approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the Journal of yesterday and that the same be approved. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE RODDENBERRY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the special order for to-day.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. PARK, by unanimous consent, *Ordered*, That Sunday, February 8, 1914, be set apart for addresses upon the life, character, and public services of the Hon. S. A. RODDENBERRY, late a Representative from the State of Georgia.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the desk to be read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia offers a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 407.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for tribute to the memory of Hon. SEABORN ANDERSON RODDENBERRY, late a Member of this House from the State of Georgia.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his distinguished public career, the House, at the conclusion of the exercises of this day, shall stand adjourned.