and Sunday School, Mettapoisett; Methodist Episcopal Church, Wellfleet; Union Church, Truro; Epworth League and Methodist Episcopal Church, Cotuit; Methodist Episcopal Church and Sunday School, East Wareham; Central Square Church Sunday School, Bridgewater; Memorial Church Sunday School, Methodist Episcopal Church and Sunday School, Plymouth; Baptist Church and Sunday School, Barnstable; Christian Endeavor, Barnstable; Immanuel Baptist Church, New Bedford; Methodist Episcopal Church and Sunday School, Fairhaven; Christian Endeavor, Congregational Sunday School and Church, Middleboro; Methodist Episcopal Church Sunday School, East Falmouth; Universalist Sunday School and Methodist Church, Orleans; Baptist and Methodist Episcopal Churches, Sunday Schools, and Epworth League, Nantucket; Baptist Churches, West Tisbury and Vineyard Haven; Congregational Church, Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, Falmouth; Methodist Episcopal Church and Universalist Sunday School, Eastham, all of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of citizens of the State of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Petitions of citizens and churches of Elizabeth, Springfield, Rahway, Rockaway, Westfield, Roselle, Dover, New Providence, Roselle Park, and Summit, all in the State of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of the Philadelphia branch of the National German-American Alliance, asking that Congress pass the necessary law forthwith that will enable the President of the United States to lay an embargo upon all contraband of war, saving and excepting foodstuffs alone, and thereby withdraw from the contending powers all aid and assistance of this Republic; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEAVER: Memorial of temperance people of Arapahoe and 160 citizens of Crescent, Okla., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petitions of 48 church organizations, total membership of 7,046, of the State of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Philadelphia branch of the National German-American Alliance, favoring an embargo on the exportation from this country of contraband of war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 21, 1914.*

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

Almighty God, the truth that Thou hast declared unto men is in itself the covenant that Thou hast made them. We know that our responsibility is alone according to the measure of our ability to know the truth. But Thy truth does not bind; it sets us free.

So far as we follow the truth as Thou dost give us to see the truth, we may be sure of our task, of our happiness, and of our destiny. It is only when we stultify our intellect in refusing to walk in the light that we meet the dark shadow of Thy frown. We are sure of our way not because we can see the end, but because we know that with zeal and fidelity we follow after the truth. Let Thy grace abide with us this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

JAMES H. BRADY, a Senator from the State of Idaho, appeared in his seat to-day.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (James M. Baker) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., December 21, 1914.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CLAUDE AUGUSTUS SWANSON, a Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES P. CLARKE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SWANSON thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer and directed that the Journal of the last legislative day be read.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 213) authorizing the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House, including the Capitol police, their respective salaries for the month of December, 1914, on the 22d day of said month.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WHITE. I present a petition from citizens of the city of Attalla, Ala., which I ask may be read and referred to the proper committee.

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

A petition to the Senate of the United States.

We, the undersigned voters, earnestly petition for the passage by the United States Congress of the joint resolution introduced in the House of Representatives December 10, 1913, by Congressman RICHMOND P. HOBSON, and on the same day introduced in the Senate by Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, providing for the prohibition of the sale, manufacture for sale, and exportation for sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes in the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

C. R. SHEPHERD
(And others),
Voters of City of Attalla, State of Alabama.

Mr. WHITE. I also present resolutions from the members of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, in the city of Birmingham, Ala., which I ask to have read and properly referred.

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

Resolutions passed by the board of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, December 7, 1914.

In view of the fact that it is probable that national prohibition will be voted on in the National House of Representatives and the United States Senate at an early date, be it

Resolved, That the official board of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, of Birmingham, Ala., heartily indorses national prohibition for the following reasons:

First. We think this the only means to successfully cope with this great evil.

Second. We feel that liquor is by far the greatest enemy of the home and church.

Third. We consider it the greatest enemy of legitimate business of all other lines of commerce. Be it

Further resolved, That these resolutions be inserted in the minutes and a copy be forwarded to each Representative from Alabama in the House and Senate, and that they be urged to support said bill or bills.

W. M. CORBY,
R. L. CASS,
J. L. TYLER,
Committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented petitions of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Takoma Park, D. C.; of the Highland Congregational Club, of Chesterfield, Mass.; of the Ministerial Association of Council Bluffs, Iowa; of International Order of Good Templars, of Mountain, N. Dak.; and of sundry citizens of Jefferson and Galveston, in the State of Texas, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRISTOW presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kirwin, Topeka, Hays City, and Ford, all in the State of Kansas, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PITTMAN. I present a telegram in the nature of a petition from Mrs. E. W. Vendevender, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Reno, Nev., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

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

RENO, NEV., *December 13, 1914.*

Hon. KEY PITTMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

One thousand votes in churches and Sunday schools of Reno for National Constitution prohibition amendment. Please inform Hon. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS and Hon. E. E. ROBERTS.

Mrs. E. W. VENDEVENDER,
President Reno Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of State Council of Connecticut, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Stamford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the official board of the Center Methodist Episcopal Church, and members of the Center Methodist Episcopal Church Sunday School; of Dristigheten Lodge, No. 11, International Order of Good Templars, Middletown; Svea Lodge, No. 52, International Order of Good Templars, of Branford; of Enighet Lodge, No. 42, International Order of Good Templars, of Manchester; of sundry citizens of Branford; of sundry citizens of Manchester; of Norden Lodge, No. 37, International Order of Good Templars, of New Britain; of the congregation of Union Plainfield Baptist Church, of Moosup; of sundry citizens of West Haven; of the congregation of First Methodist Episcopal Church of West Haven; of mem-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

bers of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Gales Ferry; of sundry citizens of Shelton; of members of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Niantic; of members of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Willimantic; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Lyme; and of the Connecticut Baptist Convention, held at Hartford, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented a petition of Snowflake Lodge, International Order of Good Templars, of Mattawamkeag, Me., and of a petition of Maine Conference Itinerant's Institute of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Rumford, Me., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of Eugene S. Barnes, of Claremont, N. H., praying that a reduction be made in the appropriations for purposes of war, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Sandwich Association of Free Baptist Churches, of Meredith, N. H., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey presented petitions of sundry citizens of Woodstown, N. J., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from sundry citizens of Norway, Mich., and a memorial of the Federation of Labor of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLAPP presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARREN. I present a telegram in the nature of a petition from P. A. Shope, business agent of the Wyoming State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

[Telegram.]

WHEATLAND, WYO., *December 15, 1914.*

HON. FRANCIS E. WARREN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Wyoming State Grange, representing 21 subordinate and 2 Pomona granges, with 495 members, in annual session assembled here unanimously adopted resolution favoring national constitutional prohibition and respectfully asking your support for the Hobson-Sheppard joint resolution now before Congress.

P. A. SHOPE,
Business Agent Wyoming State Grange.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Burns, Wyo., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Ohio Labor Home Rule Association, remonstrating against national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present a petition from the University of Illinois, relating to national defense. I ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

[The University of Illinois Special Press Bulletin, December 21, 1914.]

OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BY EDMUND J. JAMES, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, ON OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE.

SIR: The views expressed by you in your recent message to Congress concerning the ultimate reliance of the American people for a satisfactory scheme of national defense must command the support of all thoughtful Americans. Neither the system of universal military service, however many and substantial may be its advantages, nor that of a large standing army will ever be adopted by this country unless it should be really in continuous danger of invasion by foreign enemies or of destruction by domestic conflict. Neither of these possibilities is likely to be imminent in our day and generation.

We must, then, as you suggest, rely for our national defense upon a citizen soldiery. In such a scheme, however, one of the most serious difficulties is that of obtaining and maintaining a sufficient number of properly trained officers to man the regiments of the militia or National Guard. England is experiencing this difficulty at the present time in a most acute way—we also in the development of our National Guard.

I desire to call your attention to the simplest and most economic method of creating an adequate corps of properly trained officers in the United States to-day.

We have at present in each State in the Union at least one public institution supported in part by the State and in part by the Federal Government, in which instruction and drill are required of all or of a considerable proportion of the male students in such institutions. These are the colleges founded upon the proceeds of the Federal land grant of July 1, 1862.

In Illinois, for example, the State university, which received its first endowment from the Federal Government in the grant above mentioned, requires all the young men in the first and second years of the college course to participate in regular military drill to the extent of three hours per week. The students must provide themselves with uniforms, while the Federal Government supplies the guns and the supervision of the military instruction, and the State authorities furnish the armory and drill grounds.

The cadet force at present consists of a full brigade, made up of two regiments, and, including the military bands, numbers nearly 2,000 men, equal to about three National Guard regiments of the average size.

The War Department details a Regular Army officer to take charge of the work, who gives instruction to the cadet officers himself, these in turn instructing and training the privates. The cadet officers are selected by the military commandant from among those cadets who have distinguished themselves for their work as privates and who have a good standing in their academic courses.

The State of Illinois has just erected an armory which provides a drill hall with uninterrupted floor space of 200 by 400 feet—that is, 80,000 square feet—offering opportunity to carry on effective military drill throughout the year, winter as well as summer. This armory is known locally as the Temple of Peace, and surely a building like this, erected by a peace-loving people, for purely defensive purposes, may properly enough claim this suggestive title.

These university cadets, coming as they do from all parts of the State and country, from all social, industrial, and political classes, rich and poor, agricultural and manufacturing, Democratic and Republican, Progressive and Socialist; belonging to all colleges—agricultural, engineering, liberal arts and sciences—form the very best material for officers in the Militia and National Guard and other divisions of a truly popular Army.

Their college training guarantees a standard of general education fully equal to that of West Point and Annapolis graduates.

By extending the time of this military training from three hours to six hours per week and from two years to four years ample opportunity would be gained to secure a military training which would justify their appointment as brevet second lieutenants in the Federal Army or National Guard and make them the most valuable material for officers wherever they might be and whenever they should be needed.

If the Federal Government were to offer $250 per year to each cadet who would pledge himself to give this extra time to a study of military tactics and practical drill in military matters for four years, I have no doubt that anywhere from 100 to 250 officers of the second-lieutenant grade could be graduated from the University of Illinois every year and corresponding numbers from similar institutions. From 2,000 to 3,000 such officers would be added annually to the immediately available forces of our system of national defense.

I am myself a pacifist of rather an extreme type. I long for the time when international war will cease, but all history gives the lie to the doctrine that a state of military unpreparedness will insure the preservation of peace.

The wars of the French Revolution came upon Europe at a time when no single nation was prepared for war. It was the total unpreparedness of Europe for armed conflict which enabled Napoleon to overrun the Continent. The state of almost idiotic unpreparedness of the United States for the War of 1812 did not prevent us from going into the war, and led, naturally, to an almost continuous series of defeats on land until after the treaty of peace had been signed.

Certainly our unpreparedness for war did not prevent us from seizing half the Territory of Mexico in the forties.

The great Crimean War, in which, it must not be forgotten, nearly as large a proportion of the civilized world was involved as in the present war; the French-Austrian War, in 1859, and, above all, our own Civil War, from 1861 to 1865, are good illustrations of how quickly nations go into great wars on occasions without any real preparation and disposes absolutely of the contention that lack of preparation for war insures peace.

This proposition is further supported by the fact that unpreparedness for war did not prevent the Japanese-Chinese War, nor the English-Boer War, nor the Spanish-American War, nor the Russian-Japanese War, nor the Italian-Turkish War, nor the Balkan War, all of which wars, some of them of very great importance, have occurred within the last 20 years.

If preparedness for war does not guarantee peace, as we have plainly seen in the present great war in Europe, neither does unpreparedness; but the general knowledge that a great and powerful nation is ready to give a good account of itself in case it is attacked will go far to prevent such attacks. If overpreparedness for war, like that of Germany, for instance, may easily lead to wars of aggression, distinct unpreparedness on the part of a wealthy nation offering great opportunities for loot, like that of China, for example, easily provokes invasion. The only safe course for us is to establish and maintain a reasonable military force sufficient for effective national defense.

Let us by all means, then, develop the citizen soldiery, and let us take the first step toward creating a sufficient force of this sort by organizing and developing a sufficient and adequately trained corps of officers through the utilization of the great national State schools now in existence.

THE JUDICIAL CODE.

Mr. CHILTON. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 19076) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, and I submit a report (No. 847) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. CHILTON. I ask that the report accompanying the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

[Senate Report No. 847, Sixty-third Congress, third session.]

AMENDMENTS TO THE JUDICIAL CODE.

Mr. CHILTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 19076) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, having considered the same, beg leave to report it back without amendment and to recommend that it do pass.

[House Report No. 1182, Sixty-third Congress, second session.]

SECTION 1.

The first section of this bill amends section 116 of the judiciary act of 1911 by adding Porto Rico to the first circuit. Porto Rico has not heretofore been attached to any circuit, and in that respect differs from Hawaii, which has long been attached to the ninth circuit. There is, it is submitted, absolutely no reason for that difference. Porto Rico is attached to the first circuit, because there is less business pending there than in any other circuit court of appeals, and because there are established lines of communication between Porto Rico and our North Atlantic seaports.

SECTION 2.

The second section of this bill amends sections 128, 238, and 246 of the Judicial Code.

The changes made in section 128 are:

1. The words "and the United States District Court of Porto Rico" are added, thus conferring upon the circuit court of appeals for the first circuit the same jurisdiction with respect to Porto Rico that the circuit court of appeals for the ninth circuit now possesses with respect to Hawaii.

2. The words "under the trade-mark laws" are added, thus conferring the same jurisdiction with respect to trade-marks as now exists with respect to patents and copyrights. The Supreme Court has held, in the very recent case of Street *v.* Smith (231 U. S.), that the judgments and decrees of the circuit courts of appeal are final in cases arising under the trade-mark act of 1905, and the addition of the above words is intended to include also cases arising under prior trade-mark legislation. There can, of course, be no good reason why all trade-mark cases should not be governed by exactly the same rules and procedure as patents, copyrights, and trade-mark cases arising under the act of 1905.

The only change made in section 238 is the words "and the United States District Court of Porto Rico" are added, thus conforming the position of Porto Rico to that now occupied by Hawaii.

The changes in section 246 are:

1. The words "and of the Supreme Court of Porto Rico" are added, thus applying the provisions of this section to Porto Rico the same as they now apply to Hawaii.

2. Relieving the Supreme Court of the United States from the necessity of reviewing such cases from the Supreme Courts of Porto Rico and Hawaii as involve no Federal question but depend entirely upon the local or general law. Under the law as it now stands the decisions of the Supreme Courts of Porto Rico and Hawaii are reviewable by the Supreme Court of the United States not only when some Federal right is in controversy but also in all cases which involve more than $5,000 without respect to the character of the questions involved. This section as amended includes Porto Rico with Hawaii and continues the existing right to review in the Supreme Court when Federal rights are in controversy but leaves all other cases to be dealt with upon a petition for a writ of certiorari, as is now the law with respect to most of the cases in the circuit court of appeals.

SECTION 3.

Section 3 of this bill repeals section 244 of the judiciary act of 1911. That repeal is made necessary and proper because all of the cases provided for in it are taken care of by the preceding amendments.

SECTION 4.

Section 4 makes the decision of the circuit court of appeals final in bankruptcy proceedings and cases; but still leaves the Supreme Court with the power to review, through certiorari, such proceedings and cases as it may deem necessary and proper. The bankruptcy law has now been so thoroughly construed that there is not much doubt about any of its provisions, and cases now coming to the Supreme Court under it involve complicated questions of fact rather than of law. Besides all of this, many of these matters now have four hearings—one before the referee, one in the district court, one in the circuit court of appeals, and one in the Supreme Court. Certainly all litigants ought to be satisfied with a hearing before the referee, a trial in the district court, an appeal to the circuit court of appeals, with a right to review in the Supreme Court of the United States by a writ of certiorari upon a sufficient showing.

SECTION 5.

Section 5 denies railroad corporations the right to resort to Federal courts merely upon the ground that they hold a charter from the Federal Government. It is believed that the Texas Pacific is now the only railroad in this country which will be affected by this provision, and it is difficult to perceive any good reason why that road should be allowed to carry those who sue it into the Federal courts when its defense does not involve the construction of any law or treaty, or the Constitution of the United States, but depends solely on the naked assertion that it was incorporated under a Federal law.

POSTPONEMENT OF SALE OF FUR SKINS.

Mr. THORNTON. On behalf of the Committee on Fisheries I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 214) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to postpone the sale of certain sealskins. I ask that it be read, and then I will ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

That the Secretary of Commerce be, and he hereby is, authorized to postpone the sale of all skins now in possession of the Government, taken from seals killed on the Pribilof Islands for food purposes, under section 11 of the act of August 24, 1912, until such time as in his discretion he shall deem advisable, and the proceeds of such sale shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. THORNTON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution for the reason which I shall state. As Senators are aware, in 1912 a law was enacted forbidding the further killing of the Government seals on the Pribilof Islands for five years, with the exception of certain old males and some that were needed to be killed for food for the islanders. At the same time provision was made so that the skins of such animals should be sold at public auction by the Government and the proceeds placed to the credit of the United States in the Treasury.

Last year was the first sale that was made under the law, and it was made at St. Louis. Theretofore sales had been made in London. At the sale in St. Louis there was very keen competition. Foreign buyers from all over Europe attended the sale and also our domestic buyers. The result was that the sale brought 5 per cent more than the sale did in London the previous year.

By the law the sale is required to take place annually, and without an authorization of Congress to that effect the Secretary of Commerce will be required to sell the skins again this year. The Assistant Secretary of Commerce has just visited St. Louis, and he found that no foreign buyers whatever are coming there on account of the complications arising from the European war. Consequently there would be no competition and there would be a greatly reduced price in the sale. For that reason the Secretary of Commerce asked that this joint resolution be introduced authorizing him to postpone the sale in his discretion until the exigencies of the situation are over. It is in the interest of the revenue of the Government.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask what number of skins are now held under the order of the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. THORNTON. A little under 4,000. Last year, the first year under the law, it was between 2,000 and 3,000. This year it is between 3,000 and 4,000. Last year the sales brought to the Government about $54,000. This year, on the same basis, allowing for competition, they would amount to between $90,000 and $100,000.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. How does it occur that under the restrictive legislation which we passed as many as 4,000 skins have been secured?

Mr. THORNTON. Because it was necessary to increase the killing this year on account of providing food for the islanders. I think I will request that in this connection, for the information of the Senate, the letter of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce be read. It gives more information than I have given.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, December 18, 1914.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Confirming my conversation with you this morning with reference to a joint resolution authorizing the postponement of the sale of the sealskins which have been brought down from the Pribilof Islands and which are now in the possession of the Government, until such time as the Secretary of Commerce shall deem advisable, permit me to remind you that the law on this subject requires the sale of these sealskins annually, and this department is advised by its solicitor that in the absence of legislative authority for postponement the sale must take place during the present fiscal year.

The number of the sealskins now in possession of the Government is 3,284. It is the custom of the trade to sell such skins at auction, and this has been the invariable practice of the Government. The first sale of Pribilof Island sealskins in the United States was held at St. Louis, Mo., on December 16, 1913. A large number of foreign buyers were present on that occasion, and their bidding had much to do with the satisfactory prices obtained. Most of such foreign buyers were from European countries now at war. It is quite certain that if such sale were to be held at the present time or in the near future very few, if any, foreign buyers would be present, and competition would be reduced to such an extent as to materially affect the prices that would be obtained. This department is advised that the skins can be retained without risk of deterioration and with very little expense. It is impossible at this time to decide when the interests of the Government will require the sale to be held, and for that reason it is deemed advisable to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to use his discretion in fixing the date.

The number of skins sold last year was 1,896, and they brought $54,579, the average price being about 5 per cent higher than was paid for similar skins at the London sales a short time before. It was found last year that the number of seals authorized to be killed for food for the natives was insufficient and consequently the number was increased this year.

As this is purely a business matter the department strongly recommends the adoption of the joint resolution proposed.

Respectfully, yours,

E. F. SWEET,
Assistant Secretary.

Hon. J. R. THORNTON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have no doubt that the joint resolution is a proper measure, but I was surprised to find that so large a

number as 4,000 seals had been killed for food purposes. I had something to do with securing the passage of the restrictive legislation. A provision was inserted allowing the killing of such seals as were necessary for food purposes, but I had no conception that as many as 4,000, or even 3,000, would be required for that purpose. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana if he can inform the Senate what number of natives there are on the islands dependent in whole or in part upon the seals for food?

Mr. THORNTON. I am not able to answer that question. The only information I have on the subject is that the increased number of seals that were killed was due to the fact that it was found that an increased number was necessary to supply the natives with food. The Senator will remember, as he was instrumental in having the bill passed, the present number was called for for the reasons given in the debate in 1912, and in addition to that a certain number of males were to be selected—enough to give the food necessary to the natives. I see that I was mistaken in saying that there were about 4,000 killed. The number was a little under 2,000. I do not know the number of natives. All I know is the statement that this number is necessary in order to feed the natives, and the increased number killed is due to that fact.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think there is no objection to the joint resolution.

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

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A bill (S. 7015) to amend section 77 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 7016) granting a pension to John P. Todd (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 7017) granting a pension to Beulah C. Hicks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 7018) granting a pension to John McAteer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7019) granting a pension to Bessie M. Cogley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7020) granting an increase of pension to Cinderella B. McClure (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7021) granting a pension to Emma V. K. Keleher (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7022) granting a pension to G. M. Chamberlain (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7023) granting a pension to Eugene F. Clements;

A bill (S. 7024) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Keffer; and

A bill (S. 7025) granting a pension to Jeremiah Stump; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7026) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Rutter;

A bill (S. 7027) granting an increase of pension to Canrisa R. H. Richey;

A bill (S. 7028) granting a pension to Ann L. Elliott;

A bill (S. 7029) granting an increase of pension to Mahala Clemons; and

A bill (S. 7030) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Randall (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK:

A bill (S. 7031) granting an increase of pension to Alice Pollock; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming:

A bill (S. 7032) granting an increase of pension to Mary R. Kendall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 7033) granting an increase of pension to Augustus P. Horne (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7034) granting an increase of pension to Ellen C. Gardner (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 7035) granting a pension to Mary E. Weeks (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 7036) granting an increase of pension to Annie R. Jewett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 7037) granting an increase of pension to Ann Jolly (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7038) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Bird (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 7039) granting a pension to Martha J. Reynolds (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 215) to refund under certain conditions, and for the year 1914, a portion of the offers in compromise for failure to make the return required under the act of October 3, 1913, said offers in compromise having been covered into the Treasury; to the Committee on Finance.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill (H. R. 8846), which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HARDWICK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill (H. R. 8846), which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

JOE H. NORRIS.

Mr. WARREN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $260.68 to pay Joe H. Norris for salary, etc., while performing the duties of supervisor of Indian schools from October 21, 1912, to November 11, 1912, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill (H. R. 20150), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—EDWIN SNYDER.

On motion of Mr. BRISTOW, it was—

Ordered, That the papers accompanying the bill (S. 3692) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Snyder be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, there having been no adverse report thereon.

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I submit a document entitled "The National Archives," reprinted from the American Historical Review, written by Mr. Waldo Gifford Leland, on a bill which has already passed Congress, for the construction of an archives building. It is a description of the archives of the Government and the condition in which they are to be found. I ask that it be printed as a public document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. FLETCHER. I did not hear the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state it.

The SECRETARY. Mr. POINDEXTER desires to have printed as a public document the pamphlet entitled "The National Archives," a program by Waldo Gifford Leland, reprinted from the American Historical Review of October, 1912.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, it seems to me that the document should go to the Committee on Printing. I presume there will be no objection to having it printed, and if it is not very important to act on it at once I should rather have it go to the committee, for I think it ought to take that course.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator from Florida desires the document to go to the Committee on Printing, I have no objection at all. It contains very valuable and, I think, very essential information in connection with a work which has already been authorized, that of providing for the erection of an archives building for the Government.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think, as a matter of general practice, such matters should go to the Committee on Printing, because there is a rule that requires that all such documents shall not be ordered printed until there is an estimate of the cost, and so forth. I should rather have the document take that course.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The document will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

REPORT ON MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION (H. DOC. NO. 1423).

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which

was read and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the first annual report of the Commissioner of Mediation and Conciliation on the operations of the United States Board of Mediation and Conciliation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 21, 1914.*

REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning business is closed.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6060, the unfinished business.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gore	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Brady	Gronna	Page	Smoot
Brandegee	Hardwick	Penrose	Sterling
Bristow	Hitchcock	Perkins	Sutherland
Burton	Hughes	Pittman	Swanson
Catron	Johnson	Poindexter	Thornton
Chilton	Jones	Pomerene	Townsend
Clapp	Kern	Ransdell	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Reed	Walsh
Crawford	Lane	Robinson	White
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Williams
Cummins	Lodge	Sheppard	Works
Dillingham	Myers	Sherman	
Fletcher	O'Gorman	Smith, Ga.	
Gallinger	Oliver	Smith, Md.	

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. THOMAS] by consent of the Senate and to state that he is paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT].

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], who is absent from the city, is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for all votes to-day.

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY].

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. KENYON] is absent from the city and is paired with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN].

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] has been called home on account of important business.

Mr. LANE. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is unavoidably absent on business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. O'GORMAN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the pending amendment.

The SECRETARY. The pending amendment is the one offered by Mr. THOMAS, as modified, proposing to strike out certain words on page 9, lines 6 to 12, and in lieu thereof to insert:

> That the following classes of persons, when otherwise qualified for admission under the laws of the United States, shall be exempt from the operation of the illiteracy test, to wit: All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious, political, or racial persecution, whether such persecution be evidenced by overt acts or by discriminatory laws or regulations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado as modified.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I desire to make some general observations on the literacy test before the matter shall have proceeded further.

This test is one that would exclude a large number of immigrants presenting themselves who now are capable of being admitted under existing laws. It occurs to me that the only justification for this proposed change is the improvement of our own population. I do not care much myself to go into the question of the right of asylum. We may enlarge our borders here for the purpose of furnishing a more commodious home and a safer and better place for those who come from abroad, but, as I wish to consider the question, it is entirely a question of improving our own population.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] a day or two ago seemed to take the view that all the ignorant people in the world were the unlettered people. I would have been very glad if I could, on the impulse of the moment, have made whatever comment I desired right on the heels of that statement. It may or may not be correct. I do not think so; I can only sustain myself by giving such views as present themselves to me.

Mr. President, if all the wise men of the world have obtained their wisdom from between the lids of books, then I have lived some years and engaged in business of various kinds to no purpose. I have an idea that the test whether a man is learned or unlearned, literate or illiterate, useful or otherwise, and a desirable or an undesirable person depends very largely on what he is able to do after he gets in here.

I think, Mr. President, this country is surfeited with essayists, with professors of economics, with gentlemen who ride hobbies, with Chautauqua performers, with those who are enamored of theories, who are statesmen on paper and in parlors, but who are totally unable to deal with men and with actual conditions and things as they present themselves in government. The foregoing classification covers a large number of agitators in this country who propose to regenerate mankind by passing resolutions and who on platforms are celebrated mostly for the sensations they create amongst audiences wherein the gate money is the inspiration and the text of the address arranged to draw the sensation-loving populace. Those gentlemen all are clamoring for a test that shall consist of the ability or the inability to read something, whether it be in our tongue or somebody's else tongue. The fitness or unfitness of those immigrants who present themselves is to be decided by an interpreter.

I had an idea, Mr. President, that these useful gentlemen, who have been reforming everything in the country all the way from Oyster Bay to California, would be perfectly competent themselves to interpret everything that needed interpretation. Still we would have to have some seven or eight tongues constantly employed wherever an immigrant proposed to come into our country. Under this bill upon the honesty or dishonesty, upon the fitness or unfitness, the fairness or unfairness, of these interpreters would depend the question of whether proposed immigrants should be admitted or excluded.

If all the people who are unlettered are ignorant, are now to be excluded, then our ancestors, Mr. President, were totally unfit to found an empire. It did not qualify a Revolutionary soldier because he could not read; neither did it make him unfit to be an instrument for good. I do not know how educated my great-grandfather was. I never saw him or heard of him. Many of us have little pride of ancestry in this country, and, for my part, I am reasonably glad of it.

We are a mixed breed; and the difficulty is, Mr. President, if we do not have a little red blood from over the seas, we are going to breed out. What we need to do in this country, as the old ladies say out in the poultry yard, is to swap roosters once in a while. It seems as though the authors of this bill have forgotten that indispensable fact in the poultry yard of human affairs.

The fact that I have no pride of ancestry myself does not lead me to decry the qualifications of those who have. I shall not quarrel with them. I shall offer no invidious criticisms of those gentlemen. All I wish to say is that when they propose that a man shall conform to some literacy test, my idea is that it is too narrow.

I do not know how to put this the most briefly. I do not desire to occupy much space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because the longer I stay around this body the more I believe that the more space you occupy in the RECORD the less useful you are in human affairs. The Treasury is already burdened enough, without increasing the printing bill. So I do not care, for myself, to do more than make some very general observations.

The body of men that I have the honor to represent in part, together with my esteemed colleague, present a very mixed constituency—not only mixed in belief, but mixed in nationality and blood. God knows that if difference of belief made a mixed constituency we would not have any out in our country, because few there believe any two ways alike. If we had to make a discrimination on account of race, it would only add to the difficulty. I used to have a colony of Arabs among my constituents. I do not think they are naturalized. Probably they are not qualified under the laws of the country to become naturalized. We have some Turks. We have everybody from Europe that is now engaged in trouble, and many of them that are not,

in their home countries. It takes seven languages to run a campaign out there. Some of us have recently emerged from a campaign of that kind. Some did not emerge at all. [Laughter.] But when it comes to a literacy test with seven tongues in a campaign, I have an idea that in this campaign those who could not read the English language voted and behaved about as intelligently as some of those whose ancestors came over in the *Mayflower*, and whose family tree would run back to a hemp string, as one of colleagues on the other side of the Chamber [Mr. REED] said not many days ago.

So, if it comes to a matter of behavior, I would agree with my friends that that ought to be made the test. If it is a matter of having college degrees or having a diploma written in some dead tongue, or being able to read some language that is living, I doubt whether that makes a test that will add to the wisdom, the virtue, or the usefulness of our population.

The difficulty I see on this point, Mr. President, is that when you impose the literacy test it assumes that because a man has some education, because he can read in some tongue—either our own or some other one—that settles the question. If otherwise under this bill or existing laws he is qualified—if he is not an anarchist, if he is not opposed to organized government, if he does not believe in killing those who are in authority or destroying those who represent any reasonable form of government known to civilized man—he is desirable. If the test of literacy is to be further imposed upon the immigrant, it must be with a view of obtaining a fitter kind.

I thought that over a good deal in some leisure moments while I have been listening to the accumulated wisdom of the ages that pours itself in rills and torrents around this body, and I have not yet heard anything, however much I should like to change my views, that caused me to do so. I prefer to vote for this bill without the literacy test. I am inclined to think the literacy test now is more popular, outside of a few large cities in my home State, than the reverse. The easy way would be to flow with the current of this bill.

In the long, hot summer nights, when there is not very much doing around the Loop inside of the habitable part of Chicago, where nobody lives but those who do business by night—the rest of them have gone home—there is a popular place that corresponds to the place designated among the old Greeks for the discussion of public questions. There is a sort of a forum down about Jackson Boulevard on the curbstone. There, on soap boxes or on the curbstones, wherever they can stand conveniently, a number of educated gentlemen from abroad hold forth in the gloaming on public questions. I very often go about for the purpose of listening to what is necessary for the public welfare, and that is the place to find it.

The progenitors of some of these gentlemen, some 20 or more years ago, on the west side of the city of Chicago, carried into effect some of the theories promulgated by the philosophers of the Old World. They killed a number of policemen over at the Haymarket because they were interfering with the alleged right of free speech and the right of public assemblage. Afterwards they were "judicially murdered," in the language of these philosophers; and their experience was entirely sufficient to create a scene of profound peace where before there had been numerous disturbances on the Lake Front. This was an extreme form of the theories promulgated by some of these gentlemen who emigrated from other countries, all of whom could stand the literacy test when they enriched us with their presence. Possibly they left their native countries for their countries' good. I am sure they did not come to our country for our good.

I very often engage in conversation with those gentlemen. They are a type. They did not come here by accident. They came by premeditated design. They were not assisted emigrants, except so far as they were assisted by laws which they had violated and regarded as oppressive in the country from which they emigrated. They have an idea that this country is open enough for free speech to degenerate into advice for disorder and for a free press to degenerate into lawless license; so over they come. They undertake to carry into effect what they consider the rights of lawless license rather than free speech and of a free press. That it results in disorder is only a natural consequence; it is what they intend. They are not talking for the mere purpose of being heard. They are talking for the purpose of inciting somebody to action. Usually, when they are let alone for a long time, they succeed. When they incite somebody to action it usually results in a public disturbance.

There is not a solitary one of those men, not a lecturer on the curbstone, not a soap-box orator, not a solitary one of these essayists and political philosophers and dealers in dreams that could not stand any literacy test ever invented. Why, some of them bear degrees from ancient universities. Still I do not regard them as desirable citizens. I do not charge their perversion to their education. I only say their degrees emphasize their uselessness.

If I had my choice about it, before I ever sent anybody under my charge to a university I would go to the faculty of the university and find out what kind of a professor of economics the child was likely to be placed under in that institution. Mr. President, there is more ineffable rot being taught in some of the universities to-day than there is in all the ignorant slums of a European capital. It takes a sane man half a lifetime of human experience to recover from some of it. Whenever I find some parlor socialist, somebody who has inherited a few millions from an ancester that amounted to something in his lifetime, who is going out to overturn society and to destroy the existing order of things, three times out of four in a metropolis you will find somebody carrying the degrees of an ancient university, whose intellectual processes have gone wrong, taught by somebody in the privacy of a professor's cloister, taught by somebody who has gone mad on book learning, who thinks the whole course of empire is embraced between the covers of a book; some graduate of that kind, who has no more place or part in the practical human affairs of life than the veriest ignorant immigrant that ever got through the gates into our country and raised a peck of potatoes or a bushel of corn.

These men talk glibly about the laws of production; and of all the shameless rot under the guise of learning, of all the insuperable obstacles that have darkened the face of accurate knowledge, these gentlemen have produced the worst. So, when it comes to mere knowledge and mere ability to stand a literacy test I find a great many of those who have been natives here ever since I can remember, whom, in spite of their ability to pass a literacy test, I think I would vote to deport, although they were born here, if such a thing were constitutional. I would send them to Dry Tortugas, colonize them in the Philippine Islands or, if the punishment were within constitutional limits as not being cruel or unusual, I would banish them to Oyster Bay. [Laughter.]

The literacy test proposes to exclude, in the first instance, all those who are unable to read. This introduces a new test, Mr. President, not heretofore recognized in the census returns. In the census of 1910 an illiterate person is defined to be one who can not write. That is the test that the census enumerators follow. There is an inconsiderable number who can read but can not write; but they are so small, compared with our total population of illiterates, as not to be made the subject of a separate classification. The illiterate person as defined in this bill is one who can not read. It is assumed in most cases, I suppose, that the person who can not read can not write, and so answers either definition.

When I figure on our population from abroad and consider that it shall be excluded if it be illiterate or can not answer the test of being able to read, I am disposed to look at the matter not in a very altruistic sense. I do not know that I am opposed to foreign missions, but I generally prefer to take care of the heathen about home first, and there are always plenty of them. So I think probably the better way would be to take not the altruistic view that we are going to furnish an asylum for everybody that wants to emigrate from the land of his nativity, but that we are going to take care of our own people and improve our population that is coming in from abroad, as well as furnish a sufficient incentive and standard for the people of our own country.

Taking the latter view of it, waiving any further remarks on a number of distinguished professors in the country who are bent upon having a pure democracy or a higher grade of intelligence to manage the affairs of the country, leaving them for some subsequent occasion, I shall address myself principally to the improvement of our own population. I want to remark parenthetically that my philanthropy usually begins and ends at home. That of these professors begins away from home and never arrives any place else.

I cite as authority for some conclusions I will draw statements that I have found in the census of 1910. Something it seems to me has been overlooked in the literacy test. Once or twice it has been touched slightly in the reasons presented here.

Along in our experience in 1910 we got our classifications made between native-born whites of American parentage and the native-born whites of foreign or mixed parentage. That is a fairly good test. If a person coming here from abroad was really illiterate and remained not only himself illiterate but his posterity took it from him as an inheritance, I would think he ought to be excluded. I do not find it so.

The figures gathered by the United States Census Department have given us a total of 37,000,000 native-born whites. Those are of American origin. They have given us some 14,000,-

native whites born of foreign parents. I have gone to the offspring of those who are alien born—those who have come here under various conditions, literate or illiterate themselves—to find what proportion of their children are illiterate. I have searched, too, to find what proportion of the native-born alien whites of American parentage are illiterate.

It may not be very popular to draw these conclusions, but I am utterly indifferent on the matter of vote getting. Finally it will win because it is right. The longer I stay here, the more I make up my mind there is a good deal said here in this Chamber on a question which comes before us like this, and others, with a possible view of the effect it will have on the constituents of the various Members who inhabit this Chamber. I suppose the wise thing would be to take a native view of it and to stick by the American born. I assume that the American born is just as good as anybody else if he behaves himself as well as anybody else. Some of them do and some of them, which is a matter of regret, I say, do not.

The same test can apply very properly to the immigrant who is coming in. If it be a question of character, I can understand it. I wish, however, to put in the RECORD, in order that it may be preserved for future purposes, before I leave it, the figures I have taken from the census.

In the census of 1910 the total illiterates in the United States were 5,516,000, in round numbers. The whites of American birth and parentage were 37,000,000. Of these whites of American birth and of American parentage 1,378,884 were illiterate. Of the whites American born of foreign or mixed parentage there were 155,388 illiterate in that time. The whites of American birth and American parentage constituted 3.7 per cent of the total illiterates of the country. The whites of American birth and foreign or mixed parentage constituted 1.1 per cent of the total illiteracy of the country. The white foreign-born immigrants, of 10 years of age or over, were 1,650,361, or 12.7 per cent total of the illiterates.

I wish to draw some conclusions from these figures. The first is that the white natives of American parentage who are illiterate furnish 25 per cent of the total illiteracy of the country, while the whites who are native born of foreign or mixed parentage furnish but 2.8 per cent of the total of illiteracy of the country.

The foreign immigrant, an adult, who has reached our shores, it is true, furnishes 12.7 per cent of our illiteracy. That is on the idea which has been pretty definitely established that the man abroad is not ignorant because of choice. He is ignorant because of the lack of opportunity.

Something has been said of the Jew. We have a great many of them in three or four States, especially in the State of New York and the State of Illinois. The city of New York and the city of Chicago have a very large Jewish population. We can pass over all historic references to the Jew, our likes and dislikes that might or might not exist because of his historic troubles, and take the Hebrew as we find him. He is industrious. He pays his debts, as large a per cent of them as the Americans. Few of them are found in the poorhouse. Few of them are found who are not self-supporting. Their charities are collected and administered by their own people.

As a racial question the Jew ought to be admitted; on the ground of religious persecution the Jew ought to be admitted. On the question of political persecution nobody can cast that horoscope for the future. Nobody can tell much about the result of the war in the Old World. When it is done, however, Mr. President, there will be a rearrangement of the map of Europe. There will be some armaments destroyed; some navies in the bottom of the sea; new racial questions and new questions of political persecution will necessarily, unless a very great tolerance be shown in the settlement of the question, again ensue.

I rather favor here enlarging this amendment. Instead of striking out the literacy test I would enlarge the bill, if I had my views to control, so that all racial, political, and religious persecutions might be a sufficient cause, if the immigrant were otherwise qualified, for admittance.

This country was founded on religious persecution, a large part of it. The New Englanders came here on that ground. I think it would be rather a narrow test and would be out of keeping with our historic origin if we undertook to lay down a test now that would exclude those who might themselves be fleeing from either religious or political persecution in the very near future.

We can not undertake to solve the questions of the Old World. I do not think our treaties even can do that. That will be settled by the people of the Old World who are the most immediately concerned.

I think, for my part, this test laid down in the proposed qualification of the immigrant to read will let in more of those who are dangerous than it excludes.

The conclusions I wish to draw from these figures are that whatever the character of the adult immigrant who has come here in the last 10 years it is evident that his children have used the advantages better than we. The native-born child of foreign-born parents shows a lower per cent of illiteracy than the child of the native-born American. The reason that I can see for this is that those of foreign-born parents who are here use their advantages better because they appreciate them.

I have had a considerable experience in a professional way among the nationalities. I would just as lief undertake to collect a claim against a Scotchman, or a German, or a Scandinavian, or a Hebrew, or a Bohemian, or an Italian, or a Lithuanian, or a Pole, or an Austrian as I would against any Yankee who is a little slow in pay that I ever saw in my life. They bring with them from the Old World, those who are not spoiled in the making, a better inborn propensity to pay their debts and to abide by the laws of the country than some of our own people. When they come here, if they are illiterate themselves when admitted, the alien adult knows the difficulty under which he labored in the Old World that made him illiterate. He knows why it is that in his early childhood he was unable to acquire the test proposed in this bill. Knowing that, as soon as his family reaches the school age he is more diligent in seeing that the family gets into the public school and stays there and takes the discipline and instruction given in that school than the American to whom school privileges as far back as he and his immediate ancestors can remember has been as common as the air and as free as the water that flows past him in his native river. The very fact that it has been so free and so common to him has led him to neglect the opportunities presented by his birthright. And so it works out in a perfectly natural way.

The census tabulations show that the native-born American white above the age of 10 years furnishes 3.7 per cent of our illiteracy, while the native-born American of foreign or mixed parentage furnishes 1.1 per cent. The figures themselves are much more illuminating, because of the 5,516,000 illiterates total in the United States in 1910, 25 per cent of them were furnished by children native born, of American parentage, and 2.8 per cent of them were furnished by the children American born of foreign or mixed parentage.

This high average of illiteracy among the children born of American parents and relatively low average of the children born of foreign or mixed parentage shows that the activity, the zeal, and the appreciation of the opportunities given in this country are to a more marked degree found in those of foreign parentage than in those of American parentage who have become blasé and careless.

If I go into the schoolroom where these nationalities are found, whether from the Scandinavian Peninsula or from southern Europe, and from the latter place comes a large part of the criticism, and read the reports in the city of New York or Chicago, I find the same story written in the daily conduct of those who are of foreign or mixed parentage. The general course of observation is that those of foreign or mixed parentage show a diligence and appreciation and an effort that is greater even than that of the American born.

The same story is written in the census returns from the several States. For instance, in the State of Kansas the illiterates of all classes are 2.2 per cent of her population. The illiterates of those born of native white parents are eight-tenths of 1 per cent; born of mixed or foreign parentage, eight-tenths of 1 per cent. Nebraska, with an illiteracy of all classes of 1.9 per cent, the native-born children of American parentage furnish six-tenths of 1 per cent and of foreign parentage five-tenths of 1 per cent. North Dakota, with a total of 3.1 per cent of all classes in illiteracy, the native born are three-tenths of 1 per cent, and those of foreign birth seven-tenths of 1 per cent. South Dakota, with a total illiteracy of 2.9 per cent, the illiteracy of children of American parentage is three-tenths of 1 per cent, and of foreign parentage four-tenths of 1 per cent.

The excess of percentage in these last two States can very probably be explained, because a very large percentage of the settlers of the Northwest are of alien birth, likely exceeding those of native birth.

Minnesota, with a total illiteracy of 3 per cent, that of children of native parentage is four-tenths of 1 per cent, and of foreign or mixed parentage six-tenths of 1 per cent.

New York shows a total illiteracy of 5.5 per cent, and of children of native white or American parentage of eight-tenths of 1 per cent; of foreign or mixed parentage of seven-tenths of 1 per cent.

If I go to Alabama, I find 22.9 per cent of illiteracy, with an American parentage of native population of 10.1 per cent, as against 2.3 per cent of those born of foreign or mixed parentage.

Louisiana, with a total of 29 per cent illiteracy, has a total of 15 per cent born of American parentage, and 3.6 per cent of foreign parentage.

Arizona, with an illiteracy of 20.9 per cent, has 2.3 per cent of native or American parentage, native born, and 8.4 per cent of foreign parentage.

With the State of Georgia with 20.7 per cent of illiteracy, there is 8 per cent native of American parents and 1.6 born of foreign parents.

These figures indicate that if we are to improve the population the literacy test does not furnish the adequate means of doing so. The literacy test of itself is too narrow. It proposes to totally exclude those who can not meet its requirements. Whatever his qualifications in other respects may be, whatever his character may be, however industrious, however productive, whatever ability he may have, it is all to end because he does not possess the requisite scholastic attainments. The mere fact that the opportunity may be denied him in the country of his origin cuts no figure when he presents himself for admission under the provisions of this bill because of the narrowness of this test.

Because to me it furnishes an unjust reason for denying the right of admission into this country, I shall very cheerfully, Mr. President, vote to strike this section out of the bill. If it remains in other particulars as it is, I can certainly vote for it, and I shall be glad to support it because the purposes of the bill in the main are commendable.

Some restrictions ought to be provided. The existing law might be conceded to be inadequate for the purposes intended. Some such amendments of that law as proposed in this bill ought to be had. The inability to meet the literacy test of itself, though, furnishes no adequate reason why a man ought to be excluded. I can not for my part see wherein it improves our population, leaving outside entirely the question of discussing the right of asylum in this country, on the ground alone of improving our population, enabling us to people our country with those whom we admit of a desirable kind.

The literacy test of itself does not exclude any of the undesirables, nor does it permit any of the desirables to come in who would not otherwise be admitted if this test were out of the bill. The mere fact that the literacy test can be met when the person applies to be admitted does not decide his character. The criticism made of the character test that I have heard a great many times is that it is impracticable; that it can not be applied. If we can stamp upon each article of merchandise brought from abroad the country of its origin, appraise its value, pass it through the customhouse, charge the responsibility on our consuls and foreign officers abroad of seeing that the proper appraisements are made, that invoices are prepared, and no fraud committed—if this can extend to the smallest article of merchandise before it is turned loose in our markets, it seems to me that the care of this Government could be so exercised through its officers abroad that a human being might himself be inventoried and appraised and his true value, based upon his character abroad, where he is known, be stamped upon him in some indubitable way, so that when he presents himself for admission the character test, outside of the literacy test, which is the one proposed in this bill, might be the broader or better test that would admit or exclude him.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss this very important amendment at this time. The amendment as proposed practically destroys the illiteracy test, and we might as well take the question on a separate vote to strike it out altogether as to do it in this indirect way. I am not going to argue it, but I want to suggest to the chairman of the committee that the question of the illiteracy test and the question of the passage of the bill are two very important questions. No one can question the great importance of this legislation. The Senate is thin; many Senators have already left town; the Senate will not be more crowded to-morrow, I think I may say; and it seems to me that a matter of such importance as this might well be put over, if that can be done without the bill losing the place which it now has as the unfinished business.

I know the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] desires to discuss this matter at some length and the chairman of the committee, I assume, will do the same. It is hardly fair for us to have this discussion with such a very thin Senate as we have to-day, and my purpose in rising is to ask the chairman of the committee if he will not be willing to have the immigration bill temporarily laid aside and allow us to proceed to the consideration of the unobjected cases on the calendar? I am afraid we should have some difficulty in getting a quorum this evening, and it is very desirable to clear off the unobjected bills from the calendar. So long as we take up only unobjected bills by unanimous consent that will not displace the unfinished business, of course, it being temporarily laid aside. I venture to offer that suggestion to the chairman of the committee to see if such an arrangement can not be made.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, with the Senator's consent, in order that the chairman of the committee may appreciate the real force of the suggestion made by the Senator from Massachusetts along the line that there is much discussion yet to be had on the bill, I desire to inform the able chairman that I have prepared an amendment, which I expected to submit this morning, striking out the whole section containing the literacy test, which would give rise to a form of debate slightly different from that in which we have been engaged. I desire to be heard upon the question, but I naturally do not wish to be heard this morning; and naturally, out of a sense of vanity and some respect for my own utterances and the weight I think they should carry, I should like to have such Senators present as would be impressed with that which impresses me, sensible observations in connection with my objections to the whole section. I should like to join, therefore, in the suggestion that the measure may go over in order that the debate may be had to a larger assemblage, to the end that a more intelligent consideration may be had.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, in view of the request made by the Senator from Massachusetts, and also by the Senator from Illinois, I recognize that the vote to test the passage of this bill is going to be upon the literacy test, and that the pending amendment would involve the fate of the bill so far as the literacy test is concerned. In view of the facts brought out by them, I should like to ask a ruling of the Chair on this proposal, supplemental to what the Senator from Massachusetts has suggested: I take it that to-morrow there will be a repetition of the same condition that exists to-day. On Wednesday, according to the agreement reached, a resolution to that effect having already passed both Houses, we will adjourn over the holidays. I will ask the ruling of the Chair as to the status of the pending bill if this afternoon, in place of adjourning until to-morrow, we were to recess until a certain hour on Wednesday, the pending bill being temporarily laid aside? Would it not then automatically come up at the convening of the Senate after the holidays as the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that if the unfinished business is temporarily laid aside by unanimous consent, and the Senate proceeds to the consideration of other business by unanimous consent, it would not in any way interfere with the position the pending bill holds as the unfinished business, because it would then be in order at any time for any Senator to call for the regular order, and the pending bill, as the unfinished business, would then come up. So long as the pending bill is temporarily laid aside and the Senate considers other business by unanimous consent, it does not lose its place as the unfinished business; and if the Senate takes a recess it continues as the unfinished business and would be the first business laid before the Senate when it reassembled.

Mr. LODGE. It would be the unfinished business on December 29.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be the unfinished business on that date.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. With that ruling of the Chair, Mr. President, and with that understanding, I shall ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and when the time comes to end to-day's session I suggest that we take a recess, rather than an adjournment, so as not to displace the immigration bill.

Mr. O'GORMAN. So that the immigration bill will have precedence on the 29th of December when the Senate reassembles?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; at 2 o'clock.

Mr. O'GORMAN. At 2 o'clock on that day.

Mr. CULBERSON. If we take a recess, the bill will come up automatically as soon as the Senate reconvenes.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I understand that to be the desire of those who are particularly interested in the bill.

There is another reason justifying the request which has been made, if I may be permitted to state it, and that is that two of the Senators who have manifested great interest in the pending amendment, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], are temporarily absent from the city; and if this application had not been made by the Senator from Massachusetts, I should have

offered the fact of their absence as a reason why we should suspend the discussion of this amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from South Carolina that taking a recess would not aid at all in keeping the immigration bill before the Senate as the unfinished business. The Chair understands that the House and the Senate have agreed to adjourn from next Wednesday until December 29, and if nothing in the meantime shall have been done by the Senate to displace the immigration bill as the unfinished business, then on the 29th of December, when the Senate reassembles, at 2 o'clock the immigration bill will come regularly before the Senate as the unfinished business.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, if we take a recess, would not the bill come up automatically as soon as the Senate met, instead of at 2 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In that case it would come up as soon as the Senate met following the recess, because when a recess is taken there is no morning hour when the Senate again assembles.

Mr. LODGE. If the Chair will pardon me, the recess to which we are now referring is not a recess in the technical sense; it is an adjournment over six days; and when we meet again it will be just as we meet every day. The morning hour will not be affected and the bill will come up as the unfinished business at 2 o'clock on December 29.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has stated to the Senator from South Carolina that the Senate and the House have agreed to adjourn from next Wednesday until December 29, and when the Senate reassembles on the 29th, at 2 o'clock the immigration bill will come up as the unfinished business.

Mr. LODGE. Following the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Following the morning hour.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If we can have an understanding now to the effect that, if the pending measure is temporarily laid aside until the 29th of December, there shall intervene no business to take its place, I shall not object to laying aside the unfinished business at this time. The point that I was attempting to make, and the danger that I was attempting to hedge, was this: If on Wednesday next, the day when we have agreed to take an adjournment to December 29, some Senator were to move to take up a bill, and it were taken up and discussed and was in process of discussion when adjournment was taken to December 29, would not the measure then under discussion be the unfinished business rather than the immigration bill? It is that very situation that I am attempting now to guard against.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of opinion that if a motion were made after 2 o'clock to take up another measure and a majority of the Senate should agree to the motion, and it were not disposed of before adjournment, it would become the unfinished business.

Mr. LODGE. It would displace the present unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will, however, suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that if other business should be taken up by unanimous consent it would not interfere with the position of the pending measure as the unfinished business.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have on several occasions submitted some suggestions in reference to the program. The plea has been that it is important to dispose of the immigration bill. The Senator from South Carolina was very anxious to get that bill to a vote—so anxious that we could not have the morning hour; so anxious that it was necessary for the chairman of the committees to get recognition from the presiding officer every morning, and thus prevent our taking up the bill which the Senate on several occasions has expressed itself as favoring.

I have not wanted to displace the immigration bill. I have done nothing to indicate that I wanted to displace it; but now that it has been disclosed that the Senator can not hold his bill before the Senate because of lack of interest in its discussion, I will not consent that we shall be foreclosed from taking up any other measure, at least during the morning hour, for consideration.

So I shall object to this bill going over. If the Senator will allow the morning hour to-morrow to be devoted to the bill which I have called up on several occasions, and then have its consideration end at 2 o'clock, without any idea of supplanting the regular order, I have no objection to it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think it is only fair to the friends of the immigration bill to correct what seems to be implied in the Senator's remark, that there is not sufficient interest in the bill to keep those interested here. The friends of the bill are ready to vote now.

Mr. REED. Why not vote?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It is those who are so interested as to the elimination of certain features who desire further discussion; and in view of the fact—we might as well be frank with each other—that certain conditions may arise that may jeopardize the passage of the bill, I do not wish to have it lose any of its rights. I do not want to seem to interfere and take up the time that is allotted as the morning hour for the discussion of such matters as may be disposed of, and I have no desire to displace anything. But I certainly am going to insist that the parliamentary situation and status of this bill shall not be jeopardized, because I think it has waited as long as any other bill that ever has been on the calendar.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the chairman of the committee will allow me for a moment, the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan seems to me to be a perfectly reasonable one. It would not displace this bill to take up the bill which the Senator from Michigan desires to take up in the morning hour—not the least in the world. It would only displace it if it were taken up on motion after 2 o'clock. I sincerely hope the chairman of the committee will leave the morning hour to-morrow for the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts present his suggestion in the shape of a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. LODGE. No, Mr. President; I do not wish to call for a quorum.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, according to a former statement, I am perfectly willing to have the bill laid aside temporarily so as to consider unobjected bills on the calendar.

Mr. LODGE. The chairman of the committee would have no objection, I take it, to the Senator from Michigan taking up his bill in the morning hour to-morrow. That would not displace the unfinished business.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have stated the position that I now occupy in reference to temporarily laying it aside; but the danger that I call attention to is one that I do not care to risk. I ask that the bill be temporarily laid aside, and that the calendar be proceeded with; and then, before we finally take our adjournment or recess this afternoon, I shall ask that the unfinished business be formally laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed with the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar under Rule VIII. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, if I may be pardoned, and may be indulged by the Senator from South Carolina, may I propose a suggestion in order that we may gather the chairman's view? The chairman, as I understand, is perfectly content that any measure or matter may come up that does not in its nature supplant or displace the present bill known as the immigration bill?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. As I have stated, and it is unnecessary for me to repeat it, a request was made that this bill be temporarily laid aside, and that the calendar be taken up. Of course, the Senate has the power to object or not, as it sees fit. The only point I am making is that before we take our recess or adjournment for to-morrow and for Wednesday I hope this matter may be thoroughly understood, which seems to be impossible just now. Therefore I renew my request to the effect that the calendar be taken up for the consideration of such bills as are unobjected to, under Rule VIII.

Mr. LEWIS. I desire, then, to conclude, if I may be permitted.

Favoring, as I do, the volunteer officers' bill, I have memory that the bill was called up from time to time, and that we had morning discussion; and unless I am in error—and I am willing to concede that I have not the best knowledge of the rules—the measure can still be called up in the morning hour for discussion without coming within the category of a bill being called up from the calendar in such a manner that it would operate as a displacement. Therefore I am unable to see where the able chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina, in anything he says, objects at all to the measure suggested by the Senator from Michigan being taken up at any time in the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As has been stated by the Senator from Massachusetts, to-morrow at any time before 2 o'clock the Senator from Michigan can move to take up the bill referred to by him, which will be morning business until 2 o'clock. At 2 o'clock its consideration will cease, and the unfinished business will come before the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I realize that, Mr. President, and that is what I am now contending for; but suppose to-morrow morning

there should happen what happened this morning and yesterday morning—the Senator from South Carolina rises before the morning hour is concluded, and the Chair is prepared to recognize him to take up the immigration bill?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think we can have a perfect understanding. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that to-morrow morning, until the hour of 2 o'clock shall arrive, if he desires to take up the bill mentioned by him or any other, in view of the circumstances I will not call up the immigration bill, and will let it come up, as it has a right to do, at 2 o'clock.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have no objection, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Then I shall insist on its consideration, if we have not meantime made arrangements to the contrary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina for unanimous consent? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the first business on the calendar.

The first business on the calendar was the bill (S. 1240) to establish the legislative reference bureau of the Library of Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the bill will be passed over.

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, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2242) making it unlawful for any Member of Congress to serve on or solicit funds for any political committee, club, or organization was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 156) limiting expenditures for telegrams sent or received by Senators was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the resolution will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 84) providing that any Senator upon his own request may be recorded and counted as present in order to constitute a quorum was announced as next in order.

Mr. CULBERSON. Let that go over.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not ask that that resolution go over.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, are we simply taking up the unobjected matters?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement only unobjected cases can be considered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I want to plead with the Senator from Texas to withdraw his objection to the consideration of that resolution. We find ourselves very frequently in this position in the Senate: A roll call discloses when the point of no quorum is made——

Mr. SMOOT. I call for the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. PENROSE. Regular order!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is called for. Objection is made, and the resolution will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 218) proposing an amendment to the standing rules of the Senate was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the resolution will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 26) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to investigate the condition of trade in China, for the purpose of determining the desirability of establishing there a permanent exposition of the products of the United States of America, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2425) to authorize the Roanoke River Development Co. to construct and maintain a dam across the Roanoke River in Mecklenburg County, in the State of Virginia, approximately 20 miles below the town of Clarksville, in said State, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3971) to provide for a permanent exhibit of the resources of the States of the Union in or near Washington, D. C., was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, fixing the time for the convening of Congress and commencement of the terms of the President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 254) to create a special committee of five Senators to assist the Interstate Commerce Commission in investigating certain facts regarding the methods and practices of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 392) to create in the War Department and Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as "the Civil War volunteer officers' retired list," to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 121) to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6827) to amend an act entitled "An act to change the name of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service to the Public Health Service, to increase the pay of officers of said service, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1912, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4161) to prohibit the importation and entry of goods, wares, and merchandise made in whole or in part by convict, pauper, or detained labor, or made in whole or in part from materials which have been made in whole or in part or in any manner manipulated by convict or prison labor was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah that the Senate adjourn. [Putting the question.]

Mr. KERN. I call for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By the sound the noes seem to have it.

Mr. CLAPP. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask for a division on the motion to adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair decided that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. LODGE. A division can not be denied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair ruled that the noes seemed to have it, and the Senate refused to adjourn. The yeas and nays were then called for and were denied. Now a division is called for.

The motion was agreed to; there being, on a division, ayes 21, noes 13; and (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 22, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION.

Executive nomination received by the Senate December 21, 1914.

SUPERINTENDENT FOR THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES IN OKLAHOMA.

Gabe E. Parker, of Oklahoma, to be superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma. A new office under the provisions of section 17 of the act of Congress approved August 1, 1914 (38 Stat., 598).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 21, 1914.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We come to Thee, O God our Father, praying for "that light which never shone on sea or land," but which illumines the mind, quickens the heart, and makes for righteousness in the soul and the whole world akin, dignifies the smallest duty, renders the hardest task easy, and leads on to heroism and glory when heroes are needed. Hear us and answer our petition in the name of Christ the Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 19, 1914, was read and approved.

DISTRIBUTION OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a privileged report. By direction of the Committee on Ways and Means I report back the resolution in reference to the distribution of the President's message. (H. Rept. 1242.)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 670, referring to various committees such parts of the President's message as relates to the appropriation of the revenues for the support of the Government.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock to-morrow morning. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how much time is to be occupied to-morrow? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand there is an understanding between the members of the Rules Committee that there will be two hours' debate on the rule. The rule that is proposed, if adopted, provides for eight hours' debate on the constitutional amendment. That would be 10 hours' debate. There will certainly be one roll call, and possibly more, and then it is to be taken up under the five-minute rule for amendment.

Mr. MANN. The intention, then, is to remain in session, so far as the gentleman now knows, until the House finishes the consideration of the amendment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think it is important that the House dispose of this question before Members go home for the holidays. I think that will meet with the universal approval of the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. If it is not disposed of, it would have to go over until after the holidays.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; if it is not disposed of.

Mr. MANN. It would have to go over unless it came up on Calendar Wednesday, and I did not know whether there was any expectation that that would be possible or probable.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should have been glad to pass Calendar Wednesday until after the Christmas holidays and twice made the request, but it can only be done by unanimous consent; at least I do not desire to do it in any other way, and it has met with objection both times.

Mr. MANN. It is immaterial to me; I just wanted to know for the convenience of the House.

Mr. HENRY. If the gentleman from Alabama will yield, I will answer the gentleman's request about the matter.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. HENRY. As far as I am concerned, I will state as chairman of the Committee on Rules I have no desire to hold this Hobson amendment over until Wednesday, but hope to finish it to-morrow night—get through with the consideration of the amendment and everything.

Mr. MANN. Of course, after the rule is adopted the gentleman will no longer be in charge of the resolution, and I did not know what the intention was.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the spirit and understanding is——

Mr. MANN. Then those who have dinner engagements to-morrow night might as well cancel them. I have one.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Undoubtedly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and when the House adjourns to-day it will adjourn until 10 o'clock to-morrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN THE RECORD.

Mr. PARKER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I desire to have incorporated in the RECORD a resolution by resident members of the class of 1864 of the University of Rochester, December 11, 1914, with regard to the death of Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WILSON of Florida, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. TRIBBLE, indefinitely, on account of sickness of wife.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT CALENDAR.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

EXCHANGE OF FOREST LANDS WITH THE STATE OF OREGON.

The first bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the act (S. 49) to provide for the exchange with the State of Oregon of certain school lands and indemnity rights within the national forests of that State for an equal area of national forest land.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of Oregon is hereby authorized to select, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, a compact body of not to exceed 40,000 acres of unappropriated nonmineral land within townships 10 and 11 south, ranges 5 and 6 east, Willamette meridian, in the Santiam National Forest, Oreg., to be maintained as a State forest to secure its highest permanent usefulness to the State of Oregon, and particularly to the common schools to which its resources are devoted and to State forestry demonstration and education, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to grant and convey said selection to the State of Oregon for the purposes hereinbefore mentioned.

SEC. 2. That in exchange for the selected lands the State shall reconvey and relinquish to the United States a good and sufficient title to an approximately equal area of unencumbered sections 16 and 36, or parts thereof, of substantial forest values satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture, within the national forests of Oregon, granted to said State, or indemnity rights within such national forests to which the State is entitled therefor: *Provided*, That the lands reconveyed and relinquished as base lands shall immediately become parts of the national forest in which they are situated.

SEC. 3. That the lands conveyed to the State shall be at all times subject to use by the United States for the construction, maintenance, and operation of roads, trails, telephone or telegraph lines needed in the administration of the contiguous national forest areas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know if the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands is in the House or some member of the committee who can give some information. I see the chairman is here. This bill, as I understand it, is to allow the State of Oregon to take certain lands in exchange for sections 16 and 36, to which the State is entitled, that are now in the forest surveys. Now, is that correct?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman addressed some question to me? I came in just on the moment and I have not had time clearly to read the bill. Is this the Senate bill?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I think this is the Senate bill, and I think there is a similar House bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT].

Mr. FERRIS. As I recall, this is a bill that provides for the exchange of land. What was the question of the gentleman?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The question I asked was if this bill is for the purpose of allowing the State of Oregon to take lands outside of a forest reservation in lieu of lands that the State now has, sections 16 and 36, within forest reservations in that State?

Mr. FERRIS. It embraces an exchange of that sort; yes, sir.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Oklahoma, chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, to the fact that there are a number of cases where exchanges have been made, notably one in the Black Hills Forest Reservation in South Dakota. An agreement was entered into between the Forestry Bureau of the Agricultural Department and the Interior Department by which the State of South Dakota relinquished sections 16 and 36 in the forest reservation and selected lands outside in a compact body that were selected with a view of their being of equal value and character, and a proclamation was issued by the President ratifying that exchange. Now, I understand there have been similar exchanges in other States, possibly in Oregon, and the Interior Department has held, or the Secretary has held, that those exchanges were not authorized by law, and therefore legislation is necessary. My understanding is that there are a number of bills before the Committee on Public Lands on the

subject, that they have been referred to the Interior Department, and that a bill is in process of preparation dealing with the whole question. I want to know if the gentleman can give us any information on that subject.

Mr. FERRIS. I am not entirely familiar with the statement just made by the gentleman. We have passed a number of bills of this character and there are a number pending yet. I think it my duty to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the committee always in the past, and I think rightly so, exacted that the land to be exchanged should be of equal value. Of course in this instance the Secretary himself frankly requires that the land that the State gets is to be twice the value that the State gives up to the Government. I do not know whether the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] can explain why we should depart from the precedent or not. I do not have this bill very well in mind. I would yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would like to hear a statement from the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. FERRIS. There was some consideration other than the usual one which caused the committee to make this report.

Mr. MANN. The other consideration was that the Forest Service itself thought it was advisable to have the State of Oregon maintain a forestry school in connection with these lands that were intended to be conveyed to the State of Oregon. Whether that is a sufficient consideration, I do not undertake to say, but that is undoubtedly what actuated the committee. I know the Forest Service is very anxious for it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have some explanation from the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT].

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, it was proposed in this bill and proposed by the State that this land should be withheld from sale for a period of 50 years, and the proceeds arising from the sale of any timber on the land should be devoted to forestry-school purposes. The agricultural college has a school of forestry, and the proceeds from the sale of this land are going to be devoted to that school of forestry for the purpose of educating young men along forestry lines.

Mr. MADDEN. From the land or from the timber?

Mr. SINNOTT. From any timber that might be sold.

Mr. MADDEN. And not from the land?

Mr. SINNOTT. No; not from the land. The land will not be sold for a period of 50 years.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Do I understand the State of Oregon now has in forest reservation school sections 16 and 36?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. And it is proposed now to exchange on the part of the State these lands for lands outside of the forest reservation?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Now, has there been any exchange made thus far?

Mr. SINNOTT. No; there has been no exchange made.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Can the gentleman tell us why?

Mr. SINNOTT. I think it is contended there is no law authorizing it. I will say to the gentleman from South Dakota that there was such an exchange made, and it was ratified by a proclamation of the President. The Secretary of the Interior recently held that there is no law authorizing it, and it would have to be now ratified by legislation, and I understand there is a similar condition in the State of Idaho.

Mr. FRENCH. That is true. Sales have been made of lands that have been exchanged in this way. They have about 400,000 acres open to exchange at this time. I was on the committee that reported this bill, and I believe it should be passed; and the same condition ought to be recognized in several other States.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINNOTT. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there any provision that this land which the Government transfers to the State of Oregon shall be continued to be used as a forest reserve?

Mr. SINNOTT. You mean the land——

Mr. STAFFORD. I am willing to assist the State of Oregon in its policy of reforestation, and yet I do not find anything in the bill here which provides that this land which the Government is going to transfer will be utilized for that purpose.

Mr. SINNOTT. That is provided by an act of the Legislature of the State of Oregon to the effect that it is to be devoted to that purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. The enactment of the State legislature can at any time be changed. If we are going to give twice the value to the State for forestation purposes, we should have it so protected in the bill that it can not be sold and used for any other purpose.

Mr. SINNOTT. We have no objection to an amendment to the effect that the land shall be held from sale for a period of 50 years.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think such an amendment should be incorporated, and until it is presented I think it is better to have the bill go over for another two weeks.

Mr. SINNOTT. It can be presented when it comes up for discussion.

Mr. STAFFORD. I asked the gentleman to prepare such an amendment, because I do not believe the bill as it is safeguards the interests of the Government in requiring that these lands shall be used for the purposes of conservation.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think there is anything in the bill requiring that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I pointed that out—that there should be some such requirement in the bill.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will notice the language in the bill, page 1, lines 8 and 9, he will see that two words would interpret or express his meaning. The language is "to be maintained as a State forest." It should be "to be maintained for a period of 50 years" or "to be maintained permanently."

Mr. SINNOTT. That first amendment would be agreeable to me.

Mr. STAFFORD. To insert the word "permanently"?

Mr. SINNOTT. I do not know about that.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand this bill, the National Government is donating large tracts of land to the State of Oregon, to be used in connection with the State agricultural college for the purpose of developing forestry.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman take into consideration the fact that in doing that the State exchanges land that is now owns?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; but it exchanges only land to one-half of the value.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. That is not required to be used as a forest reservation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; land of one-half the value, which is not required for use as a forest reservation. If we are going to give to any State land twice as valuable, we should condition it so as to protect the purpose for which we are donating it.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bill of the following title:

H. R. 6282. An act to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes.

MINERAL SPRINGS IN NEW MEXICO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12050) reserving from entry, location, or sale lots 1 and 2, in section 33, township 13 south, range 4 west, New Mexico prime meridian, in Sierra County, N. Mex., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe my good friend from New Mexico [Mr. FERGUSSON] is here and has some amendments that he wishes to propose, to meet the objection that I suggested at the last meeting. Will the gentleman kindly have the amendments reported?

Mr. FERGUSSON. Yes; at the proper time I shall do so. I move, Mr. Speaker, that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. I want to amend it.

The SPEAKER. In the first place, the gentleman will have to get permission to consider it at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, may we have the proposed amendments read?

Mr. FERGUSSON. They are in the hands of the Clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have them read for information.

Mr. FERGUSSON. All right.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand the Clerk has the proposed amendments. Mr. Speaker, may we have them read for information?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a proposed amendment.

Mr. FERGUSSON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill and then read the amendments.

Mr. FOSTER. There are no amendments to the bill except that which the gentleman from New Mexico proposes or will propose.

Mr. FERGUSSON. There are two amendments.

Mr. FOSTER. To the original bill?

Mr. FERGUSSON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from New Mexico an amendment?

Mr. FERGUSSON. I have two amendments, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Where are they?

Mr. FERGUSSON. They are in the hands of the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report them, together with the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That lots 1 and 2, in section 33, township 13 south, range 4 west, New Mexico prime meridian, situated in the county of Sierra, State of New Mexico, be hereby set apart from the public domain and reserved from entry, location, or sale for the purpose of preserving for the use of the public the valuable mineral springs located upon said lots.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to control the use of said lots and the waters thereon, and to make regulations for the government of the reservation, and to make such contracts, agreements, and leases as will best preserve them for the use of the public; and all moneys received from such contracts, agreements, and leases by way of remuneration, or from any other source in connection with this reservation, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as a special fund to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Interior for the protection, maintenance, and improvement of said reservation.

With amendments as follows:

Amend, on page 2, by striking out, in line 9, after the word "States," the words "as a special fund to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Interior for the protection, maintenance, and improvement of said reservation" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "and credited as miscellaneous receipts."

Amend by adding at the end of section 2, page 2, the following: "*Provided*, That nothing in this act contained shall be construed as establishing a general policy by the United States of leasing reservations containing medicinal waters instead of conveying such reservations to the respective States in which the same may be situated: *And provided further*, That any act which may be hereafter passed by the Congress of the United States making transfer of such reservations to the various States wherein such reservations may be situated shall make provision for the protection of the United States and of any lessee or lessees in leases that may then be in force under and by virtue of the provisions of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I heard the Clerk read the last amendment it was as follows:

That nothing in this act contained shall be construed as establishing a general policy by the United States of leasing reservations containing medicinal waters instead of conveying such reservations to the respective States.

Now, that language implies a policy on the part of the Government of conveying the reservations to the respective States, and I certainly could not consent to the implied policy, to be inferred from that language, of conveying the reservations to the several States.

Mr. FERGUSSON. I will simply state to the gentleman that his colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] made that point. As originally written, the bill had no such provision in it. It simply contemplated the fact that the Government would lease these reservations which have long been reserved from any use whatever, and the gentleman from Wisconsin made the point that he did not think that was a proper policy, but that the Government should convey them to the States. In order to get the bill passed—a bill which is of great necessity to so many poor people in my State—I agreed with his suggestion. I do not think the Government is likely to adopt the general policy that he proposes, but if the Government should adopt that general policy, I have no objection to providing, as this amendment provides, that the leases made by virtue of this bill shall be recognized by the States if such a change of policy is made. That is all there is to it.

Mr. LENROOT. I would have no objection if the amendment stopped with the words—

As establishing a general policy by the United States of leasing reservations containing medicinal waters.

What I object to is stating it to be the policy of the Government that we shall give all these reservations to the respective States.

Mr. FERRIS. Will not the gentleman allow our colleague from New Mexico to get it up for consideration, and then try to get it amended?

Mr. LENROOT. I think it is too important to take that risk.

Mr. FERRIS. I think the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERGUSSON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] can get together and perfect an amendment that will be satisfactory.

Mr. FERGUSSON. This amendment as prepared by me was submitted to and considered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], and met no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. My objection does not go to this particular bill, but to the declaring inferentially of a general policy of the Government with reference to all reservations containing medicinal waters, and I can not consent to that.

Mr. FERGUSSON. If the gentleman will yield to me for a moment, I do not understand that it does that. I understand it leaves it to the Government to determine whether it shall consitute a policy, and if it does it provides a method of making it effective.

Mr. LENROOT. Why not omit the words "instead of conveying them to the several States"?

Mr. FERRIS. I suggest to the gentleman that he modify it.

Mr. LENROOT. I would have no objection to the amendment if it stopped with the words "establishing a general policy."

Mr. MANN. The amendment has not been offered yet.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, owing to the confusion I did not hear the amendment read. May I ask what does the amendment propose to do? What is the change made from the bill?

Mr. FERGUSSON. The last one?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The first one.

Mr. FERGUSSON. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] proposed to object to the bill, and thereby do great harm to my State, unless it was amended in that respect.

Mr. MANN. I am asking what the amendment is.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The first amendment provides that the moneys received shall go into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. FERGUSSON. That is to meet the objection of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. Then the next amendment was to meet the objection raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. MANN. What does that amendment propose to do?

Mr. FERGUSSON. It proposes, as I understand it—it is really the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin——

Mr. FERRIS. Let it be reported.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the amendment will be reported.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think it is a harmless amendment.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether it is or not.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of section 2, page 2, the following: "*Provided*, That nothing in this act contained shall be construed as establishing a general policy by the United States of leasing reservations containing medicinal waters instead of conveying such reservations to the respective States in which the same may be situated: *And provided further*, That any act that may be hereafter passed by the Congress of the United States making transfer of such reservations to the various States wherein such reservations may be situated shall make provision for the protection of the United States, and of any lessee or lessees under leases that may then be in force under and by virtue of the provisions of this act."

Mr. MANN. Still reserving the right to object, I should like to know who drew that amendment. Is this a constitutional amendment?

Mr. FERGUSSON. I drew the amendment and submitted it to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], and he accepted it as covering his point.

Mr. MANN. How can this Congress determine what shall be contained in an act passed by a subsequent Congress? This undertakes to say that if any act is hereafter passed by Congress certain things shall be contained in the act. I do not see how you can do that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is an admonition.

Mr. FERGUSSON. I was trying to get my bill passed, and to meet the views of the gentleman who objected to it because it did not have this provision in it.

Mr. MANN. I understand that, but who defends that proposition?

Mr. FERGUSSON. My position is that I want this bill passed, either with the amendment or without it, because it will

enable the Secretary of the Interior to give the people who need the use of these springs the right to build hotels and distribute the water so that it can be used.

Mr. STAFFORD. If my friend will yield, he knows that when he submitted his amendment to me I was quite occupied and did not give it the thorough consideration that it deserved, but I think it will meet my objection with the latter proviso eliminated and merely containing the first proviso.

Mr. MANN. Down to the word "instead."

Mr. STAFFORD. As suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, down to the word "instead." That will be acceptable to me.

Mr. LENROOT. I have no objection to the first part of the amendment, if you strike out all after and including the word "instead."

Mr. STAFFORD. I know the gentleman from New Mexico will have no objection to that, and I think we can have unanimity of opinion and have the bill go through in accordance with that suggestion.

Mr. FERGUSSON. I have no objection to that.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. FERGUSSON. I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment.

Mr. MANN. It has not been offered yet.

Mr. STAFFORD. It has not been offered yet.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think I shall have to object to the modification of the amendment, if it requires unanimous consent. I think the amendment drawn by the gentleman from Wisconsin suggests the proper procedure in these matters. I think it states the proper policy to be followed. If a part of the amendment is to be stricken out, the entire amendment should be stricken out. There is no sense in declaring that it is not to be the policy of the Federal Government to lease these medicinal waters. If the Federal Government is not going to turn them over to the States it is necessary for the Government to lease them if they are to be utilized. What have gentlemen in mind—simply a declaration as to this and all other waters that we do not propose to do anything with them?

Let me ask the gentleman from New Mexico a question. I suggested to him a long time ago in regard to this legislation that he modify it so as to make it a transfer of the land on which these springs are located to the State of New Mexico. Has the gentleman considered that matter at all since that time?

Mr. FERGUSSON. I did not understand that the gentleman from Wyoming would object to the bill unless I further amended it. Now, I am willing to agree to any amendment, in any shape or form, that will permit the poor people of that country to use this medicinal spring. At present there must be two or three hundred people around there. Some have put up shacks. Of course, they are trespassers; but because of the necessity of the situation men have put up little shacks to keep the rain off of the poor people who go there to use the springs. The springs themselves are down next to the river. A man cleans it out and takes a bath, and then the next man has to take a shovel and clean it out again. If gentlemen on that side can show me how I can get around it so as to accomplish what I want to get for these poor people, I would like to do it. I have been trying to do it, but I was detained and put over for one or two weeks by one gentleman, and then one week by another gentleman, and now comes the gentleman from Wyoming with other views. I think I have a right to have a hearing some time.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from New Mexico is hardly fair. He says, "And now comes the gentleman from Wyoming." The gentleman from Wyoming made a suggestion at the time the bill was first taken up for consideration, and that was that instead of attempting to load these springs onto the people of the United States and make the people of the United States responsible for their maintenance and care, the gentleman should ask to have the land on which the springs are located transferred to the State of New Mexico, in order that that State might proceed to care for and improve the springs so that the people locally could secure the largest benefit from the springs. The gentleman from New Mexico has not seen fit to pay any attention to that suggestion. It is a suggestion which if carried out would immediately settle this entire matter by placing the responsibility for these springs upon the people who are to use them—the local authorities—and the burden of the maintenance of the springs upon the people of New Mexico, where the burden should be placed.

Now, what the gentleman proposes is to have the Federal Government lease the springs, retain the receipts, and his bill contains no provision whatever for an appropriation. In other words, the people of his State can not get the benefit of these springs under the proposition now presented unless some time in the future Congress shall appropriate for the care of the springs. What the gentleman is proposing to do is to tax the local people to the amount of the lease money, whatever it shall be, and make them pay for a use that they are now securing without money and without price. The gentleman's bill does not accomplish what he desires to have it accomplish; but if he will transfer the tract to the State, the State could care for the springs and the springs would be under local control.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman from Wyoming let me make a suggestion? The real thing that the gentleman from New Mexico wants to do is to get the use of this spring for his people. Is not the gentleman from Wyoming willing to let the gentleman from New Mexico offer his amendments and take an expression of the House? It seems too bad that he should be ground to pieces between the two views. Certain Members think one way and some of us think another, and it is too big a proposition to settle on this little bill. The gentleman from New Mexico is very much interested in the passage of it and has had it up a number of times.

Mr. MONDELL. I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, who comes from a State where there is a spring that has been loaded on the Government and which we have not been able to give back to the State, and upon which we have spent a lot of money, that the gentleman from New Mexico seems to be very willing to meet certain suggestions, but he pays no attention to others. The gentleman says that he is willing to modify the form of the proposition which he has before the House, as suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin, but he has paid no attention at all to the suggestion I made.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me for the moment defend the gentleman from New Mexico. Certainly he is not guilty of being headstrong; he has yielded to everybody that has even made a suggestion to him, and it seems too bad that he should be ground to pieces between the two factions when he has accepted the suggestion of everyone in regard to it. I beg the gentleman to let him get the matter up on the floor with his amendment and let us get an expression of the House upon it. It is not right to hold him back and prevent him from getting an expression of the House.

Mr. FERGUSSON. Mr. Speaker, just one word in reply to the gentleman from Wyoming. In the other two cases of amendment it was distinctly stated by the gentlemen that they would object unless the proposition was modified. But as I understood the gentleman from Wyoming—and I do not want to do him any injustice—he did not make that a prerequisite at all. He talked in a general and theoretical way of having the States take all the springs rather than the Government. But that involves an immense big policy of the Government, and it ought to be done in a general bill applying to everything. This is a special bill with reference to one spring in the State of New Mexico, and if passed I will say, in perfect candor, it will relieve the almost certain necessities of poor people who can not go for hundreds of miles to any other spring. Last year people came there and waited for weeks and weeks to get a bath because of the unkempt condition of the springs. I was advised that the Government was not yet ready to adopt a general policy in the direction pointed out by the gentleman from Wyoming, that it involves a great big enterprise with relation to hundreds of thousands of acres surrounding springs in many portions of the West, and it would be too long a delay for me to wait until they agreed on a general plan.

This is a special bill based on the necessities of a special, particular case, and the object of the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] was that in case the Government reaches the point where it wants to adopt a general policy to provide for these things, then this particular case shall be made to conform to the general policy, and that the lessees operating under this particular bill shall be by the Government permitted to go on with their enterprise and not have their expenditures destroyed by its going into a general system. I sincerely hope that the gentleman will not defeat me at this time of day.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can not get me to yield my views in this matter by a misstatement of the facts of the situation.

Mr. FERGUSSON. I did not make any misstatement of the facts, certainly not intentionally.

Mr. MONDELL. Possibly not intentionally; and if not, then the gentleman has been listening to some ghost stories. There are no numbers of mineral springs on the public domain that are not claimed by anyone. There is no big policy involved. I doubt if in the United States there are a half dozen mineral springs of any value that are now on the public land not claimed by private individuals. This happens to be one of those springs.

The gentleman wants me to surrender my views in the matter, although he has discovered that other gentlemen will not surrender theirs. I may do so, however. I am so good-natured that I am in the habit of surrendering my views in these matters in order to please gentlemen, but the plan he proposes is a great mistake from the standpoint of the gentleman himself and the people whom he represents. There is no reason on earth why all of the people of the United States should be loaded with the responsibility for and the expense of caring for the local hot springs. This simply means another national park, one more item to be loaded onto appropriation bills as long as time runs, one more item to contest in the House, one more item to add to the constantly increasing expenditures of the Federal Government, and all for the benefit of the people in the locality in which the springs are situated.

I have had some experience in matters of this kind. Years ago I endeavored to secure an appropriation for a hot springs in my State, and I was persuaded that a much better way would be to ask for the transfer to the State of the tract of land on which the springs were located. That was done. The result is that we have there a State institution of which we are proud. It is not costing Uncle Sam a penny. Any citizen of the United States can go there just as freely as a citizen of the State and secure all the benefits that he would if the springs belonged to the Federal Government and the Federal Government was caring for them. We are taking better care of them than would be taken by the Federal Government, and it is the best policy to pursue in matters of this kind.

Mr. FERGUSSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSSON. The gentleman stated before, and I neglected to reply to it, that the object that he had in mind was to force the Government, as I understood him, to hold all of these things out of temporary use. The purpose of the bill——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can not say that, for he could not have understood anything that I said as indicating any such view whatever. I desire to have these springs used. I wish the gentleman would agree to a plan under which they can be promptly used to the best advantage of the people who desire to use them.

Mr. FERGUSSON. The gentleman did not permit me to finish, before he interrupted again, what I was going to say.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman went on to say that I did not want the springs used.

Mr. FERGUSSON. With reference to the fact that this bill carries no appropriation, instead of that being thrown at me as a reproach, I thought it would appeal to the House, because these springs are so valuable that there are dozens of men with money who are ready to build hotels, and it requires no appropriation whatever. They will build the hotels and distribute this water, and furnish it for the use of the people on certain charges which the Secretary of the Interior can see are not extortionate, so that no appropriation is necessary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERGUSSON. With the consent of the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. On the question of the value of this, what would be the least money paid to the United States?

Mr. FERGUSSON. I have not calculated that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. One hundred thousand dollars a year?

Mr. FERGUSSON. I would not say.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Five thousand dollars a year?

Mr. FERGUSSON. I have no idea. It goes into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. As a matter of fact, these are coal lands, are they not?

Mr. FERGUSSON. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Classified as coal lands?

Mr. FERGUSSON. I think not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The report so states, and the gentleman has been working all summer in favor of a leasing plan for coal lands.

Mr. FERGUSSON. That is one reason. When I suggested the possibility of having all lands of this character conveyed to the Government it was suggested to me that nearly all of the western country where these springs are have such indications of coal that it would be contrary to the general policy of the Government not to sell or give away any more coal lands in the West.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Did not the gentleman all summer advocate the holding of these things for the Government on account of their value?

Mr. FERGUSSON. That idea comes in conflict with the general policy of the Government now to lease coal lands and to no longer sell them outright.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says his bill carries no appropriation. I hope that does not fool anybody. It certainly does not mislead anyone who knows anything about the situation. Certainly it does not carry an appropriation, but the next sundry civil appropriation bill will carry an appropriation if the gentleman from New Mexico can get it, or else the people of the locality will be paying to the Federal Government for the use of the springs in the amount of the license fees that are paid, and the gentleman or his successor—I regret that it will not be the gentleman himself—will be here asking for appropriations for the care of the grounds, and he must get them, because the grounds must be taken care of. He will be here asking for an appropriation for free bathhouses, because while people may build hotels, they will charge good prices for the use of them and for the baths in those hotels. There must be bathhouses; there must be accommodations for those who go there and can not afford to pay the hotel rates, and the gentleman's proposition is that the Federal Government shall pay for all those things. Now, I am not responsible for expenditures under this administration. I am not a part of this Democratic régime of economy, and I am not responsible if these things are started, and therefore I shall not object.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands the regular order. The question is, Is there objection to the consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12050) reserving from entry, location, or sale lots 1 and 2, in section 33, township 13 south, range 4 west, New Mexico prime meridian, in Sierra County, N. Mex., and for other purposes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to control the use of said lots and the waters thereon, and to make regulations for the government of the reservation, and to make such contracts, agreements, and leases as will best preserve them for the use of the public; and all moneys received from such contracts, agreements, and leases by way of remuneration, or from any other source in connection with this reservation, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as a special fund to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Interior for the protection, maintenance, and improvement of said reservation.

Mr. FERGUSSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment. In line 9, section 2, strike out all after the words "United States" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and credited as miscellaneous receipts."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, section 2, line 9, by striking out all after the words "United States" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and credited as miscellaneous receipts."

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

Mr. FERGUSSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a modified amendment to the one the Clerk has.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will have to speak louder.

Mr. FERGUSSON. Amend by adding at the end of section 2, page 2, the following:

Provided, That nothing in this act contained shall be construed as establishing a general policy of the United States of leasing reservations containing medicinal waters—

And stop right there and——

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of section 2, page 2, the following: "*Provided*, That nothing in this act contained shall be construed as establishing a general policy of the United States of leasing reservations containing medicinal waters."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, this proposed amendment is wholly unnecessary for this bill. It has never been considered by the committee. It has no place in this bill, and it does not seem as though the House ought to establish such a policy as this for the future. Here is a small spring that ought to be provided for as in the bill, and we ought not, upon the spur of the moment, attempt to pass on a future policy by saying what we will or will not do in regard to these matters. The bill ought to pass as it is, but this amendment will not effect the general purposes of the bill in any way.

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

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FERGUSSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 20241) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1915 and prior years, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying report (No. 1241), was ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves all points of order on the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to-day after 5.30——

Mr. MANN. Make it earlier than that.

Mr. FITZGERALD (continuing). To take this bill up. Well, I will say after 5 o'clock, to proceed with the consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that after 5 o'clock the consideration of this bill shall be in order. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Why not make it a quarter before 5?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There are a great many bills on the calendar.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield? After 5 o'clock will be any time after 5 o'clock. Does the gentleman mean at 5 o'clock?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There might be a matter pending.

Mr. COOPER. It might bring it up to 6 o'clock.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We can sit a little later.

Mr. MANN. There might be something under consideration. You had better make it a quarter before 5.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will make it 4.45.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that after 4.45 the consideration of this bill shall be in order. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PAYMENT OF DECEMBER SALARIES TO OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations I report back Senate joint resolution 213, to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House their December salaries on the 22d of December (H. Rept. 1243), and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate joint resolution 213, authorizing the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House, including the Capitol police, their respective salaries for the month of December, 1914, on the 22d day of said month.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized and instructed to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, including the Capitol police, their respective salaries for the month of December, 1914, on the 22d day of December; and the Clerk of the House is authorized to pay on said day to Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners their allowance for clerk hire for said month of December.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of this resolution. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Is it usual for the Senate to initiate legislation of this character?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it is not.

Mr. MANN. If I had been in the gentleman's place, I would have thrown the resolution in the wastebasket and brought in a House resolution.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not like to do that every day.

Mr. MANN. With all due respect to the Senate, these things ought to originate in the House.

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

The resolution was read a third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CONTRACTS UNDER RECLAMATION ACT.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 124) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and settle certain accounts under the reclamations acts, and for other purposes.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter whenever a contract made under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902, or acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto shall be suspended on account of default of the contractor and the work is taken over by the Government for completion, either by Government forces or by contract, the Reclamation Service is hereby authorized to pay from the reclamation fund, on account of the contractor and the sureties, for labor actually performed on the work and for all or any part of the materials, plant, and supplies ordered by the contractor delivered at the work and needed therefor, upon satisfactory evidence that the same has not been paid for by or on account of the contractor. Any payment so made by the Reclamation Service shall be charged against the contractor and the sureties, who shall be liable therefor. All claims under this act must be filed with the Reclamation Service within 90 days after the suspension of such contract. All contracts for construction or repair of a public work under the reclamation act or acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto shall provide that all books and papers of the contractor regarding the hire and payment of labor and the ordering, purchase, and payment for materials, plant, and supplies shall become available in settlement of claims thereunder. Any claimant who under oath knowingly makes a false claim or a false statement in regard thereto under the terms of this act shall be deemed guilty of perjury and subject to the punishment provided therefor by law. A decision of the Secretary of the Interior against any claimant under this act shall not preclude such claimant from proceeding in accordance with the provisions of the act of February 24, 1905, or acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto in order to recover from the contractor or the sureties any amounts claimed to be due him in connection with such contract. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make necessary rules and regulations for the filing of sworn statements of claims and other procedure for determining the amounts due under the terms of this act.

Also, the following committee amendment was read:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out the following words: "That hereafter, whenever a contract made under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902," and insert in lieu thereof the following words: "That whenever a contract for the construction or repair of public works hereafter made under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZGERALD). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, it seems to me, in view of the fact that we put on the reclamation bill a provision for appropriating the money in the future by the Congress of the money that goes into the Reclamation Service, this bill comes somewhat in conflict with it, and there is a question of whether it ought to pass or not, as I see it.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman suggest with what he thinks it comes in conflict?

Mr. FOSTER. In returning the money that comes into the Treasury. I understand from this bill that the officials connected with the Reclamation Service pay these claims. Is that true?

Mr. RAKER. If it is appropriated, but not otherwise. It would come under the law.

Mr. FOSTER. It gives them the right to go and settle claims outside of what the Government may provide for?

Mr. RAKER. Not at all. This drops right in and fits in with the act of 1914.

Mr. FOSTER. I can not see it.

Mr. RAKER. I call the gentleman's attention to it. Suppose $1,000,000 was appropriated for a project. They make a contract for $500,000. The contractor fails, but has used $100,000. The Reclamation Service can afford from the money that has been appropriated, where the work has been done, to pay for the labor and material that has been actually furnished to the Government.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask the gentleman as to what the practice or procedure is as to assessment of the cost of a project? Is it upon the contract price?

Mr. RAKER. I do not quite get the gentleman.

Mr. LENROOT. The assessment upon the land within the project?

Mr. RAKER. It is the whole cost of the project—water, dams, reservoirs, and all—that is apportioned to the number of acres of land in that project and the total cost.

Mr. LENROOT. How is the amount of assessment determined?

Mr. RAKER. By the full expenditure.

Mr. LENROOT. The assessment, then, is not fully made until final completion?

Mr. RAKER. That is true.

Mr. LENROOT. Here is a contract for a project that is finally completed by the Government. The contract price has been paid to the contractor. This bill provides this deficiency shall be paid out of the reclamation fund. Will it be assessed upon the lands within the projects?

Mr. RAKER. Surely. But I think the gentleman is a little too strong in the matter. There will be none paid by the Reclamation Service except under the amount appropriated, for which they can authorize a contract, and not otherwise. Under

the law to-day they can not make any more contracts unless that money has been appropriated for them.

Mr. LENROOT. If the contract is the full amount of the appropriation, and then there is a deficiency, would the words "reclamation fund" include the general fund?

Mr. RAKER. There are no cases of that kind.

Mr. LENROOT. That may be, but I am asking the gentleman as to the principle.

Mr. FERRIS. Does not this contemplate a case where a contractor makes default and does not allow such project to stand on its own legs and pursue its own contractor and its own lost money? It seems to go into the general reclamation fund and pay it. My reason for stating that is the very language in the bill, on page 1, as follows:

That whenever a contract for the construction or repair of public works hereafter made under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902, or acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, shall be suspended on account of default of the contractor and the work is taken over by the Government for completion, either by Government forces or by contract, the Reclamation Service is hereby authorized to pay from the reclamation fund, on account of the contractor and the sureties, for labor actually performed on the work and for all or any part of the materials, plant, and supplies ordered by the contractor delivered at the work and needed therefor, upon satisfactory evidence that the same has not been paid for by or on account of the contractor.

Now, here is the trouble:

Any payment so made by the Reclamation Service shall be charged against the contractor and the sureties, who shall be liable therefor.

But how can the contractor be responsible who has already defaulted and gone? It seems this goes very far and makes the Government a kind of an insurer, and it seems to me the logical effect of it would be that the water-users' association would in all probability lose interest in keeping their several contractors honest and square. It seems to me it would resolve the reclamation fund into a kind of insurance proposition, so that the water users could not lose, no matter what the conduct of the contractor might be. It seems to invite the contractor to default—or, in any event, if he does default, only the general reclamation fund would suffer. I fear also the bill does not retax or make the individual project pay losses that absconding or defaulting contractors may inflict.

Mr. LENROOT. May I suggest this defect under the language of the bill? The payment to the contractor and the labor is not within the contemplation of the bill payment from the cost of the improvement, but it becomes an indebtedness of the contractor and his sureties to the Government.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; under which they may pursue him or not, as the case may be.

Mr. LENROOT. But it could not be charged up as an assessment against the land.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, yes. I do not want to take up the time of the House, but——

Mr. FOSTER. I suggest to the gentleman that he let this bill go over.

Mr. RAKER. Well, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be time desired on other bills, and still other bills following, and I do not want to take up too much of the time of the House now, but later this bill can be fully heard——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. RAKER. I do.

Mr. MANN. I would like to make a suggestion as to this bill. I think it is very desirable that we should have some kind of a mechanic's lien law in connection with this work. I do not know who drew the bill, but I am very sure the introducer of the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], did not draw it, unless he dictated it hastily.

In the first place, it makes provision for cases only where the contract is suspended. A contract that is defaulted upon is not suspended, so that the bill would never take effect. In the second place, it undertakes to make the sureties liable for the entire amount that is paid out, which we have not the authority to require.

But further, if a contract for $100,000 should be entered into and half of the work should be done and the Government should pay $50,000 to the contractor and he did not pay his labor or his material men, the Government would have to pay that over again and finish the work besides.

Now, in any mechanic's lien law there ought to be some provision to the effect that the people who wish to avail themselves of it shall give notice to the Government here, so that the Government will not pay money to the contractor who uses it to pay his old debts with, but will require him to apply it to the payment of labor or materials, or the Government will see that the money is so applied. There are no such safeguards in this bill. I hope the gentleman will prepare a bill and substitute for this one when it comes up again.

Mr. RAKER. I have a couple of amendments to suggest, but they should be submitted for the RECORD in advance. I am going to ask that this bill be continued, but I want to say a word before I do that, to the effect that absolute concrete cases have come before the department where this bill would have relieved the labor and would have relieved the material men and would have protected the Government if it had been in operation.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt about that; but in legislating you can not take some concrete case in the past, but you must provide for what might hereafter happen.

Mr. RAKER. I will prepare an amendment along the line suggested by the gentleman from Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZGERALD). The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

PUBLIC-BUILDING SITE, PLYMOUTH, MASS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 16829) to provide for enlarging the site for the United States building at Plymouth, Mass.

The bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it does not seem to me that in the present condition of the Treasury we ought to buy land that we have no need for, just because a very beautiful city desires to add to its beauty. That is commendable, but——

Mr. THACHER. Mr. Speaker, I presume the gentleman from Illinois has read the report made by the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, recommending the proposed purchase?

Mr. MANN. Oh, I have not read the report of the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, but I have received and read a large number of communications, or some communications, from the people of the city of Plymouth, urgently requesting the passage of this bill, and giving facts which, I think, show that the bill ought not to be passed at this time.

Mr. THACHER. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon his objection.

Mr. MANN. Well, I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] objects. The Clerk will report the next bill.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 17907) granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Bridge & Terminal Co., of Muscatine, Iowa, to build a bridge across the Mississippi River.

The bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it has never been customary to pass a bill for a bridge across the Mississippi River unless there was some information given that it was the proper thing to do, and unless it had somebody behind it who intended to proceed.

Mr. VOLLMER. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the proponents of this bill are reputable and responsible people in the city of Muscatine—men in whom I have every confidence. The bill itself as a proposition has been indorsed by the Commercial Club of the City of Muscatine, by the city council of that city, and by the board of supervisors of that county, and the latter body has granted a license to the corporation for the purpose.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Iowa think it would be possible at this time to finance the building of a bridge across the Mississippi River at this point?

Mr. VOLLMER. I have inquired of them as to what information they could give the House and myself with reference to the financing of the proposition, and they said that they believed they had made complete arrangements for procuring the money as soon as the financial situation was eased up.

Mr. MANN. Well, it is a certainty, if this bill should pass, that three years from now, or one year from now, probably, they being required to commence the construction within one year, they would ask to have it extended, and a year after that they would ask to do the same thing, and the year after that they would ask to do the same thing, and the following year

they would do the same thing. It takes a lot of money to build a bridge across the Mississippi River.

Mr. VOLLMER. Yes; but I have known of bridges being actually financed and builded when the prospects were even more dubious than they are in this case; one in my own State that I can especially recall, which has been of great benefit to that community, giving us additional railroad facilities.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman from Iowa how near is this point to any other bridge across the Mississippi River?

Mr. VOLLMER. There is one bridge now at Muscatine. The exact location of this bridge has not been determined, but, of course, that will be under the supervision of the War Department, who make a report on this bill, saying that they have no objection to it, and that the interests of the public are fully covered.

Mr. MANN. That is a mere formal report. The War Department never have any objection.

Mr. VOLLMER. As far as safety is concerned, and as the interests of navigation are concerned, they are fully protected under the general bridge act.

Mr. MANN. Yes; as far as they can be, and yet any bridge across the Mississippi River is necessarily an obstruction to navigation. Now, if this is to be a railroad bridge as well as a road and foot-passenger bridge, what railroads are expected to use it or may possibly use it?

Mr. VOLLMER. I can not answer that question.

Mr. MANN. I suppose the gentlemen who are seeking to pass the bill are able to answer that question?

Mr. VOLLMER. I presume so. I do not know. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House——

Mr. MANN. It is a House Calendar bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] objects. The bill will be stricken from the calendar.

EXPATRIATION OF CITIZENS AND THEIR PROTECTION ABROAD.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 1991) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act in reference to the expatriation of citizens and their protection abroad," approved March 2, 1907.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of an act entitled "An act in reference to the expatriation of citizens and their protection abroad," approved March 2, 1907, be amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Any American woman who marries a foreigner and removes from the jurisdiction of the United States, with intent to permanently reside abroad, shall take the nationality of her husband. At the termination of the marital relation she may resume her American citizenship, if abroad, by registering as an American citizen within one year with a consul of the United States, or, by returning to reside in the United States, or, if residing in the United States at the termination of the marital relation, by continuing to reside therein"—

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after the words "United States," strikes out "or, if residing in the United States at the termination of the marital relation, by continuing to reside therein."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEENERSON. Reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], in charge of the bill, whether or not it is a fact that the State Department is opposed to the passage of this bill?

Mr. HARRISON. In the Sixty-second Congress the Foreign Affairs Committee, through one of its members, conferred with the State Department, and the State Department at that time did not sanction this bill.

Mr. STEENERSON. And it is still opposed to it, is it not?

Mr. HARRISON. I presume that the State Department does not approve the bill.

Mr. STEENERSON. Is it not a fact that this proposes to make a law for the United States which will be in conflict with the international law of every civilized nation of the world?

Mr. HARRISON. I do not think so. On the contrary, if the gentleman will permit, the purpose of this bill is to give to the State the right to control suffrage and other matters that pertain to female citizenship, and those privileges which the State has given, without interference by the Federal Government.

Mr. STEENERSON. It strikes me that it utterly fails in that purpose, and that if it were passed the persons named in the report as its beneficiaries would not be benefited at all. It does not affect the citizenship of any woman to-day married to a foreigner. It could only possibly affect women, natives of the United States, who hereafter marry foreigners. It is said in the report that it is sought to relieve women in California who are married to foreigners not naturalized; but this bill utterly fails to do that, and it would repeal the law of the United States which we took great care to enact in 1907, and would put this country in conflict with the law of every civilized nation of the world, and would be liable to involve this country in complications with foreign nations, which is not desirable, especially at this time, during the continuance of the war in Europe.

Mr. HARRISON. I will say to the gentleman that the Foreign Affairs Committee did not take that view of the matter. The gentleman evidently bases his opposition to the bill on the fact that it says that hereafter it shall apply to those women who marry foreigners, but does not apply to those who have already married foreigners, and who have been affected by the Federal law. May I ask the gentleman, if the bill was amended to apply to those who have already married foreigners, would he be in favor of it?

Mr. STEENERSON. Then it would be special legislation. It would simply be to relieve certain disabilities; but the way to relieve those women who are married to foreigners in California, and who desire to vote, is to change the constitution of California. Any State has full control over its own constitution and of who shall be electors. There are numerous States of the Union which allow people to vote who have only declared their intention to become citizens. I believe the State of Michigan to-day allows people to vote who have only declared their intention to become citizens. If the State of California desires to allow women to vote who have married aliens, all it will have to do is to change its constitution. The State of California to-day disfranchises every foreigner, as well as every native, who can not read the constitution of California in English; and there are thousands of citizens of California, both male and female, who are disfranchised, because they can only read Spanish or Italian or some other language besides English. Their constitution says:

No person who shall not be able to read the constitution in the English language and write his or her name shall ever exercise the privilege of an elector in this State.

If the people of California want to change their constitution, they can do so; and they can give all these persons the right to vote.

The following cities of California, with a population of 25,000 or over, have a foreign-born population of 23,276 unable to speak the English language, and who are over 10 years of age, to wit:

Berkeley	407
Los Angeles	7,491
Oakland	3,467
Pasadena	201
Sacramento	735
San Diego	855
San Francisco	9,537
San Jose	583
Total	23,276

These figures are from the last census. But the people of California were apparently willing to discriminate against these, no matter how intelligent they are. Under their law even Mme. Montessori, the great educator, could never vote, because she does not speak English.

Mr. KENT. I think the gentleman is mistaken in his view. In California we are trying to pass laws to give entire equality between the sexes in the matter of citizenship. Here is a Federal statute which denies that right, and whatever you say about the constitution of California, women have been deprived of their votes in California under this Federal statute because they have married aliens. The gentleman confounds the right of franchise with citizenship. As we have seen, there are many, even native-born citizens, in California who can not vote. Criminals and those unable to read and write are citizens, perhaps native born, and yet can not vote. So are persons who have not resided in the county 90 days or in the precinct 30 days. To class well-educated, moral, and industrious people with criminals and disfranchise them would seem just as unjust discrimination as happens in the case referred to.

Mr. STEENERSON. Does not the gentleman from California know that in 1897 we appointed a commission, consisting of James Brown Scott, Counselor of the State Department; Mr. David Jayne Hill, then minister to the Netherlands; and Mr. Gaillard Hunt, Chief of the Passport Division of the State Department under Mr. ROOT, who was then the Secretary of State, and they investigated this matter very carefully, giving it a great deal of time, and then reported to Congress—I was here at the time and remember it very well—that the law had always been that the citizenship of a married woman followed the citizenship of her husband. The report is an exhaustive summary of the law of expatriation.

Mr. KENT. That may have been the law, but that does not make it a just law.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; it is. And the law of every civilized country in the world except Great Britain, and Great Britain changed her law in 1870, so that the laws of all the nations to-day are now harmonious on that subject.

Mr. KENT. We are not legislating for Great Britain, but we are legislating for the United States.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; but if the very persons mentioned in the report—Mrs. Gordon and others—should go to Europe, being married to natives of Great Britain, by the laws of Great Britain a woman so married would be held to be a citizen of Great Britain, notwithstanding she was born in this country and had always resided here before, and this change would lead us into interminable complications that we could not get out of, because we would be in conflict with the law of every nation in the world. Suppose this lady and her husband should now be traveling in Germany and be arrested for violating neutrality or for being spies. The United States is bound to defend its citizens abroad, even to the use of force. This woman under the proposed law would be a citizen of the United States, but under the laws of Germany, England, and every other civilized country would be a citizen of Great Britain. This would lead to conflicts that might be serious.

Mr. KENT. The gentleman considers that woman is a sort of vermiform appendix to the husband.

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, no; I do not; but the gentleman's bill would not help Mrs. Gordon a particle, because she is already married. It is a rule that where you reenact a law with new additions the new part only takes effect from the time of the passage of the new act. An amendatory act which reenacts part of an old law takes effect as to cases coming within the new provision from the time of its passage. The portions of the amended sections which are merely copied without change are not to be considered as repealed and again reenacted, but to have been the law all along, and the new parts or changed portions are not to be taken to have been the law prior to the passage of the amendatory act. The change takes effect prospectively, according to the general rule. Southerland on Statutory Construction, section 737, and authorities there cited.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman kindly state who Mrs. Gordon is?

Mr. STEENERSON. She is a native of California, but she married a British subject, a gentleman of high standing who has lived 20 years in the country, but never had time to get naturalized. Her case is mentioned in the hearings on this proposition before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the House.

Mr. KENT. But the gentleman is talking of only one case, and I am talking about a law which will apply generally. There is a woman in Washington—I can not give her name—who was a citizen of the United States, that married a man who had taken out his papers with the intention of being naturalized, and thus has forfeited citizenship rights.

Mr. STEENERSON. I desire to say that until the State Department itself thinks this bill ought to be passed, I shall object to it. I think the gentleman is mistaken in trying to have it passed now. I think he does not understand his own bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield before he objects?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. In the gentleman's State, as in my own, woman suffrage will soon be an accomplished fact.

Mr. STEENERSON. This bill has nothing to do with woman suffrage. I have not opposed woman suffrage. Those who claim this bill affects woman suffrage, even in California, are mistaken.

Mr. LENROOT. We have thousands of foreigners who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States. Does the gentleman think it just to penalize these women who are citizens now and depriving them of their vote, because they married men who have declared their intention of becoming citizens of the United States, and will become citizens as soon as possible?

Mr. STEENERSON. There is no penalizing about it. They will be citizens as soon as their husbands.

Mr. LENROOT. The woman loses her vote if she marries a man who is a foreigner, although he has declared his intention to become a citizen.

Mr. STEENERSON. So she does if she moves from one precinct to another 30 days before election. This is only a incident. It is the law of every nation in the world—that the woman's status follows that of the husband—and it ought to be so everywhere. Diversity of citizenship between husband and wife is not compatible with family life nor in harmony with our notion of the Christian marriage.

Mr. LENROOT. Is it the gentleman's idea that the United States must make our laws conform to the laws of other countries? May we not go further and make better progress than other countries have? Is not that to be the test?

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, no; not at all. Our laws should not conflict with those of other nations on a matter like this, for if they do every time our citizens went abroad we would be getting into trouble. I do not believe in doing it, at least not until the State Department is in favor of it.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the gentleman think it is the business of the State Department to legislate or the business of Congress?

Mr. STEENERSON. No; but that has jurisdiction over our foreign relations and over these matters. Here is an extract from the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

STATEMENT OF MILTON T. U'REN, ESQ., A MEMBER OF THE CALIFORNIA BAR.

Mr. U'REN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the object of this bill, as has been stated, is merely to prevent Congress from interfering with those States which have seen fit to confer upon women equal political rights with men. In California the amendment conferring right of suffrage upon women was submitted to and carried by the male voters of the State. Since then a number of women, literally hundreds of them, born in California, raised, educated, married, and now rearing families there, have discovered that they have been set apart from their sisters in the State and deprived of the benefit of the amendment adopted in California. It is not a question, as has been perhaps facetiously suggested, of reserving to certain women who have married Chinamen or Japanese their citizenship. As a matter of fact, that does not enter into the matter at all, because under the laws of California it is a felony for a Caucasian to marry a person of Mongolian or Negro blood. But there are in California persons who have married persons with Mongolian or Negro blood in their veins, and they are there because they married such persons in other States where there is no such inhibition and moved to California and live there under the rights gained in the other States.

This amendment as now proposed is presented for the purpose of relieving American women. The most of them are natives of California, as I stated. Some of them are very prominent. I have here a clipping, which I will not attempt to read at length, but which I will leave for your inspection, as to one of the most prominent women in California. She came from one of the best families, moves in the best circles, has an excellent education, and has been most prominent in the suffrage movement. She married a very prominent man, a clubman, who has lived in California 20 years, his occupation being that of a teacher of singing, in which he has been so busy that he never thought of applying for citizenship; a highly educated and highly cultured gentleman, but being deeply engrossed in his profession overlooked the matter of naturalization.

[From the San Francisco Post, March 13, 1912.]

"MRS. MACKENZIE GORDON VOTELESS—NATIVE DAUGHTER IS A FOREIGNER—SUFFRAGE LEADER LEARNS MARRIAGE TO BRITON HAS COST HER CITIZENSHIP.

"Wouldn't it make you mad through and through,

"If you had been born and raised in California,

"If you had worked your head off for the great privilege of suffrage for women,

"If you had passed up all the social prestige which your husband's position in the artistic world and your own wealth and beauty could give you,

"If you had made your name a reproach and a byword to the class of people who didn't believe in the political equality of the sexes,

"If you had put aside personal qualms and had allowed the papers to publish your picture every time you had landed a blow for suffrage,

"If, at the last, when victory was imminent, you had sat up all night while the votes were being counted and had wept hysterical tears of pure joy when it became certain that suffrage had carried California, and you at last found yourself a citizen of the great and glorious Republic,

"Wouldn't it make you mad to find you were not a citizen at all?

"Wouldn't it peeve you to find that, because your husband, whom you hadn't had more than a couple of years, is an Englishman with a Scotch name, you, too, had to consider yourself English with a Scotch name?

"MRS. GORDON'S PREDICAMENT.

"Such is the predicament in which Mrs. Mackenzie Gordon, wife of the eminent singer and popular member of the Bohemian Club, finds herself, all on account of the idiosyncrasies of the naturalization laws as they are interpreted for the California woman.

"Mrs. Gordon was Miss Ethel Coope and spent her early childhood in Santa Cruz and Santa Clara and was carefully educated in the best fashionable schools in the State. Her charm and beauty won Mackenzie Gordon, who was considered a confirmed bachelor, soon after her debut, and their wedding was a notable society event of two years ago. Since her wedding Mrs. Gordon has entered heart and soul in the suffrage campaign, affiliating with the Club Woman's Franchise League, which has since evolved into the New Era League, with Mrs. Lillian Harris Coffin as the president. This latter organization recently launched a campaign to get every one of the city's newly enfranchised women to register. Mrs. Gordon was on the executive committee of the registration tea which inaugurated the campaign and stood all day of February 14 in the registration office to receive the women as they came into the strange place.

"LAW IS SPECIFIC.

"But the law says explicitly that an American woman who marries a foreigner forfeits her citizenship unless the husband takes out naturalization papers. Now, Mackenzie Gordon—the genial, affable, and famous Gordon—has never seemed to his fellows to be what they called a "foreigner," but such is the melancholy fact. It is not that he loves Britain more and America less, but because he has never had much time to devote to politics. He has been too absorbed in his art.

"Now, to confer the dignity of citizenship upon his American wife he must needs become naturalized, whether he is interested or not.

"Another woman who finds herself in the same situation is Mrs. W. Holmes, president of the Glen Park Woman's Political League. Mrs. Holmes is American born, but her husband was born in British dominion. She is also a member of the New Era League, Mrs. Coffin's organization, and did yeoman service for the suffrage cause in the gloomy days of the campaign last fall.

"Mrs. Coffin says there are 10 other women in the league who are similarly embarrassed.

"WOULD CHANGE LAW.

"The efforts of the committee of the New Era League, appointed to look after the bill introduced by Congressman KENT, providing that the citizenship of an American-born woman shall not be changed upon her marriage to a foreigner, are beginning to bear fruit.

"A letter was to-day received from President Taft saying that he was interested in the measure, and when it came up to him for action he would give it his most careful consideration. Communications were also received from Senator WORKS, Congressman STEPHENS, of Los Angeles, and Congressman KAHN, stating that they were watching the measure and would see that it received proper consideration in the congressional committees.

"Letters have been sent out by the New Era League to more than 25 women's clubs in the State, including the Catholic Aid Society and the Native Daughters of the Golden West, asking them to exert their efforts in behalf of the Kent bill. Presidents of suffrage organizations in all woman-suffrage States have also been asked to use their influence for the success of the measure."

Mr. KENDALL. You say he had lived in California for 20 years, and married for 20 years?

Mr. U'REN. Not married for 20 years, but he has lived there 20 years.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. She ought to use her influence to have him become a citizen to reform the world.

Mr. U'REN. That is true, and doubtless she has and will succeed. But notwithstanding the effort of California to place her on a political equality with men the fact that Mr. Gordon is not naturalized penalizes Mrs. Gordon. In other words, she is penalized by his failure to become naturalized. She may use her influence with him now, but it will be four years before he can get his final papers, and during that lapse of time why should she be set apart from her sisters so far as the elective franchise is concerned? Under this section Mrs. Gordon becomes a foreigner. We merely desire to remove that act of Congress, or remove that which is preventing the amendment adopted by the people of California from its fullest operation.

Mr. CLINE. Let me inquire: Doesn't the law of California let a foreigner when he takes out his first papers on making application for naturalization do everything save hold office?

Mr. U'REN. No; a residence of five years is necessary.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Before he gets his first papers?

Mr. U'REN. Oh, no; before he can vote.

Mr. KENT. It has been decided that that does not constitute citizenship.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That is true.

Mr. CLINE. He gets his papers in Indiana the first day he arrives, if he asks for them, which is everything except to hold office.

Mr. U'REN. In California he must reside there five years before he may vote.

Mr. CLINE. You have no doubt a prejudice against the Malay and foreign races.

Mr. U'REN. That may be, but foreigners are placed upon almost an exact equality with the natives except as to foreigners of Malay and black blood; and, of course, excepting the case of our native women, about which we are now complaining.

Here is the report of the State Department on the bill:

MARCH 22, 1912.

The Hon. B. P. HARRISON,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 14th instant, concerning the proposition to add to section 3 of the citizenship act of March 2, 1907, certain amendments to read as follows:

"That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any woman who is entitled under the laws of any State to hold property in her own right or hold any office in the State or to vote at any of the elections which are now, or which may hereafter be, authorized by the laws of any such State."

It appears that this proviso includes the amendment proposed in a bill, H. R. 20349, introduced by Mr. KENT, and certain additional amendments. You say that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will appreciate any criticisms or suggestions which the department might offer concerning the amendments embodied in the proviso just quoted.

The department incloses, for your information, a copy of its letter of the 13th instant to the Hon. WILLIAM KENT in regard to the bill referred to. I may add that, in the opinion of this department, the proposed legislation for the modification of section 3 of the act of March 2, 1907, which conforms to the general international rule, is undesirable.

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

HUNTINGTON WILSON,
Acting Secretary of State.

—

MARCH 13, 1912.

The Hon. WILLIAM KENT,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The department has received your letter of the 5th instant with which you transmit a copy of a bill to amend section 3 of the act of March 2, 1907, by adding the following proviso: "That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any woman who is entitled under the laws of any State to vote at all elections which are now or which may hereafter be authorized by the laws of any such State." You ask whether the questions have been presented to the department of a woman marrying a foreigner and going abroad to live, and of a woman marrying a foreigner and continuing to reside in the United States with no intention of departing therefrom; and if so, what opinion has been rendered.

Both questions have been presented to the department, and the department has held, under the provision of the act of March 2, 1907, "that any American woman who marries a foreigner shall take the nationality of her husband," that any American woman loses her citizenship upon her marriage to a foreigner, whether she resides abroad or remains in this country. The act of 1907 merely declares the rules which, it is believed, prevail in practically every civilized country in the world. Thus Cockburn, in his work on Nationality (p. 24), says:

"In every country except where the English law prevails, the nationality of a woman on marriage merges in that of her husband; she loses her nationality and acquires his."

Since this was written the British act of Parliament of 1870 has been passed, which declares that a married woman shall be deemed to be a subject of the State of which her husband is for the time being a subject.

For many years before the passage of the act of 1907, the practice of this department conformed to this general international rule. The entire subject is very fully discussed in Van Dyne on Naturalization (p. 242 et seq.).

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

HUNTINGTON WILSON,
Acting Secretary of State.

The law now is that—

Any American woman who marries a foreigner shall take the nationality of her husband.

The amendment proposed consists in adding the words "and removes from the jurisdiction of the United States with intent to permanently reside abroad" after the word "foreigner" in the above sentence.

In view of the fact that the law, long before the statute of 1907, was as stated, it is submitted that the effect of this amendment would be nil.

Of course in such a case as here described she would take the nationality of her husband, but the converse of the proposition would not be true, for the old law would remain as before. Abundant authority on this point could be cited. Here is an extract from an opinion of the Supreme Court of California:

There is no escape from the conclusion that under the provisions of this section the plaintiff in this case when she married Gordon McKenzie, a British subject, thereupon took the nationality of her husband and ceased to be a citizen of the United States. Just as an alien woman who marries a citizen becomes a citizen herself, whether she wishes it or not, as the cases we have cited declare; so a female citizen who marries an alien becomes herself an alien, whether she intends that result as the consequence of her marriage or not. She must bow to the will of the Nation, as expressed by the act of Congress. Owing to the possibility of international complications, the rule has generally prevailed, from considerations of policy, that the wife should not have a citizenship nor an allegiance different from that of her husband. The section aforesaid was intended to put this general doctrine into statutory form. When, after Congress by this act had declared that her marriage to an alien would accomplish her expatriation, and she thereafter married an alien, she is conclusively presumed to have intended thereby to renounce her citizenship of the United States and become a subject of Great Britain. (Opinion of the Supreme Court of California in McKenzie *v.* Hare, 134 Pac. Rep., 716.)

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. STEENERSON. I object.

POST-OFFICE BUILDING AT GRAND JUNCTION, COLO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 16056) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Grand Junction, Colo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is a sort of general understanding that these bills making appropriations for public buildings shall not be considered at this time—or, at least, some of them. I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice and that it retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

VALIDATION OF LOCATION OF DEPOSITS OF PHOSPHATE ROCK.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill S. 6106, an act validating locations of deposits of phosphate rock heretofore made in good faith under the placer-mining laws of the United States.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I am authorized by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], the author of the bill, to ask that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL CELEBRATION OF NAVEL-ORANGE INDUSTRY.

The next businesses on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was House joint resolution 302, authorizing and directing the President of the United States to invite foreign Governments to participate in the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the Washington navel-orange industry.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to, and otherwise participate in, the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the Washington navel-orange industry to be held in Riverside, Cal., during the month of April, 1915: *Provided,* That no appropriation shall be granted by the United States for expenses of such representatives or for other expenses incurred in connection with said invitation.

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

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman from California [Mr. KETTNER] had an amendment to offer.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague has been unavoidably detained on a committee. I ask that this be passed over temporarily without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION (H. DOC. NO. 1423).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, transmitting the report of the Commissioner of Mediation and Conciliation, which was read and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Labor and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the first annual report of the Commissioner of Mediation and Conciliation on the operations of the United States Board of Mediation and Conciliation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 21, 1914.*

PURCHASE AND DISPOSAL OF INDIAN LANDS CONTAINING KAOLIN, FULLER'S EARTH, ETC.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 2651) providing for the purchase and disposal of certain lands containing the minerals kaolin, kaolinite, fuller's earth, china clay, and ball clay within portions of Indian reservations heretofore opened to settlement and entry.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all lands containing the minerals kaolin, kaolinite, fuller's earth, china clay, and ball clay, within such parts of Indian reservations as have heretofore been opened to settlement and entry under acts of Congress which did not authorize the disposal of such mineral lands, shall be open to exploration and purchase and be disposed of under the general provisions of the mining laws of the United States, and the proceeds arising therefrom shall be deposited in the Treasury for the same purpose for which the proceeds arising from the disposal of other lands within the reservation in which such mineral-bearing lands are located were deposited: *Provided*, That the same person, association, or corporation shall not locate or enter more than one claim, not exceeding 160 acres in area, hereunder: *Provided further*, That none of the lands or mineral deposits, the disposal of which is herein provided for, shall be disposed of at less price than that fixed by the applicable mining or coal-land laws, and in no instance at less than their appraised value for agricultural purposes.

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

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Dakota a question. I observe that the bill provides that the land shall be sold at the appraised value of land for agricultural purposes in case the value shall be greater than it is under the mining laws. These proceeds go to the Indians.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will state that this bill originally as introduced, or a similar bill, was limited to Tripp County, what was formerly a part of the Rosebud Reservation in South Dakota. The land was authorized to be disposed of under the act of 1907—under the homestead law—and the price was fixed so that all land taken within three months should be $6 an acre, and then the price reduced after that time, I believe, to $4 an acre for three months and after that to $2.50 per acre. Then, after it had been open to settlement for four years, the land that was not filed upon was to be sold at public auction. The land that was suitable for homestead entry was entered, and all of the undisposed of lands were sold at public auction. It transpires that there is a quarter or a half section that has been covered by a homestead entry, and was so covered at the time the lands were sold. It is claimed that there is some of this mineral deposit upon these tracts, which precludes title being acquired under the homestead law. The purpose of the bill is to make it possible to dispose of those lands, as they can not be disposed of under existing law. The department suggested the bill in the form in which it comes before the House, making it general. I have no desire for general legislation, and care nothing about it, and I purpose, if no objection is offered to the bill, to propose an amendment in lines 4 and 5, so that it will be limited to lands in Tripp County, in what was formerly within the Rosebud Indian Reservation in South Dakota; and then in line 10, on page 2, after the word "value," I propose to offer an amendment striking out the words "for agricultural purposes" and insert "to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior," so that the bill will be limited to lands in Tripp County formerly within the Rosebud Indian Reservation in South Dakota, which will not make it apply to more than 320 acres, at the outside, and it can only be disposed of at an appraised price to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. As I understand the gentleman, so far as it is known, there is only one 160-acre tract that contains these clays.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that these deposits are limited to 160 and not to exceed 320 acres.

Mr. MONDELL. Why would not the simple way be to provide that the homestead settler in that particular case might acquire title under the homestead law, which would be a fee title, by paying the mineral price under the placer law—$2.50 an acre, in addition to the agricultural price?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I think that would be establishing a precedent that we hardly want to establish, that lands containing mineral might be acquired under the homestead laws.

Mr. MONDELL. I think it is always well to do a thing directly and in a way that you understand exactly what you are doing. I do not think you ever establish a dangerous precedent by doing that. We know exactly what we want to do here. As I understand it, the homestead settler wants to get title to this land, and there is a question as to whether there may be some mineral there.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I will say that the homestead entryman is not a party in any way, so far as I know, to this proposed legislation. I have had no communication with him and I have not heard from him. The bill was introduced at the suggestion of persons who believe that this mineral does exist there in quantities making the land more valuable for mineral than for agricultural purposes, and that objections have been made to the acquiring of the title by the homestead entrymen because of that fact.

Mr. MONDELL. Then this may contemplate an entry hostile to the homestead man?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. It probably will.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, with the amendment that the gentleman suggests, I have no further objection.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Dakota a question. Is there any provision in the mining laws of the United States by which clay lands can be leased on a royalty?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The department states that the mineral placer-mining laws do not apply to lands containing these clay deposits.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. They ought not to apply; they are different things. But is there any provision by which they can be leased? Our mode of disposing of clay lands, where you do not know how much clay there is until you dig, is to lease on a small royalty, sometimes 10 cents, 25 cents, a ton; and on clay worth $9 or $10 a ton it would be up to $1.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, that is getting onto a rather large subject. The chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands has reported a number of bills in the interest of conservation, and whether any of them go to the extent of the gentleman's question, I do not know.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I understand you are dealing now with a new subject, the leasing of or, at least, the dealing with clay lands, and it is a thing well known through the clay districts of the United States, and the United States ought to deal with it in a businesslike manner so as to get the best royalties for the ownership of the clay.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will say to the gentleman that we have had this bill up several times in the House. It has been quite fully discussed, and inasmuch as I proposed to amend it by limiting it to certain tracts, I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I am not going to object. I reserved the objection for the purpose of getting information as much as anything else.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman from New Jersey yield to me for a moment?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Certainly; if I have the authority to yield.

Mr. MONDELL. Do citizens of New Jersey pay the Federal Government a royalty for clay taken from lands in New Jersey?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Not at all. As I understand the mining law does not apply to clay lands.

Mr. MONDELL. It does in fact apply. Clay lands are entered under the placer act.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Under the placer act?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I suggest that that is a pretty poor way of dealing with it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Page 1, line 4, after the words "ball clay," strike out the words "within such parts," and in line 5 strike out the words "of Indian reservations" and insert the words "in Tripp County, in what was formerly within the Rosebud Indian Reservation in South Dakota."

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will.

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman's amendment strike out the words in line 5? That would not make very good sense.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Strike out, after the words "ball clay," in line 5, and insert, so it will read:

That all lands containing the minerals—

And so forth—

and ball clay in Tripp County, in what was formerly within the Rosebud Indian Reservation in South Dakota, as have heretofore been open to settlement.

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

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Now, Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 10, after the word "value," strike out the words "for agricultural purposes" and insert the words "to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior."

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman to say he was going to offer an amendment to make this less than 160 acres.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. That is in the bill, I will say to the gentleman, that the area be limited to 160 acres.

Mr. FOSTER. Not exceeding that?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Not exceeding. In line 3, down to line 6, page 3, the gentleman will find the language.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice that.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will say to the gentleman this bill as amended will not apply to exceeding 320 acres and, in my opinion, to not for more than 160 acres.

Mr. FOSTER. While that may be true, that may be one reason why it ought to be 160 acres; and if there is not more than 320 acres there to be located on it might be inadvisable to have two men locate on 160 acres each and be able to get it all.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The bill says "that the same person, association, or corporation shall not locate or enter more than one claim, not exceeding 160 acres in area."

Mr. FOSTER. "Not exceeding" that; but still they have the right to locate on 160 acres of that land.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Well, is there any objection to their doing that?

Mr. FOSTER. If this mineral is so rare out there and at that particular place the deposit was considerable, any one company could go and claim it all.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would suggest to the gentleman the department fixed that limitation, and the matter was not questioned by the committee. This is the first time any question has been raised as to the area that may be acquired by one person. I have no objection if you limit it to 80 acres, though I think it is all right in its present form.

Mr. FOSTER. I am simply asking the gentleman's opinion about it.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will reiterate that I think it is all right as it is.

Mr. FOSTER. But one company probably might get all of it. There is nothing to hinder them from buying it up after location.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. They will not get very much if they do, I will say to the gentleman, as the area affected, in my opinion, will not exceed 320 acres.

Mr. MANN. It will be a liability instead of an asset if they get it all.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know how valuable it is or how much it costs to get this mineral from the ground, but I observe from reading this report it is worth about $12 a ton out there.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the bill is sufficiently safeguarded as it is.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there much of this deposit there according to the gentleman's information?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Let me say to the gentleman that while this bill has been pending two or three years I never have had a communication or suggestion from anybody in reference to it except parties who seem to imagine there is some mineral deposit there that has some value.

Mr. FOSTER. They really do not know there is anything?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Apparently not.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. NORTON. If this is the condition, would it not be just as well to let this bill go over until a general law is passed covering this?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Oh, no; I hope the gentleman will not require us to be held up here indefinitely.

Mr. NORTON. Personally I think the passage of legislation of this kind in reference to mineral lands is a bad precedent.

Mr. MONDELL. The general law does not apply.

Mr. NORTON. If the general law does not apply to it, it ought to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the title be corrected to conform with the amendments adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that the title be amended to conform with the text of the bill.

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PUBLIC BUILDING, WALTHAM, MASS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13489) increasing the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the construction thereon of the post-office building at Waltham, Mass.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to pass this bill without prejudice. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

REGULATING THE USE OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13222) to regulate the use of public-school buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the control of the public schools in the District of Columbia by the board of education shall extend to, include, and comprise the use of the public-school buildings and grounds by pupils of the public schools, other children, and adults, for supplementary educational purposes, civic meetings for the free discussion of public questions, social centers, centers of recreation, playgrounds, and for free Public Library branches, as well during the school year as during vacation. The privilege of using said buildings and grounds for any of said purposes may be granted by the board upon such terms and conditions and under such rules and regulations as the board may prescribe.

SEC. 2. That the board of education is authorized to accept, upon written recommendation of the superintendent of schools, free and voluntary services of the teachers of the public schools, other educators, lecturers, and social workers and public officers of the United States and the District of Columbia, and voluntary gifts of money in aid of supplementary education, civic meetings, social centers, or centers of recreation and playgrounds: *Provided*, That teachers of the public schools shall not be required or compelled to perform any such services or solicited to make any contribution for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the public-school buildings and grounds of the District of Columbia shall be used for no purpose whatsoever other than those directly connected with the public-school system and as further provided for in this act.

SEC. 3. That all laws or parts of laws in conflict with this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky just what this bill will accomplish?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to give the schoolhouses over for civic meetings of various kinds, under the direction, however, of the board of education. There was one provision in the bill which the committee regarded as somewhat dangerous, and so struck it out. The part stricken out is the part which would have converted each schoolhouse into a public library and would have authorized a great many new offices and a great deal of expense; but with

that provision stricken from the bill the committee regards it as a good and wholesome bill, and I myself think it is.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think that the proposition to let the board of education accept gifts of money is a desirable one?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. For the benefit of these civic meetings; that is the purpose of it——

Mr. MANN. Of course that will almost inevitably lead to begging letters, begging for subscriptions for that purpose and giving them to the board of education.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do not know that that would be the effect of it. Rather than see the bill fail, I would agree to strike that out.

Mr. MANN. I should say that that would be almost inevitable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. As I said, rather than see the bill fail, I would agree that that be stricken from it.

Mr. MADDEN. Will my colleague let me ask a question?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. In Chicago we authorize the board of education now to allow the schoolhouses to be used for civic purposes, and I think they are allowed to charge some rent, are they not?

Mr. MANN. I think not. But I doubt the propriety of saying to the board of education that they can go out and solicit money for these purposes, which they shall handle. I appreciate the desirability to a certain extent of using the schoolhouses.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if there is no objection to the consideration of the bill I would agree to the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Illinois that that portion be stricken from the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman with reference to line 10 of the bill. The language granting authority is:

As well during the school year as during vacation.

What is the purpose of using that language?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I am not the draftsman of the bill, but in reading it heretofore I construed that to be just what it says—that it should not be confined to vacation time alone, but should run during the school year as well.

Mr. LENROOT. Has the board of education authority now during vacation to grant the use of these buildings for the purposes stated?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It has not.

Mr. LENROOT. Does not the language as it reads imply that only the same authority is to be granted during the school year that exists during vacations?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It may imply that; but it would grant authority which they have not now.

Mr. MANN. That language does not mean anything.

Mr. LENROOT. Unless it is a limitation on the authority. I think the language should be stricken out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I have no objection to that being stricken out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "playgrounds," strike out the words "and for free public library branches."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, in lines 10 and 11, I move to strike out the words:

As well during the school year as during vacation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out, after the word "Columbia," line 10, page 2, the balance of the line, and also lines 11 and 12, down to and including the word "playgrounds."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 10, after the word "Columbia" strike out the following: "And voluntary gifts of money in aid of supplementary education, civic meetings, social centers, or centers of recreation and playgrounds."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

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

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed.

KING THEOLOGICAL HALL.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 5168) for the relief of the King Theological Hall, and authorizing the conveyance of the real estate to the Howard University and other grantees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be passed without prejudice. I am not as familiar with it as is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLAYPOOL], who has the bill in charge, and he is not here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POST-OFFICE BUILDING, SEYMOUR, IND.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 18172) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Seymour, Ind.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that objection is being made to bills of this character at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the same may be laid aside without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL AUTOMATIC FIRE-ALARM CONTRACT.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was joint resolution (H. J. Res. 205) to enable the Secretary of the Interior to legally fix and determine the ownership of and title to the fire-alarm system and appliances, apparatus, and connections heretofore placed and installed in the Government buildings of the Government Hospital for the Insane, and to determine such other questions as are provided for in the following resolution.

Mr. MANN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the resolution will be stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

STANDARD BARREL FOR FRUITS, VEGETABLES, ETC.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 4899) to fix a standard barrel for fruits, vegetables, and other dry commodities.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard to the present consideration of the bill, and it will be stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

BRIDGE ACROSS ELIZABETH RIVER, VA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 18281) granting the consent of Congress to the Norfolk-Berkley Bridge Corporation, of Virginia, to construct a bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Elizabeth River in Virginia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, a bill of identically the same language passed the Senate and came out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. With the permission of the chairman of that committee, I ask that the committee may be discharged from the consideration of the Senate bill, and that the Senate bill may be considered in place of the House bill. For that purpose I send the engrossed bill to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia requests that the Senate bill be considered in lieu of the House bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand that the Senate bill is identical with the House bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senate bill is in identically the same language.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia if all the usual requirements in regard to navigation are included in the bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. They are.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MANN. I understand that what the gentleman wants to do is to substitute the consideration of the Senate bill for the House bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 6227) granting the consent of Congress to the Norfolk-Berkley Bridge Corporation, of Virginia, to construct a bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Elizabeth River in Virginia.

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Norfolk-Berkley Bridge Corporation, a corporation duly existing under the laws of the State of Virginia, and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto

across the Eastern Branch of the Elizabeth River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the east end of Main Street in the city of Norfolk to a point at or near the north end of Main Street in what was the town of Berkley but is now part of the said city, in the county and city of Norfolk, in the State of Virginia, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House bill of similar tenor will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

MEMORIAL TO MAJ. GEN. GEORGE GORDON MEADE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the resolution (H. J. Res. 234) directing the selection of a site for the erection of a statue in Washington, D. C., to the memory of the late Maj. Gen. George Gordon Meade.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War, the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives, and the governor of the State of Pennsylvania are hereby created a commission to select and prepare a site on property belonging to the United States in the city of Washington, other than the grounds of the Capitol or the Library of Congress, and erect thereon a suitable pedestal for a memorial or statue to the memory of Maj. Gen. George Gordon Meade, late commander of the Army of the Potomac, the said memorial or statue to be furnished by the State of Pennsylvania.

SEC. 2. That for the plans and the preparation of the site so selected and the erection of the pedestal the sum of $15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That the design and location of said memorial or statue and the plan for the treatment of the grounds connected with such site shall be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

With committee amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the words "and prepare."

Page 2, line 1, strike out the words "pedestal for a."

Page 2, line 4, after the word "statue" insert the words "and pedestal," and in the same line, after the word "furnished," insert the words "and erected."

On page 2, line 5, after the word "Pennsylvania" insert the words "without expense to the United States."

Page 2, line 7, after "Section 2," strike out "That for the plans and the preparation of the site so selected and the erection of the pedestal the sum of $15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, *Provided*."

Page 2, line 12, after the word "statue" insert the words "and pedestal."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee if it is the purpose of the bill that the United States Government shall expend the $15,000 to construct the pedestal, the statue thereafter to be constructed to be furnished by the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I will invite the attention of the gentleman to the report, of which I presume he has a copy, in which he will find this statement, which I read:

By an act approved June 11, 1911, the State of Pennsylvania appropriated $20,000 for the erection of a monument in the city of Washington to the memory of Maj. Gen. George Gordon Meade. In the Sixty-second Congress a bill was introduced providing an appropriation of $10,000 for the foundation and pedestal of the Meade memorial. On February 19, 1912, the Committee on the Library had a hearing on the bill to provide a foundation and pedestal for the Meade memorial, at which time several Members of Congress from Pennsylvania and many distinguished citizens from that State appeared in support of the measure.

Later, there being so great pressure brought to bear on the committee to report favorably the many bills pending for the erection of monuments, the Committee on the Library of the Sixty-second Congress passed the following resolution:

"Whereas at the present session of Congress bills asking for the appropriation of over $5,000,000 have been introduced and referred to the Committee on the Library calling for monuments and memorials to be located in various parts of the United States, it has become necessary for the Committee on the Library to establish a policy and certain rules of action: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, First, that the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second Congress should not report favorably any bill for a monument outside the city of Washington.

"Second, that it should not report any bill for a monument to any individual until American science, literature, inventions, and social progress have been adequately represented."

Upon learning of the decision of the Committee on the Library, the patriotic citizens interested in the erection of the memorial to Gen. Meade appealed to the Legislature of Pennsylvania to increase the appropriation in a sufficient amount to provide for the foundation and pedestal. This was done, so that now all asked of Congress is permission to erect the monument, without cost to the United States, on some public property in the city of Washington.

For any further information in relation to it I would like to have the gentleman direct his questions to my colleague here, Mr. LOGUE, of Pennsylvania, whose resolution it is and who is familiar with the action taken by the Legislature and citizens of the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LOGUE. I may say that an appropriation of $30,000 has already been made by the State of Pennsylvania covering the question of the base and pedestal and monument.

Mr. MILLER. What is the object of the $15,000 carried by this bill?

Mr. LOGUE. It is not carried in the bill. It is stricken out. The Government will be subjected to no expense whatever.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. May I inquire of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], the chairman of the Committee on the Library, whether it is the purpose of the committee to construct in this city statues of the various corps commanders of the Civil War?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have not heard of any such policy in the committee. I have not heard it suggested. Congress is not erecting this monument or the pedestal.

Mr. MILLER. I understand that. It does not seem to me to make any particular difference whether the United States pays the bill or the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SLAYDEN. It makes a difference to the committee.

Mr. MILLER. The question is whether it will be a beautification of the city or a multiplication of statues to Tom, Dick, and Harry.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman wants my opinion on that I can give it to him. It is that we now have as many monuments in the city of Washington as we ought to have, for a very long time at least. I think the people of this country have been monument mad, and on nearly every vacant piece of ground in the city of Washington a monument to some soldier or to some sailor has been erected. Usually they have been pressed upon the committee, as I understand was the case before I became associated with the committee, and called for an appropriation out of the Federal Treasury. This is a very unique case, because the people of the State of Pennsylvania propose to pay all the expenses.

There is no such policy in the committee as the gentleman hints at of erecting monuments for all the corps commanders, nor is there any policy in the committee except to do everything reasonable to protect the Treasury and yet to pay such respect to the memory of great men as the public sentiment demands. Personally I am not in favor of the erection of memorials to any great extent.

I want to say to the gentleman in that connection that bills are now pending before the Committee on the Library which, if enacted and appropriations made, would take about $13,500,000 out of the Treasury for monuments, and after a while, if that process keeps on, there will be no room left in the country for further monuments to commemorate the achievements of great men.

Mr. MILLER. There will be no room left for the people of the city of Washington to live in on account of the monuments?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes; if the committee should yield to the pressure put on it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from Texas indicated that it is to be the policy of the committee of which he is the chairman that hereafter the States themselves will be expected to make contributions of monuments in the city of Washington?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I did not express that; but I may express the hope that that will be the attitude of the various States.

Mr. MOORE. I think we have one or two precedents indicating that the States have not been asked to make this sort of a contribution.

Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to say this with reference to this bill: The memory of George Gordon Meade is held very dear by the people of Pennsylvania. The old soldiers believe him to have been the very acme of generalship. Many of them insist that it was through his careful management at the Battle of Gettysburg that the tide of the rebellion was turned. He certainly saved the State of Pennsylvania from further invasion. Now, the soldiers and citizens of that State have long lamented what appears to have been a neglect of the memory of this great man and great soldier. He was a scholar as well as a soldier, a man of fine breeding; but he did not bask very much in the limelight during the war. He did not seem to have the favor of the war correspondents as some other generals did, and he suffered in fame because of that fact.

The bill to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] refers, upon which there was a hearing in 1912, was introduced by me. It was a bill similar to this, except that it proposed that a pedestal should be provided by the Government of the United States at an expenditure of $10,000. It seems to me it would have been fair for the Federal Government to have made even a larger appropriation for this purpose, because the Government has been very backward in recognizing the services of Gen. Meade. We have here in Washington equestrian statues of Hancock and Thomas and Grant and Sherman and Sheridan and McClellan and other distinguished soldiers with whom Gen. Meade, all his services to the Government being taken into consideration, would very fairly rank. Now, by this bill, whereby the State of Pennsylvania alone is to pay for the monument, it is not indicated that it shall be an equestrian monument. There ought to be an equestrian statue, but it is proposed only that there shall be a monument costing, with the pedestal, $30,000. I want this bill to pass, but in passing I want to say that it does seem to me that the policy of the Government toward the memory of this great American soldier has been niggardly in the extreme, and that it is not altogether fair that the State of Pennsylvania should be called upon to erect this monument at its own expense.

Originally I introduced two bills on this subject, one contemplating a participation by the State in the appropriation and another proposing that an equestrian statue should be erected at a cost of $100,000. The Grand Army of the Republic made the request for the larger appropriation. It formally passed resolutions, and sought to have Congress give recognition to Gen. Meade in that way. But we are prepared to take the best we can get, and if this bill is the best we can get I hope it will be passed, as a start, at least, toward a very tardy recognition of one of the great men of this Nation.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, let me say in reply to the gentleman that this is not the proposition of the committee, but the proposition of the State of Pennsylvania, and it increased our respect and affection for the State of Pennsylvania very much when we found that she was willing herself to undertake to do this work in honoring the memory of her great son.

Mr. LOGUE. And if I may add to that, I have a communication from the governor of the State of Pennsylvania, wherein he states that the State of Pennsylvania alone wants to contribute all the money here and objecting to the very section that the committee struck out, which required a Government appropriation.

Mr. BRYAN. Reserving the right to object, I desire to suggest a question to the chairman of the committee, which he may answer if he considers it proper. Questions have been propounded here about other bills. There is pending a bill introduced by so distinguished a Member as the Hon. JOHN J. FITZGERALD, of New York, proposing a statue to John Ericsson, the inventor of the *Monitor*.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That bill ought to be passed.

Mr. BRYAN. That distinguished inventor came from a virile race of people who are represented all over this country. In my State there are a great many of them, and their services as American citizens are distinguished. They are efficient and worthy in every sense and wherever you find them. I believe that bill should pass, and I do not understand why it is that a bill introduced by so distinguished and able a man as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has been allowed to lie idle. I have received many communications on the subject——

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not allowed that bill to lie idle. I have made the life of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] very unhappy by the way I have continually besought him to report that bill to the House. I have done everything in my power to get him to report it; but his committee has a number of such bills before it, and he assures me that when any are taken up for consideration the Ericsson bill will be among the first to be considered.

Mr. BRYAN. I want to commend the gentleman from New York for his persistence. I hope every Member of the House will back him up at every opportunity, as I am now attempting to do. I had no notion of accusing the gentleman of neglecting the bill.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from New York yield for a question?

Mr. BRYAN. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois. I have the floor.

Mr. MANN. Nobody has the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. I was recognized, and have reserved the right to object.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] was talking. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from New York think it is more desirable at this time to be putting money into cold marble or putting it into food that can go into warm stomachs abroad and at home?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to say that the services which John Ericsson rendered to the United States as the inventor of the *Monitor* were so valuable that I believe a statue to him, to stir the patriotic impulses of the people of this country, and to meet a great sentiment on behalf of many of our fellow citizens who were born in the same country or who are the descendants of people who came from the same country as Ericsson, would be very appropriate. The country can well afford to spend $50,000 to erect a monument to the memory of Ericsson much better than it can afford to waste money on many things on which money is wasted.

Mr. MOORE. What amount of money is called for by way of appropriation for the Ericsson statue?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. MOORE. Is the gentleman sure it is not $100,000?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Senate passed a bill for $50,000.

Mr. MOORE. But the gentleman's bill called for $100,000, did it not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. My recollection is that it did.

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman from New York thinks that $50,000 is a fair amount for a statue to Ericsson, the inventor of the *Monitor*, which fought a successful battle against the *Merrimac* at Hampton Roads——

Mr. FITZGERALD. It completely revolutionized modern warfare.

Mr. MOORE (continuing). Does not the gentleman think that the man who won the Battle of Gettysburg ought to have a monument costing an equal amount?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The whole great State of Pennsylvania is interested in Gen. Meade, and he has had some recognition, while Ericsson has had no recognition whatever, except that which comes from those of us thoroughly familiar with the effect of the success of the *Monitor*. I hope before the session ends that the gentleman from Texas and his committee will report a bill to the House which will evidence a proper appreciation by the Government of the services of this great man.

Mr. BRYAN. Allow me to say, Mr. Speaker, that I hope the gentleman's request will be granted.

Mr. MOORE. Would the gentleman from New York submit to an amendment to his bill providing that the money should be appropriated by the State of New York?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not recall that John Ericsson was a citizen of New York.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say that this is certainly a refreshing proposition. We are asked to erect a monument in the city of Washington without any expense to the Government. It has almost swept some of us off our feet, and the enthusiasm may warp our judgment out of all proportion as to the merits of the case.

I am inclined to think with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] that the erection of monuments in the city of Washington has proceeded rapidly enough to suit the most enthusiastic friends of monuments. In the last five years, to my certain knowledge and recollection, there have been 11 monuments completed in the city of Washington—not proposed, but completed. That is an average of more than 2 a year, and for a Capital that is liable to last several hundred years that is going pretty fast.

In this case all this money is contributed by the State of Pennsylvania. It is in commemoration of the hero of Gettysburg, who I think ought to have more credit and responsibility for the winning of that great victory than has been accorded him. I think it is a matter of doubtful expediency to permit States to come in and, because they pay the money, allow them to select a permanent site and have an unlimited right to put up monuments in the District of Columbia. If the monument ought to be here, the chances are that Congress ought to appropriate the money for it; but, in my judgment, there are enough needs for which Congress should appropriate without putting money into stone which ought to be put into bread or into business. We do not need any more monuments. If this monument is acceptable to Congress and Pennsylvania wants to honor Gen. Meade, there is no objection to passing this bill; but it ought not to be regarded as a precedent for the passage of any bill for the erection of a monument in the District of Columbia to some man that a State thinks worthy of honor. I think we ought to object to bills of this kind in the future. I am not going to object to this because of the high standing and character of the man commemorated here, but I do not want it to be accepted as a precedent.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I originally reserved the right to object, and as yet I have made no statement. I really would like to say a word, though only a word. We are spending millions and millions of dollars to make Washington the city beautiful of the world, and the American people are backing us up in the project. Are we going to mar that beauty in every particular along every boulevard, in every park, in every vista, by having water fountains and monuments of men that we have to look into the encyclopedia to see who they were, statues of men that are dear to some parts of America but unknown to the rest of the country, men who performed heroically a small part of the world's work but not quite reaching the grandeur of national achievement? I think myself that the city of Washington to-day looks like a graveyard or a battlefield. We have gone too far altogether in putting up works of so-called art, but oh, what a miserable outfit they compose. The man who moves along our streets and parks to-day as the setting sun lights up the Nation's Capital gets a phantasmagorical conglomeration of kaleidoscopic phantoms, often hideous, never beautiful, representing the puerile ideas of budding geniuses in art, and comprising the masterpieces of tried-to-bes and never-wases in the realm of sculpture, all unnamed possibilities that go by the name of city decoration. [Laughter.] God save us from any more.

I am not going to object to this bill. I do not think anybody ought to object to it, because the State of Pennsylvania very likely has the right to place here a statue to as great a man as Gen. Meade was, so long as the Library Committee has seen fit to report the bill out, and so long as the city is encumbered in the way it is. And yet I do not quite like to let the record stand as it is. I have a great admiration for Gen. Meade. I do not believe admiration for him is reasonably placed by anyone who says that he won the Battle of Gettysburg. That battle was not won by any military genius; it was won by the men behind the guns. Gen. Meade was a great soldier because he was a good soldier and a noble man. He was not a great army leader; he was not a military genius at all. He does not begin to rank with some of the others that we have had, but he was just as great and did perhaps just as much for our country as many of those whose statues have a place here; and while I would like to see Gen. Meade's statue on the battle field of Gettysburg, where all eyes might see it——

A MEMBER. It is there.

Mr. MILLER. I know it is there, and there is where it belongs. There is where his spirit would eternally hover if it ever visits this earth, because there he had his momentary command, and there great deeds were done under his general direction. But the city of Washington is no place for it. We are entirely lacking in the sense of fitness, plain, honest decency in our statue building and in the historic appreciation that gives reason and beauty to the erection of any statue. Think not that you do honor to the memory of any man by objectifying him in a miserable misfit of art, placing him in surroundings foreign to his labors and foreign to his spirit, and hear passers-by through the years ask, "What is that ugly statue about and how did it come there?" There should be no further statue building in the city of Washington for a period of 50 years. Erect splendid memorials to those whose deeds are epoched, but as for the others, save their memories from this desecration in cheap and miserable art and save the eyes of the living.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, just a word. I want to say to the gentleman that I think it extremely unlikely that the Committee on the Library, at least in its present make-up, will ever rush into the indiscriminate work of authorizing the erection of monuments in this city. I quite agree with the gentleman that it has been overdone, but this is a very unique proposition. The State from which the distinguished general came proposes at its own expense to erect this monument.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object—well, I will reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut has demanded the regular order.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will withhold that for a moment. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania intend to offer an amendment locating the site?

Mr. LOGUE. I have one that I have all ready to submit, but I thought the proper time to offer that would be after the consideration of the bill was taken up.

Mr. MANN. I do not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the words "and prepare."

Page 2, line 1, strike out the words "pedestal for a."

Page 2, line 4, after the word "statue," insert the words "and pedestal," and after the word "furnished" insert the words "and erected."

Page 2, lines 5 and 6, after the word "Pennsylvania," insert the words "without expense to the United States."

Page 2, strike out all of lines 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 to and including the word *"Provided,"* being the following language:

"That for the plans and the preparation of the site so selected and the erection of the pedestal the sum of $15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided.*"

Page 2, line 12, after the word "statue," insert the words "and pedestal."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, is this an amendment that proposes to have the site located down here in the Botanic Gardens?

Mr. LOGUE. These are committee amendments which have just been read. I have an amendment, which I have submitted to the gentleman from Illinois, respecting the location of the monument at the point where the Art Commission said it should go.

Mr. COOPER. I was just about to ask whether the Art Commission suggested that it should go there?

Mr. LOGUE. Yes. It is in accordance with their suggestion.

Mr. COOPER. I suppose the other Members of the House have done the same thing that I have, namely, to study the plan of the commission—the Burnham Commission report—which provides for what is called Union Square down here where the Grant Statue is located, and as planned by the commission, if completed, it would be an exceedingly beautiful square. I did not know that that plan included the locating in that square of the Meade Monument.

Mr. LOGUE. I took the matter up with the Art Commission, and their thought was around and about Union Square to locate at least four statues, and they suggested that it would be the proper place for the Meade statue. I have, therefore, in accordance with that talk, and the conversation I have had with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], prepared that amendment, but it is guarded under the resolution as we propose it, as it states "that the design and location of said memorial or statue and pedestal and the plan for the treatment of the grounds connected with such site shall be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LOGUE. Mr. Speaker, I now offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "Washington," strike out the word "other" and all of line 9 and insert "at or near the intersection of Third Street and Pennsylvania Avenue," so that as amended the bill will read:

"A site on property belonging to the United States in the city of Washington at or near the intersection of Third Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, and erect thereon a suitable," etc.

Mr. MANN. That should be Pennsylvania Avenue NW.

Mr. LOGUE. Yes; and I will ask unanimous consent that the Clerk correct that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

On motion of Mr. LOGUE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS OHIO RIVER NEAR SCIOTOVILLE, OHIO.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON].

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the House will consent to the consideration of this little bill without a motion to suspend the rules. It is the bill (S. 6687) to authorize the Chesapeake & Ohio Northern Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Ohio River a short distance above the mouth of the Little Scioto River, between Scioto County, Ohio, and Greenup County, Ky., at or near Sciotoville, Ohio.

This is a proposition to build a bridge across the Ohio River. Bridges across the Ohio River have heretofore been controlled by special statute applicable to that river only. The projectors of this bridge prepared to build a bridge under that idea and commenced it. They were then informed by the War Department that it was claimed that under section 9 of the river and harbor act of 1899 it was necessary to secure special consent of Congress. They stopped the construction of this bridge and introduced this bill. It is in the nature of an emergency brought about in that way, without any fault on their part. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the bill may be taken up out of its order and considered at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to take up out of its order and consider at this time the bill referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chesapeake & Ohio Northern Railway Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Kentucky, and its successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Ohio River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, a short distance above the mouth of the Little Scioto River, between Scioto County, Ohio, and Greenup County Ky., at or near Sciotoville, Ohio, in accordance with the provisions of the acts of Congress approved December 17, 1872, and February 14, 1883, authorizing the construction of bridges across the Ohio River, and of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges across navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain whether this comes under the jurisdiction of the War Department?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, it comes under the jurisdiction of the War Department. Heretofore it was considered to be controlled exclusively by a separate act to control bridges over the Ohio River, but the War Department has reached the conclusion that, in accordance with section 9 of the Burton amendment in the river and harbor act of 1899, the consent of Congress was also necessary, and, therefore, this bill is introduced.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

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

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House bill No. 19428, of similar import, lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

LICENSING OF WAREHOUSES.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 6266), with committee amendments, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, as the order of business has changed rather early in the day, I think the Members of the House ought to be notified; and I therefore make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves a call of the House.

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

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adair	Carew	Elder	Harris
Ansberry	Carr	Fairchild	Hart
Anthony	Carter	Faison	Hay
Ashbrook	Casey	Flood, Va.	Hayes
Austin	Church	Floyd, Ark.	Helvering
Baltz	Clark, Fla.	Francis	Hobson
Barchfeld	Claypool	French	Howard
Bartholdt	Coady	George	Hughes, W. Va.
Beall, Tex.	Connelly, Kans.	Gerry	Hulings
Blackmon	Connolly, Iowa	Gittins	Humphrey, Wash.
Booher	Copley	Godwin, N. C.	Jones
Brown, W. Va.	Cullop	Goldfogle	Keister
Brumbaugh	Davenport	Gorman	Kindel
Burke, Pa.	Decker	Graham, Pa.	Kinkaid, Nebr.
Butler	Deitrick	Gregg	Kitchin
Byrnes, S. C.	Dent	Griest	Konop
Calder	Dooling	Griffin	Lee, Pa.
Campbell	Driscoll	Guernsey	L'Engle
Candler, Miss.	Edmonds	Hamill	Levy
Cantor	Edwards	Hamilton, N. Y.	Lewis, Md.
Lieb	Neeley, Kans.	Sells	Tribble
Lindquist	Nelson	Sherwood	Underhill
Lloyd	Nolan, J. I.	Slemp	Walsh
Loft	Oglesby	Small	Walters
McAndrews	O'Hair	Smith, Md.	Webb
McClellan	O'Leary	Smith, J. M. C.	Whitacre
McGillicuddy	Park	Sparkman	White
McGuire, Okla.	Patten, N. Y.	Stanley	Wilson, Fla.
Martin	Post	Stevens, N. H.	Wilson, N. Y.
Metz	Ragsdale	Taggart	Winslow
Mondell	Riordan	Talbott, Md.	Woodruff
Morgan, La.	Roberts, Mass.	Taylor, N. Y.	
Morin	Rothermel	Temple	
Murdock	Scully	Townsend	

The SPEAKER. On this call 295 Members—a quorum—answered to their names.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors and the Clerk will read the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the amendment proposed by the committee is an amendment in the way of a substitute, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read the substitute as offered by the committee. I have already made a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill as amended.

The SPEAKER. What the gentleman wants read is read.

Mr. LEVER. I am asking that the amendment proposed in the nature of a substitute be read.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to demand a second at the proper time.

The SPEAKER. The proper time has not yet come. Will the gentleman from South Carolina give heed to the reading to see that he gets what he wants.

The Clerk began the reading of the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under the rule, is not the House entitled to be informed what the Senate bill was for which this substitute proposes to take the place? Some of us might vote for the Senate bill and not vote for the substitute.

The SPEAKER. Why, the practice is and the rule is that whatever is read from the Clerk's desk is the matter to be voted on or considered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is it not a fact, Mr. Speaker, that this is a Senate bill, and the report of the committee recommends that all of the bill be stricken out except the enacting clause and the committee amendment be substituted for the Senate bill, and that be passed under suspension of the rules? My inquiry, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to make it, was whether or not the House was not entitled to have the Senate bill read, so it could understand whether it should prefer to vote for the substitute or the Senate bill. That was my inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. The matter that is read from the Clerk's desk is the thing to be voted on, and any gentleman, if he gets the time, can read the other in explanation. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 6266) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to license cotton warehouses, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall be known by the short title of "United States warehouse act."

SEC. 2. That the term "warehouse" as used in this act shall be deemed to mean every building, structure, or other protected inclosure in which any agricultural product is or may be stored or held. The term "agricultural product" wherever used in this act shall be held to include cotton, grain, and other agricultural products designated by the Secretary of Agriculture to be staple and nonperishable.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to investigate the storage, warehousing, classifying, grading, weighing, and certification of agricultural products; upon application to him, to inspect warehouses or cause them to be inspected; at any time, with or without application to him, to inspect or cause to be inspected all warehouses licensed under this act; to determine whether warehouses for which licenses are applied for or have been issued under this act are suitable for the proper storage or holding of agricultural products; to classify warehouses in accordance with their location, surroundings, capacity, condition, and other qualities, and as to the kinds of licenses issued or that may be issued to them pursuant to this act; and to prescribe the duties of the owners and operators of warehouses licensed under this act with respect to the care of and responsibility for agricultural products stored or held therein.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, upon application to him by the owner or operator of a warehouse, to issue a license for the conduct of the same, subject to this act and such rules and regulations as may be made hereunder. Each license shall specify the date upon which it is to terminate, and, upon showing satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture, may, from time to time, be renewed or extended by a written instrument, which shall specify the date of its termination.

The owner or operator of every warehouse licensed under this act shall execute and file with the Secretary of Agriculture a good and sufficient bond to the United States, and such warehouses shall be designated as bonded. Said bond shall be in such form and amount, shall have such surety or sureties, and shall contain such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may require to carry out the purposes of this act. No warehouse shall be designated as bonded under this

act, and no name or description conveying the impression that it is so bonded, shall be used until a bond such as provided for in this section has been filed with and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Any person injured by the misconduct or negligence of the principal named in the bond shall be entitled in an action upon the bond, brought in his own right and name in any court having jurisdiction of the same, to recover all losses he may have sustained.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall charge, assess, and cause to be collected a reasonable fee for every examination or inspection of a warehouse under this act when such examination or inspection is made upon application of the owner or operator of such warehouse, and a fee not exceeding $2 per annum for each license or renewal thereof issued to the owner or operator of a warehouse under this act. All such fees shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of Agriculture may, upon presentation of satisfactory proof of competency, issue to any person a license to classify or grade agricultural products or specified kinds of agricultural products and to certificate the class or grade thereof, or to weigh said agricultural products and certificate the weight thereof; or to classify, grade, and weigh agricultural products or specified kinds of agricultural products and to certificate the class, grade, and weight thereof, under such rules and regulations as may be made pursuant to this act. Any such license issued under this act may be suspended or revoked whenever the Secretary of Agriculture is satisfied that the holder thereof has failed to classify, grade, or weigh agricultural products correctly or has violated any provision of this act or of the rules and regulations made thereunder, or that the license has been used for any improper purpose whatsoever: *Provided*, That no such licensed person shall inspect or grade grain or shall certify, or otherwise indicate in writing, the grade of any grain which has been inspected or graded by him unless and until he has been duly authorized or employed by State, county, city, town, board of trade, chamber of commerce, corporation, society, or association to inspect and grade grain: *Provided further*, That in States which have State grain inspection established by law the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, issue licenses to persons duly authorized and employed to inspect grain under the laws of such State at the time this act goes into effect.

SEC. 7. That the owner or operator of every licensed warehouse shall receive for storage, without any discrimination between persons, any agricultural products tendered to him in a suitable condition for warehousing in the usual manner in the ordinary and usual course of business: *Provided*, That grain or flaxseed so received shall be graded and inspected by an inspector duly licensed under this act and shall be stored with grain or flaxseed of a similar grade; and in no case, in a warehouse licensed under this act, shall grain or flaxseed of different grades be mixed together while in store. No owner or operator of a warehouse duly licensed under this act shall sell or otherwise dispose of, or deliver out of store, any such agricultural product without the express authority of its owner and the return of the storage receipt. For all agricultural products stored or held by a warehouse licensed under this act original receipts, serially numbered, shall be issued by the owner or operator thereof, signed by himself or by his duly authorized agent. No such receipt shall be issued except for agricultural products actually stored or held in the warehouse at the time of the issuance thereof. No duplicate of an original receipt shall be issued unless the same be plainly and conspicuously marked "duplicate" upon the face thereof. While an original receipt or any duplicate thereof issued under this act is outstanding and uncanceled by the owner or operator of the warehouse issuing the same no other or further receipt shall be issued for the agricultural product, except that, in the case of lost or destroyed receipts, new receipts may be issued upon the giving of satisfactory security in compliance with the rules and regulations made pursuant to this act. Any receipt issued in lieu of an original shall be upon the same terms and subject to such conditions as are prescribed by this act for such original receipt. Each original receipt shall contain such terms and conditions, not inconsistent with the laws of the respective States in which issued, as the Secretary of Agriculture may require for carrying out the purposes of this act, including a true statement of the date and place of its issuance, its serial number, and the location of the warehouse in which the agricultural product is stored or held, and shall state that the agricultural product is deliverable upon the return of the receipt properly indorsed and upon payment of proper legal charges, if any be due to the owner or operator of the warehouse. Upon return of the receipt to the owner or operator of the warehouse issuing the same and upon the payment or tender of all advances and legal charges, agricultural products of the same class or grade and quantity named therein shall be delivered to the holder of such receipt within 24 hours after facilities for receiving the same have been provided: *Provided*, That in the case of cotton or other agricultural products customarily put up in bales or packages, each original receipt shall include a description of such bales or packages by marks, numbers, or other means of identification, and the weight thereof; the owner of such original receipt shall be entitled upon presentation thereof, and the payment of accrued charges, to receive the identical bale or package described therein within 24 hours after facilities for receiving the same have been provided.

SEC. 8. That the owner or operator of any warehouse licensed under this act shall keep complete and correct records of all agricultural products stored or held therein and withdrawn therefrom, of all original warehouse receipts, and duplicates of the same, issued by the owner or operator of the warehouse, and of the receipts returned to and canceled by the owner or operator thereof, shall make reports to the Secretary of Agriculture, in such form and at such times as he may require, and shall be conducted and operated in all other respects in compliance with this act and the rules and regulations made hereunder.

SEC. 9. That any warehouse receipt or certificate of the class or grade of any agricultural product issued under this act shall specify the class or grade of the agricultural product covered thereby in accordance with the official standard of the United States applicable thereto as the same may be fixed and promulgated under authority of law: *Provided*, That until such official standards for any agricultural product shall have been fixed and promulgated under authority of law such warehouse receipts or certificates of the class or grade of agricultural products may be issued in accordance with any other recognized standard, or in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Such receipts or certificates shall show the description or the standard in accordance with which the agricultural product has been classified or graded.

SEC. 10. That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to cause examinations to be made of any agricultural product stored or held in any warehouse licensed under this act. Whenever, after opportunity for hearing is given to the owner or operator of such warehouse, it is determined that such owner or operator of such warehouse is not performing fully the duties imposed on him by this act and the rules and regulations made hereunder the Secretary may publish his findings.

SEC. 11. That the Secretary of Agriculture may suspend or revoke any license issued to any owner or operator of such warehouse under this act for any violation of or failure to comply with any provision of this act or of the rules and regulations made hereunder, and any such license may be suspended or revoked, after opportunity for hearing has been afforded to the licensee concerned, upon the ground that unreasonable or exorbitant charges have been made for services rendered.

SEC. 12. That the Secretary of Agriculture from time to time may publish the results of any investigations made under section 3 of this act; and he shall publish the names and locations of warehouses licensed and bonded and the names and addresses of persons licensed under this act and lists of all licenses terminated under this act and the causes therefor.

SEC. 13. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, through officials, employees, or agents of the Department of Agriculture designated by him, to examine all books, records, papers, and accounts of warehouses licensed under this act and of the owners or operators of such warehouses relating thereto.

SEC. 14. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall from time to time make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the efficient execution of the provisions of this act.

SEC. 15. That every person who shall forge, alter, counterfeit, simulate, or falsely represent, or shall without proper authority use, any license issued by the Secretary of Agriculture to any owner or operator of a warehouse, or to any grader, classer, or weigher, under this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 16. That the words "owner" or "operator" wherever used in this act shall be construed to import the plural or singular, as the case demands, and shall include individuals, associations, partnerships, and corporations.

SEC. 17. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000, available until expended, for the expenses of carrying into effect the provisions of this act, including the payment of such rent and the employment of such persons and means as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and he is authorized, in his discretion, to call upon qualified persons not regularly in the service of the United States for temporary assistance in carrying out the purposes of this act, and, out of the moneys appropriated by this act, to pay the salaries and expenses thereof.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to license warehouses, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] demands a second.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from South Carolina is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin to 20 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a combination of the Smith-Lever bill for warehousing cotton and the Moss bill for warehousing grain. It comes to the House from the Senate with practically a unanimous vote and with a favorable recommendation of the Agricultural Committee. It is one of three great measures—rural credits, grain standardization, and Federal warehouses—which have been framed in the business interests of our farmers. This Congress has made a great reputation for itself in passing constructive legislation to enable a better organization of the commercial business of this country, but it stands justly charged before the country with either a failure or a refusal to pass measures of equal importance to the agricultural interests of our Nation. We are passing out of the pioneer stage of farming into that of improved agriculture. One of the results of this change is to give increased importance to capital and credit engaged in agricultural industry. Land and its products have increased largely in value in the last 10 years. This important development increases the amount of capital that is necessary in order to engage in farming and emphasizes the financial phases of the farmer's life. Farming has become a business, and every successful farmer must become a good business manager. This growth brings the question of better business methods to every farmer, and is rapidly forcing a reorganization of American agriculture. Scientific knowledge, faithful industry, and commercial credit are the three great factors of modern farming. The only commodities which the farmer has to offer as a basis for credit are his land and its products. The gross value of all farm products in the United States is about $9,000,000,000 a year, but before this vast production can be pledged as security or sold in the markets to the best advantage it must be standardized, graded, and held in such a form that a warehouse receipt can be presented to the financial interests of this country, showing

on its face the essential factors which establish the market value of the commodities offered as security. This is the prime purpose of this bill.

The bill, as rewritten by the Agricultural Committee of the House, applies to cotton, grain, and all other staple and nonperishable farm crops, and the owner of any of these products may apply for its benefits. The owner of any warehouse may apply for a license to operate under its provisions. Any competent citizen may apply for a license to grade such products under recognized standards; but such licensed person must secure employment from some State authority before he can issue certificates of weight or quality of agricultural products under the provisions of the bill. It does not in any instance commit the Federal Government to Federal inspection of agricultural products or in any manner nullify any State law on this subject.

The bill in every provision is permissive; in no sense is it compulsory. It does not commit the Government to the ownership or the operation of warehouses in any degree; neither does it commit the Government to the making of advances in money upon agricultural products.

The bill makes provisions whereby owners of agricultural products can purchase storage in bonded warehouses, licensed and supervised by the United States Government; to have these products graded and weighed by licensed graders, according to uniform standards of quality to be fixed by the United States Government; and the owners of such products will receive a warehouse receipt, uniform in its terms with every other warehouse receipt for agricultural products of like quality stored in any governmentally licensed warehouse in the United States. Such a receipt will present collateral security of the highest integrity, and the holder can borrow money at any bank as readily and at as low rate of interest as if he were pledging a Government bond. In every operation, from the storing of the product to its final sale and delivery to the consumer, the provisions of this bill place the farmer on a plane of absolute equality with the merchant or broker.

Every owner of agricultural products who does not desire to negotiate an immediate sale of such products can store them under ideal conditions of safety. His receipt declares their actual grade; and by consulting any reliable market quotations the owner can know what is their actual value. Any day he can secure money at the lowest interest rate by pledging his receipt at the counter of any bank.

The bank can rediscount this receipt at the regional bank. This bill thus connects the farm with the Federal Treasury through the medium of chartered banks and gives to the farmers of the United States the full advantages of our new banking and currency law. If the farmer has money borrowed on warehouse receipts, he can liquidate his obligations at maturity by the sale of his commodities in the open markets. He thus secures every advantage which the ownership of these prime necessities can give and is enabled to sell them to the best advantage when he desires to divest himself of that ownership. The bill is therefore a long step in the direction of better business methods on the farm and to make possible better living among farmers.

Pass this measure and you make it possible for every farmer in the United States to become a business man. Pass this measure and you make it possible to inaugurate business methods on every farm in this country.

Perhaps the most notable achievement of this Congress was the passage of the new banking and currency act. Under the provisions of that act collateral backed by farm products becomes security which can be rediscounted by the Federal reserve banks, and here we have a measure by which these farm products are standardized, by which they are to be graded by graders licensed by the Department of Agriculture and stored in warehouses which are bonded to the United States. Thus it is that we aid the farmer by giving him every financial advantage that is given to the business men of this country.

The Department of Agriculture has been working on the question of standardizing farm products for more than five years, and Congress has appropriated more than $500,000, which has been expended for this purpose. The current law carries $72,000 to perfect this great work; but all this effort is in vain, and this vast sum of money in practical effect will have been squandered if we refuse to permit the enactment of this measure. For what other purpose than to aid in establishing better market methods was the work of standardization undertaken? And in what better manner can these methods be introduced than to enact this bill into law?

It is a well-known fact that in the United States we harvest a year's supply of any standard farm crop within a few weeks. The result under present conditions is to force these products on the market in advance of their actual consumption. They are thus compelled to be offered for sale to speculators to be stored for later consumption. Prices are thus forced down at harvest, when the farmer sells, to be sharply advanced after harvest, when these products are sold to the actual consumers. The result is that speculators ordinarily realize a higher net profit from farm crops than the men who actually perform the hard labor of producing them. We have thus a wide margin between the price paid to the producer and the price charged to the consumer.

This warehouse bill will remedy these adverse conditions. It will stabilize average prices, increasing them to the producer without advancing them to the consumer. In my investigation of the system of selling farm crops in Europe, where the speculator has been starved out and products go from the farm direct to the consumer, the profit which the speculator makes in this country is, in fact, divided between the producer and the consumer. It is thus literally true in Europe that improved methods of storing and selling farm crops has resulted in higher prices to the producer and lower prices for the same product to the consumer. The next great advance in agricultural business methods in the United States will be along lines of cooperation. This bill presents the most splendid opportunities for cooperative action among farmers. It will enable farmers to realize in money a fair margin of the actual cash value of their products at the moment of harvest and still hold the ownership of their products until the consumer is ready to take the product directly from the hands of the producer. The result will be to eliminate the speculator, to minimize the dealings in futures, and to divide the larger margin now taken by this horde of middlemen and to divide it between the two classes who are compelled to assume ownership of these products in order to carry on the business of the Nation—the producer and the consumer. And all of this operation shall be under the supervision of the National Government. [Applause.]

So far I have not heard an objection from anyone, unless it has been on the question of the constitutionality of the measure. I shall not attempt to argue that phase of it or try to answer the technical objections of lawyers who know less about farming than they do about law. I recall that the Webb-Kenyon bill was opposed on similar grounds, but this Congress passed it over the veto of the President of the United States when so eminent an authority as President Taft and his Attorney General stated that it was unconstitutional, and based their disapproval solely on that ground.

Mr. WEBB. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. WEBB. Just one question, for information. It is doubted whether a State may have a warehouse system if this law passes. If this bill passes, will it do away with any system that a State might adopt?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. It would have no effect whatever on that. The provisions of the bill are permissive, and any warehouseman can elect whether he will operate under State authority or under the provisions of this bill. As a matter of fact, I would like to say to my friend from North Carolina as this bill passed the Senate of the United States it expressly recognized State-owned warehouses, and provided that the operator of such State-owned warehouses may be licensed. That provision has been accepted by the Agricultural Committee of the House, and it would have been presented here as an amendment excepting for the fact that the conferees of this House will be friendly to it, and it can be written in by the committee of conference. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss] has spoken for two bills, one for the issuance of warehouse licenses and the other for the standardization of food products. There is only one of these bills now before the House, and that bill is the bill for the licensing of warehouses. The gentleman from Indiana also says that the bill comes from the Senate with almost a unanimous vote. As a matter of fact, the Senate bill has been abandoned by the Committee on Agriculture and a substitute has been reported for it by the House committee, which is vastly different in many essential particulars from the Senate bill.

I only desire, however, at this time to say that I am in favor of the principle of this legislation and should be glad to support both of these bills. I may, perhaps, be able to support the bill which shall follow it—the one for the standardization of grain—but this bill in its present form, it seems to me, no gentleman can with consistency support, and no one who is really in favor of this legislation can afford to support it, because he lays

himself liable, if he does, to an imputation of bad faith in attempting to pass a bill that on its face is absolutely unconstitutional. Why, Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing in this bill on which a right to legislate can be based—not one single thing. I know it is fashionable nowadays to think that the Constitution is not requisite as a basis for congressional action. But the courts will not so hold. They will hold that there must be authority in Congress under the Constitution to legislate on this subject under some of the provisions of the Constitution.

I have asked the gentlemen in charge of the bill to incorporate as a part of it that the terms of this bill shall only apply to the business of this character which is interstate in its nature; and if that were done, the constitutional right to legislate would belong to us; but now, under the terms of the bill, we have no power under the Constitution to legislate with regard to warehouses within the States in any respect or to any extent.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand the gentleman to say that the House has absolutely destroyed that provision of the Senate bill which classed these warehouses as such as are engaged in storing products which enter into interstate commerce.

Mr. TOWNER. Without passing upon the sufficiency of the Senate bill I do say as to the House bill that upon no possible ground can it rest upon a constitutional sanction.

Mr. BARTLETT. I agree with the gentleman entirely.

Mr. TOWNER. That is not all. The bill in its present form is certainly not in form for the purpose intended. For instance, if you turn to section 6 you will find an interpolation here in this bill which indicates a purpose to grant power to the Secretary of Agriculture to give to certain persons whom he may designate the power to pass upon and fix certain standards for grain. But there is no power given to the Secretary of Agriculture to fix these standards. And so we have a secondary power and no primary power upon which it can rest. It seems to be the intention to incorporate some of the provisions of the standardization bill in this bill. But in this bill, while power is given certain agents, to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, to determine whether the grain inspected conforms to certain standards, the standards are not fixed, and no power is granted to the Secretary of Agriculture or to anyone else to fix them. Of course if the standardization bill passes this section in this bill is unnecessary, and if it does not pass the power granted in this bill is incomplete. It is clear that the bill ought to be redrawn and ought not to pass in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I will close in two more speeches. Will he use some more of his time now?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I am still an old-fashioned Democrat and an old-fashioned lawyer. I do not believe the necessity exists in this case, in order to correct the evils it is proposed to correct by this bill, that we should flagrantly and obviously violate the Constitution of the United States, as I believe this bill does. There is no difficulty, there will be no difficulty, in carrying on the business of securing loans of money upon warehouse receipts when those warehouses are State institutions, as they now are. Numbers of States have passed laws providing for bonded warehouses, and the very currency bill that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss] referred to provided that warehouse receipts of cotton and other farm products should be accepted by the banks and by the reserve board and be rediscounted, when we did not have any such law as this upon the statute books. There is no power in the fundamental law of the land that justifies this House in passing a bill like this, which proposes to turn over to officials and employees of the General Government the right to visit various localities where farm products are stored in warehouses and demand that they shall comply with rules prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that we have arrived at that stage where we propose to exercise power in the General Government under the general welfare clause of the Constitution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. But no lawyer who has any regard for his reputation will assert that such a power as that exists under the Federal Constitution. [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman from South Carolina use some of his time now?

Mr. LEVER. We have only two more speeches on this side.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask consent to extend my remarks by inserting the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in a case where this question was treated of?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the decision referred to:

UNITED STATES V. DE WITT.

1. The twenty-ninth section of the internal-revenue act of March 2, 1867 (14 Stat. L., 484), which makes it a misdemeanor, punishable by fine and imprisonment, to mix for sale naphtha and illuminating oils or to sell or offer such mixture for sale, or to sell or offer for sale oil made of petroleum for illuminating purposes, inflammable at less temperature or fire test than 110° F., is in fact a police regulation, relating exclusively to the internal trade of the United States.

2. Accordingly it can only have effect where the legislative authority of Congress excludes, territorially, all State legislation, as, for example, in the District of Columbia. Within State limits it can have no constitutional operation.

* * * * * * *

The Chief Justice delivered the opinion of the court.

The questions certified resolve themselves into this: Has Congress power, under the Constitution, to prohibit trade within the limits of a State?

That Congress has power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes, the Constitution expressly declares. But this express grant of power to regulate commerce among the States has always been understood as limited by its terms; and as a virtual denial of any power to interfere with the internal trade and business of the separate States, except, indeed, as a necessary and proper means for carrying into execution some other power expressly granted or vested.

* * * * * * *

As a police regulation, relating exclusively to the internal trade of the States, it can only have effect where the legislative authority of Congress excludes, territorially, all State legislation, as, for example, in the District of Columbia. Within State limits it can have no constitutional operation. This has been so frequently declared by this court, results so obviously from the terms of the Constitution, and has been so fully explained and supported on former occasions that we think it unnecessary to enter again upon the discussion. (9 Wall., U. S. C. Repts., p. 41.)

The SPEAKER. Two or three hours ago the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] asked unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the bill then under consideration, and the Chair forgot to put it. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. KENT] makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the same request as to extending remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss] makes the same request as to this bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, as I understand this bill, it is not compulsory that any warehouse in the United States shall come within its terms. A warehouse need not come within its scope unless the owner of that warehouse is willing to do so. It is entirely optional with the warehouse ownership to determine for themselves whether it is advantageous to avail of this legislation or not.

The greatest disadvantage that the agricultural interests of this country have to face is the difficulty of securing credit and the difficulty of holding their crops until a good opportunity occurs to market them. Now, the purpose of this bill is to aid agriculture in securing credit. The purpose of this bill is to aid agriculture in taking care of its crops. If I have a warehouse in my community and I issue a warehouse certificate that I have a bale of cotton or a bushel of wheat stored there of a certain grade, the question as to whether or not my certificate is worth anything depends on how far the people who know me believe what I say in that certificate and believe in my honesty and integrity and care in taking care of that piece of property. If my county has a warehouse, that belief will extend further, and that confidence will be greater; and so it will be with a State. But when you come to the National Government, if it has a right to inspect these warehouses and issue a certificate as to what is contained in them, it will carry confidence from one end of the United States to the other.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the gentleman not to interrupt me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, there is where the benefit will come to the agricultural interests of this country. I recall the

days back in the nineties, when there was but slight sale for the iron and steel products of the district that I represent. A company known throughout the United States established warrant yards and issued warrants for pig iron, stating what the grades were, where it was stored, insuring the pig iron; and the results was that, although for a long period of time in the nineties it was difficult to sell pig iron, those warrants could be taken to New York or Chicago or other centers where money could be obtained and readily used by the holders as security and to sell the pig iron, because the man who took the warrant as security knew that he had a solvent corporation behind that pig iron that would guarantee that he received the pig iron according to the grade that was named in the certificate.

Now, it would be the same thing in this case. If you pass this bill, the man who places his cotton in a Government warehouse will be able to take the certificate to any portion of the United States, and the man to whom that certificate is presented will know that that bale of cotton is according to the grade; that it is properly insured, properly housed, and properly taken care of; and it will not be necessary for the banker who intends to lend the money or the purchaser who intends to buy the product to go and inspect the product or move it at once. So, Mr. Speaker, I regard this bill as one of the foremost advance steps that have been made in recent years in the interest of agriculture. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized for four minutes.

[Mr. ANDERSON addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, this is the same bill that was up for consideration at the last session of Congress, and the House refused to pass the bill under suspension. I had expected that in the discussion of this bill to-day some effort would be made to meet the arguments that were then made concerning the constitutionality of the bill. I am not altogether surprised, however, that such an effort has not been made, because I undertake to say that no lawyer in this House or elsewhere can or will claim, upon a careful examination of the provisions of this bill, that it will in any particular stand the test of constitutionality. Some gentlemen seem to think that in the consideration of bills by this House no consideration need be given to constitutional questions; but I say to you that if they are not considered here there is a place where they will be given consideration, and that is in the courts of this country. And when we are satisfied, as we must be, that this bill is unconstitutional I say any friend of the merits of this legislation who votes for this bill this afternoon is voting against the remedy that this legislation seeks to secure.

When the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] arose I expected he would undertake to discuss the constitutional features of the bill, but he did not. What did the gentleman from Alabama say? He said he understood that this bill was not compulsory, that it was optional as to whether a warehouseman should come under its provisions or not. But the gentleman from Alabama must admit that being merely optional does not give the Federal Government jurisdiction. To illustrate—and I gave the same illustration before—supposing the law relating to pawnbrokers in the State of New York was very drastic and the pawnbrokers of New York City came to this Congress and said, "We want a Federal law regulating pawnbroking in the city of New York, and we want it optional as to whether we shall come under its provisions or not; we do not ask that it be compulsory; we merely ask that it be optional, so that if we choose to come under Federal regulation we may do so"; does the gentleman from Alabama claim that would give Congress any jurisdiction to regulate the business of pawnbroking in the city of New York, overriding the laws of the State of New York? Of course not.

But, more than that, even though the statement were true that this is merely optional, there is not a shred of Federal jurisdiction upon which to hang this bill.

But it is not optional. It is optional so far as the owners and operators of the warehouses are concerned, but that is all. But will the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] or the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] claim that the farmer who raises the grain or the man who buys it for consumption or for milling has no rights? Can his rights be taken away from him by the owner or operator of a warehouse? And yet that is what this bill proposes. For instance, a farmer grows grain or cotton in a State and sends it to a warehouse in that State, to be milled in that State, to be used in that State. Under this bill, if the owner of that warehouse chooses to take out a Federal license, he must come under the Federal law with relation to all grain or cotton going through that warehouse, although it is raised, milled, and consumed in one State. Have not those people who store grain in warehouses any rights under the laws of that State? And will some one say that the Federal Government has a right to repeal the laws of the State with reference to its own internal affairs? The question was asked during the debate as to whether or not this would do away with the laws of the States upon this subject? On its face it does absolutely do away with the State law in every case where the owner or operator of the elevator exercises the option under the bill of taking out a Federal license.

It would have been easy to bring this bill within plain constitutional provisions. If it had been limited to interstate commerce, if it had provided that no grain or cotton or other agricultural products should enter into interstate commerce except in compliance with the provisions of the bill, then it would stand. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] this morning suggested to me one amendment that he seemed to think would remove this objection, but his amendment related only to the designation of the warehouse, requiring that only warehouses engaged in the business of interstate commerce should come within its provisions, but that still left the grower and miller and all others than the warehouseman exactly where they were before under the bill, and denied to them the rights they have under their respective State laws.

There is another provision. A bond is provided for, and an attempt is made to give a remedy under the bond. Well, unless the Federal Government has secured jurisdiction upon which to base its action, the giving of that bond, if it is given, does not make it worth the paper upon which it is written. There is one other provision, however. As the bill reads here—

> Any person injured by the misconduct or negligence of the principal named in the bond shall be entitled in an action upon the bond, brought in his own right and name in any court having jurisdiction of the same, to recover all losses he may have sustained.

There was a Senate provision on the subject, evidently drawn by lawyers, because that provision limited the recovery to injuries to the cotton or other agricultural product that was stored; but as this House provision reads a man may be conducting a warehouse, and if a stranger is injured in that warehouse through the negligence of the warehouseman, this bill would attempt to give jurisdiction to sue upon the bond given to the Federal Government and recover damages for the injury.

Why, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that upon the Democratic side, where there are so many and so able lawyers, some consideration has not been given to the provisions of this bill and some attempt made to make it come within the clear-cut lines of constitutional limitations. The only attempt that has been made that I have heard from the Democratic side of the House—it has not been attempted to be defended on our side—it has been claimed that we have the right to enact this legislation under the general welfare clause of the Constitution. I am amazed to hear that contention made, especially by a gentleman coming from the South. If you urge that upon this bill, then you may as well wipe out every constitutional safeguard that is written in the Federal Constitution. Because, if the promotion of the general welfare authorizes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation alone, then there is no limit to the jurisdiction that the Federal Government can exercise, and is bounded only by what the Congress itself may deem to be the general welfare of the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a bill of this importance ought never to be considered under a motion to suspend the rules, and if it was to be considered under suspension there ought to have been some effort made to make it constitutional, at least to the extent of enabling those who are favoring it to rise on the floor and defend the constitutionality of the bill. It has not been done and it will not be done, Mr. Speaker, because, as I stated, no lawyer who has examined the provisions of the bill will undertake for one moment to say that it will ever be held valid by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I said a moment ago to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I would close in one speech. Since he took the floor the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN] has asked for two minutes, and I will yield two minutes to him, with the consent of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this bill on its merits, and can defend it with facts, history, and Holy Writ. I notice that no arguments have been made in opposition except on constitutional grounds. Whether or not under the general welfare clause of the Constitution this bill can be sustained I do not know, but I am convinced by investigation and study that the general welfare of the great grain-growing section of the West is conserved by its provisions.

Speaking for the farmers of the Northwest, I say we need both national warehousing and Federal inspection, because under the grain inspection and warehouse system of Minnesota and Illinois we have been swindled out of millions in the value of our crops. The farmers of the North and South are equally interested. It is time that Congress did something to protect both grain and cotton producers from the grain and cotton gamblers in the great terminal markets of the Nation.

This bill gives our farmers a better chance to have a square deal in the sale of their crops. It provides for the warehousing and inspection of grain and cotton under national supervision. But some one asks, Why not leave the inspection and warehousing of grain to the several States? The answer is twofold. First, many of the greatest producing States, like the Dakotas, must market their surplus outside of their own borders, and therefore can have no voice or control over the way in which their crops are inspected, warehoused, and sold in the terminal market. No matter how rankly they are gouged nor how smoothly they are swindled, all they can do is swear or pray, according to their disposition.

THE STATE COMMISSIONS HELPLESS.

But the big reason for demanding help from the Federal Government lies in the failure of the States to protect their market places from monopoly, extortion, and sharp practice. It does not seem possible for the little State commissions to control the organizations that now monopolize the great cotton and grain terminals of the country. I do not know whether it is due to simple inefficiency or political servility, or both, but I do know that local government has failed in Minnesota and in Illinois to protect from exploitation the grain growers of the Northwest. You remind me that distinguished Senators have praised these State systems of warehousing and inspection and pronounced them quite as perfect as the multiplication table and quite as honest and virtuous as a corn field in midwinter; but gentlemen will observe that those who are loudest in their praise of our terminal markets, in the Northwest at least, are men who have spent most of their time for years in Washington. They do not personally know what they are talking about and have been misled by the powerful men of the grain monopoly and the influential newspapers they patronize.

THE ST. PAUL CONVENTION OF FARMERS.

If Members of Congress at both ends of this Capitol could have witnessed the great convention of farmers a few days ago in St. Paul, where over 5,000 delegates from all over the Northwest, from the Rocky Mountains to the Great Lakes, met and for three days deliberated on the necessity of securing an open market, little attention would be paid to the special pleaders who defend the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce and the Chicago Board of Trade. Those 5,000 farmers knew they had for over a quarter of a century been swindled by the grain combine at the great terminal markets, and that the method of their undoing was somehow or other mixed up with the price-fixing system and line-elevator control in the country, working in combination with double-crossing commission firms who sold to themselves and operated terminal elevators that doctored grain to make skin grades by which the millers could, in combination with grain gamblers in the pit, hammer down the price of grain to the farmer, and all in combination with ambitious politicians in the service of the State who feared the great papers where the great mills advertised and the powerful political influence of the easy-money aggregation hanging around the combination in control. They knew it was a complicated matter, and took three full days considering it. Before the convention adjourned every phase of marketing and market control, both of cotton and grain, was discussed by these wide-awake and determined farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the fact that this great gathering honored me by asking me to state to them my views on warehousing, inspection, and future trading in grain. I have studied these matters by the searching cross-examination of many large operators and by the personal inspection of many original records and statistical tables, and I told that convention of farmers what I now tell this House and the country, that it was a wise thing for the farmers of the Northwest to get together to consider their rights and to enlarge their cooperative selling agency, because it was only by determined and united action on the part of the producers along cooperative lines that they could ever hope to shake off the organized parasites that for years had been sucking the blood of agriculture and disturbing the health of the whole Nation; that St. Paul and its splendid citizenship was wise in recognizing the equity of the farmers' contention for an open market and in giving such generous support and encouragement to a great farmers' movement, because the city and farm are mutually dependent on each other, and the city that has the foresight and patriotism to make itself the center of the resistless movement toward cooperation is entitled to its inevitable first place in the list of great cities.

GREED AND WAR VERSUS EQUITY AND COOPERATION.

Generally speaking, there are only two great principles that direct human activity in the world. One is the principle of concentrated power, efficiency—speaking in broad fashion, we call it imperialism. It was fitting that Senator CLAPP in his address to the convention should speak at length upon the menace of war to our Government; that he should deplore the insanity of Europe. It is fitting that I also should join with him at this critical hour in the history of humanity in condemnation of war. All of us should stand firm, that this great Nation may not be swept from its feet in the greatest paroxysm of excitement in history, and thus spread outward the awful crime now being committed on the fair fields of Europe. I only allude to this again, however, for the purpose of contrasting it with the work of cooperation fostered by an intelligent Government. What does the war mean? And what does cooperation as a principle mean?

The war in Europe is, to us in this country now at peace, a distant and far-removed conflict, and it is very difficult for us to bring ourselves into an appreciation of what it means. I do not suppose there is a person anywhere who can, by any stretch of imagination, conceive of the awful horror and unspeakable insanity that is involved in that mighty conflict of nations. I am not going to speak of that, but I must call your attention to the fact that the war in Europe results from the avarice and greed of man, from covetousness, from an insatiable lust for property and power, and from the unsound economic conditions that follow. One great nation, with its mighty armament and equipment for destruction, wants an outlet to the sea for its commerce. Another great nation wants a tract of land somewhere that the fruit of that land may go to its coffers. Another great nation wants to control the ocean with its channels of trade that the fruits of other lands may come to her market. So I might go down the line to all these great nations and show every one of them hurling destruction at their neighbors, making every field of Europe a slaughterhouse, every home in Europe a place of sorrow and grief, where wistful-eyed women and little children hour by hour, even as I speak, listen and wait and will always wait for the footsteps of the dead, and all because rents, debts, and taxes had become so unbearably heavy that each nation felt impelled to take from some other nation its property.

It is efficiency, if you will, the perfection of the whole scheme, human business efficiency, the concealed ideal of which is to bring to the efficient what some one else produced by his toil; and efficient nations, under the impulse of greed and to cover the sins of favored classes and to become more and more efficient, build mighty engines of destruction, like battleships, for battering down seacoast cities, submarines for destroying such battleships, and even peaceful merchantmen; even aircraft, great birds of prey, for dropping bombs upon sleeping cities; in short, every hellish device conceivable for destroying life and taking the property of the dead. To take from the helpless or to withhold from other greedy men is the whole scheme and theory of armament and war; is the spirit of imperialism carried to logical conclusions. And imperialism is the one great principle that marks with tombstones and crucifixion every epoch of mankind struggling down the ages. The other great principle is the principle of justice; you might call it social equality, if you will, or equity, or fraternalism, or Christianity; but essentially it is the principle of justice between man and man wrought in mutual helpfulness and support; in essence it is honest cooperation. These two principles that guide the destinies of nations and the activities of man are in conflict with each other; and the only ray of light I see through the clouds of delirium and insanity sweeping over all Europe and endangering us is the hope—the dream, if you care to call it such—that out of the catastrophe of this war will come sufficient enlightenment and brave intelligence to all the people of the earth to crush the spirit of imperialism, with its mockery and folly, its monopoly and greed, its unearned increment and aristocratic pride, forever beneath the surface of human activity and desire! And that in its place shall arise the truth taught by the Founder of Christianity and by all the great leaders for the uplifting of humanity from the beginning of history—the principle of gentle justice and equity, making all mankind a neighborhood.

Could men do better than to hold a convention dedicated to the idea of cooperation? Could Congress do better than clear the way for equitable cooperation among the producers of human food, especially now, when the whole world is undergoing

change and must soon face universal hunger? I believe that the day will come when the spirit of avarice and greed will yield to the spirit of justice, mutual helpfulness, and true Christian fraternalism. If it doesn't come, what hope is there ultimately for humanity? But I must not generalize too long. It is better to apply these general observations to the present question of marketing and to this bill for Federal examination and licensing of grain and cotton warehouses.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE MARKET PLACE.

The market place—why, the market place should be a holy place and the light should shine through it every hour. It should not be a place of avarice and greed. Its trading should not be in a barred house with secret chambers and tribunals. Men urge the great importance of the court as a place of justice and equity. Important it is, but not more important than the market place, for the market place also has a direct and immediate relation to the lives and the food of men. The general welfare of humanity is dependent upon the purity, honesty, and fairness of the market places of the world quite as much as upon the integrity of its courts. When we demand an honest market place we challenge the highest function of political economy.

The convention of 5,000 farmers meeting in St. Paul this present month was a mighty voice of protest against the dishonesty of the grain markets of the West. It will be well for Congress and the country to heed that voice. Agriculture demands a free and open market, a fair market. This national warehouse act and Federal inspection will help, but the destruction of the present intolerable monopoly and grain-gambling device must follow to insure full protection to the husbandmen of the Nation.

MONOPOLY IN THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AT MINNEAPOLIS.

I am going to talk a moment about the market place in Minneapolis, and I am going to talk with the full consciousness of the responsibility of my position. I want that understood. I am known as a Minneapolis man, because my business is largely there, although my home is in St. Paul; but I am for Minneapolis as much as St. Paul as a city, and I am for Minneapolis and St. Paul as much as I am for the country districts—just exactly the same. I am not unmindful of the trust and place I hold as Representative of the whole State. I say what I say upon this subject fully conscious of the fact that I am responsible for what I say. When I criticize the Minneapolis market I do not refer to the city, but to the chamber of commerce, and what I say of that institution I say deliberately.

Now, then, what about that market place? And how will this bill improve it? It was my lot to represent one of the legislative committees at the last session of our legislature, investigating the grain markets of Minnesota. It also happened that during the last session of Congress I offered a resolution for the investigation of the Chamber of Commerce at Minneapolis and the Chicago Board of Trade as well as the markets of other cities, and I participated in the hearings that followed before the Committee on Rules where many important facts were brought out incident to the marketing of grain. I therefore speak with knowledge of the subject when I discuss the grain traffic and the effect of monopoly of markets upon the people.

Some may think that this market-place monopoly in Minneapolis is a new problem; not at all. It is an old, old problem. I have before me two books, each quite different from the other. I am going to quote from these two books a text or two, and comment upon them briefly.

First, to show the inception as well as to point the lesson of the control of the market place I am going to quote from a book—I never find it necessary to tell farmers what book these lines are from, because they recognize the phraseology and the text; but I know there are friends of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce who might be confused, so, and in order that they may know and appreciate the source of my authority, I will state that this is Holy Writ.

I am going to quote a few lines to show you that the combine in the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis did not begin this business. I suggest this fact by way of defense of that combine. I am speaking in charity, however, and not as their attorney. I would not undertake their defense as a professional matter, because I am not a criminal lawyer.

ELEVATOR TRUST ORGANIZED BY PHARAOH.

I quote from the forty-first chapter of Genesis:

And it came to pass at the end of two full years that Pharaoh dreamed, and, behold, he stood by the river. And behold, there came up out of the river seven well-favored kine and fat fleshed, and they fed in a meadow. And behold, seven other kine came up after them out of the river, ill favored and lean fleshed, and stood by the other kine on the brink of the river. And the ill-favored and lean-fleshed kine did eat up the seven well-favored and fat kine. So Pharaoh awoke.

And he slept and dreamed the second time; and behold, seven ears of corn came up upon one stalk, rank and good. And behold, seven thin ears and blasted with the east wind sprung up after them. And the seven thin ears devoured the seven rank and full ears. And Pharaoh awoke, and behold, it was a dream.

I will not quote further. You remember what followed. The King was troubled about the dream, and consulted the wise men and the magicians—we would call them in our day the Cabinet of the Executive—but none of them could explain what the dreams meant. They were puzzled. But Pharaoh heard about a gifted young Jew who was in jail. This young Hebrew, with that wonderful business instinct that has sustained his race through centuries of persecution, had the capacity to foresee and to correctly interpret business conditions, when consulted by Pharaoh, the King, immediately hit upon the correct solution. He said, "Mr. Pharaoh, that dream means that there will be seven fat years; seven years of bumper crops, which will be followed by seven years of famine, crop failures, and hard times; and I advise you to conserve the crops during the seven good years, store away the surplus, and be prepared for the seven bad years." It was good advice. But how was that advice taken by the thrifty king? He capitalized his dream at once—talk about watering stock—he capitalized a dream. He passed a law—I am interpreting liberally the plain meaning of the text, and I want you to know that, in my judgment, this is the best book, the wisest book, and the holiest book ever written upon this earth, and when I put it in modern phraseology I do it only to impress the lesson. They capitalized that dream—the King and his aristocratic court—they made Joseph prime minister, and ordered him to go ahead and take from the farmers one-fifth of all their crops each year for the seven years and store it away in warehouses. Joseph and his elevator managers collected this grain—it says "more than the sands of the sea"—so much. And it says also that they left off numbering "for it was without number." Do you remember the lines? That means they stopped keeping books.

And it also says here in this Holy Book that this grain was laid away "under the hand of Pharaoh." What did that mean? That the warehouse receipts were issued in Pharaoh's name and not the farmer's. Iron-clad monopoly! You can imagine what chance the poor farmers had when hard years came and they needed corn to eat and plant. Our learned but cautious Department of Justice could not have gotten that corn away from Pharaoh and his crowd. It would have been a hopeless lawsuit, with the elevator books muddled and the warehouse receipts all in Pharaoh's name. During those seven good years the farmers had plenty and were content when the administration orators shouted "Let well enough alone." If there had been some Scandinavian farmers at that time along the Nile like those who in our day organize farmers' conventions they doubtless would have made loud objection to the law, but with that government at that time criticism of a decree of Pharaoh's court would have been more dangerous than it is in North Dakota now, where the supreme court puts a man in jail if he objects to their decisions too promptly. The Egyptian farmers had no chance. Note what happened. I will read you what happened, so that no one can say I misinterpret it. But before I read this—the famine came as predicted. With the first crop failure the farmers were not much alarmed; they remembered that the great warehouses were full; they went to the capital and said to Pharaoh: "We would like some corn to plant and to feed our cattle with during the winter." What did Pharaoh say? Just what the big millers in Minneapolis say. He said, "Go unto Joseph; what he saith to you, do." They say, "Go see John; we will deal only with members of his combination." Now, I will quote, so nobody will question:

And Joseph gathered up all the money that was found in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan for the corn which they brought, and Joseph brought the money into Pharaoh's house.

That means what it says—they took all the money that the farmers had for corn for that one year. The next year also was famine stricken and the farmers were more anxious; they had no money left.

And when money failed in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan all the Egyptians came unto Joseph and said: "Give us bread; for why should we die in thy presence? For the money faileth." And Joseph said, "Give your cattle, and I will give you for your cattle, if money fail." And they brought their cattle unto Joseph; and Joseph gave them bread in exchange for horses, and for the flocks, and for the cattle of the herds, and for the asses, and he fed them with bread for all their cattle for one year.

For all their live stock he gave them bread for one year.

And when that year was ended they came unto him the second year and said unto him, "We will not hide it from my lord, how that our money is spent; my lord also hath our herds of cattle; there is

not aught left in the sight of my lord but our bodies and our land. Wherefore shall we die before thine eyes, both we and our land? Buy us and our land for bread, and we and our land will be servants unto Pharaoh; and give us seed, that we may live, and not die, that the land be not desolate. And Joseph bought all the land of Egypt for Pharaoh; for the Egyptians sold every man his field, because the famine prevailed over them; so the land became Pharaoh's.

Was not that a hard bargain; was ever a more unfair contract forced upon hungry men? It meant that for corn to eat—for corn that had been raised upon their own fields—the farmers of the Nile yielded everything to that greedy and tyrannical government; that imperial and efficient government took the men and women it assumed to govern and made them slaves; took their lands and property and the bodies of their children into bondage. Was the conservation policy of Pharaoh and Joseph wise? I have heard men in Congress commend it. But what became of the people of Egypt? The Jews alone survived by leaving the country; the Egyptians perished. That is the answer. Degradation and decay must always result from monopoly. Moses, leaving Egypt with its lesson in mind, prompted by God, said, among other things, "Thou shalt not steal." There was, however, as a result of Pharaoh's monopoly, great prosperity in Egypt for a time and for a few. The masses were slaves, but without doubt the upper classes surrounding the king had efficient business men among them. These were the captains of industry of that day. They built the libraries and pyramids and mighty government buildings. I have no doubt they got out magazines showing the great terminal facilities of Pharaoh and his aristocracy—boastful magazines, like this bastard sheet of the grain combine, misnamed the Cooperative Manager and Farmer, which on expensive paper shows all the great buildings, mills, and elevators of Minneapolis in an effort to rub into the farmers of the Northwest the sad fact, which they already knew, that the whole business of warehousing grain and making flour is monopolized by the chamber of commerce in Minneapolis the same as the grain warehousing in Illinois is controlled by the combine in the board of trade.

This magazine, listing all the elevators of the combine in Minnesota, ought to convince the reluctant lawyers of our Government in Washington that an illegal monopoly exists and thrives vigorously on the grain growers; and it also should convince Congress that the Federal Government must hasten to provide national elevators to serve our section honestly. The significance of the great Minneapolis terminals pictured in the combine's magazine will not be lost by the clear-headed farmers of the Northwest. They are beginning to realize that the method of storing and warehousing for the purpose of doctoring and mixing grain and then obtaining a skin-grade on the large quantities held by the big dealers and used to manipulate and control prices needs a vast machinery and many expensive structures which would be unnecessary if the market was an open and free place for simple merchandising. The farmers are beginning to feel that they should not be compelled in marketing their crops to send them through such an expensive and complicated plant as that provided by the Chamber of Commerce at Minneapolis. They know, of course, that the cost of upkeep and operation of such a plant must be borne by the grain that passes through it, and it is a big item. They realize that if the grain goes through the Minneapolis marketing machinery of pit, warehouse, and mill before it goes to the consumer, the men who own that machinery must take out enough to operate and pay dividends on the capital invested.

THE WAY FROM PRODUCER TO CONSUMER SHOULD BE DIRECT AND SIMPLE.

They urge that wise legislation should devise methods to simplify the process of food as it passes from producer to consumer and make it less expensive. I believe that national and State warehouses and the prohibition of gambling in grain would help, and that this bill is a step in the right direction. It interests farmers to consider how the great terminals in Minneapolis were built and who paid for them? I only regret that this magazine does not also show these facts. These great buildings, however, only represent a small part of the profits won in grain traffic. This magazine would make a better album for the children of the farmers to play with, and it would have more artistic value if it showed, in addition to these great buildings, the beautiful homes of the grain-gambling magnates of Minneapolis, which were also built out of the profits of the grain trade during the last quarter of a century in Minnesota.

I am going to briefly detail to you some of the methods used, methods which, for moral culpability, put old Pharaoh to shame. Anybody could have seen through Pharaoh's game; he made the farmers give themselves and their lands to slavery in order to get corn to eat; but these modern men were more subtle.

MARKET MANIPULATION ILLUSTRATED.

How do they do it? Listen. It is a complicated machine, this matter of marketing. To illustrate, I will take several cars of grain from Dakota to Minneapolis and follow them through and show you some of the ways they have of extracting profits from that grain, as shown, now, mark you, as shown by the testimony taken at these hearings. Let us say five carloads of grain are shipped from North Dakota to Minneapolis. One car of wheat is graded No. 1 northern, another No. 2, another No. 3, another No. 4, and the other rejected or no grade; all five cars shipped, for instance, to the Van Dusen-Harrington Commission Co. for sale. Before these cars reach the market place the inspection department of the State has inspected them and given them the grades I have indicated—I, 2, 3, 4, and rejected. They come upon the tables of the Van Dusen-Harrington Co. for sale at the hour the exchange opens; each sample is placed upon the table so that any buyer, you would think, who wanted to buy one of these cars would have an opportunity. But just as soon as the exchange opens and the samples are placed for sale by the Van Dusen-Harrington sales agent, the Pioneer Steel Elevator purchasing agent walks up at once and, before any other broker can bid, buys each car for his company. That looks almost honest, doesn't it; but note this: The Van Dusen-Harrington Co. owns the Pioneer Steel Elevator Co. What a farce to have the Pioneer Steel man walk up like a purchaser to buy from his own boss, and say, "I will give you so much for this and so much for that," indicating the different cars he was purchasing for his own company from his own company; but the Van Dusen-Harrington Co. broker never smiles at the grim joke on the Dakota farmer as he says, "Sold to the Pioneer Steel for so much per bushel," and enters a charge against the farmer for a commission for selling to himself. Pharaoh would have been ashamed to have turned such a trick at that. To make it worse, he sells it to himself for less than the grade of each car should be sold, as shown by the bidding in the pit at the very moment of the sale.

The man in Dakota will not object to that, because he will not know at what hour and minute the sale was made. Our committee had difficulty in making them produce the original cards and the pit records to show at the hearing. The Pioneer Steel Co. man gets these five cars, which he bought cheap from himself and takes them to the elevator, and what happens there? Now, bear in mind that the No. 2 wheat was sold 2 or 3 cents less than No. 1; the No. 3 at something like 3 cents less than the No. 2, and so on all the way down, the widest difference being probably 10 cents or 12 cents. He takes these five cars to his elevator, the good and the bad, and he mixes them together all ready for shipment out to any country miller who might need wheat to grind, or to fill the order of any exporter. The very next day Van Dusen-Harrington Co. gets an order from a Red Wing mill to buy five cars of No. 1 northern wheat. All right. He goes to himself, doing business as Pioneer Steel, and buys the five cars that they bought the day before and mixed, and, strange to say, the inspectors of the warehouse department of the State graded it as No. 1. The unsuspecting country miller does not realize that he is not getting the kind of No. 1 wheat that the one good car of No. 1 graded coming into the market, but he has to pay a commission, nevertheless, to the company that bought from themselves for his account. You see how they can make money and build great terminals. In the first place, they made a cent a bushel for each of the five carloads by selling it to themselves; then they have a fraction of a cent a bushel by selling it for less than it ought to be sold for, according to the market at that hour, and when they get it mixed and sell it all to a miller as No. 1 they make several cents a bushel; then they make a selling commission. This may be shrewd business, but to me it looks like pioneer stealing. Some of you may think there are not very many bushels raised in grade this way, but the official records of the State show that in Minneapolis and Duluth there are several million bushels a year which are raised from these inferior grades to the top grades while in possession of the terminal elevators of the combine. The swindle, however, of raising the grade by mixing and doctoring the grain is not measured by the profit on the particular grain so treated; its effect upon the market price, generally, is where the great evil lies.

MONOPOLY CONTROL OF PRICES THE GREAT EVIL.

This leads me to discuss briefly how the mixed grain in storage can be used to depreciate and drive down the price of grain to the producer. It is done in connection with what they call future trading. Before the committee I referred to future trading as gambling, and to men who manipulated the market in the pit as gamblers. I have since regretted that I used the

term. I feel that I owe an apology to poker players of the country. Betting on horse racing leads to the development of good horses at least; but betting on the price of wheat, what does that lead to? I am not going to talk about the effect of gambling upon gamblers; how it softens the brain of a man to concentrate upon the dream or idea of getting something for nothing. I am not going to speak of the loss to suckers who think they can speculate, nor of the almost countless instances of defalcation and ruin to well-meaning young men, tempted by the glamour of the game to take a "flyer" in May or December wheat. Right now many young men find themselves staring the penitentiary in the face because they have used some one else's money gambling in grain options. I confine my denunciation of this gambling in grain to the effect it has upon the farmer and the farmer's prices. Why, they say in this Chamber of Commerce Magazine, in an article by John McHugh, that there is an open market in Minneapolis where there is competitive bidding.

GAMBLERS THE FARMERS' COMPETITORS.

With whom does the farmer compete when he sends in his grain to that market for sale? Within the shadow of the blackboard where the quotations in the pit are made every second of the day while 'change is open, his grain is sold. Is he competing with another farmer with similar grain for sale? Oh, no; he is competing with a gambler, maybe a half-developed clerk in a banking house who does not know the difference between a bushel of grain and a bushel of chips and whetstones, but who thinks he wants to be a bear on the market. He is competing with a man who simply wants to bet, but does not have the slightest conception of the use or importance of grain in the economy of the world.

Every witness for the grain exchanges testified that the price paid for cash wheat on that market place is fixed every moment of the day by the blackboard where the gamblers' quotations are made. That, therefore, is the competition the farmer has—the competition of gamblers. How is the price of the gambler made? The great public warehouses of Chicago where this doctored grain, mixed as I have explained, is kept in storage in enormous quantities, are used for no other purpose than control of the price to suit the gambling operations of the men who control the Board of Trade in Chicago. By virtue of their ability to deliver that grain under the law upon anybody's contract for future delivery and their ability to throw upon the market depreciated grain in any quantity necessary to break down the competition of men who might otherwise be willing to compete, they are able to control the market to such a degree as to hold down the price during the period when farmers are selling in large quantities.

LAW OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND REPEALED BY MONOPOLY.

We showed before the Rules Committee in the presence of the leading members of the Chicago Board of Trade and Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce by the statistics of the Government that the law of supply and demand did not control. No one controverted; no one can deny our figures. We showed that in the year 1909, which was a year in this country and in all the world besides when not only was there a larger yield of wheat, but also a larger yield of corn, oats, barley, and other cereals; a larger yield of every kind of grain in 1909 than in 1911; and yet the price of wheat in 1909, the year of large production, was 10 or 12 cents more per bushel than in 1911, the year of infinitely less production, showing conclusively that neither the world's supply nor the supply in this country fixed the price of grain. It was fixed and always will be fixed while monopoly and gamblers rule the market places by the large operators in the pit with their public warehouses and ability to bid in concert and with secret understandings.

PILLSBURY-PEAVEY-LEITER CONSPIRACY.

In a case just tried in Chicago amazing facts were proved. It seems that in 1898 Joe Leiter, with Frank H. Peavey and C. A. Pillsbury, who while living controlled the Interior and Monarch Elevator Cos., of Minneapolis, conspired to corner and control the wheat market by withholding enormous quantities in storage. The price was driven skyward, and the corner had control until Peavey and Pillsbury broke their agreement and swamped Leiter under a loss of over $12,000,000. The fact of this conspiracy and agreement has been proved before the Federal court at Chicago to the satisfaction of a jury in a suit brought by these elevator companies against Leiter for grain they delivered to Leiter during the corner operations. Federal Judge Humphreys, instructing the jury, said:

> If you find from the evidence that there was an illegal conspiracy to obtain control of the wheat market, then the notes are void.

The jury so found just a few days ago. I only mention this case to show what a few large dealers controlling warehouses can do by pit operations and conspiracy. If some of the conspirators had not broken their agreement, there would have been no lawsuit and the facts never would have been known. Such agreements are made by the big operators whenever necessary to depress the price to farmers or to freeze out suckers or to permit the big mills to lay in a supply of cheap wheat or to raise the price by cornering operations for the purpose of afterwards pinching the lambs and little fellows. No doubt they often keep their illegal agreements of this sort in good faith with each other, so the facts are never disclosed. There is sometimes honor among thieves.

I for one am unalterably opposed to gambling in grain—future trading in grain. It offers too easy opportunity for crooked deals and conspiracy. Let the grain produced upon the farms of this Nation be sold as grain upon open and fair market places for the purpose of being made into food and then buyers will pay a just and fair price.

The provision of this United States warehouse act which we are considering authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to "investigate the storage, warehousing, classifying, grading, weighing, and certification of agricultural products." This provision would enable the Government at any time to examine the grain and cotton held in storage and the honesty of its grading, as well as probe the motives for withholding or offering great quantities for the purpose of market manipulation. Deals like the Leiter-Peavey-Pillsbury conspiracy would be more difficult and dangerous.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to license warehouses and prescribe the duties of warehousemen. He may also license inspectors to grade and classify grain and cotton and to issue certificates of the class, grade, and weight thereof, but "no owner or operator of a warehouse duly licensed under this act shall sell or otherwise dispose of or deliver out of store any such agricultural product without the express authority of its owner and the return of the storage receipt."

If this act meets the concurrence of the Senate, as it should, its terms will enable farmers, by cooperative selling agencies, to effect the exchange of their products direct to consumers without paying unconscionable profit to middlemen and speculators and without any toll to gamblers. The evolution of trade and common sense demands that the way from producer to consumer shall be open and direct; insists that any sort of monopoly is indefensible and intolerable.

The Department of Justice should, in my opinion, without delay resolutely enforce the antitrust law against the Chamber of Commerce in Minneapolis. The Government does not lack lawyers or disposition to do things, but "watchful waiting" is a bit discouraging in this instance. It is a matter of importance to the public.

I wish to emphasize what it means to have a monopoly make the price of grain by warehouse control and future trading. Annually there is produced in this country approximately five thousand million bushels of grain, subject to future trading. You will see that when great operators can change the price even 1 cent a bushel they can cut from the value of the crop $50,000,000, and if they make it go down 10 cents a bushel, as they have time and time again, they can knock from the value of the farmers' annual production the enormous sum of $500,000,000. What does that mean? It means the denial of prosperity to those most entitled to it. It means the accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few in the great centers of population to such an extent as to create national discord and disease.

BACK TO THE FARM MOVEMENT.

In my judgment, great cities like Chicago, those mighty centers of this nation, where the wealth, the cream of production of land and labor has been concentrated by virtue of laws which permit overcapitalization and kindred methods of exploitation; great cities like these, in my humble judgment, are a menace to our institutions and a misfortune to the people of the world; the artificial and unnatural life of these great centers is demoralizing and degrading to those who dwell there and inimicable to general public welfare. If ever the time comes when this great Nation of ours shall fail as a Government, it will be by virtue of the vice and corruption that come from the too great concentration in the great centers, of people and wealth, and the lack of wholesome prosperity in the rural places.

Out in the country people are nearer to God. Out in the country, where men and women have an opportunity to live wholesome and natural lives, there is a higher ideal of human nature and justice. But poverty and hardship destroys contentment anywhere. How, then, can you stem the tide cityward? You can not do it by lecturing and organizing "back to the farm" societies. There is only one thing that will do it, and that is to make the farmers so prosperous that their prosperity will

hold farmers' sons there by deliberate choice. How will you do that? By stopping excessive tribute to the transportation and distribution of farm products; not otherwise. I know myself, as a farmer's son, what it means to toil upon the farm; I know all its hardships, and as well I know, since my life has been passed in cities, its benefits and its virtues; knowing both sides I say it is of the greatest importance to this Nation that industrial justice be done to all producers. I mean that those who produce shall have a fair portion of what they produce, whether that production be by work on the farm or by toilers in town. Why is the labor question so difficult in the city? Why is the city laboring man's lot so hard? Because competition of labor is too severe. Why is competition of labor so severe in the city? Because labor in the country is so unremunerative, all things considered, that there is a stream to the city of men who ought to stay in the country. But once do justice in the market place, so that the farmers shall have an abundance, so that their sons shall be attracted by the opportunities of the country and stay there from choice—held there by virtue of that generous prosperity which the Almighty God intended to give to the sons of the earth for tilling the soil—and you solve the difficulties of the labor problem in the city. There will not be too much competition. Furthermore, there will be a greater abundance of food produced, and this will make the problem of living easier in the town. Just make the market place what it ought to be—a fair place, unpoisoned by artificial restraint, untainted by vicious practices like gambling—and you solve the problem not only of the farmer, but bigger problems of statecraft and government as well.

As one who has tried in a way to do something along the line of statecraft and government, I confess myself appalled by these problems. I confess myself absolutely overwhelmed by the difficulties of finding a right solution of the great questions that every day confront this Government of ours, problems growing out of the unequal distribution of wealth; the lack of free movement back and forth for the products of toil; the difficulty of making justice spread out to all the people and prosperity reach all quarters. These problems are hard to solve. Those of us placed under responsibility need the help of clear-brained, restful men out in the country especially.

I have no faith or confidence in these great problems being solved by a select few—a few professors, or lawyers, or Congressmen, or judges, or political economists. I have no faith in human government coming from some superior individuals down. My whole faith in our institutions rests upon my faith in the fairness and intelligence and good judgment of the great masses of all the people of the United States.

This is why I was so willing to leave Washington to participate in a great convention of farmers, to meet face to face so many earnest men from the country places, and have the inspiration and encouragement that comes from being in contact with men who do the work of feeding humanity, the most important thing in the social order. I honor the men responsible for this great gathering of farmers in St. Paul; I take off my hat in the presence of such men as those who have stood on the firing line of the farmers' fight for an open and free market. It takes brave men to fight entrenched privileges. These men have been opposed by every device and obstacle that money could buy. They have been sneered at, jeered at, and taunted; struck cowardly blows from behind; abused and villified most shamefully. They have been unfairly treated and the whole country should know it.

I could illustrate the desperate opposition of the grain combine to the farmers' movement by many specific instances of underhand work if it would make the need of relief by legislation more clear, but public praise does scant justice to the men who have borne the burden. Mr. Speaker, for months Benjamin Drake, of Minneapolis, with keen brain and unflagging industry, studied the methods of monopoly in exploiting grain growers, and, with the unanimous consent of Congress, I will print in the RECORD as an extension of my remarks, for the information of the country, the digest of his argument to the convention on the subject matter of this bill. Mr. Samuel H. Greeley, of Chicago, who for something like a quarter of a century was a member of the Chicago Board of Trade and who learned its methods from the inside, contributed valuable time in organizing the convention and made a speech exposing the vicious practices of the public-warehouse men of Illinois operating under the protection of the Chicago Board of Trade. The substance of his speech also I will, with unanimous consent of the House and for its information, print in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Marcus D. Munn, of St. Paul, one of the greatest lawyers of the West, thoroughly investigated the grain-marketing conditions in Minnesota, and vigorously condemned the illegal and unfair practices of the chamber of commerce monopoly. I regret that I have not the text of his argument to print for the benefit of Congress, but I say his opinion should carry weight with lawmakers.

To emphasize the need of prompt action by the Department of Justice in destroying the illegal monopoly of the grain combine in Minneapolis and the importance of remedial legislation, such as this United States warehouse act now pending, I call attention of Congress and the country to the fact that desperate efforts are being made right now to destroy the farmers' movement for an independent and cooperative agency for selling their grain.

The farmers have chosen George S. Loftus, known nation wide as a reformer of wide vision and great courage, as their leader, and for months now he has, in consequence of that leadership, been the object of assault by every man and paper that the easy money of the grain gamblers could buy or coerce. They have hired character assassins to slander him; liars to libel him. They have paid papers to pester him, pushed banks to break him, persuaded politicians into political prostitution to destroy his influence. He has stood up under it erect and unafraid, but it is time his brave fight for a square deal for humble men should have at least the support of just laws and law enforcement from our Government and a more lively and earnest support from the farmers of the West, whom he serves so well.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers' convention in St. Paul was addressed by Hon. C. C. Daniels, of North Carolina, now of the Department of Justice, with office in Minneapolis, on the subject of "Monopoly control of the cotton and tobacco markets of the country." His speech was so strong in pointing out the menace of monopoly in a market place, and so clearly presents the need of Federal legislation in the matter of warehousing and the wisdom of this bill, that with unanimous consent of the House I will print it in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the need of national legislation to protect the farmers' market is clearly stated in the resolutions unanimously adopted in the St. Paul convention of farmers, December 10, 1914, and reading as follows:

Whereas it is generally believed, and to the best of our knowledge verified, that the facilities for grain at Minneapolis and Chicago in public elevators are monopolized, unsuitable, unjust, and conducted against the interest of the general public; that this system as now operated has been declared a monopoly by well-informed parties who are competent judges; that such facilities although public in name are private in fact, with discriminations in favor of the proprietors which prohibit the general use of such elevators by the public; and

Whereas shippers of interstate grain have no means of expressing protest by ballot against officials permitting present violation of the public terminal warehouse laws: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention recommends to the Congress of the United States that it enact such legislation as will provide suitable public elevator facilities under ownership and control of the Federal Government at such prominent terminal points as are now dominated by illegal forces in restraint of trade, and at such other terminals where the necessities of the public demand such storage; and this convention recommends the indorsement of such charges against the grain passing through such elevators as will care for proper returns on the investments; and it is further

Resolved, That the Department of Justice of the United States be asked to prosecute all parties handling grain in public elevators in restraint of trade and violation of law in all trade centers.

We unqualifiedly denounce and condemn the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce and the Board of Trade of the City of Chicago as gambling houses and institutions aiding and abetting organized monopolies in restraint of trade; that said chamber of commerce and board of trade are themselves monopolies; that they harbor, protect, and assist lawbreakers and monopolies who take from the farmers certain values of their crops by methods which are neither legal nor justified in the interest of the common good: Therefore be it

Resolved by the farmers of the Northwest here assembled, That the secretary of this convention be instructed to demand of the Department of Justice at Washington that immediate steps be taken to prosecute those responsible for such restraint of trade; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States be furnished a copy of these resolutions; and be it further

Resolved, That the evidence already obtained from various court proceedings, commercial organization reports, State investigations, congressional inquiries, testimony before industrial commissions, circuit and Supreme Court decisions relative to the corrupt, vicious, and monopolistic methods of the said Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis and Board of Trade of Chicago be furnished to the said Department of Justice by those having charge of this contention to guide said Department of Justice in such prosecution.

Whereas it is generally conceded that "futures," "options," "puts and calls," "ups and downs," "indemnities," "settlement by differences," "ringing up trades," and various other methods and practices permitted and fostered by the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade of the City of Chicago are not necessary to the legitimate marketing of grain, nor are such methods in the interests of farmers or consumers; that the above-quoted terms represent a species of vicious gambling, breeding embezzlers and financial wrecks, and affect values of actual grain: Therefore be it

Resolved by the farmers here assembled, That said gambling should be prohibited by law, and that this convention stands pledged to assist Congress in the passage of such laws as will prevent gambling in farm products and the elimination of the institutions which foster it.

Whereas, recognizing the evils resulting from present methods of grain inspection, the unfavorable results of manipulation from misgrading of grain and the injustice to shippers, buyers, millers, and the general trade from the promiscuous methods in force in standardizing and inspection of grain; and further recognizing that State inspection at large terminals does not permit dealers from other States to participate in proper correction of these existing abuses, we urge upon the Congress of the United States to pass a suitable Federal inspection law that will provide for Federal inspection and standardization of grades on grain entering into interstate commerce, appoint, license, and commission inspectors, and remove same in failing to grade grain according to the standards prescribed by the Department of Agriculture, and that we condemn the so-called Moss bill now pending before the United States Congress in its failure to provide for these conditions, which will place the grading of grain entirely under the control of the United States as related to interstate shipments;

Whereas we heartily indorse the attitude of our official organ, the Cooperators' Herald, in its outspoken opposition to monopoly and "big business" in every form, and we pledge our support to the Herald and its management in its fight for reforms. We urge all farmers to subscribe for the Cooperators' Herald, and to use every legitimate means to increase its circulation and influence:

Resolved, That we appreciate the attitude of St. Paul and its citizens in its open-hearted welcome and warm friendship to the delegates and visitors to this convention, and recommend a rising vote of thanks on the part of this convention for the liberal hospitality which appears to be proverbial on the part of St. Paul, and heartily indorse the work of the officers and employees of the Equity Cooperative Exchange in this their crowning success in bringing about this great convention of farmers, and we desire to express a sincere feeling of warm friendship for the publications of St. Paul who are giving their loyal support to the principle of an open and honest market and farmers' terminal selling agency, and recommend the loyal support on the part of the farmers for these publications.

Resolved, That we indorse and approve the policies of President Wilson in relation to the warring factions in our sister Republic of Mexico and the deplorable strife of the warring nations of the world, and bid him Godspeed in a peaceful solution of the present unfortunate conditions existing on the Continent of Europe.

Resolved, That we consider a large standing Army and a greater Navy as a menace to peace rather than a preventive for war, and therefore do we stand opposed to an increase in either Army or Navy.

Resolved, That we indorse the attitude of the President of the United States in favoring an American-owned merchant marine, sailing under the Stars and Stripes, and urge Congress to speedily pass such legislation as may be necessary to authorize the Government to purchase and own vessels to be entered into the ocean carrying trade.

Resolved, That we favor Government ownership of railroads as a remedy for the arbitrary raise in freight rates now pending, caused by the extravagance and waste under the present system of private ownership.

Resolved, That we indorse the Postmaster General's policy in extending to the Parcel Post System the collect-on-delivery provision, and favor an increase in the weight limit to 100 pounds for the first two zones and to 50 pounds for the longer hauls.

Whereas private enterprise seeks private gain, cooperative enterprise seeks mutual advantage and community interest: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this convention that we disapprove of any alliance, pool, or understanding between our farmer elevator managers and their competitors as to fixing of margins or prices or divisions of profit, and that such alliance or understanding or any kind of business dealing with line-house competitors at country points is an injury to cooperative advance; and it is further

Resolved, That any alliance or understanding or business dealing with so-called "line-house commission firms" at the terminals, or other commission firms or organizations which are members of the chamber of commerce are not in keeping with the best interests to producers; that shipments to such concerns result in a revenue for the chamber of commerce, which is the enemy of the farmers' selling movement at the terminals: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the opinion of this convention that cooperative farmers' elevators should demand that all their grain be divorced from chamber of commerce mixtures, manipulations, storage, and gambling.

Resolved, That this body go on record as urging its several States that a substantial portion of the Federal appropriation that comes to said States by passage of the Smith-Lever bill be used for the advancement of the women and children in the farmhouse.

Whereas it is common knowledge and subject to unquestioned proof that the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce has spent money, hired men and certain newspapers to place farmers in disrepute who have been interested in the plan of marketing their own grain at terminals: that said chamber of commerce has endeavored, with police assistance, to prevent open discussion of farmers' terminal problems, which has brought public apologies from the officials controlling such police: that said chamber of commerce has, through dummies and subsidized newspaper representatives, attacked the farmers in their terminal organizations in false, improper, and misleading ways, to injure the standing and credit of the farmers' terminal selling movement; and

Whereas the said chamber of commerce and its representatives, through many channels of information, has and is constantly circulating damaging and misleading falsehoods regarding such farmer organization and its representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the farmers here assembled in the interests of honest conditions at the terminals not only denounce such practices but we pledge our united efforts and sacred honor to bring the scoundrels to justice who have not only villified and abused our leaders but have taken from us year after year by questionable methods that to which in justice and fairness they were not entitled.

Whereas it is a fact that Minneapolis mills refuse to purchase grain from farmers through their own terminal selling agency: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the farmers assembled at this convention pledge to support independent mills outside of Minneapolis who merchandise flour from the wheat bought from the equity farmers.

Whereas it is common knowledge and belief that the Minneapolis Journal is the mouthpiece and spokesman of the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis and opposed to the farmers' terminal marketing movement in St. Paul: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we condemn this attitude of the Minneapolis Journal, also that of the Fargo Forum and the Fargo Courier-News, and all other papers which are using their influence in opposition to an open and honest market at the terminals.

The foregoing resolutions reflect the intense purpose of our great farming interests to compel a recognition of their right to an open and honest market. Our great cities also feel keenly the need of cooperation and a closer union with prosperous agriculture. The Hon. Winn Powers, of St. Paul, in welcoming the farmers' convention, used the following impressive words:

No citizen with good sense, public spirit, and a feeling for great things can contemplate this gathering with ordinary emotions. The thousands of earnest farmers who have made a long journey to attend this convention must bring to our mind a vision of united citizenship, a vision of exalted cooperation, which will give us a higher faith in the future of our Nation and in the development of human service.

There is a seriousness and a dignity surrounding this convention which shuts frivolity from the mind and enforces upon one a spirit of thoughtfulness and a desire to take hold of life earnestly and unselfishly.

I can not refrain from saying that there are some very wonderful outward signs visible which tell us of the increased power and influence of the farmer. I was almost stunned with surprise when I saw upon many of the railroad posters the words "Farmers' special." Now, we have been accustomed to business men's specials, bankers' specials, editorial specials, and even pugilists' specials. But heretofore generally the farmer has been forced to content himself with riding as an ordinary passenger. So I say that when we see the railroads suddenly arranging farmers' specials and going to some trouble to secure the farmer's attendance, and making up their schedules to suit the farmer, then we may be sure that something has happened to inspire a greatly augmented respect for the farmer and his influence.

This movement of cooperation which you have started is in my judgment the most momentous thing that has happened in our country in this generation. In the first place, cooperation is the greatest word that has been coined in modern times. Unfortunately it has often remained but a word. But it is a vital force. Whether people like it or not, they may as well make up their mind to come to it. It is the conquering movement of the ages. It is sweeping across the world, to build a new epoch, in which we shall see realized a real brotherhood of man and a community of effort and interest, which shall do away with all divisions and hatreds among men. But the farmers' cooperative movement is especially significant, because the farmer has been slower than other men to realize his own need, and because more than any other class the farmer needs this movement.

The farmer has been slow to realize that he must organize to fight for himself before he can do any effective fighting for the rest of the world. Our farmers represent the most important economic factor in the world, and yet less has been done for the farmers than for any other class. Why? Because you have been so modest. You have borne your own burdens and done little kicking. You have allowed the world to fool you, to impose on you. Every other class has seen to it that it was represented in the legislatures and in Congress. The farmer has gone on carelessly voting for men, regardless of how these men served the farmer. Our legislative bodies have thought of the farmers last of all. Why? Because the farmer did not think of himself. You have been listening to men and to societies that were eager to help you, and it never occurred to you that in order to get any real help you must help yourselves. Now you have suddenly realized that if the farmer wants to progress and get somewhere, he has got to stand for his rights, and he has got to step up to the counter and insist on having the plate passed to him before all the pie has been taken by some other people. A few years ago you began to organize, and you soon found how greatly your power was increased by organization. Legislators began to have respect for you when they found that you respected yourselves and your own rights. You have found the way. But you still have a long way to travel. Many farmers as yet have not had the faith and the energy to embrace this cooperative opportunity. On the day that all the farmers join this movement most of your troubles will end.

Sometimes I think you have heard too much about improvements and have thought too much about them and have had your attention distracted from your most vital problems. Improved machinery and scientific farming are splendid things, but they have never in themselves improved the farmer's condition, and they have not and will not bring justice to the farmer. What the farmer needs to-day is not better implements or better methods or better advice. He needs a square deal; he needs justice. And once he gets that he will not ask any odds from the rest of the world. You all know how little reward has come to the average farmer. The wise men say this is due to your own folly, your ignorance, and in some cases your shiftlessness. Doubtless farmers, like other people, suffer from ignorance at times. But the most up-to-date and conscientious farmer has suffered beyond his desert, and through no fault of his own, because the law of supply and demand has not worked for him as it has for others. He has never had a fair share of the product of his labor. Less than 8 cents an hour goes to the farmer for his toil. Less than 1 cent goes to him from the loaf of bread that is sold to the consumer. Thousands of men are growing rich out of the farm products, but the farmer is not among them. The farmer does the work and somebody else gets the reward, and the consumer pays the bill. Somebody between the farmer and consumer is skinning both of them. This is the thing that you have got to fight and to kill, and I believe you are going to get down to business and do it. And when you do, we of the cities will share in the new prosperity which you have created.

No man believes more thoroughly than I do in the agricultural colleges of the country and in the ideals of scientific farming. Yet I feel that our farmers have been overwhelmed by a great deal of useless "expert" advice. It used to be a common practice among certain interests to keep the laboring man from thinking of his earthly troubles by diverting his attention to the promised glories of heaven. In like manner we see many good-intentioned people trying to distract the thought of the farmer from his serious economic problems by glibly discoursing to him of the beauties of rural life, the necessity for keeping the boy on the farm, and the wonderful results of making two blades of grass grow where one grew before. But manifestly there is no advantage of making two blades of grass grow if the farmer is losing money on each blade he grows. It is highly desirable that farm life should be beautiful; highly desirable that the boy should stay on the farm. But these are secondary problems. First of all must be settled, and settled rightly, the question of a fair division of the products of

the farmer's toil, the question of honest markets, and a square deal for the farmer in the financial operations of the country. When these primary problems are settled I have no doubt that the farmer will be most happy to listen to the expert gentlemen who want him to keep dandelions out of his front yard and to give an evening a week to the neighborhood club.

You are being fought by powerful interests; they will continue to oppose you. But you are stronger than they if you once get together and act in unison. Your voting power, your social power, is immense. You must use this to win your battle. As was said in colonial days, "You must hang together or you will hang separately." I have no fear that our American farmers will be overthrown by the pirates of the financial world. Too much depends on the success of the farmer in this great battle.

You have made St. Paul your headquarters. St. Paul is proud to have this honor. You can not help the farmer without helping the city. I assure you that you are among friends. We want to do our share toward making your country life successful, so that city and country may be united in a brotherhood of prosperity. We welcome you in the sure faith that you are earnestly working for a better and a bigger future—a future of justice and happiness—and the whole world will be better off when you have won your fight.

Speech of Hon. Benjamin Drake, of Minneapolis, on Government-owned warehouses and Federal inspection, delivered December 9, 1914, before the farmers' convention in St. Paul:

Mr. Chairman, of all vital needs confronting the grain grower of to-day, no two are of more importance than the establishment of Government-owned warehouses at terminal points and the institution of a uniform system of Federal inspection.

Why do we need Government operation of warehouses and elevators? For two reasons. First, because under the present system it is a literal fact that the Northwestern shipper has ordinarily no place to store, mix, or clean his grain at the terminals. He must sell immediately, regardless of market conditions, or else suffer exorbitant charges and certain depreciation in the price of his product. The terminal elevators of to-day are in fact "grain hospitals," and the very fact that grain is stored in a terminal elevator depreciates its value from 1 to 2 cents per bushel.. This fact was freely admitted by Charles A. Magnuson, president of one of the largest terminal elevators of Minneapolis, at the recent legislative investigation. His admission was confirmed by the testimony of many other members of the Minneapolis chamber.

In addition to exorbitant charges and certain depreciation in price incident to the storage of grain under the present system, it must be remembered, too, that the warehouses are buyers of grain. Their interests are directly opposed to the interests of the producer. The warehouses of the Chicago market handle over 90 per cent of the real grain entering that terminal for public storage. The warehouse and milling interests of the Minneapolis terminal absolutely control the policy and practices of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce. These interests do not care to provide a place for the producer to store, mix, or clean his grain. In practice they do not do it, although nominally required by law to do so. By unreasonable rules, unfair practices, and exorbitant charges the buying interests have practically eliminated private storage at terminal points. Try to store grain in Minneapolis when the millers want grain to grind and you will be informed that the elevators have no storage room. So completely and systematically is private storage discouraged in Minneapolis, that Mr. Magnuson, quoted above, testified he had no privately stored grain in his elevator in 1913 and that he could not distinctly remember a period when he had had any grain for private storage.

But the question of storage is more vital than I have yet suggested. The vast accumulations now held in the terminal warehouses of Chicago and Minneapolis are systematically used as the instrument of price manipulation. Speculation is not an incident, it is the main business of the modern grain exchange. If newspaper report and common understanding are to be believed a single member of the Minneapolis Chamber recently made $100,000 in less than one hour of future trading. I venture the assertion that members of the Chicago Board of Trade derive $10 through speculative trading where they derive $1 from handling real grain. In Minneapolis the situation is only a little better. Gambling is the corner stone of each institution, and in comparison with either I believe the operations of the Louisiana Lottery would appear literally insignificant.

To a considerable extent, and to an extent not generally understood, it is the vicious control of vast accumulations of grain under the present warehousing system which makes gambling and market manipulation possible. The same has been true of cotton in the past. The buying interests control these accumulations and use them to batter down any impending rise in price. The producer is not allowed to store his grain, but is forced to sell to the warehouse and milling monopoly as soon as his grain reaches the terminal.

The operation of Government warehouses would go far to release the producer from the grasp of buying interests and to permit prices to be fixed by the natural law of supply and demand. Here the producer might store, clean, or mix his grain at normal cost. Under the present system it invariably passes at once into the hands of the organized buying interests, and the entire accumulation is then used to batter down the price of the whole visible supply. It is immaterial, from my point of view, whether the State or the Federal Government establish such warehouses. Either would be effective for the purposes, but immediate action is imperative.

Again, I call your attention to the question of Federal grading and inspection. The Federal Government has already established grades for corn. Why not extend the system to all kinds of grain? The Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis is controlled by mills and elevators—by the buying interests. The chamber opposed the Federal grading of corn at a recent hearing before a committee of Congress. This action was obviously taken because the buying interests were satisfied with the present system of Minnesota inspection. The producer is not satisfied. He has voiced his dissatisfaction long and loud, but without avail.

When the producers of North and South Dakota and Montana ship grain to the Minneapolis terminal, what recourse have they if the inspection and grades of the Minnesota inspection department are not fair? What recourse have the producers of another State against the inspection department of Illinois if they ship to Chicago? None whatever. The interests of shippers in this matter are not bounded by State lines. It is inevitably and logically a matter for Federal enactment and control.

Further, under the present system of conflicting State grades, there is no such thing as uniformity of grades or inspection. The same grade means one thing in Illinois, another in Wisconsin, and still another in Missouri. In Minnesota the same grade means one thing at Duluth and another thing at Minneapolis. Duluth is an export market. In addition, owing to proximity to Superior, Wis., the dual system of inspection obtains and grain may be inspected by departments of both States. In Minneapolis the mills consume over 65 per cent of the wheat entering the terminal. It is distinctly a consumptive market, and the mills dominate and control. As a result, shown beyond the shadow of doubt at the recent legislative investigation, inspection and dockage of grain at the export market of Duluth is more liberal to the producer than at the mill-controlled market at Minneapolis.

The spectacle of a State inspection department setting up one standard of grading and dockage at Duluth and another at Minneapolis is too absurd to deserve comment. It aptly illustrates the vice of the whole system. In my judgment it shows beyond all question that the buying interests of Minneapolis exercise some sort of control or influence over the Minneapolis inspectors. I do not say this control is necessarily corrupt or dishonest. It may not even be conscious or intentional on the part of the Minnesota inspection department. Nevertheless it exists, and such favoritism would cease under Federal inspection.

Again, I have in my possession evidence which I think fairly establishes the existence in the past of many illicit practices on the part of Minneapolis mills and elevators which appear to be the direct result of influence and favoritism.

For example, mills were formerly allowed to obtain reinspection a week or 10 days after the date of original inspection and purchase of the grain. The condition of the grain might have changed altogether, but I am informed it was formerly the practice of the Minnesota inspection department to permit reinspection, to the loss of the producer. Grain, I am informed, was frequently removed from a car at Minneapolis mills and elevators, either in whole or in part, and then something shoveled back into the car and reinspection demanded and obtained. Other examples of the same nature might be given, but time does not permit.

Federal grading and inspection will secure uniformity of grades and dockage, to the great advantage of the producer as well as the legitimate export and domestic trade. It will remove favoritism and the unwholesome influence of the organized buying interests over State inspection departments. It is for these reasons that the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce is opposing Federal inspection, while producers in the proportion of 10 to 1 are advocating it.

Speech of Hon. C. C. Daniels before the Equity Cooperative Exchange convention at St. Paul, Minn., December 9, 1914, on cotton and tobacco marketing:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: "He who would have equity must do equity."

Most of us are tempted to regulate our conduct toward others by the way others treat us; "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" is too often the motto that we follow.

We can not afford to forget that we reap that which we sow and that injustice produces injustice.

Dishonesty and injustice can not successfully contend with integrity. The germ of dishonesty in the intended victim is the weak spot which those who attempt to deceive and defraud always find.

The victim of the scamp who sells "green goods" to the unsophisticated "hayseed" is always the dishonest man who is willing to defraud his neighbor.

The man who "goes broke" by speculating in futures expects to get the money of some one else who has bet on the wrong side of the market.

There was an intelligent, refined looking man in the North Carolina penitentiary one day as I passed through that institution. I had known him when he enjoyed the respect of all and was recognized as a reliable business man. I stopped to talk with him, and asked him why he committed the crime of embezzlement for which he was sentenced. He said he read the philosophical dissertations of a professor in a great university in which he said that dealing in cotton futures was the means by which the market was "steadied," and that he felt that as a friend of the farmers who raise cotton that he ought to help "steady" the market; that he bought "cotton futures" until his money gave out and the market was not "steady"; he then took some of the money with which he had been intrusted and tried to "steady" the market with that, but still the market instead of being "steady" became as frisky as a 2-year-old colt, and then he poured into the hands of the stockbrokers all the money he could get hold of, and some heartless man who had intrusted him with his money had him arrested and the cruel judge, not having received his instructions under the learned professor that he had followed, sent him to the penitentiary.

As I was leaving the gentleman in stripes asked me as a favor to him if I would not at least throw a brick at the fool professor who had no more sense or no more character than to teach such a doctrine. I promised I would, and this is the brick.

If the farmers of this Nation desire justice—if they want a fair return for the product of their toil—they must do justice and be content with receiving the reasonable value of the crops they raise.

There are few people who have suffered more from injustice than have the farmers. They have not received a fair share of the product of their toil, but have permitted those who gamble in the crops they raise to wax fat by taking an inequitable portion of the fruit of their labor.

This injustice has at times made many of them bitter, and a spirit of hostility and a determination to "even up the score" has found lodgment in the hearts of many.

"Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad." If the farmers can be kept mad—if they will endeavor "to fight the devil with fire"—those who seek to take from them an unjust share of the product of their labor will succeed—because they know the game.

Much of the injustice done the farmers can be avoided if the farmers will inform themselves of the conditions surrounding the products that they produce and will themselves be content to secure for their crops the real value of the same.

The fundamental basis for any equitable farmers' organization is absolute justice to others, regardless of the way the farmers themselves are treated. This is the only basis upon which any organization ought to stand.

When absolute justice is the basis of an organization the members are then in a position to use their influence and power to force others to do justice to them.

If the law against conspiracy, illegal combinations in restraint of trade and monopoly had been impartially enforced, the farmers of this

country would have had many dollars that have gone into the coffers of the lawbreakers, and their families would have enjoyed many comforts that have been denied them.

STUDY THE INFLUENCES THAT FIX PRICES.

The time has arrived when the farmers should give earnest and intelligent study to the influences that fix the price of the crops they raise.

"The past is the lamp that lights the future."

A study of that which has been done will throw light on that which may be done. If one product has been monopolized and the farmers have been made to suffer by reason of this monopoly, a study of the means by which the monopoly was accomplished and the product of the farmers' toil transferred to the pockets of those who established and controlled the monopoly may enable others to escape a similar fate.

In the section of the country in which I was reared the farmers raise tobacco and cotton and buy their meat from the Illinois stock raisers, and their flour from the Minnesota millers.

Since every portion of this country is so interwoven with every other portion, it is as impossible for one section to be injured without other sections suffering also as it is to cut off the hand of a man without the other portions of the body being affected thereby.

It may, therefore, be of service to the farmers of the Northwest to look into the way in which the tobacco and cotton crops of the South were marketed and the influences that determine what portion of the returns from these crops the farmers receive.

THE TOBACCO MONOPOLY AN EXAMPLE OF OPPRESSION.

In the early days of America, when this portion of the country was the undisputed hunting ground of the Indian and neither the French trapper nor the self-denying missionary had made his abode in these fastnesses, tobacco was a favored crop along the Atlantic coast. It was at times the measuring rod of commerce, and served as money for the early inhabitants.

For many years the law of supply and demand fixed the price of tobacco. This was true until 1890, at which time five tobacco manufacturers, under the guiding hand of James B. Duke, formed a combination and organized the American Tobacco Co. This combination without delay proceeded to effectually repeal the law of supply and demand in so far as it applied to tobacco.

The methods adopted to accomplish this end and to monopolize the tobacco business—to dominate and control it from the time the leaf leaves the smoking tobacco barn until the manufactured article goes into the mouth of the consumer—are varied. The ingenuity of some of the keenest brains of the world has been taxed to the utmost to devise the various methods used for the carrying out of the nefarious purpose of monopolization.

Immediately after the welding of this compact organization the astute gentlemen, who from that day to this good hour have been the dominating force in the tobacco business of this country, had their pliant tools and their equally pliant fools to whisper in the ears of the tobacco farmers of the section of the country along the Atlantic coast where the tobacco used by the combination was produced that by this combination the market for tobacco would be greatly extended and that the demand for the weed would be greatly increased and that the farmers would receive much larger prices for the tobacco that they raised.

To make them believe these statements they talked learnedly of the law of supply and demand—college professors of great renown were quoted to prove their statements as to the effect of the immutable law of "supply and demand."

The smooth gentlemen who represented the Tobacco Trust admitted that the small manufacturers might be driven out of business, but this was explained away as the natural result of business development and the securing of broader markets. Along with this sanctimonious cant there was mixed adroit appeals to the farmer's selfishness. Many of the farmers of that section "swallowed the bait" and helped the Tobacco Trust in its work of monopolization of the tobacco business.

The motto of the trust was "To buy where it could not butcher and to butcher where it could not buy."

The process of elimination went on—the small manufacturer was driven out of business or absorbed. The independent jobber had practically no independent goods to handle and had to seek other avenues for his energy and capital. The retailers were persuaded, cajoled, or forced to show favor to the goods of the trust. The consumers were attracted by coupons, attractive advertising, and by fake "independent" goods which were made by the trust. This process of elimination went on until the Tobacco Trust had more than 80 per cent of the tobacco business in the United States.

But what of the tobacco farmer?

Did he grow rich along with the trust magnates who ran this steam roller over the small tobacco manufacturer, the jobber, the wholesaler, and the retailer?

"Nay, verily." The demand for tobacco increased, but those who were able to compete with the Tobacco Trust had been driven out of business. There was only one bidder for the farmers' tobacco.

In 1901, however, the Imperial Tobacco Co., of England, became a real competitor for the farmers' tobacco. Prices went up, and the farmers were paid a fair price for their crops. This competition continued until September 2, 1902, and at that time the American Tobacco Co. and the Imperial Tobacco Co. made terms—the American eagle and the British lion lay down together—and tobacco dropped from 3 to 5 cents a pound in a single day.

As a result of this unholy alliance the British-American Tobacco Co. was organized and the world parceled out between them.

The Japanese Government, which has a Government monopoly of the tobacco business of Japan, was at one time a competitor for the farmers' tobacco. By some means, which the public has never been permitted to understand, they ceased to be real competitors for the farmers' tobacco, although they continued to use American tobacco. It was generally understood that there was some sort of understanding between the Japanese Government and some branch of the Tobacco Trust by which the Japanese secured their tobacco at the lowest price at which the trust bought its tobacco, so that the Japanese Government would not compete against the Tobacco Trust for the farmers' tobacco. Whatever the arrangement, the Japanese Government ceased to be a real competitor for the farmers' tobacco.

The price of leaf tobacco went down and down until the farmers were paid just enough to keep them raising it, and the prices were varied enough from time to time to cause "hope to spring eternal in the human breast."

Why should the Tobacco Trust pay more for tobacco when one man at 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, had the power to fix the price at such figures as his fancy dictated?

CONSCIOUS WRONGDOERS.

The work of the Tobacco Trust became so bold that it and its organizers and manipulators were haled into court, and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States denounced them as conscious wrongdoers, and the highest court in the land decreed the dissolution of the trust, so that competition would be restored.

The Circuit Court of the Southern District of New York was directed to carry out this decree of the Supreme Court. The circuit court, after numerous conferences with the attorneys of the Tobacco Trust, entered a decree which purported to dissolve the Tobacco Trust and restore competitive conditions.

Mr. J. C. McReynolds was at that time assistant to Attorney General Wickersham and in charge of the Tobacco Trust case. He is reported in the newspapers as having pronounced the decree of the circuit court as not worth the paper it was written on and fit only for the scrap heap. Mr. McReynolds was Attorney General under President Wilson until he was elevated to the Supreme Court bench.

It seemed to me that the decree indicated that the ears of the circuit judges were attuned to hear the tick of the stock ticker more than the heartbeat of people who had been injured by these "conscious lawbreakers."

The result of this judicially designated dissolution was to add millions of dollars to the market price of the stocks and bonds of the different companies into which the Tobacco Trust was divided.

This dissolution was simply a dissolution of the hand into the fingers.

The man who knows the history of the Tobacco Trust and the "fingers" into which the "hand" was dissolved by order of the court, who believes that real competition has been reestablished in the tobacco business, or that illegal restraint of the tobacco business has been ended, is, in my judgment, entitled to admission to the institution for the feeble-minded.

The tobacco farmers are still in the grasp of the same men that "held them up" before the Tobacco Trust was judicially dissolved.

THE FIGHT OF THE KENTUCKY FARMERS.

The experience of the farmers who raise burley tobacco illustrates the fact that there has been only a change in the method of accomplishing results and in bookkeeping since the court's decree was rendered.

At a period when the Tobacco Trust thought itself so strong that it dared do whatever it found profitable, the price of burley tobacco was put to about 6 cents a pound.

The farmers of Kentucky and other sections where burley tobacco is grown organized for the purpose of escaping the oppression of the Tobacco Trust. The bankers and business men helped them in their fight, and they held their crops for three years, and then sold it for about 18 cents a pound. While the farmers of Kentucky won a great victory in forcing the trust to pay a reasonable price for three crops of their tobacco, it was a victory that cost them dearly, and doubtless many things were done that can not be approved and are best relegated to oblivion.

The gentlemen who were trained by the trust before the elements into which it had been dissolved were washed by judicial decree and made "whiter than snow," recognized the fact that if the farmers who raised burley tobacco continued to sell their tobacco in bulk that they might cooperate again and force the "fingers" to pay the reasonable value of their tobacco, as they had forced the "hand" to do before the judicial cleansing of the "conscious lawbreakers."

To prevent this, loose-leaf-tobacco warehouses were established all over the burley-tobacco growing section, and the selfishness and jealousy of different towns brought into play as a means of preventing the farmers from cooperating for their mutual advantage.

The scheme is working. The farmers of the burley-growing section are now unorganized, and they sell their tobacco at such prices as the "little trusts" see fit to pay them.

The independent retail tobacco stores are being driven out of business more rapidly than before the court decreed the "establishment of competition." The independent tobacco jobber is a rare curiosity, while the independent manufacturers are so scarce that the skeleton of the last remnant may be preserved by some heavily endowed institution as an extinct animal that was dangerous to "big business."

The methods pursued to monopolize the tobacco business are the methods used by other "conscious wrongdoers" to monopolize and control other lines of commerce.

A study of these methods may enable us to prevent the monopolization of other products.

The trust defender is quick to announce that you can not "unscramble eggs."

From the results attained in dissolving trusts by court decree, those who oppose monopoly have but little basis for encouragement.

It is therefore of all the more importance that every precaution should be taken to prevent the "eggs" being "scrambled."

IS COTTON IN DANGER OF BEING MONOPOLIZED?

Is there any danger that "King Cotton" may become a victim to the "conscious wrongdoers," and fall from his imperial estate to be a serf, doing the bidding of the same selfish interests that dominate and control the tobacco business?

Most men will say that the cotton crop is too great to be monopolized. The undertaking is too great to be thought of. That it is a gigantic undertaking none will dispute, but this is an age of large ideas and great accomplishment.

A few years ago none would have believed that one man would dominate and control the tobacco business, or that the steel and iron business of the Nation would be controlled and dominated by one small group of men, or that the transportation facilities of large sections of this country would respond to the touch of one man's mind as the well-trained horse responds to the hand of his master.

The magnitude of the cotton business and its far-reaching effect on every avenue of commerce makes it all the more important that it should be free from the polluting hand of the monopolist.

Congressman FINLEY, of South Carolina, in discussing the cotton question, gave voice to this idea when he said:

"Cotton is a world commodity—anything that affects it affects not only the whole of this country but countries in Europe, Asia, and Africa. Cotton has its ramifications in every civilized quarter of the globe. The industry can no more be characterized as local than can the effects resulting from its prosperity or adversity be localized. If the South has to sell cotton at less than the cost of production, then she will have no money available to buy the manufactures of New England, New York, Pennsylvania, or the Middle West. In the end the rest of the country must share the hard times the South faces in the immediate future."

In 1913 this country produced 14,315,015 bales of cotton, which, together with the cotton sold, was valued at more than $1,000,000,000. Its value exceeded the world's output of gold and silver more than $400,000,000. Only 42 per cent of the crop was consumed by home manufacturers, the remainder being exported abroad. Cotton has for years been relied on to maintain the balance of trade of this country.

But what is the condition to-day?

Senator HOKE SMITH, of Georgia, thus depicts the conditions that confront the cotton farmers:

"The loss of our European market for cotton has left this country with a crop of 15,000,000 bales and with a market for 5,000,000 bales destroyed by the European war. Our own citizens have in no way been responsible for this condition; it is not a normal case of production and underdemand, but is a normal production with the demand destroyed by a foreign war.

"A week before war was declared in Europe middling lint cotton was selling for an average of 13½ cents a pound, and for the past five years it sold for an average of 12¾ cents a pound, and for the past 10 years for 12 cents a pound average. Our exportation of this great commodity brought back to our country last year through sales abroad $610,000,000. It has no rival as an American product in its value in our international trade or in its contribution to the commerce of our country. To-day we are almost groveling before the English people, consulting with the representatives of the Treasury Department, begging for extension of time on our liabilities to that country, and largely because this product is not being bought by Great Britain as it would be bought, because of this 5,000,000 bales excess for which there is no market."

The condition of the cotton business to-day is such that there has been a coming together of various elements to devise some means of preserving from bankruptcy those engaged in raising this article of commerce that is of such vital importance to this Nation.

Senators and Congressmen proposed various measures to take care of the 5,000,000 bales for which there is no market.

One proposition was for the Government to buy this quantity for which there is no market and hold it for 18 months, so as to make a market for the balance of the crop; another plan proposed was for the Government to loan the money to the farmers direct and permit the surplus cotton to be held in warehouses until the war is over and there is a demand for the entire crop. Other plans were proposed; but the plan finally adopted was for the banks, working hand in hand with the Treasury Department, to loan money to those who desired to hold their cotton for a time when normal conditions should make a demand for the cotton.

There is cooperation between the United States Treasury Department, the banks, and the business men all over the country, and much is being done to relieve the cotton producers of the South from the deplorable conditions in which the European war has placed them.

The farmers of the South are grateful to those who have joined with them in helping to save them from complete bankruptcy and to save from destruction one of the largest businesses in this country.

The Good Book truly says, "No man liveth to himself."

THE CONDITION OF COTTON BUSINESS OFFERS TEMPTATION TO MONOPOLISTS.

During and just after the Civil War graft and corruption ran riot in this country to such an extent as has probably never been equaled in the history of the Nation.

During the Spanish-American War "embalmed beef" was bought from unscrupulous manufacturers and fed to our soldiers.

"Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel," some one has said. The cold-blooded and the vicious often take advantage of the necessities and the sufferings of people to enrich themselves and thereby still further impoverish those who are helpless.

Do not the conditions existing in the cotton business to-day offer the opportunity for the crafty and greedy to do with cotton just what was done with tobacco?

Are those who monopolized tobacco, who crushed and destroyed the hopes of so many engaged in the tobacco business, too kind-hearted to put the same sort of machinery in motion in the cotton business?

Are there not other "conscious wrongdoers" who are ready to take advantage of conditions brought on by the European war and monopolize the cotton business?

Congressman HEFLIN, of Alabama, in asking the passage of an act to relieve the cotton situation, sounded this warning:

"Since Jacob's cunning obtained the birthright of Esau it has been found necessary to place metes and bounds about human conduct and restraints around the improper activities of men, and I call upon this House to provide ways and means to protect the distressed producers of cotton from the pillage and plunder of a band of marauding speculators. With some of the banks unable to do any more for the producer, and some refusing to hand him the money deposited with them by the Government, and with the market closed temporarily to more than half of the cotton crop, the producer is helpless. He is like the ship without a rudder, drifting at sea; and when that occurs, you know what happens—there are friendly vessels that would like to render aid, and there are also pirate vessels that would like to plunder the ship, and if the pirate vessels are strong enough they always rob the ship and despoil the crew. It is sadly true that there are men who delight to prey upon the unfortunate in time of their distress, and there are people who will take advantage of the deplorable and distressing condition that now affects the people of the South. There is a man who says: 'The time to make money is when you catch your friends in trouble; when they are hard pressed and are almost down and out you can make them pay any rate of interest: then is the time to press them.'

"The character of greed and avarice is still abroad in the land; the cruel disposition to rob the man who is in distress, to get rich upon the misfortune of others, is a mean and despicable thing, but it exists and must be reckoned with in a time like this, and something must be done to prevent the pillage and plunder of the people of the South."

BEWARE OF THE TROJAN HORSE.

Have those who are actuated by greed and avarice shown any interest in the cotton business?

Is there any evidence that those who have had experience in building up monopoly have cast covetous eyes at the cotton business?

It may be that the gaze of the cat as he sees the timid mouse come out in the open is only evidence of platonic interest in the little rodent, but the wise mouse puts as much distance as possible between it and the cat.

Of course, those gentlemen knighted as "conscious wrongdoers" have only a platonic desire to render aid to the cotton farmers of the South, but it would be well to be sure that the large and handsome horse presented is not filled with armed Trojans.

WATER POWER ACQUIRED.

The great water-power companies that have harnessed the rivers in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and other Southern States have been largely acquired by the financiers who are associated with James B. Duke, the brains and force that brought about the tobacco monopoly.

The development of that section of the South under the stimulus of convenient electric power means much, and the praise of Mr. Duke and his associates is on the lips of many, while the newspapers carry large advertisements of trust tobacco and columns of fulsome flattery of the "Great Wizard of Finance."

One of the first results of the acquiring of the great power companies by Mr. Duke and his associates was to induce the various cotton mills to discard their steam plants and secure the power for the operation of their mills from their power companies.

Two objects were gained by this—the mills got more economical and satisfactory power, and the men who controlled the power companies had the mill owners, to a large extent, in their power.

Large capital was invested in cotton mills by Mr. Duke and his associates. This, of course, gave people employment, made for the development of the country, and caused people to think more kindly of Mr. Duke and his associates, and, incidentally, gave them a firmer grip on the cotton business.

COTTON WAREHOUSES.

It is evident from a study of the way that the tobacco monopoly was secured that Mr. Duke recognized the fact that the control of the raw material is desirable if a commodity is to be monopolized.

For many years cotton has been sold direct from the farmer to merchants, the millmen, and exporters. Very little was put in storage warehouses.

The desire of Mr. Duke and his associates to help the cotton farmers—just as he and his Tobacco Trust associates had helped the tobacco farmers—stirred him to action. They doubtless saw that if the cotton farmers would put their cotton in storage warehouses that it would be easier to keep track of the cotton, and that cotton storage warehouse certificates could be gotten hold of with less labor and less publicity than the actual cotton.

Whatever the motive may be, in the early part of this year steps were taken by Mr. Duke and his associates to provide storage warehouses in which to store the farmers' cotton. The Raleigh (N. C.) News-Observer of April 15, 1914, says:

"Relative to the meeting of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, made up largely of the cotton-mill men of the South, and particularly North and South Carolina, which will be held in New York April 27–28, local cotton-mill men are in receipt of a letter from Secretary C. B. Bryant, of Charlotte, calling especial attention to the matter of the Duke warehouse plan, which will be up for special discussion at that time. The letter states that the plan will be presented on the night of Monday, April 27, by President Frank Vanderlip, of the National City Bank of New York. As to the manner in which the plan came before the association the letter says:

"'Mr. Duke was in North and South Carolina a couple of weeks ago inspecting the Southern Power Co., Interurban Railway Co., and other properties in which he is interested. He mentioned to the manufacturers he ran across his idea of the warehouse question and it was so convincing that we promptly set about some way of bringing it before the association. As our membership covers such a tremendous territory, it was practically out of the question, both on the score of expense and inconvenience, to get representatives from all the Southern States to attend a hurried meeting.

"Hence the temporary organization committee was necessary, and is composed of three manufacturers from each North and South Carolina, with cotton merchants and cotton farmers associated therewith to such an extent as to get their point of view as well as that of the manufacturers.

"In the meantime, therefore, it is earnestly urged that all cotton manufacturers carefully consider the matter and where possible discuss it among themselves with a view to choosing additional members of the board of governors and other officers of the association in the different States, asking that they cooperate in attending to this important phase of the matter.

"It is very encouraging that so far the plan has met with the warmest commendation from the press; that leading manufacturers all over the country who have talked it over approve it and are anxious to help it along; and that the banking interests of the whole country are really willing to back it.

"No money subscriptions are asked from the mills, and yet they will obtain their full share of the benefits of the low interest rates, their share of profits of the enterprise, and their vote in the management of its affairs."

DOES NOT THE WAR IN EUROPE MAKE IT EASIER TO MONOPOLIZE THE COTTON?

The cotton crop of this country is selling around 6 or 7 cents a pound, which is considerably less than it costs to make it.

The Government is supplying money to loan the farmers; patriotic bankers are doing the same. The bankers of the North and the West are vieing with the bankers of the South in meeting the emergency. This is another evidence of the fact that this is a united country, and he who would accentuate sectional lines is an enemy to progress and to peace, and deserves the contempt of all good men.

Loans at 6 cents a pound are being made on many bales of cotton, and the cotton stored in warehouses and certificates issued for the same.

If, perchance, there should be found men controlling large capital who believe that "the time to make money is when you catch your friends in trouble, when they are hard pressed and are almost down and out and you can make them pay any rate of interest, then is the time to press them," would not this present crisis in the cotton business be a good time "to turn an honest penny"?

There has been made this year 5,000,000 bales of cotton for which there is no market. Is it not well for "all cotton manufacturers to carefully consider the matter"? For, as Mr. Bryant so naïvely says in writing to the cotton millers in the interest of Mr. Duke's plan:

"It is believed that this cotton-warehouse plan can be utilized to furnish the South with the cheapest money in the world and an abundance. The indorsement of the plan by leading bankers in the United States and their offering to take the paper in practically unlimited quantities assures that if we carry this scheme to a successful conclusion, we will have taken probably the greatest step toward economic independence that has yet been made in the development of the South. Frankly, this proposition is whatever we make it."

It is possible that by this Duke warehouse plan "the manufacturers may take the greatest step toward economic independence" "by the cotton manufacturers of the cotton farmer" "that has yet been made in the development of the South."

The war makes more probable the "independence" of the miller, so far as the farmer is concerned.

THE STORY OF JOSEPH.

Suppose Mr. Duke should read the beautiful story of Joseph, and after reading it he and his associates should conclude to follow the biblical example of the gentleman who so virtuously rejected the seductive advances of Mrs. Potiphar, but engrossed the corn market until he had secured all the cattle and lands and had made practical slaves of the people of Egypt as a result of his business acumen.

After the patriotic bankers and business men all over the country, aided by a Secretary of the Treasury who is always alert to use his office and the funds of the people for the benefit of the producers, have done all they could to relieve the unfortunate situation brought on by the foreign war, and as a result of their efforts 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 bales of cotton should be withdrawn from the market and impounded in the storage warehouses, what might a modern Joseph do to corner the cotton market?

A modern Joseph would not find it difficult to buy from the farmers their equity in the warehouse certificates issued for the cotton stored in warehouses on which loans had been made.

In this way couldn't a modern Joseph corner the cotton market by the investment of a minimum of cash, make a name for himself as a philanthropist, and be in position, by the use of the cotton impounded in storage warehouses, to fix the price of the farmers' cotton for years to come and at the same time force the spinners to buy their cotton from or through him?

The possibilities of this cotton scheme would make Joseph turn all the colors of his famous coat of many colors out of pure envy, if he can look down from the battlements of the blessed, or look up from the summerlike temperature of the regions where they are not permitted to water even railroad stock.

The farmers of this country are interested in all conditions that affect life, and I have thus spoken to you of what has been done in monopolizing tobacco and that which appears to me to threaten the monopolization of cotton.

The conditions that the tobacco farmer has suffered from and which the cotton farmers may suffer from are not conditions brought about by natural causes, but are conditions brought about by the violation of the laws of God and man.

The three things that the farmer must consider and prepare himself to deal intelligently with are the making the transportation, and the marketing of his crop.

The making of his crop he must work out himself, depending, to some extent, on labor conditions.

The transportation of his crops he can affect only by the use of his influence and power to secure equitable freight rates and just rules and regulations. He must use his influence to secure on State railroad commissions and the interstate commissions men who are not trained to look at questions of rates solely with the view of paying dividends, but he must endeavor to get men broad enough to consider all phases of rate making and rules regulating transportation, so as to do justice to both the transportation companies and the shippers.

In marketing his crop the farmer must see, above all things, that he has an open market, and that there is genuine competition for the product of his toils.

Speech of Hon. Samuel H. Greeley, of Chicago, delivered before the Equity Cooperative Exchange Convention of Farmers, held in St. Paul, Minn., December 8, 9, and 10, 1914:

Mr. Chairman and farmers of the Northwest: I come to you with a story affecting the prosperity of this wonderful country, and feel sure that you will pardon a personal reference to myself. Most of my life has been spent on the Board of Trade of Chicago, and I know its methods, its power for good if free, and power for evil when monopolized.

Grain marketing should be a simple process of buying and selling. Under present conditions it is anything but simple. The professionals make it complicated to confuse the public and cover their tracks. Let me call your attention to the way they tell what they are doing with your innocent wheat and corn in their newspaper statements during the last few weeks.

"The game in grain," the Minneapolis Tribune of September 15, in its "Notes from the pit," says: "The rumor that Gen. Von Kluck had been forced to surrender gave the peace party in the Chicago pit an opportunity to raid the market." Same paper, same date: "The market acted as if it was going to do better at the opening. There was no hedging to speak of in the pit. Cables were firm, export business was uncovered, but the upturn brought renewed and effective selling pressure." Same paper, same date: "The undertone of the market during the early session was good, but it was not clear that it was more than a temporary recovery on the 'bear onslaught.'"

Professionally analyzed, this is what the above means: Such a thing as a rumor as to what happened to a certain general in Europe gave a band of market raiders called the "peace party" an opportunity to raid the market in the Chicago pits. The market looked firm; there was no hedging to speak of, export business and cable indicated higher prices, but there was a "bear onslaught." Then, referring to the onslaught, it is inferred that there will be more normal markets of sufficient importance to broaden the trading volume again—that is, it won't take long for a new bunch of suckers to come in after the onslaught.

The Chicago Herald of September 15, in "Gossip from the pits," says: "Liquidation has been drastic, and leading commission houses reported last night that all the 'pyramiders' and most of the 'weak holders' in wheat and oats have sold out. Expectations of the trade are that there will be a selling movement early to-day, which they think will clean up the last of the liquidations."

Does the farmer have to have this analyzed professionally to understand its meaning? But let us explain, anyway. "Liquidation has been drastic" tells you, in the language of the professional, that the gullible public, which bought grain on foreign war reports, ran up against a "freeze-out" game and received a good, sound licking in the "exhaust of margins." It was not a partial licking, it was "drastic." There was a break of 20 cents a bushel about that time, which is some "drastic onslaught." Some "raid," wasn't it?

"Commission houses reported that all the 'pyramiders' and most of the 'weak holders' in wheat and oats have sold out." Why should prominent commission merchants report what traders are doing? Whom do they report to? Are they in league with the fellows who freeze out the pyramiders and weak holders in the onslaught process? Notice the report says, "will be a selling movement to-day, which they think will clean up the last of the liquidations." They didn't get all the money yesterday, but to-day will clean them up.

What do you farmers think of commercial exchanges which will permit conditions like these to exist in this country? When the Equity Cooperative Exchange again carries the fight to Washington to make known the curses of the terminals, will you be with them or supporting the grain gamblers?

Do you understand what happens every day while the professionals are making your prices and measuring out your profits to you? Here is another sample. It is as clear as mud.

The Chicago Record-Herald September 16, under "Notes from the Pits," says:

The most severe break in grains of the season has been experienced the last few days. It has carried prices down to a point that has cleaned out all the weak holders, the pyramiders, and the stop-loss orders. Many large traders who were bearish covered on the decline. Wall Street is said to have taken profits on the recent bulge and was a buyer on yesterday's break.

Wall Street! Weak holders and pyramiders cleaned out! A 20-cent break; were not the farmers cleaned out also? How could these games in grain be played unless the Chicago Board of Trade and Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce furnished the machinery? What part did the farmers perform in this 20-cent break? The farmers knew nothing until it occurred. The Equity fights this organized system. It tells the farmer to handle his own grain at the terminal. They want the farmer to raise the grain and then keep still and let them juggle the market.

The Minneapolis Tribune September 17, 1914, published the following:

Wheat went soaring to-day—meaning September 16—largely because of reports of Austro-German advantages that made the end of the war appear remote. After a rise of as much as 5 cents a bushel, the market closed nervous, with gains of 4⅛ to 4⅝ net. Heavy receipts Northwest were ignored.

The same paper, under date of September 18, published as follows:

It was demonstrated that the wheat market has great underlying stubbornness. A very tame opening showed steadiness with a dash of strength, and the market appeared to have settled into a strong position, but more "peace" rumors gave the "pit" "peace" party an opportunity to raid the market. The trade seems to fall for such reports every time they appear. That the buying all through the session was much better than the selling was shown by the drying up of offers and the persistency of the demand largely from cash interests taking off hedges and the firmer tone of the cash market.

The following is a report published in the St. Paul Dispatch, September 17, 1914, as coming from Chicago the same date:

Wheat prices recovered to-day from an early dip that resulted from a selling drive by "pit" speculators.

The following, from the Minneapolis Tribune, September 17, 1914:

Wheat bulls appear to have come into their own again. Speculatively the sharpness of the upturn since Tuesday suggests some distressed covering of commitments. It also indicates that there has been a reentry of strong interest who believe the decline was altogether too drastic and the short account over-extended.

"As far as the news upon which the bear" has made much capital, the Tribune has seen nothing in it substantial enough to justify any such decline as apparently culminated Tuesday. The so-called peace prospects were used most effectively as a "bear" factor, and as much as the Tribune would like to see peace it has been unable to see such a wished-for sign on the horizon.

Following is a quotation from the Minneapolis Tribune in Notes from the Pit, of September 18, 1914:

Adverse peace negotiations gave the "peace" party in the wheat pits of the country another opportunity to raid the market. The break was sharp and rather drastic, having caught the market when it was bare of buying orders.

The Minneapolis Journal, under date of September 18, 1914, published the following:

The wild fluctuations of the last 10 days up to yesterday are demoralizing to business, and, furthermore, legitimate conditions have not warranted them. The big break from the recent high level had demonstrated to the farmers in a convincing way that there are two sides to the price question. The result will doubtless be that they will be more inclined to sell some wheat at around present prices.

The only thing stated plainly in these newspaper notes on the market is the threat to the farmers that, war or peace, "there are two sides to the price question," and therefore the suggestion to get busy and sell. The methods of making both of the "two sides to the price question" do not refer to supply or demand, but are covered by such mysterious terms as the following expressions, used in the above quotations: "Peace party," "Pit," "Raid the market," "Hedging," "Effective selling pressure," "Bear onslaught," "Broaden the trading volume," "Liquidation drastic," "Pyramiders," "Weak holders," "Shorts," "Will be a selling movement," "Clean up the last of liquidations," "Soaring to-day," "Nervous," "Dash of strength," "Pit peace party," "Early dip," "Selling drive," "Pit speculators," "Distressed covering," "Reentry of strong interest," "The bear," "Break was sharp," "Wall Street is

said to have taken profits," "Severe break," "Cleaned out all weak holders," "Stop-loss orders," "Wild fluctuations."

How do you like to compete with "pyramiders" or trust a market that has "cleaned out all weak holders"? When your good honest wheat leaves Dakota and starts for such a market you do not know whether it will meet with a "selling drive," an "early dip," or "a bear onslaught." Would it not be better to have wheat sell on its merits as wheat for flour-making purposes by honest merchandisers to real millers?

It is impossible to have honest prices or fair and open competition in the merchandising of grain under existing conditions because—

1. The State systems of grain inspection lack strength, freedom, and competency, and there is no uniformity of standard in grades or in method of grading.

2. The public warehousing of grain in Chicago is conducted openly and brazenly in violation of State law and common decency, and controls the pit trading on that market, which in turn controls the pit trading of all other markets in this country.

3. That on account of such open and brazen violation of law and the usurpation of a public function by private parties fair, open crop competition is destroyed.

4. That this destruction of competition not only invades grain but "grain future" trading.

5. That unfair competition and the systems and methods resulting therefrom deprive the cash markets of much substantial legitimate support.

6. That this lack of support is an injury to grain values.

7. That this usurpation of public warehouses by proprietor-merchandisers creates larger volumes of grain in public storage than would otherwise exist, the same being created illegally and held illegally to the detriment of crop values.

8. That this system of warehouse prostitution largely enters into the manipulations, fluctuations, artificial skyrocket and diving performances in "futures" or "options," which are neither legitimate nor conducive to the sound, rational courses of values as more natural circumstances would direct them.

9. That it is recognized that "futures" or "options" enter largely into the regulation of cash grain values; that "futures" or "options" are largely dealt in and often controlled by the illegal forces under public warehouse control and that 95 per cent at least of the cash grain which has entered public storage for many years past, has been stored by and controlled by illegally operating warehouse proprietors.

10. That the joint control of the deliverable public warehouse grain receipts and manipulation of "futures," together with questionable inspection systems and practices closely related thereto and apparently friendly therewith, all tend to absorb the money of unwary investors, as well as control prices to producers.

11. That the enormous solicitation of "margin" deposits from those unfamiliar with these conditions, such deposits to be paid in case the "long" or "short" side of the market suffers an advance or a decline from a given price sufficient to absorb such deposits, embodies a system so manifestly injurious to such large numbers of innocent chance takers that in the interests of public policy the system should be abolished.

12. That such innocent individuals are subject to many hardships or "odds" or "percentages" in the "game" which are correspondingly in favor of the combined warehouseman-speculator or merchandiser; that such odds and advantages have already been declared illegal; and that such hardships thus handicapping such individuals are almost insurmountable in the ordinary and average course of the business as now conducted, and almost invariably result in loss.

13. That the warehousemen usually take "the other end" of trades made for grain held in public storage as against outside investors, such grain being held and controlled by such warehousemen; that such possession is a great leverage in causing what is known in the trade as "freeze-outs" or "exhausts of margins" in the "pit," and in the culmination and settlement by the payment of "differences" through a clearing house established and maintained for the purpose.

14. That such warehousemen to evade the law have and do compensate "dummy" substitutes to assist them in the monopolization of cash grain and in the collection of such differences in "futures" or "options."

15. That leased telegraph facilities from public-service corporations are now used to aid and abet the warehousemen in the conduct of their business, in that such wires are used to solicit orders in small towns through the use of blackboard quotations and other means, which are transmitted through such leased telegraph service, the result of which prevails upon unsophisticated traders to "invest in grain," but which really invites and actually does cause them to take a chance on market fluctuations, and the consequent absorption of their margins in the payment of the differences between two quotations, the settlement being made through the clearing house above referred to and the so-called trades in grain for future delivery, subject to the conditions heretofore described.

16. That such leased-wire service in many instances is interstate, and much of the business connected therewith in reference to confirmations and written matter is carried through the mails, and therefore subject to Federal investigation.

17. That certain boards of trade or chambers of commerce permit such trading in "futures" or "options" which is subject to such warehouse domination and control and on which boards of trade such warehousemen are among the largest clearing house users and "difference" collectors, and, indeed, are frequently the absolutely dominating factor in control of the deliverable property which may settle contracts in grain "futures" or "options" under the rules and regulations of such boards of trade or chambers of commerce.

18. That the allegations herein set forth in most instances are not based upon surmises or inferences or suspicion, but many of them have already been tested in court, which makes sworn testimony available, which sets forth clearly the bold methods of market usurpation and law violation, which are "running daily with the doors wide open."

This selling out of futures, month by month, and the profits obtained there by the men who hold and maintain a monopoly of this grain in public storage, when we consider the profits which they receive through the board of trade clearing house which they operate—the profits which they receive as against the man who speculates against them—this is not the big factor involved. The big question is this, that if a man can sell, not only the grain he holds in public storage as a warehouseman and can collect by undue charges his collections from others who are opposed to him in future contracts, if he can go into the open markets through the power of the possession of warehouse receipts which he holds in his own control and can force the liquidation and selling out of futures and collect the money, even that is not the great point at issue. The main point at issue is that when they do create that condition they create a depreciation in the price of the value of all farm products in this country. It is that depreciation in price of the entire crop which decreases the purchasing power of agriculture.

I know what trading in grain is. I know what future trading is. I have been in it. I was brought up in it; bred in it from youth. No man on the board of trade that knows anything will deny that in the wheat pit alone, on an average, every day of the year the total amount of the purchases, plus the total amount of the sales in the futures, will at least total 25,000,000 a day, from 9.30 in the morning to 1.15 in the afternoon. There are those who have boasted that they have traded in 20,000,000 a day, a single firm. Think of it. I myself, although I have been a little dealer, what you might almost term an "insignificant trader," have many a day traded in 500,000 bushels to 1,000,000 bushels, and never thought much about it myself at the time.

And there are men in the business to-day trading in millions upon millions of futures, tens of millions of futures, hundreds of millions of futures, firms that do it every year, that do not know what the color of a warehouse receipt is; they never saw a carload of grain. As a matter of fact, a future trade in grain is never a trade in grain until the trade is consummated with the actual delivery of the stuff. So that what they do do, they deal in contracts. That is what future trading is; it is a contract that they will receive a certain amount of grain to be delivered at a given time in a given warehouse, and the only place where they can receive it is the warehouse that the board of trade makes regular.

Another contention is that the public warehousing of grain, the inspection of grain, and the trading in grain futures are very closely allied. This is true. If public warehouses truly public are established at market centers, stop and think for a moment what an advantage it would be to the farming interests of this country. The profits which now accrue to the elevator people at the terminals would go to the farmers and the curses of "future" manipulation by warehousemen be abolished. An impartial conduct of these warehouses would furnish to the producer ample opportunity to mix, clean, clip, dry, and otherwise improve the condition of his grain. And it is our contention that the business is large enough so that if the Government should institute such terminal warehouses such business would be profitable to the Government; that a fair charge for service could be made that would take care of depreciation, interest, and all other fixed charges of the investment and be an accommodation and assistance, a means of profit to the pro-

ducers who ship their grain to those markets, and eliminate the curse of artificial accumulation.

I call attention to one fact, which should ever remain uppermost in your minds, and that is this: That the great evil of the future and the public-warehouse system is not the few millions of dollars, perhaps no profit at all, which the public-warehouse men receive in the conduct of their business. I am not stating or estimating any amount of profit which they may receive, but this I do think to be true—that their operations confine the price of real grain within the limit of the price for futures, which they largely dictate, and that it is an impossibility in the conduct of the business for cash grain to get outside the limits of the futures in the ordinary normal course of business, although at times a few cars occasionally have escaped the prescribed limits.

Mr. MANAHAN referred in his address to the profits which a combination may have received at Minneapolis, to the extent of perhaps $20,000,000. The profits that any combine may receive in the control of this business is not the only point at issue. I make the general statement, based upon careful investigation and many years of study, that the operations of the Chicago public elevator monopoly, with the assistance of the controllers of the Illinois inspection department and with the assistance of the board of trade, have created a condition in Chicago where an average of at least 10 cents per bushel, and perhaps 25 cents per bushel, has been taken from the values of wheat, corn, and oats for the past 20 years. And if the crops of this country equaled in the last year 5,000,000,000 bushels, we may say for safety that the average for the three crops for the past 20 years has been 3,000,000,000 bushels yearly. If they have taken 10 cents a bushel from the value of the crops by their method of setting a price upon the absolute cash grain of the country through their monopolistic methods, I would estimate that $300,000,000 a year has been taken from the profits of the producers of this country through the operation of mixing and "future" domination. And that does not take into account any very meager millions which their operations as warehousemen may have produced for them.

Now, as regards hedging, these men will advance the argument that "what we need in these markets is some place that we can hedge." Let it be known to every man throughout this country that this thing they call hedging will never be necessary when you take from the market this illegal system of dominated future trading, which can be enhanced or depressed at the will of these men. They say that bankers will more readily advance money when a man's wheat is hedged. What is the security for a banker—the hedge? No; the wheat. Now, which would be the better security for a banker to advance money on, wheat treated and mixed and doctored to the "lowest of the grade" held in a public elevator by these proprietors, manufactured in these hospitals, or good wheat properly placed in public storage under the supervision of the United States Government? Quality means security.

The terminal elevators in Minneapolis and Chicago are public in no true sense of the term. The private owners of these elevators have such an advantage as traders as to insure their control of the market and the prices. Their storage earnings do not measure the gains they make for their owners. There should be no profit and no gain for the owner of a public elevator or warehouse any more than there should be for the owner of a public highway.

The word "public" does not contemplate that any man should receive a profit. The mere fact that elevators are used for public purposes, our contention is that no profit should exist. It should be controlled by organized society. But having grown up in the system where private parties put their money into elevators, in some instances, and where railroads give elevators free of charge in other instances—having grown up under that system, it is not remarkable at all that we should be in this plight in which we are to-day. And that brings me to a statement which I think is largely true: That when any great unrest occurs in this country, when any great agitation is aroused as to monopolistically controlled enterprises, you will generally find, gentlemen, that the cause of that monopoly exists in the usurpation of what should be the public function of government by a private individual, where a private individual assumes the duty which the State itself should perform. Or, stated in another way, the creation of this unrest is occasioned by the fact that the State refuses to perform to the individual that function which the State should perform in the exigency of the hour. And this is a tremendous question which has come up at this time for solution, when, as I said in opening, we are confronted with a volume of business involving every year in three crops 5,000,000,000 bushels of grain, which at an average of 50 cents a bushel is worth $2,500,000,000.

It is said that perhaps this should be an administration matter to secure public warehouses, Federal inspection, and prevention of future trades as dominated by this monopoly, and that action should be taken against the commercial exchanges for their alliance with this monopoly. But I contend that it should be no administration measure. It is not a measure for any faction, any party, any clique, any committee, any fine work, any attempt at doing star-chamber methods, if any such ever did exist or ever will or ever do. This is a question for the broad open daylight, for fair, honest discussion on real merit. And I care not whether a man is a Republican or a Democrat or a Socialist, or a president or a banker or a schoolteacher, or what he may be. This problem is so great in its importance that it should be seriously met, regardless of any administration of any kind, shape, or form. This is a matter of principle, of fairness, of justice, and equity, and in closing, touching upon that subject, let me quote the words which I committed to memory in my childhood:

Loyalty to principle is higher than loyalty to party. One is a heavenly sentiment from God; the other is a device of this earth.

It is said that we will throw away our votes and our opposition will fail. Fail, sir; no honest, earnest effort in a good cause ever fails. Did the Christians fail when with their precious blood they sowed the seed of the church? Did the 300 Spartans fail when in the narrow pass they did not fear to brave the innumerable Persian hosts, whose very arrows darkened the sun? No; overborne by numbers, crushed to earth, they have left an example greater far than any victory. And this is the least we may do; our example will be a source of triumph hereafter.

I thank you, gentlemen, for so patiently listening to me in presenting so fully this exceedingly difficult problem.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina has eight minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I am not a constitutional lawyer. In fact, I am not lawyer enough to hurt in any respect. I am hardly competent to pass upon the constitutionality of this bill, although whatever doubt I may have had in this respect was allayed by the judgment of the Democratic lawyers on the Agricultural Committee, whose ability I rank with the best in the House, to whom I have submitted it.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that when there is a great general good to be accomplished by legislation I am not so squeamish about the Constitution. I believe that when a thing is to be done, when an object is to be accomplished, it should be reached in the quickest and most direct way. I recognize the fact, as every student of agricultural economics in this country does, that one of the chief problems of agricultural economy is the lack of a proper relationship between farm products and the banking and commercial world. There is no more pathetic sight to me than to see a farmer carrying his products into the market, allowing an outsider to grade and sample them and fixing for him the price for which he must part with them.

The grader may be honest and he may not; he may be an expert and he may not; but whether honest or not, whether an expert or not, the farmer is the man who suffers in any event either because of his ignorance or his absolute lack of honesty. The farmer must stand and deliver upon terms fixed by the other party to the trade. The injustice of such a system to the man who produces must be evident, and yet it is the system under which the bulk of farm products is marketed.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina to the fact that in the State of Maryland we have a system of State tobacco warehouses, one of these warehouses having been constructed only a few years ago at a cost of some $400,000. Our tobacco interests of southern Maryland are very large indeed. In some counties tobacco is the staple product. The interests of these people are bound up in the cultivation of a good grade of tobacco. The State of Maryland has endeavored to protect and foster this industry in every possible way by the construction and management of these warehouses. This is a system which does not prevail in other States of the Union but is almost wholly confined to the State of Maryland.

The purpose of this bill is to make the products of the farm as assets as liquid as possible; that is, to authorize the issuing of warehouse receipts, so that those having cotton, tobacco, and other products of like durable nature may be able to store their goods and secure warehouse receipts and borrow money upon them.

I think the intentions of the bill are manifestly highly in the interest of the farmers. It will enable them to store their goods

and await better markets; it will define certain grades so that money can be better secured upon these receipts; it will establish a credit throughout the country for the borrowing of money by virtue of the proper storing and inspection of these products.

I am interested in the purpose of this bill, and while I have no doubt the gentleman intends to protect every interest he had in mind, yet I feel that the bill does not sufficiently make provision for State tobacco warehouses, and for that reason I have risen to bring before the gentleman this matter, which I feel is of vital interest to our people.

In the bill passed by the Senate, by section 16, provision for State tobacco warehouses was made, but in this bill no particular mention is made of them, and, so far as I can see, no provision for the issuing of receipts by them is provided.

I have called the gentleman's attention to this fact and submitted to him an amendment I intended to offer; but as this bill comes up under suspension of the rules, it is impossible in that form to amend. I ask the gentleman his opinion upon the proposed amendment, which reads as follows:

Amend, on page 11, line 19, after the word "determination," by striking out the period and substituting in lieu thereof a colon and the following language:

"*Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may, under such rules as he may prescribe, issue a license to any person not the owner or operator of a warehouse to accept the custody of agricultural products and to store the same in any warehouse or warehouses owned and operated by any State. Each person so licensed shall issue receipts for the agricultural products placed in his custody and shall give bond in accordance with all the provisions of this act affecting the owners and operators of warehouses licensed hereunder, and such rules and regulations as may be prescribed hereunder by the Secretary of Agriculture, and shall otherwise be subject to this act and said regulations.

Mr. LEVER. So far as the amendment is concerned, personally I have no objection to it. I think the amendment only clarifies the language already in the bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Then the gentleman has no objection to the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. I would not like to commit myself to it before going into conference.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Is not this a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. LEVER. It can hardly be held to be so, because certain members of the committee reserved the right to oppose it; but no minority report is filed.

Mr. Speaker, what does this bill undertake to do? What measure of good does it seek to accomplish? What is its purpose? It undertakes, and will result in, the establishment of a uniform system of warehouses and warehousing for the storage of agricultural products. At present there is no such system. Whatever of storage facilities we have is of a hodgepodge character, entirely lacking in that uniformity so desirable for the greatest simplicity and efficiency and economy.

It will result in the adoption throughout the country of a uniform warehouse receipt for agricultural products of the same kind. This is of the greatest importance. To illustrate: Assume that I am a farmer living in Lexington County, S. C., operating a private warehouse, properly insured and fully bonded, in which I have stored 100 bales of cotton, correctly and expertly graded. Upon this cotton I issue my private warehouse receipt. It is possible that I would be able without difficulty to negotiate a loan upon such receipt with my own local banks, where my integrity is known and my credit established. But suppose I should find myself in the city of Birmingham, the home city of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], with this receipt in my pocket and a desire to borrow upon it. Does anyone imagine that the Birmingham banker would take the risk of the integrity of this receipt unless he had full confidence in my own personal integrity? The combination might get me the loan; but suppose this receipt had been indorsed to a third party, an absolute stranger to the banker; I think no one will doubt the difficulty which he would have in getting its face value. To him the value of this receipt as collateral or for loans would be worth no more than the paper upon which it was written. But if all warehouse receipts for cotton from Texas to South Carolina were uniform in character and meant in Texas what they mean in South Carolina, the value of such a receipt would of necessity be greatly enhanced; in fact, such a receipt would become easily negotiable and transferable in the ordinary course of trade.

It will give an integrity and a certainty of value to warehouse receipts for agricultural products, which they do not now possess. The meaning of this is clearly brought out in a statement at the cotton conference called by Secretary McAdoo last August of Mr. H. R. Eldridge, of the National City Bank of New York, in which he says:

In the near future the bankers of the wheat-producing sections will probably have surplus funds to invest, and the Eastern and Northeastern States, as well as those of the Middle West and the West, will be reasonably easy in the matter of money and will be attracted toward good paper, well secured and of assured payment when due. Under the old order of things, paper secured by cotton and many other commodities was rarely presented on the market in such form as to command the respect of investors, and it can not be so presented this season, unless conditions are changed in certain respects. One essential to this end is a uniform warehouse receipt of undoubted integrity. As things now are such warehouse receipts are few. Where it is deemed necessary to improve the standing of warehouse receipts, warehouses making application to the proper authorities should be governmentally licensed under regulations to be established, and each warehouse so licensed should be supplied with a Government inspector, who should issue a uniform receipt for each bale of cotton, or other form of package representing a commodity stored, certifying thereon the mark, the weight, and the grade. This system would create a form of security good beyond peradventure and one that would command the respect of all bankers and investors everywhere.

Let me illustrate this by taking up again my private warehouse receipt for cotton stored in my own warehouse in Lexington. Such a receipt will have full integrity among those who know me and know that I have such a warehouse as I claim to have and that I have in it such an amount of cotton of such grade and weight as I claim to have in it and as represented in the warehouse receipt upon which I am seeking to borrow money. Such a receipt is good locally; it would not be good in Houston, Tex.; and a banker in Texas who would loan the face value of such a receipt would be treading indeed upon dangerous ground as a banker. If, however, this receipt should show upon its face that the warehouse issuing it was either supervised or operated by the State of South Carolina and that the State of South Carolina vouched for every claim of the receipt, the Texas banker would be within the bounds of good and safe banking in relying upon the integrity of it. Now, if this last proposition is true, does it not stand to reason that if this receipt had issued from a warehouse supervised by the Federal Government its value as collateral would be greatly enhanced? In my judgment such a receipt would pass current in the channels of trade almost as readily as a bank note. Mr. Eldridge, you will see, says that a warehouse receipt to be of undoubted integrity should issue from warehouses governmentally licensed under regulations and should be uniform in character. Such a system, he says, would create a form of security good beyond peradventure and one that would command the respect of all bankers and investors everywhere. In this opinion Mr. Eldridge is supported by every student of the economic question involved, and this bill proposes just such a system as is suggested.

Under the provisions of the bill uniform warehouse receipts will be issued upon agricultural products stored in warehouses governmentally licensed, graded, weighed, and certificated by governmentally licensed inspectors. We are trying in this bill to make liquid the evidence of the ownership of agricultural products, something that is not the case at present; we are trying to give a more ready negotiability to such evidences of ownership than they now possess; we are trying to bring into proper relationship, to link up, as it were, agricultural products and banking and investing capital. We are trying to make the provisions of this bill dovetail into the provisions of the Federal reserve act in so far as they touch agricultural products. The Secretary of the Treasury has expressed his willingness to issue currency on warehouse receipts for cotton, tobacco, and other staple and nonperishable agricultural products, but the Secretary of the Treasury would be lacking in that wisdom with which I credit him if he should agree to issue currency upon warehouse receipts indiscriminately and without any regard to the character of the supervision of the warehouses from which they issue. He would of necessity, out of business caution and to preserve the integrity of the Treasury, to maintain its credit, examine the manner of supervision of the warehouses issuing the receipts upon which he is asked to issue currency or, through the Federal reserve act, to rediscount agricultural paper secured by such collateral.

The bill will result in furnishing larger storage facilities for agricultural products and will serve as an incentive to farmers not only to store their products, thereby saving millions of dollars of weather loss each year, but, which is more important, enable them to market their product at periods when the demand for them is strongest and the price highest. With us in the South millions of dollars are lost annually because we permit our chief staple crop—cotton—to lie out in the weather; but we lose more, infinitely more, because of our custom and necessity of marketing the bulk of our crop in the course of three or four months. This measure will furnish the machinery by which this enormous waste may be saved and this unbusinesslike system abolished. Not only this, but for the first time in this country machinery under the terms of this bill is provided through which the farmer may know from disinterested sources both the grade of his product and its commercial value. This, in brief, is the bill and what it seeks to accomplish. It is

in every line of it a farmers' bill, and to my mind is the most far-reaching step forward in the building up of a real system of marketing, a system which looks to the benefit of the man who produces the goods to be sold, that has been taken in many a day either by State or Federal enactment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LENROOT) there were—ayes 158, noes 64.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 219, nays 98, not voting 111, as follows:

YEAS—219.

Abercrombie	Dixon	Keating	Rouse
Adair	Donohoe	Kelly, Pa.	Rubey
Adamson	Donovan	Kennedy, Conn.	Rucker
Aiken	Doolittle	Kent	Rupley
Alexander	Doughton	Kettner	Russell
Allen	Dupré	Key, Ohio	Sabath
Aswell	Eagan	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Saunders
Baker	Eagle	Kinkead, N. J.	Seldomridge
Barkley	Estopinal	Kirkpatrick	Shackleford
Barnhart	Evans	Kitchin	Shreve
Barton	Faison	Korbly	Sims
Bathrick	Falconer	La Follette	Sinnott
Beakes	Farr	Langley	Sisson
Bell, Cal.	Fergusson	Lazaro	Sloan
Bell, Ga.	Ferris	Lee, Ga.	Small
Blackmon	Fields	Lesher	Smith, Idaho
Booher	Finley	Lever	Smith, J. M. C.
Borchers	FitzHenry	Lieb	Smith, Minn.
Borland	Foster	Lindbergh	Smith, N. Y.
Brodbeck	Fowler	Lindquist	Smith, Tex.
Broussard	Frear	Linthicum	Sparkman
Brown, N. Y.	Garner	Lloyd	Stedman
Browne, Wis.	Garrett, Tex.	Lobeck	Stephens, Cal.
Bruckner	Gill	McGillicuddy	Stephens, Miss.
Bryan	Gilmore	McKellar	Stephens, Tex.
Buchanan, Ill.	Glass	MacDonald	Stevens, N. H.
Buchanan, Tex.	Goeke	Maguire, Nebr.	Stone
Burgess	Goodwin, Ark.	Mahan	Stout
Burke, S. Dak.	Goulden	Manahan	Stringer
Burke, Wis.	Gray	Moon	Sumners
Burnett	Hamlin	Morgan, Okla.	Talcott, N. Y.
Byrnes, S. C.	Hardy	Morrison	Tavenner
Byrns, Tenn.	Harrison	Moss, Ind.	Taylor, Ala.
Candler, Miss.	Haugen	Mulkey	Taylor, Ark.
Cantrill	Hawley	Murray	Taylor, Colo.
Caraway	Hayden	Norton	Ten Eyck
Carter	Heflin	O'Brien	Thacher
Clancy	Helgesen	Oldfield	Thomas
Clark, Fla.	Helm	O'Leary	Thompson, Okla.
Collier	Helvering	Padgett	Underhill
Connelly, Kans.	Hensley	Page, N. C.	Underwood
Connolly, Iowa	Hill	Palmer	Vaughan
Conry	Hobson	Park	Vinson
Cooper	Holland	Peterson	Walker
Cox	Houston	Porter	Watkins
Cramton	Howell	Post	Watson
Crisp	Hoxworth	Pou	Weaver
Cullop	Hughes, Ga.	Powers	Webb
Dale	Hulings	Price	Whaley
Dent	Hull	Prouty	Williams
Dershem	Humphreys, Miss.	Quin	Willis
Dickinson	Jacoway	Raker	Wingo
Dies	Johnson, Ky.	Rauch	Young, N. Dak.
Difenderfer	Johnson, S. C.	Reilly, Conn.	Young, Tex.
Dillon	Kahn	Reilly, Wis.	

NAYS—98.

Anderson	Fordney	Johnson, Utah	Moore
Avis	Francis	Johnson, Wash.	Moss, W. Va.
Bailey	Gallagher	Keister	Mott
Bartlett	Gallivan	Kelley, Mich.	O'Shaunessy
Britten	Gard	Kennedy, Iowa	Paige, Mass.
Brockson	Gardner	Kennedy, R. I.	Parker, N. J.
Browning	Gillett	Kiess, Pa.	Parker, N. Y.
Bulkley	Good	Knowland, J. R.	Patton, Pa.
Callaway	Gordon	Kreider	Peters
Cary	Graham, Ill.	Langham	Phelan
Cline	Green, Iowa	Lenroot	Platt
Crosser	Greene, Mass.	Logue	Plumley
Curry	Greene, Vt.	Lonergan	Rayburn
Danforth	Hamilton, Mich.	McKenzie	Roberts, Mass.
Davis	Hammond	McLaughlin	Roberts, Nev.
Doremus	Hay	Madden	Rogers
Drukker	Hayes	Maher	Scott
Dunn	Henry	Mann	Sherley
Esch	Hinds	Mapes	Sherwood
Fess	Hinebaugh	Miller	Smith, Saml. W.
Fitzgerald	Igoe	Mitchell	Stafford
Steenerson	Thomson, Ill.	Vollmer	Witherspoon
Stevens, Minn.	Towner	Volstead	Woods
Sutherland	Treadway	Wallin	
Switzer	Vare	Winslow	

NOT VOTING—111.

Ainey	Deitrick	Hughes, W. Va.	Patten, N. Y.
Ansberry	Dooling	Humphrey, Wash.	Ragsdale
Anthony	Driscoll	Jones	Rainey
Ashbrook	Edmonds	Kindel	Reed
Austin	Edwards	Konop	Riordan
Baltz	Elder	Lafferty	Rothermel
Barchfeld	Fairchild	Lee, Pa.	Scully
Bartholdt	Flood, Va.	L'Engle	Sells
Beall, Tex.	Floyd, Ark.	Levy	Slayden
Bowdle	French	Lewis, Md.	Slemp
Brown, W. Va.	Garrett, Tenn.	Lewis, Pa.	Smith, Md.
Brumbaugh	George	Loft	Stanley
Burke, Pa.	Gerry	McAndrews	Stephens, Nebr.
Butler	Gittins	McClellan	Taggart
Calder	Godwin, N. C.	McGuire, Okla.	Talbott, Md.
Campbell	Goldfogle	Martin	Taylor, N. Y.
Cantor	Gorman	Metz	Temple
Carew	Graham, Pa.	Mondell	Townsend
Carlin	Gregg	Montague	Tribble
Carr	Griest	Morgan, La.	Tuttle
Casey	Griffin	Morin	Walsh
Chandler, N. Y.	Gudger	Murdock	Walters
Church	Guernsey	Neeley, Kans.	Whitacre
Claypool	Hamill	Neely, W. Va.	White
Coady	Hamilton, N. Y.	Nelson	Wilson, Fla.
Copley	Harris	Nolan, J. I.	Wilson, N. Y.
Davenport	Hart	Oglesby	Woodruff
Decker	Howard	O'Hair	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. KONOP with Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington.

Mr. HOWARD with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. GREGG with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. MCANDREWS with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. JONES with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. MONDELL.

Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. TEMPLE.

Mr. ASHBROOK with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. CASEY with Mr. AUSTIN.

Mr. COADY with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. DECKER with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. WOODRUFF.

Mr. RAINEY with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. NELSON.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening?

Mr. HULINGS. I was talking.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening?

Mr. AUSTIN. Not when my name was called. I desire to be recorded as present.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] makes the same request.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the other bill which I discussed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman already has it. Is there objection to these other requests? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

IMPROVEMENT OF EAST RIVER AND HELL GATE, N. Y.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the following House joint resolution with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 366) authorizing the Secretary of War to use any allotment made under the provisions of an act approved October 2, 1914, entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," for the improvement of East River and Hell Gate, N. Y.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and empowered to use any of the allotment made under the provisions of the act approved October 2, 1914, entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," for the impovement of East River and Hell Gate, N. Y., together with any funds heretofore appropriated for the said improvement and now available, for the removal of Coenties Reef in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 188, Sixty-third Congress, first session, for the improvement of East River and Hell Gate, N. Y., to the extent of removing said Coenties Reef: *Provided*, That the work hereby contemplated shall not be commenced until assurance satisfactory to the Secretary of War shall have been received that the city of New York, or other local interests, have made provision for the removal of said rock beyond the depth specified in said project to the depth of 40 feet: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as adopting the said project beyond the removal of said Coenties Reef to the extent and in the manner specified.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands a second.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from New York is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois to 20 minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the city of New York is engaged in constructing a system of subways, at a cost of $300,000,000. One of the tubes of the subway system is to connect the Borough of Manhattan with the Borough of Brooklyn. It passes under the East River at a point about opposite to the Battery in the lower portion of the city. It will pass through a reef known as Coenties Reef. At mean low water there is not more than 11 or 12 feet of water at some portions of this reef. A project has been recommended to the Congress for an improvement of the East River to a depth of 35 feet. If the subway tube be constructed before the reef is removed, the Army Engineers state that an attempt to remove the reef later will result in the destruction of the tube.

Unless the authorization can be given to remove the reef at this time, the work on the subway system will have reached such a point that the entire enterprise must be suspended pending legislation at some time by Congress. The tube will pass beneath the river about 50 feet below mean low water. It is stated by Army Engineers that no demand of commerce will ever require that there be more than 40 feet over the reef. It was suggested that if the reef were to be removed at this time it should be removed to the full depth. The committee amendment provides that the money now available for river and harbor improvement in connection with the improvement of Hell Gate and the East River may be utilized to the extent of removing this reef in accordance with the report of the Engineers in House Document No. 188, upon condition that the city of New York gives assurance that the money necessary to remove the reef to a depth of 40 feet will be provided. The city is prepared to spend the additional money to remove the reef to that depth.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will.

Mr. MOORE. New York desires to make an improvement in connection with this tube service, and it is necessary to have the sanction of the Government in this way before that work can go on? Is not that a fact?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not entirely. The improvement is proposed by the Federal Government, and the Army engineers will not permit the city of New York to construct the tube until the reef is removed.

Mr. MOORE. That is what I mean; but the city of New York expects to do that work except for the proportion of the recent $20,000,000?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The city will provide the funds necessary to take out the additional 5 feet to bring the depth to 40 feet.

Mr. MOORE. I am somewhat familiar with this, and I believe it absolutely necessary for commerce and navigation as well as for the welfare of the people of New York, but I would like to ask the gentleman one question more: Why was not this item incorporated in the river and harbor bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was not incorporated in the river and harbor bill, according to the information given to me, because this resolution was reported from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the last session of Congress. It was believed an opportunity would be afforded to pass this resolution, and therefore it should not be included in the river and harbor bill.

Mr. MOORE. It came too late to be considered in the bill? Is that the idea?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it was included in last year's bill; but in last year's bill the provision approved a project that would cost over $13,000,000. The committee declined to approve that project at this time except so far as the removal of the reef at this particular point through which the subway tube is to pass.

Mr. MOORE. But this particular project stands by itself? It is not a part of the general project?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it is not.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will.

Mr. GOULDEN. Is it not a fact that the contract has been let for this tube, and the contractor is ready to proceed just as soon as the Government has decided to remove the rock at Coenties Reef?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The contract was let and the work was commenced in October, and considerable progress has been made toward the construction of the tube down to and out toward the reef.

Mr. GOULDEN. This is a part of the general improvement as provided for by the bill introduced by myself and adopted by the engineers and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will.

Mr. HAWLEY. How much money will be required to be taken from the $20,000,000 appropriated last year for this work?

Mr. FITZGERALD. A hasty examination of the report of the Secretary of War showing the allotments made of the $20,000,000 appropriation does not indicate that any of that appropriation was allotted to the project known as the improvement of Hell Gate and the East River, but there are funds on hand coming over from former appropriations on account of that project that can be better utilized in this way than on the project approved some years ago.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will any part of the $20,000,000 appropriated in the last river and harbor bill be used for the work contemplated in this bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think not, because it has all been apportioned and none has been allotted to that particular project.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will say that it will require, according to the estimates of the engineers, $196,000 to carry the channel down at Coenties Reef to 35 feet. As stated by the gentleman from New York, the city of New York or some local interest will furnish the money to take it down to the additional depth.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution.

The question was taken, and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

EDWARD B. KELLEY.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 6939) to reimburse Edward B. Kelley for moneys expended while superintendent of the Rosebud Indian Agency in South Dakota, and concur in the Senate amendment. It is on the Speaker's table now.

The SPEAKER. What is the number?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. H. R. 6939.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,381.20, to reimburse Edward B. Kelley, formerly superintendent of the Rosebud Indian Agency in South Dakota, for moneys expended for costs and expenses in a suit brought against him by one H. A. Bloom, involving the property of an Indian, a member of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe, and for the payment of a judgment entered against him in said suit: *Provided*, That before any part of the amount herein appropriated is paid to the said Edward B. Kelley there shall be filed a duly attested certificate of the clerk of the court in which the judgment was entered, showing that said judgment has been fully paid and satisfied: *And provided further*, That the said Edward B. Kelley shall file a receipt in full of all claims or demands against the United States or any Indian by reason of the moneys expended in connection with the suit herein referred to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is before the House?

The SPEAKER. The thing that is before the House is a Senate amendment to a House bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. How does it come before the House at this late hour?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] asked to take it from the Speaker's table.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the amendment provide an appropriation?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas asked unanimous consent, I assume?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No; I did not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate amendment was agreed to was laid on the table.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 20241, the urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I rose, Mr. Speaker, to move to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER. The House made a special order to-day to the effect that this urgent deficiency bill should be taken up at a quarter to 5.

Mr. MANN. Not earlier than a quarter to 5?

The SPEAKER. Yes; not earlier than a quarter to 5. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOSS] may not have been in the Chamber at the time, but that was the order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with general debate.

Mr. MANN. Well, I shall want a very few minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the general debate be limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and 5 minutes by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and 5 minutes by himself. Is there objection?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, before we enter upon the consideration of such an important bill as this I think we should have a quorum here. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WATKINS] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well; that will not help the gentleman from Louisiana to get that special employee in this bill. I can tell him that right now.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana withdraws the point of no quorum. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that the general debate be limited to 10 minutes?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 20241, the urgent deficiency bill, with Mr. RUSSELL in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 20241, the urgent deficiency bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20241) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1915 and prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the article marked that I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

TERROR RULES MEXICO—"DEATH TO TRAITORS!" IS BATTLE CRY OF BOTH FACTIONS—PLOT AGAINST GEN. VILLA—MANY EXECUTIONS REPORTED AT CAPITAL, CHIHUAHUA, AND VERA CRUZ.

* * * * * * *

EL PASO, TEX., *December 20, 1914.*

"Death to the traitors!" is the battle cry of both factions in Mexico to-day, following orders given by Gens. Carranza and Villa, to show no mercy to those who are found to be wavering in their loyalty.

Unofficial reports of the discovery of a widespread and threatening conspiracy against Villa in Chihuahua City reached the border to-day. It is said the discovery of conspiracy was followed to-day by the execution of several men well known in Chihuahua military circles, and Gen. Fidel Avilla, military governor of Chihuahua, is having the city searched for others who are suspected of being implicated in the conspiracy.

EXECUTIONS AT VERA CRUZ.

Advices from Vera Cruz to-day say that men are being executed there without trial. That Carranza, after giving the order for the general executions, attempted to recall it, but that he is powerless now to stop the riotous soldiers, who are going about the city dealing death to whom they suspect. In Mexico City, according to Carranza advices, there have been innumerable disappearances since Villa left the city, and invariably they are men suspected of being in sympathy with Carranza. Often their bodies are found a day or two later in some secluded spot.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the article which the Clerk has just read appeared in the Washington Post this morning. I do not know how accurate the statements in it may be, but I am quite confident that there are a great many statements which could be truthfully made along those lines concerning the situation which exists in Mexico as the result of the impotent policy of the Bryan administration. And as this bill carries an appropriation of something over half a million dollars to pay the expenses of our troops at Vera Cruz, sent there for the purpose of obtaining a salute of 21 guns, which has not yet been given. I thought it was proper to have the article read to the House. Those who are satisfied with the results of the situation in Mexico may smile complacently over it; but the people of the country deeply regret the present chaotic, awful conditions in Mexico, which exist simply because we have not had anybody at the head of anything who had any nerve or sense. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, everybody regrets exceedingly the situation in Mexico. No one can fail to deplore what is going on there. During the last administration, when President Taft, a Republican, was in the White House, the President and Vice President of Mexico were assassinated. Conditions in Mexico were unbearable long before the Democratic Party came into power in this country. While not knowing all of the horrible details of the atrocities being committed, I do know that it is hardly credible that any intelligent man in the country, particularly any intelligent man in this House, has any belief whatever that the administration of the United States, either present or past, is at all responsible for or has instigated or connived at the situation existing in our neighboring Republic. I think we all, regardless of party, realize that whoever is in control of the administration of this country has a sufficiently difficult, delicate, and trying task in endeavoring to adjust matters so that life and property will speedily be more secure in Mexico, without having anyone in this country, for partisan, political, or other selfish ends, attempt to embarrass the administration by arousing the sentiments of the people of the country by the circulation of misleading, inaccurate, and ill-tempered statements. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

With this brief reference to the situation in Mexico, and in the spirit of Christian peace prevalent at this time, especially in our own land, I unite with all other good and patriotic citizens—including those misguided ones who have been adhering so long to the Republican Party—in indulging in the hope that peace will speedily settle upon Mexico, and that her citizens may enjoy a happiness, a contentment, and a freedom from turmoil which they have long been denied. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. There does not seem to be much chance of it, though.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask the Clerk to read the bill under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

For transportation of the Army and its supplies, including the same objects specified under this head in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1914, $554,371.24.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the sake of asking the gentleman from New York a question. I understand that this half million dollars is to pay the expenses of bringing back our troops from Vera Cruz. Can the chairman of the committee tell us what has been the total pecuniary expense of that expedition?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In a speech which I made in the House during the last session of Congress, which the gentleman from Massachusetts listened to very carefully and read several times with great interest, I stated that the situation in Mexico, including certain additional troops carried in the Army, had cost the United States between $8,000,000 and $9,000,000. Back in February the Regular Army was increased by from 7,500 to 8,000 men. That enters into the cost. This appropriation of $554,000 consists of two items—one of $324,000 for the chartering of vessels and the refitting of chartered vessels, and the remainder is to make up a deficiency occasioned by insufficient funds to meet the allowance to enlisted men for travel from the place where discharged to the place of enlistment.

Mr. GILLETT. Then the first amount which the gentleman mentioned covered everything, I suppose—the Army, the Navy, and all the extra expenses.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is my understanding—between $8,000,000 and $9,000,000.

Mr. MANN. Does it also cover the numerous special representatives sent to spy out the land and report how virtuous and humane the people in control in Mexico are?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think they were paid out of the emergency appropriation of the State Department.

Mr. MANN. I understand that; but did the sum the gentleman names include this, or not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was more than amply sufficient to include it, but I do not believe it did.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says it was more than amply sufficient; that shows that the gentleman's statement is not accurate. If it did include it, he should say so.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not recall whether it does. There was a deficiency appropriation for the emergency fund—the secret fund of the State Department—but I do not recall whether that item was included in the total at the time.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. A little while ago the leader of the Republican Party——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Which branch of the Republican Party?

Mr. MOORE. The regular branch, of course, and the only branch; for the leader of the Republican Party is a harmonizer. In his reference to the war expenditures made in pursuance of our peace policy in Mexico, he indicated that there were those in control of the affairs of State who did not exercise much nerve.

That remark impressed me, because I think we are exercising a great deal of nerve in the State Department in the interest of peace, which we are bound to have even if we pay for it. Here we have an item to pay upward of $500,000 military expenses in connection with our peaceful occupation of Mexico. How different is the method employed with regard to Colombia. There has been a quarrel between Colombia and the United States with respect to the taking of Panama. Does the State Department justify the expenditures for military defenses at Panama or Colombia? It does not. If we have insulted Colombia, and we seem to have made an abject apology to that country, we are not to engage in a war, but we are to buy our way out. We do not send troops, but still we maintain peace. In view of the admission of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that we have spent $9,000,000 or $10,000,000 supporting our military maneuvers in Mexico and vicinity, it is interesting to observe how we avoid any such complications with Colombia. The report of the Colombian minister of foreign affairs throws considerable light upon this subject. Colombia is satisfied that we have made an abject apology for our alleged offenses. The Secretary of State is willing to blot out our differences forever by paying the price. It was a matter of considerable negotiation. I quote that portion of the Colombian statement which shows how easy it is to maintain peace if you are willing to pay for it:

This counter proposition was answered by a memorandum from the Colombian Government proposing certain modifications and concessions and repeating the request for $30,000,000 and annual payments of $250,000 for 100 years. This memorandum was answered by another from the American minister raising the indemnity to $25,000,000 without annual payments, on condition of acceptance by Colombia of the remainder of the proposition of the American Government. This was answered in turn by another Colombian memorandum relinquishing annual payments, but requesting in addition to the $25,000,000 a lump sum of $5,000,000 to be employed for the improvement and sanitation of the ports of Buenaventura and Cartagena. The money question was finally fixed at $25,000,000 on receipt of a cablegram from the Colombian minister in Washington, dated March 30, 1914:

"Convinced that Congress will refuse more than $25,000,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, without discussing the merits of the proposed item of $25,000,000 for Colombia, the fact is the gentleman's own party tendered $10,000,000 to adjust the differences between Colombia and the United States. The $250,000 in perpetuity, which the gentleman mentioned, was provided in the treaty between the United States and Panama, and Colombia believes the annual payments should be made to her.

Mr. MOORE. But the Republican administration did not approve the lump-sum payment to Colombia.

Mr. MANN. If any Republican administration, as has been claimed at different times by this administration as a justification for what this administration has done, made an agreement to pay Colombia $25,000,000 under any conditions, they took particular care to keep it under cover so that the Republicans could never find it out.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is true of the most of the things that they did. They kept them under cover while we make our actions public for the information of the public.

Mr. MANN. As fast as you can find them you try to copy them, but the trouble is that you can not draw a line and copy those that are right and reject those that are wrong. You can not distinguish. If we make a mistake, we repudiate it; but you take it up always.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the trouble is that the Republican administration did most of its business in secret, in the dark; this administration has been conducting its business in the light. There is a very great difference between the two methods, and it will be a long time before the dark and nefarious methods of the Republican régime that was in power previous to this administration will ever be permitted to be reestablished in the conduct of the Government.

The Clerk read as follows:

OUT OF THE POSTAL REVENUES.

For freight or expressage on postal cards, stamped envelopes, newspaper wrappers, and empty mail bags, fiscal year 1914, $50,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice here the first deficiency appropriation ever carried for the carriage of postal cards and other freightable articles in the Postal Service. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether anything developed before the committee as to the reason for this $50,000 deficiency appropriation. I had understood that there was some testimony presented before his committee that the Government is undertaking a new policy of shipping millions of dollars of gold by parcel post instead of sending it by express. If the gentleman has any such information, I wish that he would, in a few words, give it to the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the Second Assistant Postmaster General testified that the appropriation of $510,000 made for the fiscal year 1914 for freight or expressage on postal cards, stamped envelopes, wrappers, and mail bags had actually been expended, and there was an ascertained deficit of forty-nine thousand and odd dollars. There was some testimony before the Committee on Appropriations as to the shipment by parcel post of a very large sum of money in coin from the city of Philadelphia to the city of New York. Fifty million dollars in coin was shipped in the recent past from Philadelphia to New York.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the House what protection was given for the security of those $50,000,000? It is so out of the ordinary that I think it is worthy of consideration.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this money was shipped in separate cars, and the Second Assistant Postmaster General personally accompanied the shipment, with a number of guards whom he believed to be sufficient to protect the shipment from any possible danger. Thirty men, if I recall correctly, accompanied the shipments.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do the hearings disclose whether that is to be the new policy as to the shipment of gold between the subtreasuries?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I believe the Treasury Department is perfectly satisfied, because the saving to it was very large. An attempt was made to make a shipment by parcel post from Denver to New York, but the Second Assistant Postmaster General was unable to arrange for the services of a special through train, which was the only way in which he was willing to make the shipment. He found it was impossible

to make any arrangement by which the railroads could be compensated for the additional service, and that shipment was not made by parcel post, but was made by express. Of course, the difference in the rate by parcel post and express may to some extent be accounted for by the fact that the charge for the expressage on all sums of money shipped in that way covers the insurance, while the parcel-post shipment does not cover any insurance.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no charge in the shipment by the Government by parcel post whatsoever, except——

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is the regular parcel-post rate.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Government is not charging itself for the postage or the rates under parcel post.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes. The Treasury Department tenders this material for shipment by parcel post and pays the regular parcel-post charges.

Mr. STAFFORD. Who pays for the guards that accompany the trains to safeguard the shipment of these millions of dollars?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I imagine that they are postal employees.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Treasury Department, then, does not?

Mr. GILLETT. I think the Treasury Department did pay that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not certain about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For facing slips, plain and printed, including the furnishing of paper for same; and for card slide labels, blanks, and books of an urgent nature, $5,000.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is any deficiency in the item of Rural Mail Service in the appropriation made for the current year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. We have no estimate or knowledge of any deficiency.

Mr. WINGO. The department has not advised that they are short of funds on that account?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; there was no estimate or statement made that they were short of funds on that account.

Mr. WINGO. The appropriation, I understand, for the current year carried $3,000,000 more for rural mail than was estimated for the Rural Mail Service by the Post Office Department, and the department has not called the attention of the committee to any deficiency?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It has not.

Mr. WINGO. Or that any deficiency was liable to arise?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. The items in the bill are supposed to be urgent deficiencies, cases in which it is essential to have appropriations made at once. There was no estimate and no reference to any deficit in the Rural Free Delivery Service.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment and send the following amendment to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 19, insert as a new paragraph the following:
"For extension of rural mail service by the establishment and operation of new routes heretofore approved, $100,000."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, while the amendment is subject to it, I hope the gentleman will not press the point of order. There are some rural routes that are urgent, and they should be provided for by an appropriation in this bill if there is a deficiency in the present fund.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman——

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no deficiency.

Mr. MANN (continuing). That the Post Office appropriation bill will be up for consideration and with full chance to consider. I believe in the establishment of these rural routes, but the gentleman knows this item is not likely to be in this bill if it becomes a law before Wednesday night, even if it should pass the House.

Mr. WINGO. Here is the point to it: The Post Office bill which has been reported is for the next fiscal year.

Mr. MANN. It is and it would be just as much—it might not be in order, but it could be made available at once. I do not think there is a shortage of money.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, I may say there is no deficiency in the rural-carrier item at the present time, as the hearings disclosed before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. The annual rate of expenditure on November 1 for the rural service during the present year is $50,200,000, and the appropriation for that service is $53,000,000, so there is at present $2,800,000 available, and has been available for the extension of new routes. The gentleman's remedy does not lie here, because there is ample money available, but lies at the department. These routes have been approved of by the department, but for some reason or other they have failed to install them. There are ample funds.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman from Arkansas will not press his amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no deficiency.

Mr. MANN. Our side of the House is trying to let the bill go through.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I feel inclined to press for some relief for the routes held up by the department, because I think they are absolutely necessary, and I have been advised they are holding them up for the reason there are not ample funds.

Mr. MANN. One hundred thousand dollars would not amount to anything.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And there is no deficit or lack of funds. There are ample funds, and this $100,000 probably could not be used if appropriated, because there is more money available now than enough for this year.

Mr. WINGO. Now, in view of that statement, if the gentleman will pardon me, because my time is nearly up, the information of the gentleman from New York does not square with the information I have, and that is that these routes are held up on account of financial conditions. Now, the only financial condition that I know of that could hold up a rural route would be a deficit in the funds appropriated for their establishment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I can tell the gentleman that the attitude of the department probably is that the condition of the Treasury is such that it does not wish to extend these routes, although appropriation has been made, and it can incur the expense if it desires. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Arkansas that there will be a general deficiency bill before the end of the session, and an opportunity will be offered to go into the matter thoroughly. While we did not give the Post Office Department all the money it asked in this deficiency bill, we did give them money on account of every item they presented excepting, I think, one; and it was agreed that on that one it was not necessary to act at this time. They will submit estimates later, I know, in connection with the general deficiency bill.

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

Mr. WINGO. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will undertake to ascertain when the general deficiency bill is under consideration the real reason for the failure to extend these routes, and whether it is due to the fact that there are no available funds, or whether it is simply a desire to curtail expenses. In the Post Office appropriation act a sum very largely in excess of that requested was appropriated by Congress. There should be ample funds to meet the situation.

Mr. WINGO. I do not agree with the contention that the United States Treasury's condition is such as to call for the curtailment of any legitimate line of activity by the Post Office Department. The condition of the United States Treasury is better than it ever has been before, in my opinion, and I see no reason why rural routes that have been approved and that are really a necessity should be held up on the claim that the finances or the condition of the Treasury will not permit their establishment.

I recognize, Mr. Chairman, that with the chairman of the Appropriation Committee holding the view that he does there would be no hope of my amendment becoming a law, even if it should be held in order and adopted, and I have no desire to hold up urgent items embodied in the bill and do not want to see those items held up. But I do insist that we ought to relieve the situation, and I shall insist on it when the regular Post Office appropriation bill comes up for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to withdraw his amendment now?

Mr. WINGO. On the statement of the chairman of the committee I will withdraw the amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

For the arrest and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease, the payment of claims arising out of past and future purchases and destruction

of animals affected by or exposed to the foot-and-mouth disease, and for a deficiency in the objects specified under the head "General expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry," in the Agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915, $2,500,000, to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 5, after the word "Agriculture," insert:

"*Provided*, That for all cattle destroyed by the agents of the Agricultural Department the full value of such cattle shall be paid."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I do not concede that the point of order lies, but inasmuch as it is reserved, I shall make this statement of the matter:

The Agricultural Department has sent its veterinary agents throughout the country and has destroyed and is destroying cattle which are diseased and which have been exposed to the foot-and-mouth disease. These agents of the Agricultural Department are provided with printed slips by the department. Those slips are presented to the owner of the cattle and his signature is asked, whereby he agrees to take one-half of the value of the cattle destroyed instead of the full value. Now, these agents of the Agricultural Department in going upon farm after farm induce the owners of the cattle to believe they have authority to destroy cattle, when, as a matter of fact, they are not clothed with any such authority. The farmers, believing that their cattle are going to be destroyed anyhow, in some cases have signed these printed slips sent out by the Agricultural Department offering to pay one-half of the value of the cattle instead of the full value.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will.

Mr. BORLAND. Is not that only in States where the State and Federal Governments are cooperating, and the State is paying the other half?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; that is not the case.

Mr. BORLAND. That is my understanding.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BORLAND. My information is that the Government pays one-half and the State pays one-half, and that they are cooperating.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I received one of those printed slips to-day from Kentucky. If I am correctly advised—and I feel sure I am—there is cooperation between the State and Federal power toward doing away with the disease, but there is no agreement whereby the State is to pay one-half of the value of the cattle destroyed.

Mr. BORLAND. I think the gentleman will find that there is in most of the States, and probably in Kentucky.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Does not the State of Kentucky pay one-half of the value of the cattle destroyed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. My information is that she does not. She has nothing to pay it with.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. In the State of Michigan the State is paying one-half.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. As I am informed, the State of Kentucky can not do this until there is a session of the legislature. There is no authority in Kentucky to do it.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Kentucky is the only State that the gentleman knows of which is not paying it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do not know anything about the matter except in the State of Kentucky. I did not know that this matter was coming up to-day. I did not know there was such a provision in this bill until it was called up. If I had known, I could have had one of those slips over here with me.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have one of them here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. In view of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that cattle perfectly well are being destroyed simply because they may have been exposed to this disease, I feel that this appropriation ought to be used toward the payment of the full value of them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the only authority that the Federal Government has is to quarantine an entire State and to prohibit the shipment from out of the State of cattle if any of the cattle are affected with the foot-and-mouth disease; to prevent the hardship that would result from such action, the officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry cooperate with the State officials, and they quarantine only the portions of the State wherein the disease is prevalent. The Federal Government has no authority to seize and destroy infected cattle or cattle which have been subjected to the infection, but the State authorities in all the States have comprehensive and drastic powers to seize and destroy cattle infected. The result is that an agreement has been entered into by the officials of the Federal Government and the State government by which they cooperate in the effort to stamp out this disease.

Dr. Melvin, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, testified that the Federal Government assumed to pay 50 per cent of the appraised value in all instances, and the States have assumed the other 50 per cent. At present there is no appropriation in some of the States available out of which to pay the 50 per cent payable by the State, and it will be necessary for the money to be appropriated later. One of the forms signed by the owners of cattle is as follows:

Form 93. United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Animal Industry.

I hereby agree to accept, as compensation in full from the United States Department of Agriculture ——— dollars, which is 50 per cent of the value of all property destroyed or damaged in disinfecting on account of the existence of contagious foot-and-mouth disease.

That is signed, so that there can be no controversy later as to whether the proportion of the Federal Government was paid before the officials of the Government slaughtered and buried the cattle.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Can the gentleman tell us how much was appropriated for the destruction of the cattle and how much for the deficiency of the Bureau of Animal Industry? Is this amount divided?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There has been expended already about $800,000 for this work, commencing the middle of October, of which sum I think $400,000 has been paid to the owners of the cattle destroyed, and outstanding obligations have been incurred, for which provision is made in this appropriation to the extent of $800,000. A slightly different form has been signed in the cases in which the cattle were slaughtered since the exhaustion of the appropriation.

In addition, it is estimated that of the eight hundred-odd thousand dollars also carried in this item about two-thirds is for services and expenses and one-third will be to pay for the cattle to be destroyed.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Can the gentleman tell how the value of the cattle is arrived at?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are appraised at their meat value, and I think that is fixed without much difficulty. The complaint arises in the case of very fine pedigreed dairy or breeding cattle which have cost large sums of money. The owners of those cattle have been inclined to insist that they ought to be remunerated at the rate they paid for the cattle, but they are paid at the same rates as for the ordinary beef cattle—at their beef value alone. Of course, what the Federal Government could do would be to refuse to participate in the payment at all, and where the disease exists in a State to quarantine the entire State and prohibit the shipment of cattle out of the State, and leave to the State authorities the effort to eradicate the disease.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks an extension of three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The policy now pursued by the Department of Agriculture is the one which has been followed on other occasions when there have been outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease among cattle in the United States, the only difference being that on former occasions the Federal Government paid 60 per cent of the value and the States 40 per cent. This time the agreement was made that the Federal Government should pay 50 per cent and the States 50 per cent.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Can the gentleman tell whether or not the owner of the cattle has any authority to refuse to permit the destruction of the cattle?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes; the owner of the cattle can refuse to permit their slaughter by the Federal officials; but in that event the State officials, under authority conferred under State laws, immediately take control of the situation, and they have ample power to act under State laws.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York insist on the point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I insist on it. It is legislation within the rule and obnoxious to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. This is a limitation on the expenditure, and it is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is legislation, and without authority of law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The committee proposition is legislation. Certainly the gentleman will admit that it is legislation, because it provides not only for a past deficiency but for the future. That being true, we can perfect it by amendment. In addition to that, this amendment is only a limitation upon the expenditure. This is not strictly a deficiency item, but it provides that it shall be paid for cattle that have been destroyed and which may hereafter be destroyed. The item itself would have been subject to a point of order. I did not care to make a point of order to it and do not now; but that item being left in the bill, and the point of order not being made against it, under the rules of the House it can be perfected, and that is the nature of my amendment.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Under the gentleman's amendment the owners of cattle would get the full value of the cattle, and if they were thoroughbred cattle their owners would get the thoroughbred value?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; the price would be 100 per cent of the value, ascertained, as it now is, upon the basis of the beef value.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman's amendment does not so state.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Neither does the bill state upon what basis the value is to be fixed. It is accepted by everybody that beef prices are the basis of the value.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman does not so state in his amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Neither does the bill.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I would be glad to see farmers of Michigan receive the full value of their cattle; but I would not like to have the farmers of Michigan paid the milk value or the meat value of their cattle and have the farmers of Kentucky get thoroughbred value.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I would not have it that way, either. All I would have them paid would be the meat value, just as was stated by the gentleman from New York; and in order to cure the objection made by the gentleman from Michigan, I ask unanimous consent to extend my amendment by providing that the valuation shall be fixed as for beef cattle.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman had better make it milk and beef value, because they are also rated on their milk value.

Mr. MANN. Let us determine whether the amendment is subject to a point of order, and then fix the amendment correctly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Kentucky one question. The Chair understands that under the present law the Government is liable for one-half.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; there is where the Chair is mistaken. The law is that the Federal Government may purchase and destroy diseased cattle, but there is no law by which the Federal Government can destroy these cattle until they have been purchased by the Federal Government. Now, the Federal Government proposes to purchase, not by paying the full value but by paying half the value.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's provision is purely legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The proposition offered by the committee is legislation; but no point of order was made against it, none will be made against it, and at this stage of the proceedings none can be made against it. But when a proposition is left in the bill that would have been subject to a point of order, an amendment offered to it to perfect it is in order

The CHAIRMAN. Does not the gentleman from Kentucky understand that his amendment is new legislation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; the Chairman should not lose sight of the fact that under the rule, when there is an item in the bill that is subject to a point of order and which is left in the bill, that item can be perfected by an amendment which would have been subject to a point of order if the original matter had not been subject to a point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This provision is not subject to a point of order; it is within the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It is without the law.

Mr. MANN. It is mere appropriation; it is not legislation; it confers no authority.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The gentleman from Illinois is mistaken about that.

Mr. MANN. I do not think I am, and I think I know what I am talking about.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The law confers upon the Secretary of Agriculture the power to quarantine diseased cattle whenever in his judgment it is essential to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, tuberculosis, or other diseased animals from one State to another. This appropriation is to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for general expenses of the Bureau of Animal Industry. Under the law the Secretary in purchasing these animals, if he be able, can purchase them for half or one-quarter or one-tenth of their value, or he has authority to pay in excess of their value. The proposition of the gentleman from Kentucky is to compel the Secretary to pay according to a certain rate fixed in his amendment. It limits the discretion of the Secretary and it curtails his power, and is legislation within the rule.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has just read from an appropriation bill which was made for one year. It made no permanent law, and it authorized no future appropriation. The language just read by the gentleman from New York from the last Agricultural appropriation bill was to purchase and destroy diseased or exposed animals. Now, just that language is in the bill, and would have authorized, if no point of order had been made, an expenditure of the appropriation in that bill, but no appropriation for this purpose was made in the bill.

Now, they come along afterwards and undertake to put into this appropriation bill an item which was unauthorized by any other act or by any former act. As I said, no point of order was made to it, because nobody wishes to make a point of order to it. Everybody wishes to see that passed, even if my amendment should not prevail. But since the item is in the appropriation bill without being authorized by any law, a point of order would lie against it, and if no point of order was made, no point of order could be made against my amendment, because this authorization can be perfected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think the provision in the bill is in order and is not subject to a point of order as suggested by the gentleman from Kentucky. The quarantine law authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture and requires him to take such steps as may be necessary to prevent the spread of disease, including the destruction of the animals affected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Does the gentleman mean to convey the impression that there is any law by which these cattle may be destroyed without their being purchased?

Mr. MANN. I mean identically that very thing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The gentleman is in direct conflict with the authorities of the Agricultural Department, who say there is no law.

Mr. MANN. Well, I do not yield for the gentleman to say what I am in conflict with. The quarantine bill came out of the committee of which I was a member. The General Government has no authority, in my judgment, to go and seize property in a State and destroy it, but they have authority to quarantine it and have authority to destroy it when they purchase it. The law gives them the authority to destroy it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Authority to destroy it if they purchase it.

Mr. MANN. The law does not say so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The law has just been read.

Mr. MANN. The trouble with the gentleman from Kentucky is that he does not know where to look for the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. There is none except this.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to take the time of the House, but I have two statutes here on the subject, quite full, which the gentleman from Kentucky has never seen. I say that the bills came out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I remembered something about it, and the gentleman from Wisconsin, who used to be a member of that committee, remembered more, and he got them. We have authority to appropriate money for the Secretary of Agriculture to use in his discretion, but when you come to direct how much the Secretary shall pay for the animals, that is legislation and not appropriation. The item appropriating the money to be used in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture is in order. That is an original provision, because the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to destroy these animals; but a direction that the Secretary of Agriculture must pay so much for the animals is legislation, and not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. This is purely an appropriation bill, and the Chair understands that fixing the amount that must be paid by the Government would be legislation. The Chair thinks it is new legislation, and the Chair is of opinion that it is out of order and sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY.

For the emergency caused by the infectious nature and continued spread of the destructive disease of citrous trees known as citrus canker, by conducting such investigations of the nature and means of communication of the disease, and by applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as may in his judgment be necessary, $35,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to pay such expense and employ such persons and means, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and to cooperate with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers, or individuals as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purpose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on this item. This seems to be an entirely new proposition. Has it been considered in any way by the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I can explain the matter. This is to take care of a situation from the 1st of January to the 1st of April. A very destructive disease of citrus fruit trees which has been known for some time in Texas, but which because of the hardy character of the plants there has not had much effect, has extended into the Gulf States, and particularly into Florida. It threatens the destruction of the entire grape fruit and orange industry of Florida. The only way a tree can be treated is to burn the tree where it is growing. The tree can not be saved. The Fruit Growers' Association has raised some $30,000, which is being expended, and the Legislature of Florida, which will convene in April, we are assured, will enact the necessary legislation and provide the necessary moneys to take care of the situation. This merely enables the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry to take care of it from the 1st of January until the 1st of April.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, I am satisfied. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST SERVICE.

For "General expenses, Forest Service," including the same objects specified under this head in the Agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915, $349,243.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee for what purpose this appropriation is made? Is this an emergency due to fire fighting?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Entirely. The appropriation for fire fighting was $250,000, and a very excessive drought in the Northwest last year compelled the expenditure of other moneys, and this is to make good the deficiency.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF LIGHTHOUSES.

Lighthouse tender, general service: For constructing and equipping a lighthouse tender for general service, authorized by the act approved March 4, 1913, $250,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. Has not this lighthouse tender been appropriated for once?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it never has been appropriated for. This tender is the *James R. Mann*. [Laughter.] It was authorized in 1913, on the 4th of March. Since that time the committee has been willing to appropriate the $250,000, the amount authorized in the law, but the department believed that it was essential to build a larger tender. The gentleman from Illinois has effectively antagonized the legislation, and the department has come to the conclusion that it is impossible to obtain the larger tender and requests the appropriation for this one at this time, because prices are much lower than they have been for some time.

Mr. MANN. I was under the impression that we had appropriated once for this and that the department wanted an additional appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. It was in this peculiar situation, that the department wanted a larger sum, and we were willing to give the smaller sum that was authorized, and nothing was ever done.

The Clerk read as follows:

For folding speeches and pamphlets, at a rate not exceeding $1 per thousand, $2,000.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman why he makes this appropriation for $2,000. According to the testimony before the committee and the facts as I understand them, the Doorkeeper has expended thus far a little over $300; and he asks for an appropriation to cover the year 1916, and does not show any necessity, as I understand it, for an appropriation that ought to be included in an urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. MANN. How about the balance of this year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. He asked for the $300 mentioned by the gentleman from Missouri, and for $2,000 in all. He was uncertain whether the entire sum would be utilized during this fiscal year. It would depend entirely on the number of speeches requested by Members. Then he asked that in the event he did not spend it during this fiscal year that it should be made available during the next fiscal year. The committee recommended that an appropriation be made of the amount of money that he might possibly use this year, but declined to carry it over until the next fiscal year.

Mr. LLOYD. Did not the gentleman allow him all he asked—all that he might be able to use during this fiscal year and carry into the next fiscal year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it was necessary, because he could not tell just what the Members of the House would do regarding speeches—as to whether he would actually use $2,000—and he wanted to guard against the possible failure to use the money by having it available after the 30th of June. This bill is to take care of the current fiscal year.

Mr. LLOYD. This is a question that was asked by the chairman:

And the balance is asked for the rest of this fiscal year?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes, sir. The reason I asked to make it available during the fiscal year 1916 is, in case I did not use it this session, it will be available for the following Congress.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We do not do that. In appropriating money we do not provide that if it can not be expended in the current fiscal year that it shall remain available during the next fiscal year. That system absolutely destroys the fiscal year of the Government. Now, this sum is appropriated, and if it is required during the current fiscal year it can be used. If it is not required during this fiscal year and is not used, it is covered back into the Treasury. The money required for folding speeches after the 1st of July will be paid from the appropriation made for that purpose in the appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916 and not in a deficiency appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915 and prior years.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, the only purpose I have in asking the question is to ascertain whether the testimony shows that the $2,000 would likely be necessary to be used during the rest of this session of Congress.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It may be used after this session of Congress adjourns and still be used during this fiscal year. It is available up to the 30th of June. The Doorkeeper did not know and could not tell whether the demand for folding speeches made upon him would require the expenditure of this money. The committee recommended the appropriation of $2,000 to take care of any demand that might be made upon him up to the 30th of June, which ends the fiscal year. If any money is required for folding speeches after the 30th of June, it will be paid for out of the appropriation carried for that purpose in the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1916.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the provisions of section 5 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915 shall not be construed as applying to the purchase, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying vehicles needed in carrying out the various projects adopted by Congress for the improvement, preservation, and protection of rivers and harbors: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War shall, at the beginning of each regular session, report to Congress the number of all motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles acquired for and operated in carrying out the several projects adopted by Congress for the improvement, preservation, and protection of rivers and harbors, and the original cost of each and the year in which purchased.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order against this paragraph.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the provision in the legislative bill requires estimates to be submitted for the purchase, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles. In appropriations for rivers and harbors work the department does not estimate in advance; the appropriations are made and then they have to do the work. An investigation regarding this matter disclosed that, while an average of $30,000,000 a year is spent on river and harbor work, they have but two motor-propelled vehicles purchased, one a $1,200 automobile in the Dallas district for the Trinity River improvement, to enable the engineer to go from his headquarters——

Mr. MANN. They need that on the Trinity; they could not go by boat.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Somebody remarked that before; that is becoming quite ancient.

Mr. MANN. Well, it is truthful, of course.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The other was a $500 Ford automobile in Ohio. The committee believed that the peculiar conditions

under which these appropriations are made it was desirable to exempt them from the operations of that law.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I will have to insist upon the point of order. I do not doubt the merits of the proposition as stated by the gentleman from New York, but last year when the item went into the law I called attention to the fact that it was crudely drawn and nobody could tell what it would affect; that it ought to be considered before such a thing was written into the law. The only thing that that law has accomplished so far is to interfere with something that ought not to be interfered with and adding a few words to the appropriation bill.

I just wish to impress on the distinguished gentleman from New York the desirability of considering legislation in appropriation bills, at times, before they are enacted. I make the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman withhold that for a minute?

Mr. MANN. It is too late in the evening.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; that provision originated in the Senate.

Mr. MANN. It originated here, and I struck it out on a point of order. You went to the Senate and got it put back in again.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It stopped what was commencing to be an indefensible practice of nearly everyone connected with the administration of the Government who was in a position to do so to provide himself with an automobile at the expense of the public.

Mr. MANN. So that in the legislative bill this year every place where any money was appropriated for the department you include an item for passenger-carrying vehicles.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; but it does not open up the way for automobiles. I admit that the provision is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Illinois has no objection to this applying to those places where there really is no water in the river and harbor work, has he?

Mr. MANN. I understand that a very good argument can be made in favor of an automobile in connection with the Trinity River.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RUSSELL, 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. 20241) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1915 and prior years, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

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

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

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. UNDERHILL] is recognized.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. J. Res. 213. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House, including the Capitol police, their respective salaries for the month of December, 1914, on the 22d day of said month.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 37 minutes) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Tuesday, December 22, 1914, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting state of expenditures in the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1424); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Public Printer, transmitting statement relative to purchase, exchange, and repair of typewriting machines in the Government Printing Office covering the period from July 1 to September 30, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1425); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication of the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission—a statement of per diem rates paid to employees of the commission while traveling on official business away from their designated headquarters (H. Doc. No. 1426); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting a request that an indefinite continuing appropriation be authorized by Congress of an amount not to exceed one-tenth of 1 per cent of the amount of 2 per cent bonds converted under the law the first year, and that thereafter a similar indefinite appropriation be authorized not exceeding one twenty-fifth of 1 per cent of the amount permitted to continue while authority to convert exists (H. Doc. No. 1427); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication of the Acting Secretary of Labor submitting an amended estimate for rent of offices outside of the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 1428); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18747) to reserve certain lands and to incorporate the same and make them a part of the Pike National Forest, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1244), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 20241) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1915 and prior years, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 20242) to equalize the bounties of soldiers who served in the late war for the Union; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER: A bill (H. R. 20243) to acquire a site and erect a building thereon for the use of the United States post office at Wildwood, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 20244) for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at the point where the line of the proposed Duluth and St. Vincent State highways enters upon the Minnesota National Forest, and also a bridge across the Narrows between Cass Lake and Pike Bay, where the line of said proposed highway leaves said Minnesota National Forest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 20245) defining and establishing the judicial district of Nebraska and providing for changes in said district, and a division of said district into divisions, and for holding the terms of court therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 20246) to establish and maintain military training in the several States of the Union, in Alaska, and in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 392) to determine the construction of an act to increase internal revenue, and for other purposes, approved October 22, 1914; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 393) to discontinue the printing of certain publications; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Resolution (H. Res. 685) to amend the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: Resolution (H. Res. 686) authorizing the Clerk of the House to pay to Wilber H. Estey,

clerk of the late Hon. Edwin A. Merritt, jr., the sum of $125, being an amount equal to one month's salary; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 20247) granting an increase of pension to Laura N. Thomson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 20248) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Keys; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DERSHEM: A bill (H. R. 20249) granting a pension to Mary E. Temple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 20250) granting a pension to Robert Cowan, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20251) granting a pension to George H. Dry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 20252) granting an increase of pension to Anna Nau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 20253) granting an increase of pension to Stephen J. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 20254) granting a pension to Dora Hewey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 20255) granting an increase of pension to Levi Sanderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 20256) granting a pension to Elizabeth Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 20257) granting an increase of pension to J. K. P. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 20258) granting a pension to Andrew Howard Carpenter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 20259) granting an increase of pension to Hanbill Combs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 20260) granting an increase of pension to David Harrison Colby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 20261) granting a pension to James G. Caldwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 20262) to remove the charge of desertion from the service record of Edward Stanton and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PROUTY: A bill (H. R. 20263) granting an increase of pension to George W. Barrickman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 20264) granting a pension to Catherine Steele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 20265) granting a pension to David Owens; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20266) granting an increase of pension to William Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20267) granting an increase of pension to Esau M. Shelton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 20268) granting a pension to John Fletcher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 20269) granting an increase of pension to John W. Marks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20270) to reinstate Alonzo E. Wheat to his former rank and grade in the Philippine Scouts, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20271) to reimburse S. S. Buzzerd, postmaster at Berkeley Springs, Morgan County, W. Va., for cash stolen; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 20272) granting an increase of pension to William H. Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 20273) for the relief of the Shreveport Mutual Building Association; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 20274) granting a pension to Moses R. Hardin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20275) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Marks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20276) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20277) granting an increase of pension to John W. Cain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20278) granting an increase of pension to John W. Gahan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 20279) granting an increase of pension to Edward T. Wolfe; 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): Memorial of the Synod of California, relative to polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of Federal Council of Churches of Christ of America, relative to our policy toward oriental nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AINEY: Petitions of 100 voters of Troy, Pa.; 418 people of Wyalusing, Pa.; Rev. J. C. Bryan, of Le Roy, Pa.; and D. A. Ross, of Burlington, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ALLEN: Memorial of Ohio Building Association League, requesting exemption of building and loan associations from operation of the emergency revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Council of the City of Cincinnati, favoring the passage of the Hamill bill (H. R. 5139); to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 18003, for the relief of Sidney Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 19098, for the relief of Anna R. Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany bill (H. R. 12479) for the relief of Frank Klingler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of business men of Afton, Mulberry Grove, Lebanon, Keyesport, and Collinsville, Ill., favoring passage of House bill 5308; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, telegrams from churches of cities of East St. Louis, New Douglas, Alton, Greenville, and Edwardsville, Ill., favoring passage of House joint resolution 168, for nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of divers persons of Godfrey, Worden, Alton, Reno, Hamel, Edwardsville, Granite City, Venice, Sorento, and Collinsville, Ill., favoring passage of House joint resolution 168, proposing amendment to Constitution for nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of St. Louis Trades and Labor Union, representing 65,000 workingmen, against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of the Charles Ehlermann Hops & Malt Co., of 830 members of the Brewers and Maltsters' Union, of 480 members of the Brewery Freight Handlers' Union, and of 240 members of the Brewery Oilers' Union, all of St. Louis, Mo., against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BEAKES: Petitions of 750 citizens of the second congressional district of Michigan, in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of 25 citizens of Memphis and Palmyra, Mich., in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petitions of the Friends' Church of Huntington Park; the Friends' Sunday School of Los Angeles; the united Sunday schools and churches of San Dimas; the Methodist, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Baptist, and Christian Churches of Glendale; and various churches and Sunday schools and the Federated Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pasadena; the First Norwegian-Danish Methodist Episcopal Church, of Los Angeles; and the Methodist Episcopal Church Sunday School and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Compton, all of California, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of N. H. Bern, of New York, favoring civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Edmund Pfeuffer, of New York, favoring loan by United States Navy Department of a suitable vessel to be used as a training ship by the New York State Nautical School; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the German-American Chamber of Commerce, New York, favoring bill prohibiting export from the United States of munitions of war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of Mrs. Courtney T. Kitchel, 297 Ogden Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis., and Miss Marie Marchant, 297

Ogden Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of the woman-suffrage bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Robley D. Evans Camp, No. 33, Spanish War Veterans, favoring resolution to investigate the War and Navy Departments; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Petitions of L. D. Cole and 95 others, of St. Clair County; Y. J. Humphries and 74 others, of Croswell; Miss Lillie Brooks and 51 others, of Brown City; Thomas J. Coote and 137 others, of Huron County; L. N. Moon and 54 others, of Sandusky; Noot Gerger and 12 others, of Pigeon; J. R. Reid and 16 others, of Avoca; Adrian J. Bishop and 9 others, of Wales; O. B. Griffin and 67 others, of Vassar; L. H. Nixon and 29 others, of Almont; John H. Merrill and 19 others, of Yale; I. M. Hurt and 58 others, of Richmond; C. D. Summers and 52 others, of Mayville and vicinity; A. J. Williams and 38 others, of Memphis; Sidney D. Coa and 91 others, of Marine City; Arthur Van Blaricom and 23 others, of Tuscola County; Joseph Armstrong and 62 others, of Lapeer; Earl Clothier and 15 others, of Clifford; J. C. Fritch and 91 others, of Deckerville; Louis Weber and 36 others, of Elkton; A. B. Atkins and 7 others, of Atkins; Decker Thomson and 208 others, of Sanilac County; Rev. William Edgar Brown, of Port Huron; John F. Seeley, of Caro; Adolph Halmhuber, of Sebewaing; and Mrs. Sheldon Smith and 78 others, of New Haven, all of the seventh district of Michigan, in favor of the Hobson resolution for the submission of the question of national prohibition to the legislatures of the several States; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolutions of Rev. Sidney D. Eva and congregation of Methodist Episcopal Church, Marine City; Rev. M. P. Karr and congregation of Methodist Episcopal Church, Millington; Rev. L. N. Moon and congregations of Methodist Episcopal Church and Custer Church and other organizations of Sandusky; Rev. B. E. Allen and 80 members of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Branch; Rev. W. B. Weaver and congregation of Methodist Episcopal Church, Port Huron; Rev. J. W. Wallace and congregation of First Baptist Church, Capac; Rev. J. G. Haller and 40 men of Methodist Episcopal Sunday school class and 200 of congregation, of Lapeer; Rev. A. V. Brashear and congregation of Presbyterian Church, Marlette; Rev. B. E. Allen and congregation of Methodist Episcopal Church, North Branch; Rev. S. G. Livingston and congregations of Presbyterian and Methodist Churches, Lapeer; Rev. John E. Mealley and congregation of Washington Avenue Church, Port Huron; and Rev. F. T. Kyle, paston of Erskine Church, Bad Axe, all of the seventh district of Michigan, in favor of the Hobson resolution for the submission of the question of national prohibition to the legislatures of the several States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of citizens of Bridgeport and Hartford, Conn., against woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Danbury and Bridgeport, Conn., against woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Stamford, Bridgeport, Glenbrook, Greenwich, and Darien, Conn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of citizens and churches of Bridgeport, Stamford, and New Canaan, Conn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOREMUS: Petition of citizens of the State of Michigan, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey, favoring the Mondell resolution, relative to woman suffrage; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of members of the Adult Bible League of Pleasant View Sunday School, of Somerset County, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FESS: Petitions of J. C. Shewatter, Springfield, Ohio; C. W. Evans, Huntsville, Ohio; Morrow (Ohio) Methodist Episcopal Church; Ralph C. Jones, Morrow, Ohio; R. J. Mason, Waynesville, Ohio; E. J. Whiteley, Waynesville, Ohio; W. D. Piper, Springfield, Ohio; Cedarville (Ohio) Reformed Presbyterian Church; W. R. McChesney, Cedarville, Ohio; Charles A. Magovern, St. Paris, Ohio; D. B., M. A., and A. E. Magovern, St. Paris, Ohio; Charles Scanlon, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Young Men's Christian Association of the Ohio State University; T. P. Cain, Waynesville, Ohio; "Every Man's" Bible Class of Clifton Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, of Sprinfield, Ohio; T. E. Keelor and Peter D. Hatfield, Lebanon, Ohio, urging favorable action on the Hobson resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the Ohio Building Association League, asking that such associations be exempted from the tax imposed upon them by the emergency-revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARNER: Memorial of Guadalupe County (Tex.) German-American National Alliance and German Club, of Bishop, Tex., protesting against sale of firearms by United States to warring nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of executive committee of the Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas, commending Bureau of Animal Industry in its work relative to foot-and-mouth disease among cattle; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the Ohio Labor Home Rule Association, of Cincinnati, and Union Label Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor; Louis Wreghorst and United Brewery Workers of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of State legislative board, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Pennsylvania, favoring the passage of the Goeke bill, H. R. 17894; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Woman Suffrage Party of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the Bristow-Mondell resolution for suffrage for women; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Man Suffrage Association, opposed to political suffrage for women, and Marie Watson, of Monessen, Pa., protesting against suffrage for women; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Navy League of the United States, regarding baseless attack on Navy League in Congress; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the national legislative committee of the Antisaloon League of America and members of Ankaret Lodge, No. 19, International Order of Good Templars, of Chicago, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRAY: Petition of Rev. Harry C. Harman, pastor First Methodist Episcopal Church; Rev. H. S. James, pastor United Brethren Church; Rev. C. Raymond Isley, pastor Second English Evangelical Lutheran Church; Rev. M. S. Hinchelle, pastor East Main Street Friends Church; Rev. W. O. Stovall, pastor First Baptist Church; Rev. Conrad Huber, pastor St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church; M. D. Thomas, president Christian Endeavor Society of Second Methodist Episcopal Church; Charles M. Lyons, president Bible class of First Methodist Episcopal Church; A. L. Bramkamp; Mr. and Mrs. Francis W. Shepherd; James Charles; S. E. Nicholson; Dr. Joseph M. Thurston; John F. Holaday; Robert W. Randle; W. P. Richardson; C. Wellbaum; C. E. Newman; J. E. Eves; S. G. Curtis; Elbert Russel; C. Sumner Beard; John R. Jordan; S. A. Mills; Timothy Nicholson; Lenora H. Kenworthy; R. T. Davis; Mahlon Lindley; L. H. Bunyan; J. M. and Zelinda Glugs; Adam H. Bartel; Murray S. Kenworthy; Conrad Huber, president Young Men's Christian Association; A. L. Ellis, of Whitewater Friends' Church; Robert L. Kelly, president Earlham College, all of Richmond, Ind.; Rev. L. E. Brown, pastor Christian Church; Rev. W. D. Lewis, pastor First Presbyterian Church; Rev. J. F. O'Haver, pastor First Methodist Episcopal Church; Rev. F. A. Guthrie, pastor Grand Avenue Methodist Church; Rev. H. H. Peters, pastor German Presbyterian Church, all of Connersville, Ind.; Rev. H. A. Wingard, pastor Christian Church; Rev. H. A. Wingard, Bible school of Christian Church; and Ora McDaniel, all of Morristown, Ind.; Rev. A. W. Jamieson, pastor United Presbyterian Church, of Rushville, Ind.; W. E. Lisher and Davis Birely Table Co., of Shelbyville, Ind.; Rev. Elmer Mater, pastor Homer Church, of Homer, Ind., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of teachers and students of Elizabethtown (Pa.) College, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: Petitions of 200 citizens of Monticello and 100 of Newport, Me., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Petition of Young People's Branch of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Falconer, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HINDS: Memorial of church organizations and citizens of the State of Maine, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOXWORTH: Petition of citizens of Quincy, Ill., favoring prohibition of the Menace from the United States mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of divers persons of the fifteenth Illinois district favoring the passage of House joint resolution 168, by Mr. HOBSON, of Alabama, providing amendment to Constitution for a Nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of business men of Rushville and Lewiston, Ill., favoring passage of House bill 5308; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IGOE: Petitions signed by Eugene Sarber, of St. Louis, and over 150,000 voters of Missouri, protesting against the passage of all resolutions seeking to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to provide nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, a telegram signed by David Kreyling, secretary of the Central Trades and Labor Union of St. Louis, representing 65,000 organized workingmen of that city, protesting on behalf of the union against the passage of resolutions providing for Nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, a telegram signed by Thomas H. Gaus, secretary of the Brewery Engineers, No. 246, of St. Louis, protesting against the adoption of any resolutions providing for Nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Brewers' Union, Local No. 114, Providence, R. I., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of president and secretary of Branch No. 268 of Catholic Knights of America, relative to treatment of Catholics in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Mrs. R. G. Hazard, of Peace Dale, R. I., and Mrs. John K. H. Nightingale, of Providence, opposing woman suffrage; petitions of Mrs. Harriet K. Carpenter, of Peace Dale, R. I.; Anna D. Robinson, Edna Kroener, Annie C. B. Kroener, and Lottie S. Diekesman, all of Wakefield, R. I., favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petition of citizens of Apollo, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LEVY: Petition of citizens and manufacturers of New York; Cincinnati, Ohio; Brooklyn, N. Y.; and Louisville, Ky., against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Joseph Edelstein, New York, favoring "war preparedness"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of National Board of Steam Navigation, favoring appropriation for United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LINDQUIST: Petitions favoring the passage of the Hobson resolution from citizens of Stanton, Big Rapids, Onoway, Rosebush, Mount Pleasant, Hercey, Entrican, Lake View, East Jordan, Breckenridge, Clarion, Petoskey, Good Heart, Harbor Springs, Stutzmanville, Gladwin, Everett, Shepard, Traverse City, North Star, Ithaca, St. Louis, Manton, Copemish, Mesick, Pamona, Elk Rapids, Wildwood, Conway, Allison, Lake City, Howard City, Amble, and Greenville, all of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LOBECK: Petition of citizens and churches of Omaha, Benson, Blair, South Omaha, Dundee, Gretna, Springfield, and Valley, Nebr., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Mrs. Morgan G. Bulkeley, of Hartford, Conn., and 9 other Connecticut citizens, opposing woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: Resolutions of citizens of East Dixfield, Franklin, Boothbay, Phippsburg, Byron, Oxford, Norway, Paris, West Paris, Round Mountain, Glencove, and North Haven, all in the State of Maine, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAHAN: Letters from Guilford, Bridgeport, Hartford, Glastonbury, New Haven, Waterbury, Willimantic, West Haven, all in the State of Connecticut, in opposition to the adoption of constitutional amendment granting woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Monessen, Pa., and New York, N. Y., against woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of Corporation of Pittsburgh, Pa., against railway mail bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MURRAY: Petitions of Oklahoma Presbyterians and citizens of Sumner, Mulhall, and Stillwater, Okla., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Petitions of Division No. 2, Ancient Order of Hibernians, Oakland, Cal., and the Insurance Brokers' Exchange, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of the Hamill bill to pension superannuated civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, resolutions of the Nord-Oestliche Saengerbund of America, protesting against the passage of the Hobson prohibition resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Resolutions and petitions favoring national prohibition from J. G. Johnson, Francis W. Gibbs, Herbert M. Clarke, Raymond I. Blanchard, John Davidson, M. L. Dunning, W. K. Logee, John F. Vickert, George W. Smith, E. L. Clarke, Gideon A. Burgess, George H. Lewis, T. W. Waterman, the executive committee of State Sunday School Association, Sadie U. Rogers, Herbert B. Lee, Sarah A. Ward, Loren A. Clevenger, the Roger Williams Sunday School (330 people), Paul R. Pieri, Inez E. Lakin, Mrs. S. Mellor, A. H. Appleby, C. H. Keach, Gaius Atkins, William H. Fido, E. L. Marsh, A. Totten, F. E. Dodge, O. L. Paine, J. V. Prinly, H. J. Warren, A. A. Church, L. W. Roberts, John Burdsell, A. E. Hodgkins, Frank E. Farmham, Frederick Lockwood, W. W. Bowen, Alexander Potter, Lewis Wiswall, Alexander Hindmarsh, Thomas R. Simmons, Waldron C. Nason, Arthur C. Farmham, Mary E. Marsh, Ellen E. Chandler, Helen B. Waterman, Marion Germaine, Ada M. Field, Minnie Sheldun, A. M. Black, Margaret M. Schellinger, Georgia H. Murray, Fanny D. Lane, Mrs. Matilda A. Roberts, Ellen Rotch, Mrs. R. C. Manchester, Mrs. B. B. Hodgkins, Mrs. H. J. Warren, Mrs. B. L. Davis, Mrs. William E. Mitchell, Marietta B. Billson, Mrs. Nellie F. Farmham, Miss Sarah E. Dyer, Mrs. E. M. Farnham, Mrs. Grace Germanshausen, Ernest George Wesley, the Hope Street Methodist Episcopal Church (34 people), James E. Springer, and Clarence I. Brown, all of Providence, R. I.; the Shiloh Baptist Church, of Newport, R. I.; the Men's Club of the People's Congregational Church (30 people), the People's Congregational Church (84 people), William C. Gardiner, M. M. Tallman, all of Barrington, R. I.; Frank V. Crowell, of Warren, R. I.; Edward B. Ayler, sr., Raymond H. Ayler, Isabell F. Tenap, Louise J. Ayler, Alice L. Ayler, all of Portsmouth, R. I.; Mrs. Martha A. Philips, Mrs. Helen A. Hosmer, Mrs. S. V. Chaffee, Mrs. Alice M. Luther, Mrs. A. C. Potter, Mrs. Susie Ide, Mrs. R. Rossler, Mrs. Schyardson, Mrs. William B. Enos, Mrs. Clifford F. Leonard, all of East Providence, R. I.; F. B. Murch, Leroy L. Daniels, John J. Clarke, the Broadway Baptist Sunday School, the Fourth Baptist Church, Howard P. Norton, L. D. Burlingame, all of Providence, R. I.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts; Petition of 57 organizations of Massachusetts having a total membership of 6,241, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of 53 citizens of Leominster, 59 citizens of Orange, and 35 citizens of Franklin County, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PETERS: Petitions from sundry citizens of Columbus, Liberty, Belfast, Waldo, Cornville, Harmony, Ripley, Ocean View, North Penobscot, Sullivan, Hancock, and Wayne, all in the State of Maine, urging passage of Hobson resolution for national constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWERS: Petitions of citizens and church organizations of the State of Kentucky, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of sundry citizens of the third congressional district of the State of Connecticut, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial of First Baptist Church and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Holmdel; 131 members of Methodist Episcopal Church of Allenwood; 180 members of First Baptist Church, of Lakewood, all in the State of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Manalapan Grange, No. 19, Patrons of Husbandry, of Englishtown, N. J., protesting against taking rural free delivery from under civil service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petition of 234 citizens of Kalamazoo, 79 citizens of Charlotte, 91 citizens of Coldwater, 40 citizens of North Adams, 86 citizens of Eaton Rapids, 97 citizens of Albion, 37 citizens of Reading, 87 citizens of Osseo, 87 citizens of Battle Creek, 11 citizens of Camden, 98 citizens of Hillsdale, 47 citizens of Homer, 24 citizens of Jerome, 17 citizens of Somerset Center, 19 citizens of Pinckney, 7 citizens of Howell, 33 citizens of Vicksburg, 3 citizens of Scotts, 12 citizens of Rollins, 14 citizens of Hudson, 10 citizens of Mainton Beach, 11 citizens of Townley, 1 citizen of Addison, 23 citizens of Grand Ledge, 6 citizens of Mulliken, 11 citizens of Sunfield, and 4 citizens of Portland, all of Michigan, favoring national constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, papers to accompany bill for pension for Mary A. Tilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Petition of citizens and churches of West Virginia, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, papers filed in support of a bill introduced for the purpose of granting an increase of pension to John W. Marks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of First Baptist Church and citizens of Bowling Green, Ky., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma: Petition of 50 citizens of Crescent, Okla., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petitions from churches and organizations in the towns of Leyden, Great Barrington, Shelburne Falls, Lenox, Stockbridge, North Egremont, Westfield, Greenfield, Lee, Richmond, Cummington, Plainfield, Heath, East Colerain, and the city of Holyoke, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Petitions of citizens of Pleasant View, Plainfield, Roselle Park, Rahway, and Elizabeth, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petitions of sundry societies and citizens in the fifth New York congressional district, favoring national prohibition; to the committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: Petitions of citizens of the tenth congressional district of Michigan, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of United Commercial Travelers of Fargo, N. Dak., against any increase in cost of railway mileage books; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of United Commercial Travelers of Fargo, N. Dak., favoring House bill 18683, relative to election of Representatives in Congress and appointment of electors of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 22, 1914.*

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

Almighty God, all of our work is begun, continued, and ended in Thee. Thou art the Lord of life. How fully Thou dost hold us in Thy hand. We propose great plans, and Thou dost prevent us. We submit ourselves to the divine rule, and unnumbered blessings are showered upon us. We contend with each other in the sincerity of our purpose to live out a worthy life. We do not contend with Thee who art the Lord of life. Before Thee we submit ourselves, our all. We pray for the divine guidance that our life may be worthy and that we may hear at last from Thee, Well done, good and faithful servant. We ask these blessings in Christ's name. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (James M. Baker) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., December 22, 1914.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CLAUDE AUGUSTUS SWANSON, a Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES P. CLARKE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SWANSON thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer and directed that the Journal of the last legislative day be read.

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

NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 661).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting the report of the National Forest Reservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914. The communication and accompanying paper and illustrations will be referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game and ordered printed.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent that 1,000 additional copies of the report be printed for the use of the commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it is so ordered. The Chair would suggest that the report includes charts. Does the request of the Senator from New Hampshire include the printing of the charts also?

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask consent that the charts may also be printed. They are not very voluminous.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the charts also will be included in the order to print 1,000 additional copies.

SALARIES OF NAVY-YARD EMPLOYEES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, at the request of the National Association of United States Civil Service Employees at Navy Yards and Stations, a scale of salaries adopted by that organization in convention, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

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

In the cause of R. A. Jones, administrator of the estate of Solomon Jones, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 672);

In the cause of William M. Ross, administrator of Stephen M. Holt, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 663);

In the cause of Philip H. Andrews *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 664);

In the cause of John V. Apthorp *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 665);

In the cause of Frederick E. Bullock, son and sole heir of George W. Bullock, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 666);

In the cause of Elise Brammer, daughter of Henry Kroeger, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 667);

In the cause of Leonard H. Mahan *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 668);

In the cause of George B. Loud *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 669);

In the cause of Jerome Tourtellotte *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 670); and

In the cause of John Strang *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 671).

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6939) to reimburse Edward B. Kelley for moneys expended while superintendent of the Rosebud Indian Agency in South Dakota.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills:

S. 6227. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Norfolk-Berkley Bridge Corporation, of Virginia, to construct a bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Elizabeth River in Virginia; and

S. 6687. An act to authorize the Chesapeake & Ohio Northern Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Ohio River a short distance above the mouth of the Little Scioto River, between Scioto County, Ohio, and Greenup County, Ky., at or near Sciotoville, Ohio.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 6266) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to license cotton warehouses, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2651) providing for the purchase and disposal of certain lands containing the minerals kaolin, kaolinite, fuller's earth, china clay, and ball clay within portions of Indian reservations heretofore opened to settlement and entry, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 12050. An act reserving from entry, location, or sale lots 1 and 2 in section 33, township 13 south, range 4 west, New Mexico prime meridian, in Sierra County, N. Mex., and for other purposes;

H. R. 13222. An act to regulate the use of public school buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 20241. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1915 and prior years, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution directing the selection of a site for the erection of a statue in Washington, D. C., to the memory of the late Maj. Gen. George Gordon Meade; and

H. J. Res. 366. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to use any allotment made under the provisions of an act approved October 2, 1914, entitled "An act making appropria-