PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, against shipment abroad of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BELL of California: Communications protesting against any legislation to prohibit the Government printing return requests on stamped envelopes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce, Klamath Falls, Oreg., against any change in the boundary of Crater Lake National Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Associated Employers of Indianapolis, Ind., favoring militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of chamber of commerce, Los Angeles, Cal., advocating the formation of a naval reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of chamber of commerce, Santa Ana, Cal., favoring establishment by the Reclamation Service of an irrigation project to reclaim 100,000 acres of land near Victorville, Cal.; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of Bay Cities School Board Association, Berkeley, Cal., favoring national aid to States for vocational training; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of E. G. Buerkle, Whittier, Cal., also San Francisco Scheutzen Verein, favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROCKSON: Petition of citizens of Wilmington, Del., protesting against the bill for the segregation of the colored people in separate cars in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: Petition of W. D. Wright, John Jamison, and others, of Warsaw, and J. Boyd Stephenson, M. G. Smith, and others, of Weyauwega, Wis., protesting against House bill 20644, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of L. W. Llewellyn, C. F. Kickhoefer, and others, of Marion, Wis., protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petitions of Nicholas Meyer and 115 other citizens of New York City and American citizens of Paterson, N. J., protesting against export of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of New York City, protesting against circulating the Menace through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of Mrs. E. G. Strassburger, Mrs. William F. Hilgen, and 135 other lady citizens of the city of Cedarburg, Wis., asking for the passage at this session of H. J. Res. 377, to levy an embargo on all contraband of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Memorial of Woman's Missionary Society (Tenn.) Conference Methodist Episcopal Church, favoring amendment to abolish polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of Empire State Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, relative to national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of H. F. Shive and others of Palm Beach County, Fla., against S. 6865, providing prohibition for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of Holy Name Society of the Church of St. Mary of the Immaculate Conception, protesting against the publication of the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, against abridgment of freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of National Order of Antipolygamy Crusaders, of Columbia, Pa., favoring prohibition of polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry residents of Pennsylvania, against legislation abridging freedom of the press, from Albion, Allentown, Athens, Catasauqua, Cementon, Conshohocken, Egypt, Fullerton, Harrisburg, Jamestown, Lottsville, Marietta, Northumberland, Oil City, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Pottsville, Sayre, Scranton, Shamokin, Somerfield, Sunbury, Weatherly, and Wormleysburg; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of citizens of California, favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOBECK: Memorial of Commercial Club, of Grant, Nebr., favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of International Association of Mechanics, favoring changes in House bill 17894; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of William Ahrens, of East Granby, Conn., favoring bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY: Petition of St. Benedict's Church, Shawnee, Okla., favoring protection of the clergy in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Catholic Church of Coalgate, Okla., favoring protection for Catholics in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Urban A. Walter, Denver, Colo., against the biennial-promotion proposal in the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles,, Cal., favoring formation of a naval reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHREVE: Petition of Rev. Harry Marschner and 695 other citizens, of Erie, Pa.; St. Paul's United Evangelical Church, St. Luke's Evangelical Church, St. Benedict's Society, August Swartz, William Muellerstein, Alfred Stein, and John E. Wickles, of Erie, Pa.; O. H. Andrews, of Corry, Pa.; and Charles Oldach and others, of North East, Pa., favoring embargo on war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petition of 17 citizens of Coldwater, Mich., protesting against House bill 20644, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of Davenport (Iowa) Commercial Club, favoring legislation for flood protection and reclamation along the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of American citizens in Paterson, N. J., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *February 24, 1915.*

(Legislative day of Friday, February 19, 1915.)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there are very few Senators in the Chamber, and I think we ought to have a quorum before beginning the day's duties. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gronna	Nelson	Swanson
Bankhead	Hollis	Norris	Thomas
Brandegee	James	Overman	Thompson
Bryan	Jones	Page	Tillman
Burleigh	Kern	Penrose	Townsend
Burton	Lane	Perkins	Vardaman
Catron	Lodge	Robinson	Weeks
Chamberlain	McCumber	Sheppard	Works
Clapp	Martin, Va.	Smith, Mich.	
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smoot	
Gore	Myers	Sterling	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence from the city of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA]. He is absent on account of illness in his family. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND] on account of sickness. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. POMERENE, Mr. RANSDELL, and Mr. SHIELDS answered to their names when called.

Mr. SMOOT. I also desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], on account of sickness.

Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SHAFROTH, and Mr. DILLINGHAM entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. BRYAN. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of the absentees.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. HUGHES] has been called away from the city to his home on account of his mother's very serious illness.

Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. SMITH of Georgia entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19909) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, and Mr. GOOD managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 20347) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HAY, Mr. DENT, and Mr. KAHN managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 21491) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

S. 6980. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 7213. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 7402. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 21161. An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 21491. An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19909) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. GALLINGER conferees on the part of the Senate.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 20347) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. FLETCHER, and Mr. DU PONT conferees on the part of the Senate.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 20189, known as the river and harbor bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

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

On February 23, 1915:

S. 604. An act for the relief of Sarah A. Clinton and Marie Steinberg;

S. 926. An act for the relief of the Georgia Railroad & Banking Co.;

S. 1880. An act for the relief of Chester D. Swift;

S. 3419. An act admitting to citizenship and fully naturalizing George Edward Lerrigo, of the city of Topeka, in the State of Kansas;

S. 3925. An act for the relief of Teresa Girolami;

S. 5092. An act for the relief of Charles A. Spotts;

S. 5254. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to sell and convey a certain tract of land to the Mandan Town and Country Club;

S. 5449. An act to make Pembina, N. Dak., a port through which merchandise may be imported for transportation without appraisement;

S. 5497. An act authorizing the issuance of patent to Arthur J. Floyd for section 31, township 22 north, range 22 west of the sixth principal meridian, in the State of Nebraska;

S. 5990. An act to authorize the sale and issuance of patent for certain land to William G. Kerckhoff; and

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution requesting the President of the United States to invite foreign Governments to participate in the International Congress on Education.

On February 24, 1915:

S. 2334. An act for the relief of S. W. Langhorne and the legal representatives of H. S. Howell;

S. 4146. An act granting certain lands to school district No. 44, Chelan County, Wash.; and

S. 2335. An act to provide for the register and enrollment of vessels built in foreign countries when such vessels have been wrecked on the coasts of the United States or her possessions or adjacent waters and salved by American citizens and repaired in American shipyards.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19906) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee striking out section 21, beginning at line 14, on page 56.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Before we proceed to the consideration of that question I move a reconsideration of the amendment, on page 28, striking out line 13 to line 21 and inserting line 22 to line 3, on page 29. I desire to have the Senate reconsider it for the purpose of disagreeing to the Senate committee amendment, leaving the text just as it came from the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama moves to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate committee amendment, commencing on line 13, page 28, and ending on line 3, page 29, was agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I now move that the Senate disagree to the committee amendment, so as to let the House text stand.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question now is on the amendment of the committee striking out section 21, on page 56.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I trust that this amendment proposed by the Senate committee will not be agreed to. I realize, I think, that there are financial embarrassments connected with the administration of the Post Office Department, but we all hope that they will be temporary. In any event, it seems to me that it is a very unwise thing for the Senate to try, by reducing the pay of the rural letter carriers of the country, to recoup losses which may have been sustained. It may

be a trite saying, but it is nevertheless true, that the Post Office Department is the one department that comes closest to the people. The people have been exceedingly pleased with the Rural Delivery Service, and I doubt if anything that this Government has done in many, many years has been more conducive to the general welfare and happiness of the people than the establishment of the free rural delivery.

It is an open secret that the Postmaster General believes that it would be best to abolish the present carrier service and resort to the contract system. It is probably true that a saving could be made to the people if that were done, but it is equally true that that kind of a saving would be false economy and would not, in my judgment, be approved by the people themselves.

When this system was established, and for many years thereafter, a discretionary power was left with the Postmaster General, by reason of the fact that the salary limit was fixed in the language, not to exceed $300, $400, $800, and so forth, and in the last act not to exceed $1,200 for a standard route of 24 miles. The Postmaster General, feeling that he could accomplish an economy to the Government, has ruled during the last year, and under the law creating the increase of a year ago to $1,200 as the maximum for a 24-mile standard route, that he could impose conditions upon the carriers which will enable him to reduce that salary on many routes of 24 miles, sometimes to a considerable extent; and if he could reduce it a dollar, under his conception of the law, he could reduce it so low that the rural carrier's life would be intolerable, that he could not carry the mail on the route, and that the contract system would be at once established.

Mr. President, I do not believe that when we increased the maximum salary last year to $1,200 there was any other thought in the mind of a single legislator but that the Postmaster General was to pay every man who served a 24-mile route the maximum sum of $1,200; but that has not been done during the last year. There has been an artificial standard fixed, based upon the amount of mail carried, and other elements, all of which are exceedingly unsatisfactory and entirely unscientific. They can not be so based with any degree of justice to the carrier, because the amount of weight changes weekly and monthly, and sometimes daily. Are we going to change the pay daily, weekly, and monthly in order to comply with this artificial standard which shall be fixed by the Postmaster General? I submit, Mr. President, that that is entirely impracticable and that it is a blow, and a disastrous one, to the rural service itself.

I am so thoroughly convinced of the necessity and of the wisdom of free rural delivery that I am seriously protesting against continuing further this discretionary power in the hands of the Postmaster General. If the old law had been interpreted as we supposed it was to be interpreted, and as it had been interpreted during its existence, I would have no objection; but the Postmaster General, I repeat, has insisted that he has the power, and he has exercised that power, of fixing the salaries upon a basis to be determined by him.

Mr. President, a few years ago—I think it was not to exceed two years, anyway—we raised the salaries of the carriers and said we were going to give them an official status; that they were under civil service; that their status was fixed so that there should be no more juggling with it. I say to you what I have said to the carriers, that I believe we have now reached the point when we have provided to pay the carriers all that the conditions of the country will warrant us in paying them for some time to come, perhaps for years; but, that salary being fixed, I do not want it changed by an executive official, by a department head. I want the will of Congress to be carried out, as it was expressed in no uncertain language.

Furthermore, we have been adding to the duties of the carriers. We have established the Parcel Post System, which imposes additional duties upon the carriers, and at this time, with those additional duties imposed upon them, are we to say that their salaries shall be reduced when the natural argument would be rather in favor of increasing them? But let us make that status sure, so that there can be no mistake about it.

It is no reflection upon the Postmaster General that we shall put these terms in the law, because he has construed the law contrary to the intent of the Congress, although he has done it probably legally under the terms that were employed, but not under the practice, not under the wish or the desire or the intention of Congress itself.

Mr. President, I said a moment ago that this plan of the Postmaster General to impose artificial conditions, such as weight, is absolutely unreliable. I have here scores of letters from rural carriers. I am not going to give their names or addresses, because I do not wish to embarrass any of them with the department; but I think it will not be disputed that in the application of the rule that has been laid down by the Postmaster General during the last year there has been grave injustice done even as between carriers out of the same office.

A carrier who serves a 24-mile route or more, whether he carries a load of a quarter of a ton, or of 100 pounds, or even less, must maintain the same equipment. His operating expense is the same, whatever weight he carries. One carrier puts in the same time as another; he puts in the time which he has contracted to the Government; he has the same number of horses, the same number of rigs, and he is subjected to the same expense as any other carrier of mail out of a particular office. Therefore it is an injustice, I say, to impose artificial restraints which can not be checked up and which can not be established on any scientific basis.

These men write me letters in reference to the matter, pointing out the defects of the system that has been adopted by the Postmaster General. I understand, Mr. President, that the Postmaster General asserts that, if this discretion is not left with him, if he can not reduce these salaries as to him seems best, he may be obliged—his statement even amounts almost to a threat—to discontinue some of these routes, to make them triweekly or less often than once a day. Mr. President, I can not imagine that the Postmaster General would do such a thing. Certainly no such threat or suggestion should influence the action of Senators in the performance of their duties. There are other sources of revenue, there are other expenses of the Post Office Department which should be considered before we undertake to retain money that belongs to the carriers, the men who are working day by day in carrying the mail in the rural districts.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

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

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Mr. CLAPP. I desire to suggest this: The Senator refers to letters he has received from carriers. I have received a great many letters from men who are not carriers in defense of the rights of the carriers. This is not only a question of compensation of the carriers, but, even if it amounts to an expenditure over and above receipts, it is the one expenditure that goes to the people themselves, to the homes of the farmers and the people who live out from the cities.

I am in hearty accord with the suggestion of the Senator that there are other sources from which this amount may be made up, if it is necessary to make it up. The Rural Carrier Service is the one thing that goes to the homes of the American people, and their best interests, as well as justice to the carriers themselves, require that the service shall not be curtailed.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I am obliged to the Senator from Minnesota for his suggestion. I was saying that if it were necessary to make receipts meet the expenses of the Post Office Department there are sources where money could be raised, and where it ought to be raised, which would involve no injustice to anybody, but when have we undertaken before to say that the Post Office Department must in all of its branches be self-supporting or revenue-producing to the Government? Why, we are told that the Rural Delivery Service is an expense to the Government, that we are losing millions of dollars each year; that we do not receive by millions—probably by $20,000,000; I do not know what the figure may be; it is variously stated—as much as we pay out. Mr. President, if the second-class mail privileges of this country were adjusted we might receive into the treasury of the Post Office Department twice as much as we lose through the Rural Delivery Service. I have felt for some time that the Government should impose upon second-class mail matter what it costs the Government to haul advertisements through the mails. If we did that, we could reduce the first-class letter postage one-half, and we would receive enough money in addition to offset any loss that would come to us through the Rural Delivery Service or of any other service of the department.

The rural delivery, as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] has stated, is the one system that the people want. It is their system, expanding year by year; and, with the growth of the parcel post, if it is extended, as we hope it may be extended, the time will soon be here when the rural carriers will have to occupy their whole time and supply themselves with additional equipment, and the present salaries which they receive will largely be exhausted in supplying that equipment.

But, Mr. President, I think that most of us understand this situation. I think this is a bad place to come in and attempt to make a saving in the expenses of the Government by reducing the pay of its employees. We are imposing additional burdens upon the carriers; we gave them last year an increase of salary, with the idea that their status would be fixed, that

they were all to be affected, and that they would have a standing on the civil-service roll that could not be affected; and just as that has been established it is now proposed to put in the hands of an executive officer the fixing of salaries contrary to the wishes of Congress itself, thereby placing it in his power to abolish the Rural Free Delivery Service, if he wishes, so far as the carrier system is concerned, and establishing the contract system in its place. Such a change is possible under the unbridled discretion proposed to be given to the Postmaster General.

Mr. President, unless some Senator desires me to do so, I do not care to put into the RECORD the letters from carriers and letters from others who, as the Senator from Minnesota has suggested, are not carriers, but who are interested in the Rural Delivery Service——

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

Mr. TOWNSEND. Because, if the Senator from North Dakota will permit me, I have no doubt that every Senator on this floor has received similar letters and knows from his own experience just exactly what the conditions are in his own State.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am very glad to know that the Senator from Michigan takes the position he has taken. I wish to add to what he has so well said, that it is the people in general who are interested in the Rural Free Delivery Service. In the section of country from which I come the rural carriers are really the ones who are the least interested. Many of our routes are more than 30 miles in length; we have many routes which are 33 miles in length; and the farmers of our State have to pay the carriers additional in order to get them to carry on the service. That has been done ever since the Rural Free Delivery System was established.

Now, does the Senator from Michigan know of any other class of people who are doing more for their country at this time and have done for it at all times than have the very class of people from whom we are now trying to take the service to which they are entitled? We hear a great deal about the people and the advice given to the people that they should go back to the farm. The rural free-delivery system is one of the features that has made the farm attractive, and I am very glad to know the Senator from Michigan has taken the position that we should provide by law what the carrier shall receive. The Postmaster General has arbitrarily fixed the salary of carriers. It makes no difference to them whether they carry 500 letters or a thousand letters; they have to make the long trips; they have to devote all their time to the service; and they should be paid in accordance with the law enacted by Congress. I believe it is a mistake for us to make this appropriation in a lump sum and leave it to the discretion of the Postmaster General to fix the salaries of these men who so well earn the salaries that they receive.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I do not care to detain the Senate——

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, before the Senator closes I desire to say that I assume the Senator has not taken this occasion to make a set speech, but has brought up this matter for such additional information and illumination as may be given it. Assuming this, and not caring to speak upon the subject myself, I am going to ask the Senator to allow me to make a statement at this time in connection with his remarks that I admit would go beyond the ordinary limits of a mere inquiry. It is this:

In the Northern States of this country, where the winters are long and the farmers somewhat stormbound, there has been a remarkable degree of melancholy bordering upon and often termed insanity, undoubtedly very largely due to the lonely life of the farmer; and especially the farmer's wife, shut in as she is in her isolated home during the long winter months. I am credibly informed, although I have not had time to verify the figures, that it is a fact that since the introduction of the telephone and the rural free delivery to the farm homes of the Northwest the statistical insanity has absolutely decreased about 40 per cent, undoubtedly due to the opportunity for the interchange of views, the social contact through the medium of the telephone, and the daily receipt of the daily newspapers.

I thought that fact would be of value, and perhaps appreciated, in connection with the argument the Senator is making.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do appreciate, Mr. President, what the Senator has stated. I do not believe any considerable number of people in the United States will dispute for a moment the proposition that nothing has done more to uplift and make more tolerable rural life than free rural delivery. I am not going to spend any time arguing that proposition. I am going to beg the question, if you call it begging the question, and assume that that is so, and that nobody is disputing it. The arguments in favor of it are so overwhelming that it seems to me there can not be two sides to it.

Mr. President, this proposition of the House does not add to the appropriation bill. It does not add a dollar to the appropriation as it was intended by Congress—not a dollar. It simply says that this money shall be spent as Congress intended it to be spent. Is that an unusual thing to ask of Congress—that inasmuch as the Postmaster General has interpreted the law differently, Congress shall assert again in unmistakable language just what its intent is? That is the proposition before the Senate.

I think that this amendment, if it is adopted, should go in on page 30, at the end of line 10, in connection with the office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General. There are some things in connection with it that may need a few changes after it is adopted, if it is. I shall speak about that a little later; but, as the Senator from Minnesota has suggested, I have no intention of making a set speech, and I am not going to make one. I am simply calling the attention of the Members of the Senate to things they already know. I am only sorry that we have not a majority of the Senate present here so that we can briefly submit this matter to them and they may understand exactly what the situation is; but I hope we are all sufficiently impressed with the importance of the case to make no change, at least at this critical time, and especially no change which may eventually result in an abolition of the carrier service in the United States.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. I shall detain the Senate only a short while to express my views in connection with this amendment.

I have always been a staunch friend of the Rural Free Delivery Service. I was on the Post Office Committee that reported the first $10,000 for this purpose. I have watched its growth. I am one of those who believe that the estimates of deficiency or loss occasioned by the rural delivery are mistaken. Ever since rural delivery has been established the Government has been more self-sustaining than before in connection with its postal receipts. In charging up the rural delivery they do not credit it with letters that emanate from sources off the rural delivery route. I am satisfied that nothing has done more to develop the country, to make country life pleasant, and to make the country progress than the Rural Delivery Service. I think anything that would impair that service would be a great calamity to the entire Nation.

I have always been opposed to putting the rural delivery carriers under the contract system. About 10 years ago we had a terrific fight in the House of Representatives over a proposition to let the carriers be put upon the contract system. After nearly two weeks' debate, though all the members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads except two members—myself and Mr. Comer—reported in favor of the contract system, Congress, by an overwhelming majority, decided that the rural carrier system should not be put to contract.

The mistake of putting it to contract is that the carrier delivers the individual letters. He handles your mail. He handles your packages. It requires a man of character to have that responsibility and that power in handling anyone's mail. There is a vast difference between carrying mail in pouches under the star contract system and delivering it specially by carrier, who must be a man of character, a man with the confidence of the community, and a person that you think will deliver your mail promptly and properly.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. Let me inquire of the Senator if the star-route carriers do not distribute mail on almost every star route in the United States?

Mr. SWANSON. They do it on the request of the patrons. It is delivered only where the patron himself expresses confidence in the star-route carrier. As I understand, it is not compulsory.

Mr. BRISTOW. Let me ask the Senator again whether it is not almost universally the practice for star-route contractors to deliver the mail to every patron on their routes?

Mr. SWANSON. The carrier makes that contract; but I understand that if a man has not confidence in his star-route contractor he does not ask him to deliver his mail. In addition to that, the rural carrier sells stamps, and also issues money orders.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to say in that connection that there are star routes where that is not done, namely, the delivery of the mail to individual persons.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, so far as this amendment is concerned, the House and the Senate at the last session of Congress fixed up almost unanimously what they considered a fair compensation for the rural carriers. There had been a system by which this was estimated. We reached the conclusion that, on account of the parcel post, and on account of the increased cost of taking care of the horses, wagons, and expenses incident to rural delivery routes, a salary not exceeding $1,200 was fair to the rural carrier. There has been no diminution in the cost of operating these rural delivery routes. Consequently I am satisfied that the salary fixed a year ago is just and proper, and is not too large. The House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote, though it was subject to a point of order, brought in a special rule and fixed in this bill the salaries that we thought the rural carriers were entitled to 12 months ago.

I am satisfied that that is right. It was the will of Congress, it was the desire of Congress and its expectation, that these salaries would be given. They have not been given. The department had a discretion which precluded, in the exercise of that discretion, certain rural carriers getting the increase that was anticipated by Congress. Now, the House amendment does this. I shall vote to retain the House amendment in the bill. I believe it is right; I believe it is fair; I believe it is just to the carriers. I can see no reason why the rural carriers' salaries should not be fixed equally with those of the carriers in cities and the clerks and other employees of the Government. The disposition of Congress has been to exercise its judgment, its will, its thought, and its convictions as to the salaries to be paid its employees. The House bill does this; and I will vote for a provision that will let Congress fix the salaries of rural carriers as it fixes the salaries of other employees of the Government.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. The appropriation asked for by the department this year was, in round numbers, $299,000,000. The bill as passed by the House carries $321,000,000, in round numbers. In other words, if the appropriation asked by the department had been granted, the bill would have been about $22,000,000 less than as it was reported to the Senate. The Senate committee undertook to reduce the amount of the bill as passed by the House, and did so, by some $3,000,000. Among the changes was one to do away for this year with the automatic annual compulsory promotion of post-office clerks, letter carriers, and railway mail clerks. After the bill was reported to the Senate there came from these three classes of employees protests in large numbers, so many that it was thought advisable to call back together the Post Office Committee, and that committee receded from the action it had taken in so far as the annual promotion was concerned, thus giving back about $3,000,000. The Senate sustained that action.

There is involved in this controversy $2,700,000. If the House provision contained in section 21 prevails, you must add to this bill $2.700,000.

Mr. President, this is not an ordinary year. There are unusual conditions. I do not believe the Government should conduct any branch of the service for the purpose of making money. I believe the men should be paid a reasonable wage for reasonable service. But it is no secret—the Post Office Department does not undertake to withhold from Congress the information—that if this bill is passed, carrying over the estimate of the department $22,000,000 or $25,000,000, we are going to face an enormous deficit in the Post Office Department.

This post-office delivery service is a great business in all its many branches. It is confronted now by conditions brought about by the war and by other causes. Like any other business man engaged in conserving the interests of the business he represents, the Postmaster General says to Congress: "Gentlemen, this is a year in which we ought to economize."

Senators speak as if the Postmaster General was the enemy of the rural carriers; yet, Mr. President, he has established in two years over 1,500 rural routes. The record he has made in establishing rural routes will compare favorably with the record of any prior administration.

It is interesting to note that there are more applications for the establishment of additional routes than there are routes in existence. The total number of routes in existence December 1, 1914, was 43,814, and the total number of applications to December 1, 1914, was 66,945.

It is all very well, Mr. President, to speak of carrying this service into the country to the farmer, but you render it impossible for the department to do so when you place a burden upon it that the Government itself can not carry.

Now, what is all this row about? When the Parcel Post System was adopted in 1913, the rural carriers were receiving $1,000 a year. By reason of the fact that weight would be added to the loads they would have to carry, the Congress raised the salary to $1,100. In August, 1913, the Postmaster General again increased the weight limit, and Congress was appealed to again to raise the salaries of rural carriers and it did so; it raised the salaries to $1,200. But in every appropriation act since the rural service has been established the law has said that the Postmaster General shall pay "not exceeding" whatever the actual salary happens to be. Under that law, reading to-day as it has always read, and as it will remain unless section 21 is adopted, there is discretion given the Postmaster General to pay less than the annual salary stated because of the words "not exceeding" the salary authorized.

I believe I will state the position of the department, because I think it is only fair the Senate should have that when it is considering this question. The Post Office Department said you raised the salary $100 a year because weight was to be added, because it was thought the parcel post would increase the weight so greatly that an increased salary would be justified. Again when the weight limit was increased the salary was increased. Because of what? Because it was supposed that the weight limit, the weight of the sacks or boxes or whatever the carrier had to take with him, would be enormously increased. The Postmaster General said, "Now, then, if that was the purpose, wherever that has happened I will pay the maximum salary, and I will pay between $1,100 and $1,200 in proportion as weight has been added to the carrier."

It is shown in this report of the House committee those who receive $1,100 and the graded allowance up to $1,200. As stated here there are 43,818 carriers. There are given the full routes of 24 miles. The number of those who now receive $1,200 is 6,208; 1,404 receive $1,188; 1,631 receive $1,176; 1,982 receive $1,160, and so on. I shall put the statement in without reading it. It shows 33,286 carriers are involved, but that 6,208 are now receiving the full salary of $1,200.

$1,100	5,085
$1,104	1,607
$1,112	2,956
$1,116	2,045
$1,124	1,852
$1,128	2,191
$1,136	1,849
$1,140	2,393
$1,148	35
$1,152	2,044
$1,160	4
$1,164	1,982
$1,176	1,631
$1,188	1,404
$1,200	6,208
Total	33,286

Mr. President, it is easy to say that we are the friends of the rural carriers. I suppose everybody is; but there are other people to be considered. If you raise the salary of the rural carrier so high that the department will refuse to establish any routes where they are needed, I want to know who is benefited. No rural carrier, because he will not have any job; and yet you leave the people entitled to this service without it simply because the department feels that it can not pay the high salary Congress has insisted it should pay if it does establish the routes.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course it is true that an increase was made in the salaries of rural carriers; but is it not also true that we increased the amount the railroads should receive 5 per cent in the last Post Office appropriation bill? We have heard no complaint about that; that is, so far as I am concerned, I have heard no complaint.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the full significance of the question asked by the Senator from North Dakota. Congress authorized an increase of not exceeding 5 per cent because of the parcel post, and the department itself has never paid quite 5 per cent, but almost. I do not think anybody would say that if the railroads were being paid a proper rate at the time the parcel post was put on they should not be paid a little more money after it was placed upon them.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that a joint commission of Congress, constituted of Members of the Senate and House, after an investigation of over 20 months, have come to

the conclusion that, without considering the parcel post, the railroad companies were underpaid. I am not entering into that. They can take care of themselves.

So communities that are entitled to additional routes will not have them if you make it so burdensome that the department can not provide them.

So far as I am concerned, I do not hesitate to say that, as between the employment of one man at $1,200 and the denial of service to hundreds of people along a rural route, while I will remember the carrier, I will not forget the people entitled to rural-delivery service.

Sir, in the city in which I live the department, after investigation, has recommended three additional rural routes. A community has sprung up there off the railroad, without a post office, where 1,200 people want their mail. Will you tie down the department so that it can not put in that route?

Let us see what benefit this is going to be to the rural carrier. The chances are that by the inclusion of section 21 in the bill for that class of employees the rural carriers are being done an unintentional injury, and it will not take very long to find that out. Now, let us see. I undertake to say that the Postmaster General ought to save a deficit if he can. Pass section 21, and it is still within the power of that department to abolish routes. It is still within the power of the Postmaster General to reduce the frequency of delivery. You may say that on a standard route of 24 miles for daily service he must pay $1,200. He may say in reply, "I can save this money. I will reduce the frequency of delivery upon that route and make a triweekly service, and where the man is getting $1,200 he will hereafter get $600."

Mr. President, routes can be abolished, and they will be abolished. The department does not say that it will do that, but it would be justified in many instances in doing it.

This matter was before the Post Office Committee, and at first they decided to allow section 21, which fixes the rigid and invariable rate of pay. The Postmaster General asked for a hearing and came before the Post Office Committee and stated facts that in my opinion justified the committee, and will justify the Senate, in allowing the law to remain as it is. He pointed out to us that in a certain congressional district of this country there is a county with rural routes around every section of land running north and south and east and west. Take 24 miles, the standard route, and if one of these carriers has 22 miles and people living half a mile or three-quarters of a mile away are in the habit of coming to the road along which he passes to their letter boxes and get their mail, it will enable the rural carrier to increase his salary by having enough mileage added to make it 24 miles, and therefore a standard route. What does he do? He says, "Get up a petition by which I can come right by your house here and deliver the mail to you. Fix up a petition to your Congressman and I will bring it right to your door." Naturally the man falls in with that suggestion and gets up a petition, his neighbors sign it, and on a route of 22 miles somebody living a little farther off will petition Congress to make it a standard route, and you will have what is known in the department as a "tracer." The carrier will be going along the road if it is a mile to his house, and he will have that put on his route; he will go that mile and back and that will be credited to him in the standard route making the 24 miles. There are innumerable instances like that.

Mr. President, I do not know whether there is any use to undertake to argue this question. Congress seems willing to allow these rural carriers to name their salaries. I do not think, in the first place, it will operate to increase the amount. The Postmaster General stated before the House committee that if permitted to let out by contract this service he could do for $35,000,000 the same work, and as efficiently, as it is being done to-day at an expenditure of $54,700,000.

Now, sir, grant that these are worthy men. Grant that they are entitled to consideration at the hands of the Government—and I grant it—ought we for the sake of 43,000 men to inconvenience the millions of people who would get their mail, and who can not get it if Congress is going to yield to their demand and increase their pay? This is the year of all years in which the Post Office Department has the right to appeal to its employees to allow the pay they now receive to remain one year more. This is not the last year. This is not the last appropriation bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BRYAN. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. I wanted to ask the Senator from Florida a question just for information. I know the Senator from Florida has given this matter very careful study, as he gives to all questions with which he has to do. Is it not true that before any rural route is established it is inspected by a Government inspector and that it is practically laid out by a Government inspector?

Mr. BRYAN. I think that is true.

Mr. GRONNA. Now, how could it be possible for a rural carrier to establish a route in the way the Senator from Florida just described?

Mr. BRYAN. Just in the same way that it is possible for them, organized as they are, to come here and raise annually the Post Office appropriation bill from four to five million dollars for their benefit.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator knows, of course, better than I do that the routes are increasing every year. There are many routes desired in my State, I want to say to the Senator from Florida, that should have been established more than a year ago. I can say that of my own personal knowledge. But they have not been established.

Mr. BRYAN. Let me say to the Senator from North Dakota that in his State on December 1 there were 584 routes, and there have been, all told, petitions for 898 routes. If you make it so the department can not operate except at this tremendous loss, not one of them will be established and perhaps all of them ought to be established.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator from Florida has given great thought to this subject, and he is speaking upon it in a very interesting and instructive way. I want to ask him to put into the RECORD just the amount that will be saved at this time by permitting the law to remain as it is.

Mr. BRYAN. Two million seven hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator inform me further as to whether there has been any retrenchment or reduction in the expenses of the department anywhere else except in this service?

Mr. BRYAN. Oh, yes; I think several appear in the bill.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Does the Senator recall to what department or service it applies?

Mr. BRYAN. Let me say to the Senator from Mississippi there are a number of instances, as he will see by examining the bill. But this is no decrease in the salary of a single man in the employment of the Rural Service to-day.

Mr. VARDAMAN. It is a decrease from the salary intended to be fixed by Congress.

Mr. BRYAN. It is not the decrease of salary of a single man. It is saying to the Postmaster General that you can not grade these salaries between $1,100 and $1,200, and you must pay them all $1,200.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If I am not interrupting the Senator, I should like to ask him further if he was not surprised in the statement of the Postmaster General when he assumed the right to interpret the law in this way and refused to pay the salaries as they were fixed by Congress?

Mr. BRYAN. I was, Mr. President, because usually the maximum provided for was paid. But I can understand that the Postmaster General, in making his rate for the parcel post with a certain salary in view, could not expect those rates to be self-sustaining if the salaries were increased $5,000,000 a year. He could only expect to make two or three millions dollars at his own figures, but if you let him make that and then increase the salaries of the rural carriers, of course he can not do it.

Mr. President, it is undoubtedly true, I think the facts will demonstrate it, as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] knows, that the great bulk of the parcel-post packages never reach a rural route at all. They go between the cities. Sixty per cent are mailed out from Chicago and New York. So the feeling that this is going to add very greatly to the weights they have to carry has no foundation in fact, or very little.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me?

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, the Senator states, and I think probably fairly, I know intentionally so, that there has been no salary reduced, that no man has received less pay than he has heretofore received. May I ask the Senator if the carriers have not been receiving during the last year less salary than Congress intended that they should receive when it increased the salary to $1,200?

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator from Michigan is just as well able to reach a conclusion upon that question as I am. He

knows the law as well as I do. He knows the law has always read "not exceeding" the annual salary.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is true, but——

Mr. BRYAN. The Postmaster General had a standard rate of $1,100, and when last year it was increased to $1,200 he thereupon graded the salaries between $1,100 and $1,200 in proportion to the weight and the length of time it took to make the trip.

Mr. TOWNSEND. But that had never been done theretofore.

Mr. BRYAN. Twelve hundred dollars had never been paid.

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; but that rule had never been applied. Let me ask the Senator this question. The Senator said that there had been no salary reduced. If Congress approves the action of the Postmaster General in adopting these arbitrary rules, is it not possible for the Postmaster General to reduce the salaries even below $1,100?

Mr. BRYAN. That is possible; but, Mr. President, the Postmaster General appeared before the committee and stated that he had no such purpose and would not do it.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BRISTOW. Let me inquire of the Senator from Florida if the Postmaster General has not always had that authority since the Rural Delivery System was established?

Mr. BRYAN. Always. I stated in the beginning the law has always read not exceeding the annual salary. The words "not exceeding" have always preceded the annual salary.

Now, Mr. President, just one word. I make this prediction: I am not an enemy of the rural carrier, but, if I were his enemy, I do not know how I could better show it than to vote to adopt section 21. Some of their salaries will be taken away altogether and others will have their salaries reduced one-half. I make that prediction.

Mr. President, is it supposed that the Postmaster General will stand idly by and see a deficit mounting up into the millions accrue when he has it in his power to stop it?

Mr. TOWNSEND. May I ask the Senator another question? The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] asked the question as to whether there had been any curtailment in Government expenses elsewhere. May I ask the Senator from Florida whether, in his judgment, the discretionary power exercised by the Postmaster General in reference to the parcel post, the abolition of the second zone, the increase of weights and the decrease of rates, has not tended to make that deficit in the Post Office Department?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I do not know why the Senator from Michigan wants to ask me embarrassing questions this morning.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I certainly do not wish to do so. I will state it in this way, if the Senator will permit me, that I believe the Postmaster General's orders have had the effect of creating a deficit in the Post Office Department.

Mr. BRYAN. I do not care to argue that question at this time. The Senator from Michigan knows very well the position I took at the time the order making the change was made. One of the grounds of my position was that the Postmaster General did not have it in his power to fix the expense. He was trying to produce an income regardless of what the expenses of procuring that income would be, and I pointed out that the increase of a hundred dollars a year to the salary of each of the rural carriers would be $4,300,000 a year. I never questioned the good faith of the Postmaster General, and I do not question it now; but if he was wrong about that and I was right, or if he was right and those of us who believed otherwise were wrong, no good will come about by now discussing that question. He is right now, and I propose, if I can, to help him save this $3,000,000, in order that the deficit in the Post Office Department may be as small as possible; and, sir, I believe there is enough patriotism among the rural carriers to cause them to recognize the equity of the request to help the department stand the loss of this year, when business is disarranged and when the revenues of the department in all classes of mail matter have fallen off.

I recognize—I have seen it too often not to recognize it—the power of organized insistence for an increase of salary in Government positions. I know these men go into the rural routes; they discuss politics with the people to whom they carry the mail; they may influence them; they are organized, and the people out there are not. But, sir, you can carry a thing like that too far; you can carry it so far as to create an opposite opinion among the people who are now being served. A very good way to do that is to take away the service they are now receiving, in order that one man may receive a hundred dollars a year or forty or fifty dollars a year more, or they be deprived of getting their mail.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, there are some routes, more particularly on the Pacific coast, where travel is difficult, where the roads are bad, and where a compensation of $100 per month would be little enough for this service; in fact, it is not enough pay. There are, however, other portions of the country where, I presume, it would be good wages. If, however, the adoption of the amendment is going to result in curtailing the number of routes, and it remains in the hands of the Postmaster General to do that, I do not see how we would gain anything by making the minimum wage $100 per month, although in many places that would not be adequate compensation.

I was in favor of the amendment until I heard the explanation given by the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. In a general way we ought to pay good wages and require good service for it, and we ought to economize and cut our expenses in other ways. There are many opportunities to do so in the expenditure of the moneys of this Government.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

Mr. LANE. Just one moment. I shall be through in a moment.

Mr. BRYAN. I want to make a suggestion to the Senator. The Postmaster General says there are postal clerks, letter carriers, and postmasters who are trying for positions as rural letter carriers and who are willing to resign the positions they now hold, which shows that that position is not looked upon as one of hard work for little pay.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, during the last year I have received many complaints from people living in remote districts of the State from which I come, that their mail star routes had been discontinued on account of the prices which were asked for carrying the excessive weight of the mail which now goes over such routes in comparison with what they formerly had to carry. The Postmaster General has discontinued the routes, or has failed to receive bids which seem to justify him in their continuance. We have had much complaint about that, and it is important that we appropriate enough money to deliver the mail to the people of this country. It is more important that we do that than that we do many other things for which we expend money.

The Senator from Minnesota called attention to the fact that in certain rural districts the percentage of insanity had decreased. Twenty-five years ago I made a report, as the superintendent of an institution, on that subject, calling attention to the fact that among the wives of farmers and their children, and among the settlers generally who lived in the isolated portions of the State, more particularly among those living in the heavily timbered districts, where roads are bad and trails almost impassable, where they were separated from communication and association with other persons, where the husband would break away perhaps once a month and go to town and stay all Saturday night, leaving his wife alone in a district where the darkness was so impenetrable after night set in that you could not see your hand before you, oppressed with a deep silence so oppressive in the heavily forested districts, where no sound breaks the silence aside from the scream of the panther, unless it was a storm, which in its turn was terrifying—among the people in those districts the percentage of insanity in proportion to population was perhaps double what it was in other communities where they had easy means of communication.

In such districts, under such circumstances, to the poor, pitiable mothers with little children, isolated, driven in upon themselves, with no associates, no sympathy reaching them from anywhere, the rural mail carrier, with his horse and cart and bundles, perhaps of shoddy goods or cheap ribbons bought from some exploiting firm in the East, came as a godsend, and the Government can well afford to pay the money to carry the mail to such people. In their behalf I would vote for this notwithstanding the $2,000,000 increase, hoping to cut expenditures in some other manner, if I thought it would accomplish that object, but if it is going to result in the Postmaster General reaching forth his hand and shutting down on the number of routes, I would be afraid to do so.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] that it would be well that the Congress should be careful and discreet in making appropriations. The people in the South particularly are in a condition just now which makes it very necessary, if their interests are to be considered, that we lighten the burden of taxation, so far as it is possible to do so without impairing the public service; but I hardly think it altogether fair to make the cut solely upon the

officers who serve that class of our population—the farmers—who bear the greater burden, who produce the wealth of the country, whose labor maintains its commerce in time of peace and the majority of whom give their strong arms to fight the Nation's battles in time of war. I can not see the justice of such a proposition. It seems to me that some people look upon the farmer as a mere thing to be used only to vote and pay taxes. That, I am sure, is not the view of the Senator from Florida. A more patriotic Senator does not sit in this Chamber than he.

The rural mail delivery is the one branch of the General Government service in which the country people are most interested, and by which they are more directly benefited than any other function of the Government. It has done more to drive away the clouds of ignorance and misinformation, it has done more to elevate the standard of intelligence, it has carried more light and comfort into the homes of the patient toiler of the rural sections than any other agency of the Government, and, while we ought to economize, I repeat I do not think it altogether fair to commence economizing on them.

I do not think the rural mail carriers get any more than they are entitled to. The hardships incident to the performance of their duties is too well known to need repetition here. I do not think that $100 a month is more than a man should receive who has to furnish his own team and do the work that the rural carrier has to do. When the carrier is well paid he is going to give better service; he is going to make it more convenient, more helpful to the people he serves. While, as I have said, I do not want to add to the burden of taxation, and I also think we ought to economize, I am not going to begin here. If there were a gradual cutting down of the salaries and reduction of the expenses of the Government generally in other departments, then I should insist on the rural carriers suffering a proportionate cut, but we are not doing that.

As a matter of fact, this Congress is almost reckless in its expenditures. Notwithstanding our platform promise, the last session surpassed any Congress within the history of the Republic in the magnitude of its appropriations. We have created commissions and fixed enormous salaries, provided for an army of minor officers and employees, and otherwise made demands on the Public Treasury which should be done only in times of unlimited prosperity. Every idea of economy seems to be thrown to the winds until we come to treat with the rural carriers, whose salaries are already less than they ought to be. I am very much more interested in improving the Free Rural Mail Service for the farmers of the country than I am in providing ships to be run in foreign commerce for the speculators and manufacturers. In the larger things, and in the service of other classes of our population, and the employees in other branches of the public service this Congress has been liberal to a point approaching extravagance. I am not going to vote to cut down the salaries of the rural carriers who are serving that class of our population that receives less favors at the hands of the Government than any other class and who contribute most to the support of the Government. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the labor that tills the soil is the source of all material wealth. To the farmer we look for the products that feed and clothe the world. Not only is it true that his labor is the source of all material wealth, but the manner of his living and his environments make him also the source of patriotism, unbiased good judgment, and dauntless courage—the indispensable elements which enter into and make up that healthy public sentiment which writes the laws of the land and maintains the institutions of the Republic. For these reasons I shall be compelled from a sense of duty to vote against the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, in connection with this subject matter I think it ought not to be forgotten that the burden and the work of the rural carrier are continually increasing. The burden and work of the carrier to-day are far and away greater than they were three or four years ago when the service was first instituted. That comes about very largely from the operation of the parcel post. The Congress and the country are committed to the idea of a parcel-post system, and the burden of sustaining that service, it seems to me, ought not to fall in any degree upon those engaged in the Postal Service. It ought to fall, rather, upon the country generally.

I took occasion to say in this Chamber a year or more ago that the operation of the parcel post, unless some relief was had, would do one of two things: It would either create a great deficit in our Post Office Service or else it would reduce the service from the high standard that had heretofore been set. That was not in the nature of a prophecy at all; it was simply a matter of business calculation and computation.

Now we are confronted by a deficit in the Post Office Service. It is costing more than we have appropriated for it, and it will continue to cost more than we appropriate for it. The operation of the parcel post alone constitutes an unknown expense that we can not estimate for, and I doubt very much whether the Post Office Department itself can tell to-day within many millions of dollars what the operation of the parcel-post system is actually costing.

We have that system with us. It is largely a matter of discretion—it has been so interpreted on the part of the Postmaster General—as to what service he shall perform under that system. I think it was not intended that it should be more than a system for distributing small parcels through the mails; but it has grown and grown, until now, in certain sections of the country, we are transacting something of a freight business, and we are doing it at less rates than are charged for actually freighting the same class of goods in the same localities. That is true, and nobody disputes it. There are many places in the West where a 50-pound sack of flour can be transported through the United States mails cheaper than it can be transported by a freight wagon or a freight train. I do not know that that can be avoided, but it is inevitable that somebody must pay for it.

I think we may well expect to increase appropriations for the Post Office Department until something is done to equalize the cost, but I do not think we ought to make that equalization at the expense of the men who are actually transacting the business, and on a standard route, where the carrier is furnishing his own team, his own conveyance, and giving his entire time to the service. I can not for the life of me think that in these days $100 a month is excessive compensation. I hope that the amendment of the committee will be disagreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. WHITE. I was impressed with the argument of the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] to the effect that the Rural Free Delivery System should be extended, or, rather, I was confirmed in the view that I already possessed on that subject. He makes a strong argument in favor of extending this system. I quite agree with him, but I do not think it should be extended to the detriment of the public or at the expense of the men who are engaged in the service as rural carriers.

It has been stated by the Senator from Florida that if this amendment is adopted it will impose a burden of something over $2,000,000 upon the Treasury. No doubt that is true. Then, if the Treasury is relieved of that burden, some one has to bear it. Who will it be? It will be the carriers who are described in section 21 of the House bill, and who this amendment contemplates depriving of the benefits contained in said section. In other words, we will take from them, according to the Senator's view, about $2,500,000.

Is it proper that that burden should be imposed upon men who are receiving only $1,200 a year for six days' service a week, traveling a route of 24 miles or more, furnishing their own vehicles and their own teams, paying for the upkeep of the outfit, the feeding and care of the team? Why, Mr. President, it does seem to me that there can be no question that this economy should not be instituted at the expense of these men. Let it come from some other source, if it must come; but I say the economy should not be instituted so as to impair the service rendered to the public. The public are interested as well as these carriers. When you deny the laborer fair compensation for his work poor service must be the inevitable result. Fair compensation procures fair service. A meager compensation result in indifferent service.

Mr. President, this is one place where the money of the people is being expended for the people. There is no other expenditure made by the Government where the people receive as directly, as immediately, as proximately, as they do here the benefits that result from the expenditure. This is the people's money that we are spending. We are providing by it service for the people—immediate, direct service—and when we deny to its employees fair compensation we are injuring the public to the extent that the service is impaired.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an interruption by way of a suggestion?

Mr. WHITE. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the Post Office Service is about the only department of the Government which is expected to be anywhere near self-sustaining. The Naval Establishment, the Military Establishment, the Agricultural Department, the Forestry Service, all of them are creating every year what is termed in the Post Office Service a deficit, and the Post Office Service is far and away greater in magnitude and in importance and making for

the well-being of the communities which it reaches than any of the other services. I think we ought not to be horrified if our Post Office Department is costing us a few million dollars a year outside of the receipts that we obtain from it.

Mr. WHITE. I quite agree with the Senator.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WHITE. I will, if I do not lose my place on the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. I have no intention of taking the Senator from the floor.

Mr. WHITE. I know the Senator has not.

Mr. BRYAN. I hope the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming will be remembered, and that if, because of the unusual war conditions which necessarily affect the activities carried on by the Post Office Department, a deficit is produced of from twenty to thirty million dollars some Republican will not arise hereafter and say that it was because of the extravagance of the Democratic administration and the appropriations made by a Democratic Congress.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, a deficit in the Post Office Service can be met in the same way that a deficit in the Agricultural Service can be met, or in the Forestry Service, or in any other service conducted in times of profound peace, when we do from year to year meet here and appropriate millions of dollars, without reference to any war, for sustaining the particular service for which the bill provides.

Mr. BRYAN. I shall await the outcome with much interest and with the belief that hereafter some man will rise and claim that there has been an enormous waste of money by the Democratic Congress, and point to the appropriation bill and to the deficit contained in it. During the last Congress, when Republicans were pointing to what they designated as extravagant waste, did any of them call attention to the fact that the expenditures of the Post Office Department, which increased by some $30,000,000, ought to be left out? If they had called attention to that item they would have shown that the appropriation was not large as compared with other years. My recollection is that it was included, however, and no claim was made that we ought not to consider the increase on account of the expenditures of the Post Office Department.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator from Florida to misstate—inadvertently, of course—the position I take. I believe in the economical administration of all the affairs of the Government, but I think the Senator from Florida realizes that we can not expect to make a government self-sustaining. A government will not sustain itself. It must be sustained by taxes imposed in one way or another. When we are expecting no other department of the Government to be self-sustaining, how can we justly expect the Post Office Department of the Government to be self-sustaining?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, does not the Senator realize that the Post Office Department is perhaps the only department that is engaged in business?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Oh, not at all.

Mr. BRYAN. What others are there?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Why, the Agricultural Department. That department, in my State, is engaged in the business of manufacturing timber and selling hay, and doing a thousand other things. We do not complain at all when the Forestry Service of the Government runs three or four million dollars behind. We do not think anything about that; but when the Post Office Department begins to run a little behind, we must trim down to make it self-sustaining. How? By attempting to trim down the salaries of the men who are putting in six hours a day with their teams in the public service.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, of course it is delightful to hear these gentlemen——

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not mean to interrupt him.

Mr. WHITE. I know the Senators did not mean to interrupt me, but their colloquy having become somewhat extended while I was on my feet, it occurred to me it would be more agreeable to listen to them while seated.

I am not particularly concerned, Mr. President, in the discussion as to what position my colleagues may be placed in by their respective positions on this question; that is far removed from the issue we are considering. The question is, Shall the Senate amendment be adopted or shall the provision of the bill as it left the House be allowed to remain?

The Senator from Wyoming is right in saying that we are taking a wrong view of this question when we are insisting that the Post Office Department, among all the departments of the Government, should be self-sustaining; that is, that it should return to the Treasury as much as it takes from it. Neither the Navy, War, nor any other department of the Government yields any revenue to be returned to the Treasury. They all take vast sums from it. That they are helpful can not be questioned, but their benefits are remote; to say the least of it, they make no returns in dollars and cents to the people.

The Post Office Department, as I have said, is the one branch of the Government by which the people are immediately and directly benefited. This great department that serves the people so well and so generally should not be stinted in order to effect economy, even if a deficit of a few dollars should result from its operation; why, I ask, should Congress become unduly alarmed and seek to destroy its efficiency by withholding needful appropriations.

Mr. President, I am surprised that there is not even a greater deficit. I am surprised that the Post Office Department yields as much money to the Treasury as it does, and that Congress is called upon to go into the Treasury to such a limited degree in order to sustain it. It is the people's department of the Government. Therefore, we should not stint the people in the expenditure of their money. This is their money. It is not ours. This expenditure will be for their benefit. There can be no doubt about their receiving the benefit themselves.

We are spending vast sums of money, Mr. President. There can be no question about that, but I am not criticizing it. We are spending and have spent hundreds of millions on the Panama Canal. It was a proper expenditure; but, sir, that was a gift of the people of the United States to the world. When we are bestowing upon mankind this magnificent gift from the people's money, should we hesitate about spending $2,000,000 to retain efficient service in which they are immediately and directly interested? I think not.

Then, another thing: The will of Congress should follow the expenditure of the people's money; hand in hand with its expenditure the will of Congress should go. It seems that unless this provision of the House bill is restored the will of Congress is to be ignored and the will of a department substituted for its will.

I prefer to accept the views of the Congress of the United States rather than the views of the head of a department, however efficient, when the people's money is to be expended in providing service for them. I am not criticizing this department of the Government; I think that it is being ably and well handled.

Who can say that $1,200 is excessive compensation for a man who has to provide his own team and vehicle, feed his team and keep his vehicle in repair, and serve a standard route of 24 miles or more six days in every week? He must be a man of at least some intelligence, intelligent enough to see that the mail is properly distributed over this route; see that every piece of it reaches its proper destination. He must be a man of integrity and character; otherwise the mail might not be faithfully and honestly distributed. He must have energy and determination. It requires a man of energy and determination to serve one of these routes six days in every week, encountering the vicissitudes of weather. He must be a man of strength and courage; he might be called upon to defend, at the risk of his life, the mail in his charge.

Shall men possessing these traits, these qualities, be driven from the service for want of reasonable and fair compensation? Shall men of inferior intelligence, men lacking in standing and caliber be substituted for them in order to economize even to save between $2,000,000 and $3,000,000, when this service, covering the entire United States, is to be taken into consideration? I think not. The people of the United States are not calling for economy such as is sought to be instituted by depriving these faithful servants of theirs from receiving a fair and equitable compensation.

If economy must be practiced, we should not commence at the bottom, where the salaries are the lowest and the services are arduous, but rather at the top, where the salaries are large and the honor is greater.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. They have not been getting it during the last year. Has the Senator heard of anybody resigning?

Mr. WHITE. No, Mr. President, I have not. Possibly resignations were withheld hoping that promotions would be granted such as are sought to be denied by this bill unless the provision of the House bill is restored. Or they may have been withheld because these carriers, having given up other business or other occupations and having provided themselves with teams and vehicles to perform this service, could not dispose of them and find other employment. Possibly many of them may have remained in the service for another reason. They may have been men with families dependent upon them for their daily bread.

They may have had wives and children whose bodies had to be clothed and whose mouths had to be fed. These wives may have been sick, these children may have been small, and all of them absolutely dependent upon the carrier. Men surrounded by conditions like these could not resign if they would. Mr. President, neither have I heard of other Government employees resigning, such as officers of the Army or Navy, judges of the courts, or even Members of Congress, who, having given up their business or their callings, can not afford to resign, even if they believe their salaries were not as great as their earnings would be if they were following the occupations and callings which they had left.

For these reasons, Mr. President, among many others that I might advance, I trust that the committee amendment will be defeated, and that the provisions of the House bill will be restored.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, the statement has been made by the Senator from Florida, a member of the committee, that the effect of fixing the salaries as they are provided for in section 21 of the bill as passed by the House would be to curtail the rural-route service or prevent its extension. I do not know whether that is a mere expression of opinion on the part of the Senator himself or whether it is intended as a statement of fact. I should like to ask the Senator what warrant he has for making that statement.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I do not care to enter into the business of detailing private conversations. I place it upon the responsibility of the Postmaster General. What would the Senator from California do in the congressional district in Michigan where there is in one county a rural route around every section of land in it? Would he abolish any routes there?

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, that has nothing to do, in my estimation, with the salary that should be paid to carriers. It may be that there are a great many rural routes established already that ought not to have been established and could not have been justly called for.

Mr. BRYAN. I will say to the Senator that some of them have recently been abolished.

Mr. WORKS. Certainly, and they may have been abolished rightly; but what I am insisting upon is that that should not depend upon the salary paid to carriers, but upon the question as to whether the people are justly entitled to that service.

Mr. BRYAN. It seems to me it can very easily be appreciated that when people have been accustomed to receiving their mail by rural delivery it would cause confusion, dissatisfaction, and protests to officials against the abolishment of that route.

Mr. WORKS. There is no doubt about that; but that simply calls upon the public official to do his duty as he sees it.

Mr. BRYAN. The question the Senator asked was if I thought any routes would be abolished.

Mr. WORKS. No; my question was, What authority did the Senator have for stating that the effect of fixing these salaries would be to curtail or prevent the extension of the service?

Mr. BRYAN. I can say, so far as the extension of service is concerned, the Postmaster General said he did not feel that he could extend it where it ought to be extended in many instances; and, as a matter of fact, he is not extending it any now. Although he has made a great many extensions since he has been Postmaster General within the last two years, that is all stopped now.

The department claims that some discretion ought to be left to it, and it seems to me it was the intention of Congress in the beginning to leave it some discretion. It is one thing to go over 24 miles of paved roads and another thing to go over rough roads the same distance. You can not correct that inequality if section 21 is adopted, because then the man on the most difficult route will get $1,200, where it will take him 8 or 10 hours to do the work, just the same as the man who will do the work on a paved road in 2 hours. Some discretion ought to be left.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, this question seems to be a very simple one, as I look upon it. The question should be whether the amounts fixed as the salaries for these rural carriers are reasonable and just compensation for the services rendered. If so, they should be paid that amount, and the Postmaster General should have no right to abolish any rural route or refuse to establish another because, in his judgment, the salaries paid are too high. That is simply a question of deficiency in the revenues of the Government. So far as I am individually concerned, I feel that the carriers should be paid a reasonable compensation for their services. If it should result in a deficiency, then the people of the country ought to be willing to make up that deficiency by way of taxation, as the extra or extended service is for their benefit.

The trouble about it is that we are attempting to determine this question of the compensation of the carriers by the amount that is necessary to carry on the whole Post Office Department, and the attempt here to economize by reducing the salaries of the carriers in the rural districts to prevent that deficiency which is, to my mind, entirely unjust.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the Post Office Department might discontinue some star routes in the western part of my State, and, further, that the Post Office Department might refuse to put in operation some rural routes that have already been established in that State, because of a deficit either actual or anticipated; but, Mr. President, I am satisfied that the salary of $1,200 a year to the average carrier over the average standard route of 24 miles, considering conditions of roads, considering the work done by that carrier, is not too much, and that he should receive for that average distance traveled in carrying the mail and the work done; considering, too, the equipment which he furnishes, the sum of $1,200 for his work.

I should not object, Mr. President, to some discretion on the part of the Postmaster General, but when a maximum sum of $1,200 was suggested with a minimum sum, between which maximum and minimum the Postmaster General might exercise some discretion in fixing compensation on account of the condition of the roads or on account of the weight of the mail carried, the suggestion was not taken kindly to; but it appeared that the Postmaster General wanted the broad discretion to fix the salary anywhere from $1,200 on down without any limitation.

Mr. President, I think this is too wide a discretion to give the Postmaster General. It is more a matter of legislation than administration to fix these salaries. If they are not to be fixed within certain reasonable limits, then I favor the compensation as fixed by the House. For the reason that the committee amendment gives the Postmaster General too wide a discretion, I am opposed to it and am in favor of the House provision.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I have, perhaps, followed the development of the rural carrier service as closely as any Member of this body. I have been a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads for nearly 18 years, and during a large part of the time I was chairman of the committee. When I was assigned to duty upon the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads the appropriation was considerably under $100,000,000, but so rapidly was this service developing that the committee viewed with alarm the time when the annual appropriations for this strictly business end of the American Government would pass the $100,000,000 mark. The comparatively brief period of 18 years marks a gigantic development in the history of the Post Office Department. From eighty or ninety million dollars of annual appropriation 18 years ago the present bill, according to the committee, aggregates the sum of $317,948,869.

The business of the Post Office Department is to a great extent a barometer of the business of the country. Its extraordinary development is a measure of the commercial growth of our country during the last 18 years.

The rural carrier service was started in a small and humble way after prolonged discussion and agitation. It was thought that it might furnish temporary employment to a farmer or the son of a farmer who might in a desultory way carry the mails through the rural districts. As no one dreamed 18 years ago that the expenditures of the department would be over $317,000,000 to-day, so no one dreamed when the seed was planted for the Rural Delivery Service that in a very few years, much less than 18 years, a period represented by a decade, the appropriation would exceed considerably over $50,000,000 for the Rural Service.

Yet, Mr. President, not withstanding the great doubts which were at the time entertained by many sincere men as to whether this service was not likely to cost more than it was worth, and was not a luxury that was really not demanded by the people, and would entail a lavish expenditure; notwithstanding the fact that the actual expenditure and appropriation has exceeded the enormous total of over $50,000,000, there is not a Member of this body who would raise his voice to abolish it or curtail it.

The employees of the service have grown from badly organized and untrained young men, who were first enlisted to carry the mail, into a well-trained, well-disciplined responsible body of rural carriers, who, in my opinion, are as hard working, conscientious, honest, and deserving a class of postal employees as any in the service of the American Government. Their responsibilities are very great. The standard route is supposed to be 24 miles. In I think over 50 per cent of the cases it is much over that.

I am informed on responsible authority that 50 per cent of the routes in operation are in excess of 24 miles, and that quite a large number are 30 miles, and some 36 miles, and some even more in length.

These rural carriers are exposed to all the inclemencies of weather. They are out every day. The mail has to be delivered. They are at their own expense for horses and vehicles, very largely, and no one who has investigated their condition can, in my opinion, reach any other conclusion than that these men are not overpaid in any of the schedules under which they work.

I received, I think, in the first session of this Congress, when I made a careful investigation of this matter, nearly 1,500 or 2,000 letters from rural carriers, chiefly in Pennsylvania. These letters were written by the men themselves. They were intelligently written. They were written in considerable detail, giving most intresting facts regarding the various character of roads and highways, from the good macadam road or the asphalt boulevard to the dirt road which was nearly impassable in the springtime, from the level country to the difficult roads over the Allegheny Mountains, details in regard to the strain and stress on the horse and on the vehicle, common-sense statements which, if I cared to burden the RECORD or occupy the time of the Senate by reading even some of these communications as a sample, would persuade every Senator—aye, and convince him—that these men are worthy of all that Congress has heretofore done for them.

Originally, by the act of April 21, 1902, the Postmaster General was authorized to classify the Rural Delivery Service and fix the compensation of the employees in such service. That was one of the earliest efforts to bring into a disciplined organized army this great body of efficient and industrious postal employees. It was my pleasure, as I have said, and my opportunity to participate in that early legislation.

Then in 1912, 10 years afterwards, another distinct step in the development and advancement of this branch of the Postal Service was made. After years of representation by the rural carriers and their friends, after a decade of experimenting, the salary was made by the act to which I have referred, which provided that letter carriers of the Rural Delivery Service shall receive a salary not exceeding $1,100 per annum.

Then another step was taken. I ought to remind the Senate, Mr. President, that this progress was slow, that 10 to 15 years have been taken in the careful investigation, in the thorough discussion, in the committee of the House and committee of the Senate, and in long-drawn-out and often bitter contentions in conference committees of the two Houses on the Post Office appropriation bill to bring about a steady develcpment on the lines which we now have embodied in the laws of Congress.

This growth has not been hastily taken. It is the mature thought and conclusion of men of great experience in the House and Senate concerning postal matters, and following out those conclusions and the experience of years the act approved March 9, 1914, provided:

For pay of letter carriers, substitutes for carriers on annual leave, clerks in charge of substations, and tolls and ferriage, Rural Delivery Service, $53,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $20,000 of the amount hereby appropriated may be used for compensation of clerks in charge of substations: *Provided*, That on and after July 1, 1914, letter carriers of the Rural Delivery Service shall receive a salary not exceeding $1,200 per annum.

So it was the final and best thought of Congress, the conclusions of the two committees of either branch of Congress, the most recent verdict that these men should receive a maximum salary of $1,200. No one familiar with their duties, as has been stated earlier in the morning by several Senators, who have spoken on this question, can contend for a single moment that that maximum salary is too large for the man who has to cover a route from 24 to 36 miles in length, in many cases exposed the greater part of the year to inclement conditions of weather and on roads that are often nearly impassable.

But notwithstanding this decision of Congress by men who would be admitted to be experts by nearly anyone in either branch of Congress, on account of their years of familiarity on either of the committees in the House or Senate, the Post Office Department, and I have no doubt that they had the best intentions in the world, although I disagree with them, proceeded to nullify absolutely the purpose of Congress.

I have here the order of the Postmaster General, dated November 4, 1914, in which an effort is made to modify the schedules based on the length of route by a schedule based on the pieces of mail per month and the pounds of mail per month, an arbitrary and, in my judgment, an entirely unjust schedule, so far as the carriers are concerned. It is impossible to make any fair estimate based on the number of pieces carried. These vary with the seasons. During the Christmas holidays they are almost beyond the strength of the ordinary man, and at other seasons of the year they fall off very much. The number of pieces or the pounds of mail per month might not come up to the maximum fixed by the department's order, and yet the carrier is compelled to travel his route whether it be 4 miles or 34 miles, and feed his horse, pay for the repairs of his vehicle, and go ahead every day, regardless of whether he is doing a large amount of carriage or a small amount.

I will ask permission to insert as a part of my remarks the order of the Postmaster General fixing the schedules based upon pounds of mail per month and pieces of mail per month, in order not to take up the time of the Senate by reading it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Order No. 8451.]

NOVEMBER 4, 1914.

Order No. 8246, of July 14, 1914, is amended to read as follows:

On and after November 1, 1914, the compensation of rural carriers shall be based upon the length of the routes, the time required to serve them in accordance with the authorized official schedules, and the number of pieces and the weight of mail carried as shown by the records of the department.

The rates of pay shall be computed and fixed according to the following schedule:

Schedule.

Length of route.	Salary base.	Pieces of mail per month.	Pounds of mail per month.
4 miles and less than 6 miles	$480	3,000	400
6 miles and less than 8 miles	528	3,700	490
8 miles and less than 10 miles	576	4,400	580
10 miles and less than 12 miles	624	5,100	670
12 miles and less than 14 miles	672	5,800	760
14 miles and less than 16 miles	720	6,500	850
16 miles and less than 18 miles	840	7,200	940
18 miles and less than 20 miles	960	7,900	1,030
20 miles and less than 22 miles	1,080	8,600	1,120
22 miles and less than 24 miles	1,152	9,300	1,210
24 miles and over	1,200	10,000	1,300

An increase or decrease of $12 per annum shall be made for each 1,000 pieces and for each 100 pounds, respectively, greater or less than the schedule, with an allowance of $12 per annum for each closed pouch or closed sack of mail carried per day, and also for each full mile of route served in excess of 25 miles in length: *Provided*, That no carrier shall be reduced in compensation below the schedule in effect June 30, 1914, because of this order, and that $1,200 per annum shall be the maximum salary.

A carrier serving one triweekly route shall be paid on the basis and subject to the above conditions for a route one-half the length of the route served by him, and a carrier serving two triweekly routes shall be paid on the basis and subject to the above conditions for a route one-half the combined length of the two routes.

In addition to the foregoing the following are hereby established as the official time bases for serving routes, and shall begin with the time of leaving and end with the time of return to the office or station.

LENGTH OF ROUTE AND TIME BASES.

Twenty-four miles and over, six and one-half hours a day.
Twenty-two miles and less than twenty-four miles, six hours a day.
Twenty miles and less than twenty-two miles, five and one-half hours a day.
Eighteen miles and less than twenty miles, five hours a day.
Sixteen miles and less than eighteen miles, four and one-half hours a day.
Fourteen miles and less than sixteen miles, four hours a day.
Twelve miles and less than fourteen miles, three and one-half hours a day.
Ten miles and less than twelve miles, three hours a day.
Eight miles and less than ten miles, two and one-half hours a day.
Six miles and less than eight miles, two hours a day.
Four miles and less than six miles, one and one-half hours a day.

When under the present or future schedules as fixed by the department additional time is required to serve any route, the carrier shall be entitled to $12 per annum for each one-half hour thus authorized in excess of that named in the time base.

The compensation of carriers on newly established routes shall be at the rates in effect June 30, 1914.

A. S. BURLESON,
Postmaster General.

Mr. PENROSE. Now, the question before the Senate is on disagreeing to the committee amendment and to restore section 21 as it came over from the House of Representatives. This provision of the House bill is, I believe, identical with an amendment which I introduced in the Senate as early as August 17, 1914, providing for the salaries of rural carriers. I have not compared the House provision with my amendment with sufficient care to say that it is absolutely the same, but it is based upon the same principle, and for all practical purposes they are identical. I will ask to have this amendment, presented by me long before this question came up for consideration in the pending bill, inserted in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

That on and after July 1, 1914, the compensation of each rural letter carrier for serving a standard route of 24 miles and over, six days in the week, shall be $1,200 per annum, payable monthly; on routes 22 miles and less than 24 miles, $1,152; on routes 20 miles

and less than 22 miles, $1,080; on routes 18 miles and less than 20 miles, $960; on routes 16 miles and less than 18 miles, $840; on routes 14 miles and less than 16 miles, $720; on routes 12 miles and less than 14 miles, $672; on routes 10 miles and less than 12 miles, $624; on routes 8 miles and less than 10 miles, $576; on routes 6 miles and less than 8 miles, $528; on routes 4 miles and less than 6 miles, $480. A rural letter carrier serving one triweekly route shall be paid on the basis for a route one-half the length of the route served by him, and a carrier serving two triweekly routes shall be paid on the basis for a route one-half of the combined length of the two routes: *Provided*, That, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, the pay of carriers who furnish and maintain their own motor vehicles and who serve routes not less than 50 miles in length may be fixed at not exceeding $1,800 per annum: *Provided further*, That the salaries of rural letter carriers shall be based on the length of route served, regardless of the number of pieces or pounds of mail handled.

Mr. PENROSE. Perhaps the clearest statement that could be made of the reasons against departing from the schedules fixed by the House of Representatives and giving this very great and unlimited power to the Postmaster General to classify these employees and expend as he may see fit, on classifications of his own or on a system of star-route contracts, the enormous sum of money appropriated for this service, can be found in a communication addressed to me as a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, from W. D. Brown, editor of the Rural Free Delivery News. This paper, I am informed, is the official organ of the National Rural Letters Carriers' Association. It is the official organ of the rural carriers of the State associations and also the official organ of hundreds of county associations of rural carriers. It represents very largely and, I take it, officially the views of the 43,000 rural carriers in the United States. I call the attention of the Senate to a very careful consideration of Mr. Brown's communication. The letter is not very long, and I ask the Secretary to read the communication.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read it.

The Secretary read as follows:

RURAL FREE DELIVERY NEWS,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1915.

Hon. BOIES PENROSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I beg leave to call your attention to one feature of the Post Office appropriation bill which, as a member of the Senate Post Office Committee, I would like to have you consider favorably.

Last March the Senate amended the Post Office appropriation bill, fixing the pay of rural letter carriers at $1,200 per year for standard routes of 24 miles or more in length, and a proportionate increase for routes of less length. This amendment was concurred in by the House and became a law. Anticipating the increased salary, many rural carriers purchased new equipment so as to make a more creditable appearance and render more satisfactory and efficient service. This increase was expected to become effective July 1, 1914, but instead of following the established schedule, as Congress manifestly expected him to do, the Postmaster General adopted a new basis of compensation for carriers, which withheld about 65 per cent of the increased pay intended by Congress.

When the Postmaster General's course became known the House took prompt action, and on August 10 passed a bill fixing rural carriers' pay specifically upon 2-mile gradations and removing all discretion from the Postmaster General This provision was included in the railway mail pay bill, which now awaits action by the Senate Post Office Committee and was intended to become effective at the beginning of the current fiscal year, July 1, 1914.

The Post Office appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1916, as passed by the House, also definitely fixes rural carriers' pay on 2-mile gradations, and I respectfully ask your support of that provision, making same retroactive and to become effective July 1, 1914, in harmony with the action of the House.

I respectfully submit that the new schedule of pay arranged by the Postmaster General, which includes three separate units, namely, length of route, number of pieces of mail handled monthly and weight of same, is unfair. Furthermore, I have received a large number of complaints from carriers to the effect that even this new schedule is not being faithfully observed.

Carriers are required to provide all their own equipment and to cover their full routes daily, regardless of weather or road conditions, and mileage and average road conditions throughout the year should be controlling factors in the adjustment of the pay. It makes little difference to the carrier whether his daily mail be large or small, but the length of his route and condition of his roads have an important bearing upon the durability and cost of repair or replacement of his equipment. When a wagon breaks down or a horse dies the cost falls upon the carrier alone. Many such casualties occur each year.

It has been asserted that rural delivery service is conducted at a loss of $40,000,000 per year. Based upon the system of computation now in use, that claim may be true. At present rural carriers are only allowed credit for mail collected on their routes and carried to the post office for dispatch or delivery. When it is understood that such collections do not equal 20 per cent of the mail carried from the post office for delivery on their routes, it will be seen that any such basis of calculation is entirely unfair. Farmers may telephone orders to local merchants for desired articles and have same forwarded by parcel post. The carrier handles all such parcels, but is allowed no credit for same. Is this fair?

You may not be aware that recently the Postmaster General arranged a new schedule for rural delivery, fixing the maximum time on a route of 24 miles or more in length at six hours and one-half. As about 50 per cent of the number of routes in operation are in excess of 24 miles, quite a large number being 30 miles and some 36 miles and even more in length, it is plain that this time schedule will add greatly to the equipment cost of rural letter carriers. Horses and vehicles can not stand the strain.

The volume of mail handled by rural carriers varies at different seasons of the year, and to adhere strictly to the Postmaster General's present scale of pay would necessitate frequent readjustments. Carriers are liable to be penalized for conditions for which they are not responsible, and I respectfully submit that in fairness to them a straight-out salary scale, such as has been passed by the House, is far better than the Postmaster General's plan. It will require no additional appropriation for the current fiscal year to fix the salaries as Congress intended. The House already has passed a bill giving all rural carriers a level increase in pay of 9 per cent and making same effective July 1, 1914, the beginning of the present fiscal year, and I earnestly solicit your support of this measure in the carriers' behalf.

Thanking you in advance for your interest, I am,

Sincerely, yours,

W. D. BROWN.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, before I proceed further—and I do not intend to detain the Senate much longer—I want to call particular attention to the proviso in the amendment which I have been permitted to insert in the RECORD, introduced, as I say, by myself as early as August 17, 1914, providing for the salaries of rural letter carriers, because I think this amendment is worthy of the very serious consideration of the Senate, and I hope ultimately will be followed by proper action in line with the suggestion contained therein by legislative enactment in some future appropriation bill. I call particular attention to the proviso in the amendment, which reads:

Provided further, That the salaries of rural letter carriers shall be based on the length of routes served, regardless of the number of pieces or pounds of mail handled.

Mr. President, it has been the custom in the last six months to blame a great many of the evils in the body politic upon the war in Europe; and I observe in the report of the committee that one of the reasons stated for the proposition of biennial promotions was that some $2,500,000 would be saved, and would help provide for the deficit caused by the falling off in postal revenues due to the war in Europe. The committee on this point says:

In view of the statements of the Postmaster General made to the committee concerning the marked falling off of the postal revenues due to the war in Europe, and the apparent necessity for economy in the Postal Service, the committee adopted the recommendation relating to promotions of post-office clerks, letter carriers, and railway postal clerks, that after July 1, 1915, these employees should be promoted from the lower to the higher grades after having served in such grade two years instead of one year, as at present, making a saving in this item for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, of $2,760,000.

Then there is a statement by the Postmaster General, as follows:

Biennial promotions: The scale of salaries established by law for the compensation of post-office clerks and letter carriers is not so arranged as to stimulate the most efficient service on the part of the employees or to secure to the Government the full advantage of their promotions. A closer adherence in this regard to the methods and practices in the business world is desirable. The compensation of these governmental employees is now and will naturally continue to be much higher than the commercial scale of wages for like services. The present practice of advancing all employees automatically at annual intervals to the grade carrying the maximum salary has a deleterious effect on the efficiency of the service, as promotions come to be regarded as matters of course, and the employee so quickly reaching the highest grade and lacking the years of experience and training necessary to fit him for promotion to supervisory duties becomes dissatisfied and careless. The present promotions are made within certain grades annually and carry salary raises of $100. It is believed that these substantial advances should be reserved in each case as the reward for not less than two years of efficient service, and accordingly it is recommended that the promotions now made annually be made biennially, and that no post-office clerk or letter carrier be promoted before he has served at least two years in the next grade lower than that to which he is promoted.

Mr. President, the proposition of biennial promotions in the opinion of the Senate yesterday was clearly that the effect was deleterious, and the bill as it now stands retains the same old system of annual promotions as heretofore in the three branches of the service referred to—post-office clerks, letter carriers, and railway postal clerks—but, in view of the fact that the committee states the falling off in the postal revenues is due to the war in Europe, I would ask the attention of the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] for a moment, and inquire of him—I was not able to be present at the meetings of the committee as often as I should like to have been—whether there was any estimate of the amount of such falling off in the postal revenues due to the war in Europe.

Mr. BRYAN. The statement was made that for the month of January the revenues had fallen off 8 per cent from those of January, 1914.

Mr. PENROSE. That is, of postal revenues distinctly to be credited to the foreign mail? Do I understand that?

Mr. BRYAN. The postal revenues for January, 1915, lack 8 per cent of being as large as they were in January, 1914.

Mr. PENROSE. Well, how much of that falling off was due to the war in Europe?

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator can form his estimate as to that as well as can anybody else. The fact was stated that beginning in August, 1914, the revenues began to be less than they were in the corresponding months of the preceding year; but that up to August——

Mr. PENROSE. I can easily understand that, Mr. President.

Mr. BRYAN. I hope the Senator will let me answer, as he asked me a question.

For years the normal increase in a month over the corresponding month of the preceding year had been from 4 to 7 per cent. The Postmaster General stated that the department had enjoyed that normal increase month by month until the month of August last, and that in the month of August the revenues decreased from the revenues of August, 1913, 1.12 per cent; in September the decrease was larger; and it has been growing greater every month, with the exception of December, when, on account of the holidays, the deficit over the preceding December was only 4 per cent, but that in January, 1915, the deficit showed 8 per cent. If that runs throughout the year we are bound to have a very large deficit.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to concede the facts as the Senator has represented them, but I say, with the greatest respect for the Senator's knowledge of this bill—which is more comprehensive perhaps than mine, because he has been a diligent member of the committee and belongs to the party in control of legislation in this Congress—I do not feel that my question has been answered.

I admit the deficit, but I want to know what foundation there is for the statement made by the Postmaster General, as embodied in the committee's report, that it is due to the war in Europe. If it be due to the war in Europe, I want to know whether it is all due to the war in Europe; or, if not, what percentage is due to the war in Europe.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, the Postmaster General did not make an argument as to the cause of the deficit. He was stating the facts to guide the committee in the preparation of the bill. We did not discuss with him the causes which produced the deficit, but we were confronted by the fact.

Mr. PENROSE. The statement is boldly made, Mr. President, that the marked falling off in revenues is due to the war in Europe. Now, nearly everything is being blamed on the war in Europe.

Mr. BRYAN. If the Senator will pardon me for a suggestion, I suppose the conclusion was arrived at in this way: That until the war in Europe began the normal increase that has existed for many years existed in the year 1914 and continued to exist until the month of August, when the war in Europe commenced.

Mr. PENROSE. Do I understand the Senator from Florida to agree with the Postmaster General in the statement to the committee that the marked falling off of the postal revenues is due to the war in Europe? That is what I want to know.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I do not know that it would be of any benefit to the Senator from Pennsylvania to have my opinion, but I have always understood that the Post Office Department was a very accurate barometer of the conditions of business and that in times of depression the revenues of the post office have invariably fallen off.

Mr. PENROSE. Well, Mr. President, with all due respect to the Senator, I do not feel that I am much more enlightened than when I began my inquiry. The statement is made that the falling off of the postal revenues is due to the war in Europe, that consequently the greatest economy must be exercised in the Postal Service, and that it must be exercised to the detriment of post-office clerks, letter carriers, and railway postal clerks, whose compensation and status and standards of service and of living have been developed by 18 or 20 years of consistent effort, the mature thought of men in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, and that they are to be made to suffer for the war in Europe.

Mr. President. I am somewhat tired of hearing everything blamed on the war in Europe. We are not at war; we are supposed to be going ahead with our business affairs as a nation at peace, jealously guarding our neutrality.

Is no inference to be drawn concerning this deficit in the soup house and in the bread line in the city of Philadelphia and elsewhere; in the nearly 700,000 or 800,000 men out of work or only working on half time in the State of Pennsylvania, and thousands more in other States; in the universal prostration and curtailment of industrial activity; in the fact that there is hardly an industrial concern in the State of Pennsylvania that is running at more than 40 or 50 per cent of its maximum capacity, and that business enterprise and initiative are absolutely paralyzed in the American Republic? Is that due to the war in Europe?

Under date of February 19, we read:

> Two hundred hotels in New York City to-day made arrangements to give free meals to men out of work.

Is that due to the war in Europe? I do not intend to delay the discussion of the appropriation bills by a tariff argument, but we have heard for months that the beneficent operations of the Underwood tariff law were suspended by reason of the war in Europe, and that elections are to be carried in the future by the party now in power on account of the war in Europe. Now the Postmaster General comes along and says that the post-office clerks and letter carriers and railway postal clerks are to have their high standard lowered and their comfortable condition of living and their efficiency, which have been brought about by years of mature thought on the part of men familiar with the situation in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, interfered with on account of the war in Europe.

Mr. President, in my opinion the deficit in revenues is due to the prostration of business in the United States. That is a condition which we must face; but it furnishes no argument for visiting the unfortunate results of this condition upon the helpless postal employees, who are compelled to go ahead and discharge their responsible duties, upon which the business life, the social intercourse, and the very circulation of the lifeblood of the community depends.

There is nothing gained by having cheap postal employees. I reached this conclusion long ago in my study of the question as a member and as chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. There is nothing gained by having cheap employees or by having discontented, dissatisfied, and overworked employees, but there is a distinct gain in having the vast army of many thousand men engaged in these responsible employments contented, loyal to the Government, and ambitious to discharge their duties faithfully.

It is generally admitted that there is no branch of the Federal Government the employees of which are so strictly held to the mark as in the Postal Service. In other departments of the Government in ordinary times many employees may be laid off, many of them may be sick or off on a holiday and the Government does not suffer materially; certainly any delay in the routine in the department might be made up by a little activity later on; but the postal employee, the letter carrier, the railway mail clerk, the man who distributes the mail in the post office, must be on his job every day of the 365 days of the year, either in person or by competent substitutes.

The mail must be delivered; the lifeblood of the social and business community must circulate, and it pulsates through the arteries of the post office. The men in that branch of the service have a responsibility to meet such as the employees of no other branch of the American Government have to meet. Its thousands of men from the West Indies to Alaska and Manila, in every climate and in every manner of employment, have burdens and responsibilities thrown upon them which are not thrown upon the employees of any other department; and I say that these men are the last of all the employees of the Government who should be degraded in their occupations and in their salaries on the pretense that it is necessary to do so because of conditions growing out of the war in Europe.

The Post Office Department is the business end of the Government, and it should be made as nearly self-sustaining as possible; but that it should be entirely self-sustaining is not essential. It is more essential to have employees well paid and contented and efficient than it is to have the department self-sustaining. The department can not always be self-sustaining. The aim is to keep the deficit down as low as possible and in some years not to have any deficit at all; but in taking up new problems, in taking up postal savings banks, the Rural Delivery Service, and the parcel post, which in their inception must necessarily be experimental, it is impossible that every year, year in and year out, the Post Office Department should always be self-sustaining. That has not been its history in the 130 years of its usefulness, and I, for one, am not alarmed if the department occasionally from year to year during a decade or more shows up on the wrong side of the ledger; but I do think that efficiency should be the first aim of everyone who legislates concerning the Postal Service.

If greater revenues are necessary, if it is finally thought that we should secure greater revenues from the Post Office Department, it should not be brought about by a mistaken economy which undoes the development and the work of 20 years, and it should not be brought about at the expense of post-office clerks, letter carriers, and railway postal clerks—the latter of whom often administer their duties at the peril of their lives—but it should rather be brought about by increasing the postage on second-class mail matter or by revising the schedules of the parcel post, or in other ways which will bring about the needed revenue.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAULSBURY in the chair). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to report from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment, the fortifications appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Florida, from the Committee on Appropriations, reports a bill the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 21491) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19906) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of the Washington Post of a few days ago, and it is in marked contrast with what the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] has just said. I want to read some of the headlines and a few of the items conveyed in telegrams from many of the cities of the United States. The first headlines relate to a dispatch from New York City, and are as follows:

Big trade rush begun—New York textile buyers tell of widespread prosperity—1915 will be record year—Central West leads with business boom, but extraordinary recovery from the war scare is reported from all sections, including the South, where demand is general.

In the same paper, Mr. President, there are contained a number of dispatches from other portions of the United States, and I want to call attention to the headlines of just a few of them. The following is from Cleveland, Ohio:

Rush of war orders—Cleveland gets contracts for $17,000,000 in supplies—Motor trucks in demand—One factory turning out $3,000,000 worth of wire—Knit goods sales to belligerents total $2,417,000—England buys $150,000 worth of field glasses.

A telegram from Rhode Island has the following heading:

Textile mills report biggest gain in decade.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President——

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will yield to the Senator in a moment. An item from Elizabeth, N. J., is printed with the following headline:

Full time for 9,000 at sewing-machine plant.

The following headlines precede a dispatch from New York City.

United States shipyards rushed with orders for vessels.

The following dispatch from Chicago is in the same paper:

ENTIRE GARY PLANT OPEN; 2,000 RETURN TO WORK.

CHICAGO, *February 13, 1915.*

With the starting of the rail mill, all departments of the Gary plant of the Illinois Steel Co. are now in operation.

From Pittsburgh comes a statement preceded by the following headlines:

Ask bids on 1,000,000 shells for England.

From Sharon, Pa., comes a statement with the following headlines:

Mills start to work on 1,500,000 pairs of socks.

Then, from Chicago, comes a dispatch preceded by the following headlines:

Italy buys 600,000 pairs of American blankets.

The following headlines are at the head of a dispatch from Philadelphia:

France orders 100 American locomotives.

From Connellsville, Pa., a telegram is prefaced by the following headlines:

Three thousand three hundred and fifty-five more coke ovens fired by Frick Co.

The same copy of the Washington Post also contains this item:

FACTORY EXPORTS JUMP HIGH.

* * * * * * *

A statement by the Department of Commerce Tuesday shows that in certain lines of manufactures, however, exports made phenomenal gains compared with December a year ago. Among the more notable increases were: Commercial automobiles, from $101,000 to $3,333,000; cotton knit goods, $295,000 to over $2,000,000; woolen clothing, $183,000 to $1,333,000; other woolen goods, including blankets, $103,000 to $2,725,000; rubber boots and shoes, $84,000 to $864,000; sole leather, $354,000 to $3,600,000, and upper leather, $1,750,000.

Zinc increased during the same period from 137,000 pounds to 36,666,000 pounds, while metal-working machinery increased in value from $1,350,000 to $2,432,000.

Surely the Washington Post can not be said to be an administration paper, and yet in this one paper of February 14, 1915, I find 15 statements made of enormous increases in various lines of production, a condition which evidently would reflect itself in the number of men employed and in the steady employment which follows. Now, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I shall not comment on the condition of mind which would boast about prosperity based on the agony of Europe. The orders to which the Senator has referred are for munitions of war and for clothing for millions of men engaged in destroying each other among the civilized nations of Europe. A large body of our citizenship in the United States would urge legislation absolutely to prohibit the exportation of such munitions and articles of destruction, murder, and slaughter which are going over to the other side. Yet the Senator stands here in the Senate of the United States and boasts that his party is bringing on prosperity in the American Republic by sending to Europe the means of destruction or clothing for men exposed to the wintry blasts in the trenches in Germany, Russia, and France. What kind of prosperity is it, Mr. President? A temporary meretricious condition which does nobody any good, which is haphazard in its nature, which may be a relief to starving men who were out of employment six months before the war was ever dreamed of. It may be a slight improvement over the soup house or the bread line, but of no permanent value. It is based on a condition of war which may end to-morrow, which is likely to end in a comparatively short time, which can not last forever, and when it is over, if the present fiscal policy shall be continued, we will face black ruin in the United States so far as American industry is concerned.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, from the comments of the Senator, one would think that the Democratic Party had brought on this war. We had nothing whatever to do with the war. We have tried to mitigate in every way possible the severities of the war. The Senator, however, has been complaining that people are out of work, and that there are soup houses, and I wanted to show that in just one recent issue of the Washington Post, which can not be considered an administration paper, there are some 15 or 20 statements from all sections of the country showing an enormous amount of increase in the manufacture of products and the opening of factories.

I want to say to the Senator, in reference to the tariff policy which he has always advocated, that there never was so high a protective tariff as now exists by reason of the war, because imports are nearly prohibited by the fact that there is war, and consequently American factories are in a position to have no competitors whatever. But it seems to me that these statements that are made here in the Washington Post, not from any one section of the country but from any number of sections of the country, in only one paper, show that there is an enormous advance, which indicates a great prosperity that we are bound to have for the year 1915.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARDWICK. The motion pending before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] to agree to section 21 of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives and disagree to the committee amendment striking out that section. I am in favor of the motion and shall vote for it, and I earnestly hope the Senate may adopt it.

A year ago the Congress of the United States undertook to establish the salaries fixed in this paragraph of the pending bill for the rural letter carriers of this country. It employed language which left the Postmaster General some discretion. It provided that the salaries should be not exceeding the figures named in the present section of the bill. Acting under that authority, although the legislative intent, considering the practice of the departments of this Government in construing acts of Congress, was that the carrier should receive the salary fixed in the bill, and not less than that, the Post Office Department did not give the salary that Congress clearly intended to establish.

It seems to me that when it comes to establishing the salaries that the employees of this Government are to receive, any class or any number of employees in any branch of the service, the will of the Congress of the United States ought to be controlling, and that it is not a matter of departmental or Executive discretion. The salaries established in this bill are reasonable. They are not excessive compared with the salaries of city letter carriers, and when you consider that these rural carriers have to pay for the expense of furnishing their vehicles and horses the salaries are relatively lower. It seems to me that the Senate could do no better than to agree to the carefully worked out proposition of the House. It is a matter of simple justice, and of tardy justice, too, to one great class of our employees, and a deserving class at that.

Mr. President, I feel that in any event this matter would have received this direction in conference. Knowing as I do the temper and desire and disposition of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I believe that our conferees

could have been relied upon to provide absolutely and distinctly for this branch of the Government service, and to see that these carriers received the pay that we intended they should get a year ago, and that we are determined they shall have now. But after all, since the House proposition has been carefully worked out, I think the safest plan is to agree to the motion made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], and agree to the section as proposed by the House, and it will afford me great pleasure, when the motion is put, to vote in that way.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to say just one word about this provision.

When we increased the pay of the rural carriers to $1,100 per year and to $1,000 per year it was based upon the 24-mile limit as being the usual length of the service required. We felt that that was not enough, and we finally raised it to $1,200 per year. I then introduced an amendment, which passed the Senate, providing that in no case should it be less than $600 per year, so that the pay would range from $600 to $1,200 per year, it being understood that the $1,200 would take the highest mileage with 24 miles as the basis, and that the least amount would be $600, and that the difference between the lowest and the highest should be a gradual scale upward to the $1,200, when the carrier reached the 24-mile limit.

It seems, Mr. President, that the Postmaster General, disregarding the intent of Congress at the time, has made rules that bring into operation other elements to determine the amount of the salary or pay than the question of mileage, and it is determined somewhat by the weight and the number of packages. That this is certainly a very novel and a very poor method of arriving at a service I think anyone must admit who will give the subject the slightest consideration. The question of the character of the roads is a thousand times more important in determining what the pay should be than the question of the number of packages or the weight.

If a letter carrier should pass between this city and Baltimore, he would find a splendid paved road all the way; and to say that because he took a few more packages in weight than some one who attempted to pass in the springtime for the same number of miles over an ordinary Virginia road, carrying almost nothing, would seem to the average person to verge upon the ridiculous. But we could not make the condition of the roads the basis, so we did the very next best thing we could do, and that was to fix upon the matter of mileage; and we ought to have a system which we would compel the Postmaster General to adhere to that should be based solely upon mileage.

My own view is that there should be nothing less than $600 per year, because there is no route so short that it does not require one-half a day of a man's time, and the longer routes can not require more than one whole day. Therefore, we ought not to have anything less than $600. It requires a team of at least one horse and a vehicle to make the very shortest route. It requires at least three horses and probably two vehicles to make the longer routes, if we make allowance in bad weather for a change, for repairs, and so forth; and in the northern sections of the country, where we have long winters, we must have both the sleigh and the wheeled vehicle, so that it would absolutely require two kinds of vehicles in that section of the country.

When we take into consideration the cost of the feed for the horses, the care and repair of the vehicles, the shoeing of the horses, and when we realize that taking an average of 20 miles per day year in and year out, the average horse will not last over four years of active service, and that the carrier must buy another horse every four years, we will realize that the amount we are paying is exceedingly low compared with what we pay for those engaged in city delivery.

I would be in favor of making $1,200 the basis of a 24-mile route, and proportionately increasing the amount above $1,200 for any number of miles above that. I would also be in favor of making a minimum of $600, and then making a gradual scale from the $600 up to the $1,200; but as we probably will not be able to carry that through, I should favor the provision that we probably can carry through, it having passed the House, and that is the provision which has been stricken out by the action of the committee.

I certainly shall support with a great deal of pleasure the motion made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. I send to the desk a letter from a rural carrier at Glenview, Ill., which I ask the Secretary to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

GLENVIEW, ILL., *February 22, 1915.*

Hon. JOSEPH L. BRISTOW,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I note that the Senate committee, in dealing with the Post Office appropriation bill, has left the Postmaster General's salary plan for rural carriers untouched. I just want to say that I am very glad this has been done. I have been a rural carrier nearly 10 years, have had both light and heavy routes in four States, and I want to say that the present arrangement of compensation for the rural boys is all right and ought not to be changed. It is the best thing the service ever had. I hope the committee will not pay too much attention to Mr. W. D. Brown, editor of the Rural Free Delivery News. Mr. Brown is against the order because the majority of the associations seem to be. Mr. Brown gets $531 a year from the association, besides individual subscriptions. I sent three letters to the News for publication, each letter being an expression of good will toward the new salary order. Not one letter was ever published. I am forced to the conclusion that Mr. Brown suppressed the letters because he wishes to make it appear that the entire carrier body is against the department. However, Mr. Brown does not reflect the attitude of all the carriers by a long shot. In closing, let me again say that I am heartily in favor of the present salary plan and hope it will continue. I am not, of course, in favor of the contract proposition, but I can not believe that will happen.

Thanking you for your attention thus far, I am,

Yours, very truly,

W. W. BEARLY, *Carrier No. 1.*

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, this controversy is in regard to the assignment of the last appropriation. I do not question the fact that it was the expectation of the carriers to receive an increase of $100 for each standard route of 24 miles and a corresponding proportion of $100 for the shorter routes. Now, all that the Postmaster General did in apportioning this increase was to take into consideration the question of weight of mails as well as the distance traveled. This controversy is simply a question as to whether the adoption of the parcel post, which in some instances imposes a great deal heavier weight of mails upon the rural carriers, shall be considered in adjusting their compensation. Heretofore the element of weight has not been taken into consideration, because it was not of so much consequence.

The facts are that the average weight of the rural carrier's mail, up to the adoption of the parcel-post policy, was only something less than 25 pounds per day, and of course the difference between 25 pounds or 20 pounds or 15 pounds was not sufficient to justify the department in taking into consideration the weight of the mail which the carrier handled; but when heavier packages were intrusted to the mail and the volume and weight of the mail became an important factor, then he felt in justice to the rural carriers that that element of service ought to be given consideration in fixing the compensation. While he did not reduce any salary as it existed prior to this advance authorized, he did adjust the $100 advance so as to give the carrier who carried a heavy volume of mail a little more than he gave the carrier who did not have a heavy volume of mail.

I think he was justified in doing so, and I do not believe that any criticism against the Postmaster General in regard to this order is justified. I say he had a right to take into consideration that fact, because it was alleged on the floor of the Senate time and again during the debates that this additional compensation of $100 ought to be given because additional demands were being placed upon the carriers because of the Parcel Post System. If that is true, then on a route where there was practically no additional burden the Postmaster General had a right to consider that fact. Congress did not, by mandate, order him to give the full increase that was justified, and so he construed it. Politically speaking, it might have been wiser for him to have let the matter go as it formerly had gone, give everybody the proportionate advance which the $100 would give them, and say nothing about it; but in the discharge of his duties, having in view the equitable adjustment of compensation, it seems to me that no criticism should be made upon him for taking into consideration this new element of service which Congress had imposed upon these carriers.

The question as to whether or not $1,200 a year is enough for a rural carrier is not the question involved here. The question as to whether or not the rural service is a good service is not involved here, because there is no Senator who does not believe that the rural service has been a great blessing to the rural communities of the United States; and those Senators who try to make it appear that the Postmaster General, in this adjustment that he has made has done so as the enemy of the Rural Delivery Service, in order to curtail its usefulness and its desirability, do him an injustice and put him in an improper light.

I can say this with absolute frankness, because I have not been supporting the Postmaster General in a number of his policies. I do not belong to the same political party that he does; but when he does that which I believe is equitable and just, not only to the carriers who deliver the rural mail but to

the revenues of our Government, I believe he is entitled to the support of any Senator who believes that he has done his duty and done it well. So far as I am concerned, whenever he does what I think is right in the administration of his department I shall stand by him and support him to the best of my ability.

It has been said by Senators here that this effort to readjust these salaries, this method of taking into consideration the weight and the volume of the mail, will have a tendency to cripple and limit the service. I was surprised to hear Senators say that. They certainly have not studied the effect. Say that we appropriate fifty-two or fifty-four million dollars, or whatever it may be. There are now, according to the statement submitted here by the junior Senator from Florida, the correctness of which I do not doubt, 66,000 applications for rural routes pending in the department, while there are something over 43,000 in existence. There are 25,000 more applications for additional service than there is now service in existence.

I believe the Congress should pursue a policy which would enable the department to extend this service into the territory where it does not now exist. The Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] is absolutely right when he says that if we make this service so expressive, if we make the cost of establishing a rural route so great, the department will not be justified in extending it as far as it could be if conducted at a less expense.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Where does the Senator get his information that there are 20,000 applications now on file for Rural Delivery Service?

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] made the statement that there are 66,000 applications on file now in the department for rural routes.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. BRYAN. I will say to the Senator that after going over a table I understand that the total number of petitions is 66,945, and the total number of routes is 43,818, which would make 23,000 more petitions for routes than have been established.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If the Senator will permit me, the fact is that there are not to exceed 2,000 live applications on file. That includes all the applications from the beginning of the service down to the present time. Many of them have been merged into the others and satisfied by the establishment of rural routes taking them in, so that to-day the good, bad, and indifferent applications on file do not exceed 2,000.

Mr. BRYAN. The others have been rejected.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator from Michigan may think that the whole country is covered with rural delivery routes, but I know it is not, and he will find that to be the fact if he will examine into the facts. I know that in my own State there are vast territories where there is no free delivery, where we would like very much to get it. I know that there is a vast territory in that State where there is a triweekly service where I should like to see it made a daily service, and I know that when you make the expense of establishing a rural route so great and fix iron-clad and inflexible rules by which the Postmaster General can not establish one unless he establishes one at the maximum cost you are going to deny thousands of people the privilege of free delivery when they live 6, 8, 10, and 15 miles from post offices. I am in hearty accord with the view of the Senator from Florida. I have in mind the man who has to go 10 or 15 miles for his mail, and I should like to extend this service to his home.

Why, there have been rural routes discontinued in my State within the last year because the Postmaster General did not believe the number of families served would justify the expense of $1,100 or $1,200 to pay a carrier to deliver their mail. I have in mind now one that was discontinued within the last six weeks in the southwestern part of Kansas that served, I think, something over 30 families. It was the practice in the department for years that 60 families should be served by a route where the carrier received the maximum pay, or the route could not be established. It was afterwards reduced, I think, to 50, and then exceptions were gradually made until the number of families served was still less; and the present Postmaster General, in going over the routes that had been established, and in examining them, has found some that he believes are not justified by the number of people to be served, and they have been discontinued. Now, when you make the expense of maintaining the routes more the inevitable result is that more of them will be discontinued and that more of them will be reduced from a daily service to a triweekly or every-other-day service. That will follow, I do not care who is Postmaster General, if he takes into consideration the facts in the adjustment of this rural service. You can not say that he shall inaugurate any route, if it is not justified by the number of people served, at a cost of $1,200 or $1,300, or whatever it may be, to the Government. The Senate, instead of helping the rural service, instead of extending and improving the rural service by adopting this House provision and refusing to agree to the Senate amendment, in cutting it out, is taking action which will injure the rural service and have a tendency to reduce it from its present state and also to prevent its extension; and I do not believe that is in the public interest.

Where there is a dense population, where there are large quantities of mail to be delivered, the carrier is getting the full amount; but where there is a small amount of mail, he is getting not the additional $100, but a part of it, and that is what all this fuss is about.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. GRONNA. The estimate of the department, as I understand, was $54,700,000, was it not?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not remember the exact figures. The Senator doubtless has them.

Mr. GRONNA. And the amount recommended by the Senate committee is $52,000,000?

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senate committee recommended whatever the Postmaster General thought would be necessary to maintain the service, and with the extensions that he thought would be desirable under the law as it now exists.

Mr. GRONNA. Was that due to the fact that it was considered better to take the difference of $2,700,000 out of the pay of the rural carriers rather than to appropriate it by Congress?

Mr. BRISTOW. How the Postmaster General arrived at that I do not know, but if the Senator from North Dakota wants to offer an amendment to the provision providing that the increase between the $52,000,000 and the fifty-four million and some hundred thousand dollars shall be used in extending the service where it does not now exist and leave the law as it is, I will join with him and vote for the appropriation. But I do not want to deprive those people of a service and give additional pay to the carriers in order to do so, because I do not believe that it is just. If I thought the Postmaster General was rendering an injustice to the carriers, if I did not think there was merit in the proposition that the volume of the mail handled and the weight of the mail that he is compelled to handle is an element which should be considered, then I would not be supporting the amendment of the committee to cut out the House provision.

Mr. GRONNA. I am quite sure the Senator from Kansas is always sincere in his belief; but the bill explains itself. The amendment reported by the Senate committee is that we shall appropriate $52,000,000. The estimate of the Post Office Department is $54,700,000. Evidently that difference could be used in extending the rural route service. There can be no question about that.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator from Florida will correct me if I am mistaken; but I do not think the $54,700,000 was the estimate of the department, except that it is the estimate of the department if the carriers are given the full advance, regardless of the weight of the mails they handle. Then it will require that much.

Mr. BRYAN. If section 21 remains in, it will require $54,700,000.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; and that does not provide for any more extension of the service than the $52,000,000 which is recommended by the Senate committee would provide for.

Mr. BRYAN. Not at all.

Mr. BRISTOW. If we appropriated the full amount of $54,700,000 and put a provision in the bill that the $2,700,000 shall go to the extension of the service, leaving the salary provision as it is, then you will extend a benefit to the rural people, because you will extend vastly the service that now exists and enable the Post Office Department to extend that service upon an equitable and just basis to carry and deliver the mail.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the Senator from Kansas understand that the Postmaster General, whatever is done, has any intention of extending the Rural Delivery Service?

Mr. BRISTOW. Of course I do not know. I can not speak for the Postmaster General.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Senator knows that during the last year there has not been a single route established?

Mr. BRISTOW. No; I do not know that during the last year none have been established. I think the Senator from Michigan means that none have been recently established. I want to be absolutely frank in this discussion and I am not going to be a partisan. For the first time in 20 years the revenues of the postal service are less than they were for the previous year. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, there will be a decrease in the amount of revenues collected through the Post Office Department, less this year than last year, and that has not happened in 20 years before.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Senator from Kansas permit an interruption at this point?

Mr. BRISTOW. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator from Kansas will yield, I should like, with the consent of the Senate, to bring up the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Kansas yield for that purpose?

Mr. BRISTOW. I have not a right to yield for that purpose, and I shall ask that there be an explanation of that report.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It will take but a minute. The chairman of the House committee has been over here urging that we take action upon it.

Mr. BRISTOW. I want to know what is in that conference report before it is adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The report was presented yesterday, and it has been printed.

Mr. BRISTOW. I would rather it would not be taken up now and passed. I would rather not yield for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It has been printed and is before the Senate now.

Mr. BRISTOW. When it is taken up I want to ask some questions in regard to what it contains, and I will not have an opportunity to do it while I am speaking on this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas declines to yield.

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not think it is fair for the Senator from Maryland to ask me to yield to allow a conference report to be adopted when I am interested in the provisions of that conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Then, I understand the Senator refuses to yield?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; I do. If the Senator insists on my refusing, I will refuse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas will proceed.

Mr. BRISTOW. I am advised by the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] that since June 30 there have been established 162 additional rural routes.

Mr. BRYAN. Between June 30 and December 1, 1914.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Postmaster General stated before the committee—I know I am not mistaken about that, because I asked the question, as I recall it; or, if not, some one asked it—that during the first two years he had established something like 1,500 routes, but since then he had not established a route.

Mr. BRYAN. He had not been Postmaster General for two years, and he was speaking of the time since he was Postmaster General. I read from a table printed in the House hearings, in which it is stated that the routes in operation June 30, 1914, were 43,652; routes in operation December 1, 1914, 43,814, which is an increase of 162 in those five months.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I was discussing the deficit in the postal revenues this year. Of course, we all have our views as to what caused that deficit. The Postmaster General feels that it is due very largely to the European war. I think that that has had some effect, but I myself think that other causes contributed to it very largely. But regardless of the cause the deficit exists. Whether or not it is a mistaken economic policy we will not discuss here; whether it depends upon the European war and its effect on the commerce of our country we will not discuss, because there would be a difference of opinion, and it would not be relevant to the question now under consideration. But the fact all must admit is that we are facing a deficit in the postal revenues.

I am not one who believes that the general public should be taxed to maintain a postal service. The Government of the United States has monopolized the postal business and handles it as a Government function. It did that because it thought it would be a wise policy, and it is the policy of governments as a rule. But the purpose is to render a distinct service to the citizen for a compensation which it receives for that service. It is not a function of the Government primarily. It is a function the Government assumed, because it is believed the Government can do it more equitably and more impartially than it could be done by any private company or any private individual or corporation, and in that I am in thorough accord. But there is no obligation on the part of the Government to render this particular service to the people at public expense. Fair and adequate compensation ought to be paid for service of this character which the Government renders.

So, if the postage collected is not sufficient, then there should be an increased rate of postage. If the postage collected is too much, then there should be a decreased rate. I believe that we should so adjust the rates and the expenditures that they would about balance. I do not believe in making it a source of revenue, but I do believe it should be self-sustaining, and I think that is sound and equitable.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly.

Mr. GRONNA. Is it not possible that the parcel post is the cause of a great loss in the revenues of the department?

Mr. BRISTOW. I think the policy of the present Postmaster General in administering the parcel post is not wise. I have disagreed with him upon a number of his official acts in regard to the parcel post. While he claims that there is a surplus, I disagree with him and believe that there is a deficit coming from the parcel post, and I think he has made some great mistakes in the administration of that law.

Mr. GRONNA. Will the Senator from Kansas tell the Senate what the loss has been to the Treasury of the United States or to the Post Office Department in changing third-class matter to fourth class .

Mr. BRISTOW. I think it has been very great. I can not state what the loss has been, because no man can state what it has been, but there has been a loss of several million dollars in the revenues of the department by that change.

Mr. GRONNA. Has there not possibly been a loss of at least $6,000,000?

Mr. BRISTOW. I would not make any statement as to the loss, because I do not believe it has, with any accuracy, been ascertained. I think there is a loss, without doubt, but still the very fact that the parcel post has been extended, that the Government is now carrying a great burden of catalogues, which it did not formerly carry, for the catalogue houses through the mails and delivering them to the rural communities, simply confirms the fact that the Postmaster General, in adjusting the compensation of the carriers, should take into consideration this added burden which falls unevenly upon the carriers, depending, of course, upon the density of the communities which they serve. The very fact that the parcel post has put into the mails very large volumes of merchandise and books and catalogues and tons of stuff that had to be delivered, when investigation showed that the burden resting upon some carriers for this additional service is much heavier than upon others, and where the distance traveled may be the same, makes it absolutely equitable and just that the Postmaster General should take into consideration this volume of mail in making an adjustment of the compensation.

He did not reduce the compensation of carriers, but all he did was to take the advance and apportion it, taking into consideration in the distribution of the advance the volume of the mail as well as the length of the route. You can not have absolute equity in this service, because the roads are very different. Complaints are made. I will say in passing that a carrier who has to travel a route that is 26, 27, 28, 29, or 30 miles ought to have more pay than a carrier whose route is 24 miles. It depends upon the circumstances. Take it over here in the hills of Virginia, where there are mud roads. At this season of the year 24 miles is all that any carrier can successfully handle. Take it in a section of New Jersey or Pennsylvania, where there are macadamized roads, or out West, where there is little rain and where the roads do not get muddy, as they do in other sections of the country, a carrier can make 30 miles, comparatively, with the same ease and during the same time that a carrier would make 24 miles in some other section of the country. So as to the added distance beyond the standard route of 24 miles it has been the policy of the department for years only to go beyond the 24 miles when the conditions of the road will justify it and not impose a burden upon the carrier who has to make it.

Some reference has been made here to the increase in the railway mail pay. Contrary to my judgment and against my vote, there was an increase of 5 per cent for the railways for the added weight due to the parcel post after the parcel-post law was adopted. The Postmaster General has followed the same policy in apportioning this 5 per cent that he has in apportioning the increase in the salaries of carriers. Where he has reason to believe or where he ascertains in his own way that the weight or volume of mail has not been increased 5 per cent he has not given the full 5 per cent. If, according to his investigation, he thinks it has been increased 2 per cent, he has added 2 per cent to the compensation, and if 3 per cent, he has added 3 per cent, and if 5 per cent, he has given the whole amount.

Now, I want to say this in closing: I think the compensation which the Government now pays the rural carriers is adequate. In some instances it may be small, in others it is excessive, depending upon the conditions which may obtain. I believe we ought to pay rural carriers or any other Government employees a just and liberal compensation. I am in favor of that and I am in favor of it now. But I also believe that in fixing the amount of public expenditure for any purpose we should take into consideration the public revenues and the means which we are compelled to resort to in order to obtain them. We find ourselves now, because of the condition of the public revenues, resorting to extraordinary taxes in order to maintain the public service. We have added or undertaken to add $100,000,000 by an extraordinary system of taxation. We have added an income-tax system to the sources of revenue which we formerly had. Yet with this additional revenue coming from the income tax and from these special taxes we are now confronted with a large deficit in the revenues of the Government.

In taking into consideration the revenues and the means we have to resort to to obtain them we should take into consideration the public expenditures. I believe that the present salary of a rural carrier is equal to or is larger than the great majority of such carriers would receive if they were employed in their private occupations in the communities where they live.

Whenever we increase the compensation we have to obtain the money with which to pay it by taxing those who are in private occupation, and when you impose a tax upon the man in the community who is working for $50 a month in order to increase the compensation of the man in the same community who is receiving $100 per month, you are imposing unjustly upon the man who is receiving $50 in the private occupation.

While it may not be popular with the Government employees who are asking for the increased pay to oppose increased pay, and while the citizen upon whose shoulders is placed the burden of furnishing the money to increase this salary may not realize it directly and feel that obligation to a public servant who serves in a legislative body like this for refusing to impose additional burdens on him for the benefit of his neighbor who is in Government service, yet under my duty as a Senator of the United States I feel that I am compelled to do it, and for one I am going to take into consideration in appropriation bills the man who has got to pay the money to sustain the Government of the United States.

It is an easy thing for us to pour out these millions into the public service when it appeals to our imagination or our desires. It is an easy and agreeable thing to pay and increase salaries of the hundreds and thousands of Federal employees, who have their paid representatives here sitting in the galleries to look down and to report to their organizations what every Senator is doing. But, nevertheless, if we do our duty, we have to take into consideration the men who are not organized and who pay the bills. That is what I propose to do. Sometimes I grow somewhat pessimistic when I observe the organizations which during recent years have been formed and maintained, who keep representatives in Washington to increase their own profits or pay whether they are in private business or in the public service.

It is only a short time in our history that the officers of the civil service of the United States have organized their association and employed their paid representatives and lobbyists and maintained them in the Capital for the purpose of increasing their compensations. But now there is not a year passes, there is not a session of Congress, when the corridors of this Capitol are not occupied by men who are paid by organizations of Federal employees to come here and try to induce Congress to tax the American people more than they are now being taxed for their special benefit. For one I do not propose to be unduly influenced by representations of that kind. I will receive their representations with respect. I am glad to listen to any complaints they may have; if I think they are just, I will vote to remedy them; but I will not forget that the majority of the people of the United States live to-day upon a compensation which is less than $60 a month, and that the great burden of the taxes that are paid to sustain this Government of ours comes from people who do not earn $750 a year. In my opinion we should take into consideration that element which deserves our consideration, because they have no one here to represent them as others have. Take the great farming population of the country. They do not keep lobbyists here to protect their interests. They are not so organized. We are discussing now a service in which they are vitally interested, a service which should be extended far beyond what it now is, a service that should be administered with the greatest economy in order that the Government may justly extend it beyond its present limits.

The amendment of the Senate committee to cut out the House provision simply gives the Postmaster General the power to extend that service without doing injustice to a single rural carrier or without reducing the pay of a single Federal employee, and we can do that in the face of the fact that we now have a deficit in the revenues, which we all deprecate.

So I earnestly trust that the amendment of the Senate committee disagreeing to the House provision as contained in section 21 will prevail.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I do not intend to take up more than a few moments of the time of the Senate on this question. To me, from my observation, the question seems very simple and confined within narrow channels. Whatever deficiency has occurred or is occurring in the Postal Service, I imagine we are all agreed that it comes to a large extent from second-class matter and partially within recent times from the undue extension of the parcel post; that is, extending it to merchandise and commodities that never ought to be carried in the parcel post.

The real question here is in reference to the compensation of rural carriers. The question is whether we should take it out of them—deprive them of a little benefit that would inure to them to help make up this deficiency. From the time the service was established it was always the custom, until the present Postmaster General made a change, to base it upon the distance traveled by the rural carrier.

I have in mind concrete cases in my own neighborhood. I live in a town where we have eight rural mail routes. Two of them going out of town pass my own house where I live. I have watched those carriers. In our part of the country we have what you might call at least five months of hard winter weather—bad roads, snowdrifts, snowstorms, sometimes so bad you wonder that the carrier can ever venture on the road. The carrier in our part of the country can not use an automobile. Perhaps there are a few routes on which in summer he can use an automobile, but mostly he must have a light rig. The roads are so constituted that he can not drive with one horse. The tracks in the country are of such a character that you need a team. A rural carrier in our country must keep three horses. He keeps a team on the road steadily every day, and he has an extra horse to meet an emergency. So he has three horses to feed and take care of, and he gives his own time. He has so many miles to make a day. Whether his wagon is loaded with 100 pounds or 500 pounds makes no difference, he has to travel that number of miles; he has to keep that many horses; he has to be out on the road so many hours; he has to go through snowdrifts; he has to go on those country roads, rain or shine, regardless of the amount he carries. The mere fact that a carrier in one instance carries 300 pounds and another carrier in another instance only carries 100 pounds ought not to make a difference in their pay. The real expense to the carrier is in maintaining the team, feeding it, taking care of it, and taking care of himself. It is the time that is put in and not the mere pounds that he carries. Whether a carrier carries 50 pounds of mail on his route or carries 200 pounds, or whether he carries parcel post amounting to 100 pounds or carries parcel post amounting to 300 or 400 or 500 pounds, it is all the same to him; it does not make any difference. The only difference is that with the heavier load perhaps he may have to get out of his wagon a little oftener to deliver the packages than he otherwise would; but the same time, the same expense, the same horses, and the same weight are required in one instance as in the other. Now, why in those cases should you discriminate?

One carrier passes my house. He has a route of 24 miles. Another carrier has a route passing my house. He has a route of 26 miles. I have watched them when they came in at night. I have seen their little horses tired and worn out.

Now, in respect to those carriers, what difference does it make? Why should you discriminate because one wagon or

one sled—they have to use sleds in winter—has a few pounds more than the other? That is not a criterion, and it is unjust to attempt to make up the deficiency that is arising in the Postal Service out of these poor carriers.

For that reason, Mr. President, without going into any extensive discussion of this matter, knowing as I do the hardships of our rural carriers in the northwestern country, knowing and seeing what they have to encounter, my heart goes out to them, and I do not think there ought to be anything done to cut down or diminish their salaries. While I am not here to criticize the Postmaster General, while I am not here to find fault with the administration of that department, yet I think in this respect an injustice which may be unintentional has been done to the rural carriers. If we want to make up the deficiency, let us change our law in relation to second-class mail matter and make that class of mail matter pay its just proportion of the expenses. Let us limit the extension of the parcel post so that it will not be compelled to carry sacks of flour or sacks of oats or sacks of salt or sacks of barley; let us not make our Parcel Post System the vehicle to carry merchandise; let us use it for what it was primarily intended, for carrying packages of a limited size, such as are ordinarily sent by express. If we do that, and if we make second-class mail matter pay its just proportion of postage in this country, if we limit our parcel post within proper bounds, we shall not only have no deficiency, but, Mr. President, I believe in time we may have 1-cent letter postage.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE of Maryland in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I do not know that I can add anything of value to what has already been said on this subject. However, I want to state my opinion regarding it.

The rural carriers in my section of the country are not adequately paid. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and other Senators have made so plain the investment which has to be made by such carriers that it is unnecessary for me to take up the time of the Senate to go into that matter any further; but I want to say with emphasis that the rural carrier in the western section of the country, in my State and in other States, is not getting as much pay as he is entitled to get.

Only a few days ago, Mr. President, Senators from agricultural States refused to vote for an appropriation of $2,280,000 which provided for a census that, it might be said, was in the interests of the agricultural class. It has been intimated here this afternoon that we ask for this provision simply because we come from the agricultural portion of the country. So far as I am concerned, I am for the House provision, because I know it is only proposing to do justice to the carriers. I know that the people of my State are glad to pay them $1,200 a year, where the route is 24 miles long or more. The Postmaster General has never previously placed such a construction upon the law as he has placed upon it during the last year, not only against a carrier on a standard route or a route 24 miles in length, but holding that such carrier must carry 10,000 pieces of mail per month, and that he must carry weight to the amount of 1,300 pounds.

The Senator from Minnesota has just illustrated the difficulty that the rural carrier encounters in our section of country, at least during the winter months. During four or five long winter months he has to go through snowdrifts which are almost impassable. It is not fair to take $2,700,000 of the money which belongs to these carriers and to say that you are exercising economy and making up for the deficiency caused by the department making a classification which has produced that very deficiency of from $6,000,000 to $9,000,000, when less than 50 firms are benefited by that amount. No one but the mail-order houses of this country are receiving the benefit of that classification. No Senator who has been on the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads will deny my statement in this regard.

Mr. President, I only have the same interest in this legislation that every other Senator has. It is only a public duty that I feel I have to perform; but we should not say that these rural carriers are not patriotic because they demand fair pay. We have no right to say that the people in the West, where the country is sparsely settled, are not patriotic because they want mail service. The people of the country do not complain because in the Post Office Department there is a deficiency. If you are in favor of extending the rural mail service, increase the appropriation $10,000,000 more, and I shall vote for the proposition. To say that if we do not permit the Postmaster General to make an arbitrary ruling, an arbitrary classification, we must take $2,700,000 of these poor carriers' money in order to extend the service, to me is no argument. The Senate of the United States ought to provide for a sufficient amount of money not only to pay its carriers a fair compensation, but we ought to appropriate enough money to extend the service where the service is needed.

Mr. President, I do not care to delay the Senate any further. I am for the House provision. It is fair, it is honest, and it is just, not only to the carrier but to the people to whom this service is rendered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee striking out section 21.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	du Pont	McLean	Sheppard
Bankhead	Gore	Martine, N. J.	Simmons
Brady	Gronna	Myers	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	Hardwick	Nelson	Stephenson
Bristow	Hughes	Newlands	Sterling
Bryan	James	Norris	Stone
Burleigh	Johnson	Oliver	Swanson
Burton	Jones	Page	Thomas
Camden	Kern	Penrose	Thompson
Chamberlain	La Follette	Perkins	Townsend
Chilton	Lane	Pittman	Vardaman
Clapp	Lee, Md.	Poindexter	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Lewis	Pomerene	Weeks
Clarke, Ark.	Lippitt	Root	White
Culberson	Lodge	Saulsbury	Williams
Dillingham	McCumber	Shafroth	Works.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to state that the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is detained from the Senate on account of illness.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am requested to announce that the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] is detained from attendance upon the Senate by illness.

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] because of illness.

Mr. RANSDELL. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] on account of sickness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee proposing to strike out section 21.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Upon that, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment striking out section 21 of the House bill.

Mr. HUGHES. That is the amendment in regard to the salaries of the rural mail-route carriers?

Mr. TOWNSEND. As I understand, to strike that out will leave the provision as it came from the House?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is to strike out section 21.

Mr. TOWNSEND. By striking that out, we leave it as the House had it?

Mr. JAMES. No; if it is stricken out, it eliminates from the bill the language of the House text.

Mr. HUGHES. By refusing to accept the committee amendment the effect will be to retain the House text.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Then, by disagreeing to the Senate committee amendment we leave the House provision in the bill?

Mr. JAMES. That would leave the House provision in.

Mr. TOWNSEND. A vote in the negative is a vote to disagree to the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, the question, as I understand, is on agreeing to the committee amendment?

Mr. SIMMONS. That is it.

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senate disagrees to the committee amendment, that leaves the House provision stand?

Mr. SIMMONS. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] and vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. RANSDELL (when Mr. THORNTON's name was called). I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] on account of sickness. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to my colleague [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina], and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. STERLING. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CRAWFORD], and to state that he is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA].

Mr. GALLINGER. I am requested to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY], that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and that the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 62, as follows:

YEAS—10.

Bristow	Gore	Thomas	Weeks
Bryan	Ransdell	Tillman	
Fletcher	Saulsbury	Walsh	

NAYS—62.

Ashurst	Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Simmons
Bankhead	Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Brady	Hardwick	Myers	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	Hughes	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Burleigh	James	Norris	Stephenson
Burton	Johnson	Oliver	Sterling
Camden	Jones	Overman	Swanson
Catron	Kern	Page	Thompson
Chamberlain	La Follette	Penrose	Townsend
Chilton	Lane	Perkins	Vardaman
Clapp	Lee, Md.	Pittman	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Lewis	Poindexter	White
Culberson	Lippitt	Pomerene	Williams
Dillingham	Lodge	Root	Works
du Pont	McCumber	Shafroth	
Fall	McLean	Sheppard	

NOT VOTING—24.

Borah	Hitchcock	Owen	Smith, Ariz.
Clarke, Ark.	Hollis	Reed	Smith, S. C.
Colt	Kenyon	Robinson	Smoot
Crawford	Lea, Tenn.	Sherman	Stone
Cummins	Newlands	Shields	Sutherland
Goff	O'Gorman	Shively	Thornton

So the amendment reported by the committee was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to take up for consideration the report of the committee of conference on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I suggest that the Senator allow us to proceed with the pending bill. As I understand, in a few minutes we can get the bill out of the way.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is on page 30, line 7, after the word "Service," to strike out "$54,700,000" and insert "$52,000,000," so as to read:

For pay of letters carriers, substitutes for carriers on annual leave, clerks in charge of substations, and tolls and ferriage, Rural Delivery Service, $52,000,000.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, in order to make effective the vote of the Senate on the question just taken as to section 21 the committee amendment on page 30, just stated by the Secretary, should be disagreed to. I ask that the amendment be disagreed to on account of the action taken by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 30, striking out "$54,700,000" and inserting "$52,000,000."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, we have disagreed to the committee amendment to section 21, thereby retaining the House provision. An amendment should be made to that provision, in view of the fact that we have made this change, which will direct the Postmaster General to pay the portion of the salaries of rural carriers which has been withheld during the last year on account of his order construing the act of 1914. Therefore I propose as an amendment, at the end of the House provision, on page 57, at the close of the paragraph, the following proviso:

And provided further, That the basis and scale of compensation for rural letter carriers specified in this section shall be applied to the appropriation for pay of rural letter carriers for the fiscal year 1915.

I have already explained the amendment, and I think it will not require any further explanation. It is simply to carry out the intention of Congress from the time the appropriation became effective until the present time.

Mr. BRYAN. That would only increase the deficit $3,000,000 more.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. PENROSE. I understand—but I should like to confirm my view about it by having the opinion of the Senator from Michigan—that this money was appropriated in the last appropriation bill?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It was.

Mr. PENROSE. And was available and was due to the rural carriers, so that this is simply to provide for their getting the compensation which Congress contemplated giving them. Am I correct?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is correct.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I really am not going to argue against the proposition of the Senator from Michigan. It is rather a small matter; it only increases the deficit $3,000,000 more. If the Senate wants to do that, very well.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, it would seem to me to be a very peculiar situation if now, after having interpreted the act of last year and having provided for enforcing its provisions, we should still allow these amounts to be held in the Treasury. It certainly would lay the Government open to a claim on the part of these men; and it seems to me we should carry out and make the legislation homogeneous and have it mean just exactly what we intended. I am willing to submit the matter on that proposition. I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the text of the House bill it is proposed to insert the following:

And provided further, That the basis and scale of compensation for rural letter carriers specified in this section shall be applied to the appropriation for pay of rural letter carriers for the fiscal year 1915.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, that means a further expenditure on this bill of $2,700,000. It means that during the present fiscal year we will pay $2,700,000 additional to rural mail carriers. The duty has already been performed. I do not think the Senate understands that not a single, solitary salary has been reduced by the department; but if the Senate wants to throw away $3,000,000 it can do so.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, while it is technically true that the money has not been taken away from them, they not having received it, it is true also that we appropriated this money for them last year. It is true that we have now adopted a proposition to pay them this amount for the coming year. During the last year the Postmaster General construed this act to mean that he could withhold a portion of their salary. They were entitled to that salary last year under the vote of the Senate at this time and by the vote of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. I doubt very much the advisability of the amendment now proposed by the Senator from Michigan——

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. This amendment has not been reported by any standing committee; it has not been estimated for; and I think I would rather take the chance of appealing to the rules of the Senate to protect the Treasury at this time than to the Senate itself. I raise the point of order that it has not been estimated for or reported by any standing committee.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, may I be heard for one or two minutes on the point of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. PENROSE. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan, as I understand it, is simply to carry out the provision of the existing law, and therefore it is clearly in order.

Mr. BRYAN. No, Mr. President; the existing law says "not exceeding $1,200."

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator from Michigan can explain his own amendment more thoroughly than I can, as he is more familiar with this particular item; but, as I understand, it is simply to pay these men what the act of Congress—the last Post Office appropriation bill—directed should be paid.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is correct.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator from Michigan will not contend, nor will anybody else, that the Postmaster General has violated any law or any act of Congress. He has exercised a discretion that Congress has left to him from the beginning, which provides that the salary on the standard route shall not exceed $1,200.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I am not arguing the question as to whether the Postmaster General has exceeded his authority or not. I have a high respect for that gentleman; but in my opinion his action has resulted in completely negativing the act of Congress and the intention of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, is not this the truth about it? His action followed the law. We probably meant to do something that we did not do.

Mr. PENROSE. I think that his action completely shatters the law and ignores the law, as if it never had been written into the statute books.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let us understand where we are. Will this amendment increase the appropriation?

Mr. BRYAN. It will.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It will increase it $3,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has it been estimated for? [A pause.] The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. I move to strike out lines 20, 21, and 22 on page 30. Yesterday I made the motion at a time when it was not in order; and I desire now to read and call attention to what took place before the House committee. This language is:

For experimental village delivery service in towns and villages having post offices of the second or third class, $150,000.

They have experimented with a number, and pretty soon they will have experimented to the extent of one in each congressional district. As a matter of fact, there is no experiment about it. I suppose every man knows that a letter carrier can deliver mail in a village the same as he can in a town or a city. The department has never estimated it and has always opposed it. I desire to read exactly what occurred, if I may.

The Assistant Postmaster General says:

As soon as a petition from patrons is received it is investigated and the conditions relative to the equipment of the community in the way of sidewalks, streets, lights, etc., are ascertained. If it is shown that there are good grounds for its establishment, it is taken care of forthwith.

Mr. TUTTLE. You only provide for one in each congressional district until all of the congressional districts are taken care of?

Mr. BLAKSLEE. That is the policy; yes, sir. And I might say that I indicated in my report that its value to the Postal Service, either in increasing the revenues or in the adding of any tremendous improvement, is dubious. We have endeavored, however, to combine it with rural-delivery service, so that the rural carriers could be utilized in this service, and we have presented a recommendation for legislation that would permit us to pay rural carriers extra money for such service.

Mr. TUTTLE. In order to get this delivery service installed in a village a petition must come from the patrons of the office?

Mr. BLAKSLEE. Yes, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is the policy to establish at least one village delivery service in each congressional district for experimental purposes?

Mr. BLAKSLEE. We endeavor to do so.

When you establish one in each congressional district the demand will come from every village in each district similarly situated for a village delivery service. It is not experimental at all. It is being built up in this way by having one established in each congressional district, and thereby inviting the insistence by every other village in that district that a village delivery service shall be given to it.

The Post Office Department has never asked for this money. A Congressman selects a town so as to put one in his district. When they get one in each district and the communities and villages all over the country begin to demand it, we are going to have a village delivery service, and the good old days of the people living in town going down to the post office to get their mail and to see the trains pass will have gone. Why, Mr. President, it would be more reasonable to have experimental service in the milking of the cows and the feeding of the horses. You could not keep the people in a village away from the post office if you tried to do it. There is no necessity for this legislation. It is simply a waste of $150,000.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. I do not quite understand the question before the Senate. Do I understand the Senator from Florida to object to the $150,000 allowed by the committee?

Mr. BRYAN. I object to all of it.

Mr. PENROSE. To all of it?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. PENROSE. I did not know whether the Senator was abiding by the decision of the committee or not.

Mr. BRYAN. I am not. I do not know of any reason why I should. Nobody else does. [Laughter.]

Mr. PENROSE. There is another question I should like to ask the Senator. What is there in this provision, as contained in the House bill or as amended in the Senate, which requires putting this experimental service in every congressional district?

Mr. BRYAN. That is the plan. That is the understanding.

Mr. PENROSE. I never heard of this plan before.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. You were in the Senate.

Mr. BRYAN. I am surprised that the Senator did not.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. This goes to Congressmen.

Mr. PENROSE. When the Senator is through I may have a very few remarks to make on the subject.

Mr. BRYAN. I am through.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida a question, Mr. President. If this service is extended to the extent he thinks it will be by having this special delivery in these small towns, what does the Senator think will be the ultimate cost to the Federal Government?

Mr. BRYAN. Why, I should say we ought to pay the carriers $1,200 a year apiece in the villages.

Mr. SHAFROTH. How much will that amount to, in the Senator's judgment?

Mr. BRYAN. I believe in 10 years it will be half the cost of the pay of the rural carriers.

Mr. SHAFROTH. And how much is that?

Mr. BRYAN. Fifty-four million seven hundred thousand dollars this year.

Mr. SHAFROTH. And the Senator thinks that this experiment, if it is extended, will ultimately cost the Government $27,000,000 a year?

Mr. BRYAN. There is no experiment about it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I mean, if it is extended to what it is anticipated it might be?

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator knows the number of villages in this country, or he knows there are a great many, and the Senator knows that when one village gets it you can not resist the claim and the justice or the right of another village having it; and the Congressman who gets one in his district will invite the attempt of every other town and village to get one, and he will naturally advocate it; and how long will it take? It will come in a very few years.

I see the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] rising. Perhaps I ought to show what has been done in this bill. They have a village delivery service in Virginia in several places. In some places they have two carriers in towns of 1,200 people. They are paying them only $600 a year apiece. I understand there is an old soldiers' home, or something of the kind, that the junior Senator from Virginia wants to take care of. I believe there are 10 districts in Virginia. They all have one apiece.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. BRYAN. This book says they have.

Mr. SWANSON. It gives the number of them there—four in Virginia, I think.

Mr. BRYAN. Perhaps I have the wrong place. I will find it.

Mr. SWANSON. I will wait until the Senator gets through.

Mr. BRYAN. Alabama has 3, Arizona has 1, Arkansas 5, California 1, Colorado 1, Connecticut 1, Florida 1, Georgia about 8. Some Congressmen have not been as active as others. New York, for example, has 5 and Virginia 10. Let us see about Michigan; that ought to be a good illustration. Michigan has 5.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. How many are there in Georgia?

Mr. BRYAN. Georgia has seven.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from Florida has attacked this provision which simply continues a service where it now exists, and appropriates $150,000 for that purpose. There are certain small towns that in three or four years will have city delivery. Under the law you must have a certain amount of receipts before you have city delivery. Of all the communities that have less mail facilities and are more inconveniently situated in that respect than the people who live in the country, the most conspicuous cases are the cities that are on the verge of becoming entitled to city delivery. This has worked such a great hardship that Congress has made this small appropriation, but not for congressional districts. I do not know where the Senator got the idea that each congressional district would have one, except from people who are opposed to it.

Mr. BRYAN. I will read it to the Senator.

Mr. SWANSON. That is a charge that was made in the hearing, but there is no law fixing it.

Mr. BRYAN. Does the Senator say that the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General did not tell the truth about it?

Mr. SWANSON. The Fourth Assistant Postmaster General antagonizes this appropriation, and in order to antagonize it they have said that ultimately every Congressman will get one. He will not get it unless the necessity exists in his district.

Now, look at the situation. Here are cities in Georgia, in Arkansas, in all the States, that in two or three or four years will be entitled, by population and by receipts, to city delivery.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then they will get it.

Mr. SWANSON. Pending that, they have less convenience, less facilities, less mail efficiency, than any class of people in the United States. You deliver the mail in the country, you deliver it in the cities, but this works a hardship in a great many small towns. They are not villages. They are named as villages, but what they mean by villages are cities that are not large enough to have city delivery and yet do not have rural delivery; and this is an amount appropriated to get rid of these hardships where that condition exists.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then, why do you not put it in the shape of a general bill, and take care of all that occupy that status, instead of just singling out a few?

Mr. SWANSON. You do not single out a few. You leave it to the department to inaugurate the service where the need is most urgent.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then you just pick some according to the ability to select and enforce it.

Mr. SWANSON. You pick cases where hardships exist. You pick cases where people are inconvenienced; and where you inconvenience the patrons of a post office you lessen the receipts of the office. You deliver the mail in Wall Street, in New York, and in other large cities seven or eight times a day. Why? It is not a special favoritism to them. It is because, when you do that, the people use the mails more, and it pays. Now, if the Senator from Georgia will point out cases in Georgia where hardships do not exist, where they ought not to have this delivery, and if he will go to the Post Office Department and say, "This is a waste of money," I am satisfied that they will withdraw it and give it to places where hardships do exist.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator if he thinks it possible, in as large a State as Virginia or Georgia, to single out just seven post offices that have their conditions so peculiar that you could distinguish them on account of those conditions, and require that they should have the service, and not give it to others of the same size?

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, the applications from the different States, as I understand, are made to the department. I think the appropriation ought to be larger. I do not see why, in cities of three or four thousand, some of whose people live nearly 2 miles from the post office, the people who pay for the office and make the office profitable should have less mail facilities than people who live 20 miles from town. This is an appropriation to try to equalize these hardships pending the time when they will have city delivery. If you should strike out this appropriation and withdraw it in a great many of the places that now have this advantage it would be a hardship to deprive them of it. It has been divided among the different States, as I understand, fairly, and it is an appropriation that I think ought to be increased instead of being decreased. There is no intention to give it to every little village. The idea is to give it in the cities where you do not have rural delivery and you do not have city delivery, where a hardship is worked.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, the question has been talked of around here about when a town is entitled to city delivery. My information is that when it reaches the third class it is entitled to city delivery, and this appropriation would be for fourth-class post offices; and the populations of the towns are given.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am opposed to this provision because it is not an experiment. That is simply a name. It contemplates picking out a few towns in each State and giving them city delivery.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption there?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to correct a statement made by the Senator from Florida. I believe that the law, or the rule of the department, if it is not a law, permits cities to have free delivery when they have a population of 5,000 and receipts from the post office of $10,000.

Mr. SWANSON. That is right.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that is so.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Five thousand population and $10,000 receipts.

Mr. NORRIS. I believe that is the rule.

Mr. SWANSON. I think that is it—$10,000 receipts.

Mr. BRYAN. I got my information from the clerk of the Post Office Committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. And they have to have suitable pavements as well.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to say further to the Senator that in these cases before you are permitted to deliver mail to the city you have to number the houses, and the people have to go to an expense. It was intended that this appropriation should be applied where there were hardships before they had city delivery on account of the requirements.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, let us see what this provision is. Our general rule provides that where the population is 5,000 or more and the receipts $10,000 or more there shall be city delivery. That is the general rule. The proposition is to appropriate money for an alleged experiment in smaller cities. We have tried the experiment. It is no longer a matter of experiment. We know now. Do we wish to lower the size of the places that are to receive city delivery, and lower the amount of receipts as a basis of city delivery? If so, well and good; treat them all alike. If we wish to say that 4,000 population or 3,000 population or 2,500 population is sufficient for city delivery, let us say so. If we wish to say $5,000 receipts is sufficient, let us say so. Let us not simply take a few in each State and give them city delivery when there are many more of the same class that do not get it.

You can not pick out five or six or seven towns in a State the size of my State under any rule. You pick them arbitrarily. You pick them because somebody suggests them and wants them to have this service. Nobody can suggest a rule for a State the size of mine that would add simply seven more cities to the present law applicable to city delivery. I do not believe they could fix upon a principle that would simply include five more in the State of Virginia. Then how are the seven to be selected? How are the five to be selected? Those that Senators and Congressmen pick out of the lot for some purpose of special favor.

I do not believe in that kind of legislation. I am opposed to picking, as a matter of special privilege, certain cities or certain persons for favors. I believe they ought to be all treated alike. If the Senate is prepared, as I said, to reduce the size of cities to 4,000 before they are permitted to have city delivery, well and good. If it is prepared to reduce the amount to be received from the city in order to have city delivery, well and good. But let us take a uniform scale and give the city delivery alike to all cities that come up to the standard which we fix, and not proceed upon the theory of special favoritism.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to suggest to the Senator that I believe I was wrong in the statement I made a while ago about the population of cities required in order to get city delivery. I do not believe it is confined to cities of 5,000 people. I believe the rule, or the law—I do not know whether it is a law or a rule of the department, but I believe it is a law—requires the receipts to be $10,000. I do not believe there is any law in regard to population. I made the statement hurriedly, and I am inclined to think I was wrong in it. I know of cities that have city delivery that I am satisfied have considerably less than 5,000 population.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the rule is simply that they must have $10,000 receipts, then that is made the standard. What I am insisting on is that we have a standard, that we adopt what we consider a proper standard, and feed all the communities and all the States out of the same bowl and under the same plan.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I will read from the Postal Regulations the cities that are entitled to City Delivery Service.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRYAN. Section 665 of the Postal Regulations covers this matter, and is as follows:

> Letter carriers shall be employed for the free delivery of mail matter, as frequently as the public business may require, at every incorporated city, village, or borough containing a population of 50,000 within its corporate limits, and may be so employed at every place containing a population of not less than 10,000 within its corporate limits, according to the last general census, taken by authority of State or United States law, or at any post office which produced a gross revenue, for the preceding fiscal year, of not less than $10,000: *Provided*, This act shall not affect the existence of the free delivery in places where it is now established: *And provided further*, That in offices where the free delivery shall be established under the provisions of this act such free delivery shall not be abolished by reason of decrease below 10,000 in population or $10,000 in gross postal revenue, except in the discretion of the Postmaster General.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should be glad to extend the free delivery to cities just as rapidly as we can do

it without a loss. I have presented my view completely when I urge the proposition that we should treat all alike.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not wish to take any considerable time in discussing this question; but I have been attracted by the statement which has just been made by the Senator from Georgia that this is not an experimental service. I think, in making that statement, he is in error. It was instituted two or three years ago because there was very considerable pressure from those living in villages for the installation of a similar service on the ground that every person living in the city under the conditions which obtained had his mail delivered at his door, that every person living in a rural section where there were a sufficient number on the route had his mail delivered at his door, and that there was no reason why a person living in a village a mile from a post office, for instance, should not have the mail delivered to him as in these other cases.

I am quite in sympathy with that contention. I agree that possibly this service can be carried on more economically than by having a distinct village delivery service. I think it ought to be connected with the rural carrier service. I think that if proper experiments are made along that line, many of these people who do live a considerable distance from their post office in a village, and very often do not have conveyances of their own, so that it is more difficult for them to get their mail than it is for the man who lives in the country who does have a conveyance of his own, could be connected up with the rural carrier routes so that the mail could be delivered to them. But we have had no report from the department that I am aware of as to the results obtained from this service, and we have not any recommendation about what should be done with it in the future obtained from the results of the service up to this time. I think, therefore, this appropriation should be continued for another year, with the understanding that the department shall report to Congress next winter some definite, concrete plan for connecting up this village service with the rural carrier service, thereby giving these people the service to which, I think, they are entitled without any very material increase in the expense.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. My attention has been called from the beginning to this special form of delivery service. The proposition was originally started in the House of Representatives by the Hon. WILLIAM W. GRIEST, a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, and the first experiment was had in the town of Ephrata in Lancaster County, which constitutes his district; and since then he has consistently pressed the continuation of the experiment. The experiment was undertaken, as the Senator from Massachusetts has said, in response to a real demand on the part of the public and on account of a real need. It is correctly described as an experiment in the bill and in the report of the Postmaster General. The Senator from Georgia may be entirely right in his contention that this service ought to be ultimately upon a more stable and well-defined basis, but evidently the time has not arrived when any such legislation can be secured.

The Postmaster General, in his report, states in regard to village delivery service as follows:

> In pursuance of a provision contained in the Postal Service appropriation act for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913, experiments have been conducted—

He describes them as experiments—

> in the free delivery of mail from post offices of the second and third class located in communities that are not now entitled by law to City Delivery Service. At the close of the fiscal year the service was in operation in 124 villages. Of these, 22 were offices of the second class and 102 were offices of the third class. A total of 164 carriers were employed, with an average annual compensation of $600.

The report of the Postmaster General then goes on to say that—

> There is no such need or demand for free delivery of mail in small towns and villages as there is in cities and rural districts, and its establishment does not occasion any appreciable increase in the use of the mails. For this reason an economical administration of such a service requires that it be inaugurated only where it is necessary to meet the needs of a particular locality.
>
> The department is endeavoring to work out a feasible plan to coordinate the village delivery with the Rural Delivery Service. As rural routes emanate from practically all of the communities where this village delivery service would be desired, it is believed the carriers should be used to make such deliveries as may be desirable and feasible to the residents of the communities affected. With this change these carriers could be used not only to supplement the general delivery service as indicated, but in many instances in the delivery of parcel-post matter as well, thus obviating the necessity for additional horse hire for the delivery of the larger packages.

It will be observed, therefore, Mr. President, that the Postmaster General distinctly describes this service as an experiment, not as a system to be inaugurated, and he distinctly states that it is to be tried only where the needs of a particular locality may seem to require or justify it.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. PENROSE. Certainly.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the Senator now read, beginning at the bottom of page 323?

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senator will just permit me to finish what I was about to say in relation to this paragraph, I will be very glad to have him call my attention to that page.

Then the Postmaster General goes on to state how he thinks that ultimately he may be able to amalgamate it with the rural delivery service, which may be feasible or not feasible, I do not know; but he goes on to use this language, and I quote from the same page of his report:

> The use of the village delivery service has not extended far enough to determine definitely its practical and economic value to the entire service. Efforts will be made through the utilization of the rural delivery, as already stated, and otherwise to perfect and extend this service in proportion to the benefits to accrue therefrom.

I can not find anything in the recommendation of the Postmaster General adverse to this very small appropriation of $200,000 as fixed by the House, or $150,000 as reported by the Senate committee, to continue what, in my opinion, is a most beneficent and necessary experiment in the Postal Service.

I will be glad now if the Senator from Florida will repeat his inquiry.

Mr. BRYAN. The Postmaster General does not recommend the continuance of this experiment and the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General in commenting on it——

Mr. PENROSE. On what page?

Mr. BRYAN. At the bottom of page 322.

Mr. PENROSE. I have it, Mr. President. This appears to be the report of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General. He says:

> EXPERIMENTAL VILLAGE DELIVERY.
>
> The establishment of this service is authorized at villages and towns having post offices of the second and third classes that are not by law entitled to free-delivery service. The department requires that in towns where the service is instituted there shall be sidewalks, street lights, street signs, and house numbers, and that the patrons shall provide receptacles for the mail. Since the service was assigned to this bureau special attention has been given to the feasibility of utilizing the services of rural carriers to deliver mail to residents of villages, the regulations having been amended so as to permit such delivery. In many towns where the village service is established, rural carriers are rendering service in conjunction with the village carriers, and it is expected that in the smaller villages having post offices from which rural routes are operated, the rural carriers will be able to serve without assistance all patrons who desire to be accommodated. In order that extra compensation may be given to rural carriers in cases where such service adds considerably to their work it is desirable that authority be obtained for such payment out of the appropriation for village delivery service, the additional compensation not to exceed $150 per annum in any individual case. This improved method of administering the experimental delivery service would greatly decrease its cost.
>
> Reports received at the department, however, show that in most of the towns where the experimental service is operated the postal receipts have not been stimulated thereby and that, especially in villages where there are several mail trains daily, the patrons continue to call at the post offices for a large proportion of their mail. The average population of the towns where the service is established is less than 2,000, and the number of persons residing any considerable distance from the post offices in these towns is small. It would thus appear that the village delivery service does not constitute any great convenience for the patrons. Furthermore, the cost of operating the service is heavy when compared with the benefits derived.
>
> An inspection of this service has been directed at each office where it has been in operation for more than six months, and it is expected that by next December full information will be at hand which will be of great service to Congress in determining the advisability of continuing the experiment.

I can not find anything there against continuing this experiment.

Mr. BRYAN. Let me suggest to the Senator that this report was written in October, 1914; that the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General said he would be ready to make a recommendation in December; and then this same gentleman goes before the House committee and says he does not want it.

Mr. PENROSE. I am only stating what he said then. I would be glad if the Senator from Florida would call my attention to the statement made before the House committee. I have the House hearings here, if he will give me the page.

Mr. BRYAN. On page 210.

Mr. PENROSE. I might state, in this connection, that the department in the Book of Estimates for 1916 estimated $200,000 for this item, which the House accepted.

Mr. BRYAN. On page 210 Mr. Blakslee says:

> And I might say that I indicated in my report that its value to the Postal Service, either in increasing the revenues or in the adding of any tremendous improvement, is dubious. We have endeavored, however, to combine it with the Rural Delivery Service—

And so forth. Then he states what the policy is—to give one in each congressional district.

Mr. PENROSE. I see nothing in the statement of Mr. Blakslee before the House committee which does not bear out what I have said. He says as follows:

That is the policy; yes, sir. And I might say that I indicated in my report that its value to the Postal Service, either in increasing the revenues or in the adding of any tremendous improvement, is dubious.

Why, every experiment is dubious, or it would not be an experiment. Let us keep on experimenting until it ceases to be dubious. He continues:

We have endeavored, however, to combine it with Rural Delivery Service, so that the rural carriers could be utilized in this service, and we have presented a recommendation for legislation that would permit us to pay rural carriers extra money for such service.

I can not find in the report of the Postmaster General or the report of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General any definite and specific adverse report on this service. The furthest they go is to say it is experimental, and that, in the opinion of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, it is dubious. I will concede for the sake of the argument that it is dubious, as all experiments are. That is no argument against this small sum of $150,000 in a bill carrying three hundred and twenty-odd million dollars, more or less, to continue an experiment which many people scattered throughout the country have greatly at heart and are greatly interested in.

Now, who the author is of the myth that it is contemplated to put one of these experimental deliveries in every congressional district has not yet developed in this discussion. Somebody said the Postmaster General or the Fourth Assistant had conjured up this ghost. I find no statement of theirs making any such allegation. The statement is made that after this monstrous outrage is perpetrated of giving free delivery in at least one village of every congressional district of the country, we will have saddled on the annual appropriation bill an item of $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 or more. I can not find any foundation for that assertion in any record of the House hearings or in the reports of the department. The proposition has gone no further than the experimental stage, as I understand it.

I have here, Mr. President, a statement of the village delivery service in operation December 1, 1914, which I will ask permission to have inserted as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

Village delivery service in operation Dec. 1, 1914.

State.	Office.	Date established.	Number of carriers.	Annual cost.
Alabama	Florala	Dec. 15, 1913	2	$1,200
Do	Piedmont	May 15, 1913	1	800
Do	Russellville	Nov. 16, 1912	1	600
Arizona	Temple	Jan. 1, 1913	1	925
Arkansas	Benton	Aug. 1, 1913	1	600
Do	Clarksville	Aug. 15, 1913	1	600
Do	Harrison	Apr. 15, 1913	1	600
Do	Morrillton	Apr. 1, 1913	2	1,200
Do	Van Buren	Feb. 17, 1913	1	600
California	Willits	Nov. 16, 1912	1	780
Colorado	Littleton	do	1	600
Connecticut	Guilford	Apr. 1, 1913	1	600
Florida	Monticello	Apr. 15, 1913	1	600
Georgia	Calhoun	Nov. 20, 1912	1	600
Do	Decatur	June 16, 1913	2	1,200
Do	Forsyth	June 1, 1913	1	600
Do	Hawkinsville	July 16, 1914	2	1,200
Do	Sylvania	Jan. 1, 1913	1	500
Do	Sylvester	Oct. 1, 1914		(1)
Do	Waynesboro	July 1, 1914	2	1,200
Idaho	St. Maries	June 1, 1913	1	720
Illinois	Carterville	Mar. 1, 1913	2	1,200
Do	Georgetown	Feb. 17, 1913	2	1,200
Do	Homer	Oct. 16, 1912	1	600
Do	Le Roy	Nov. 1, 1912	1	600
Do	New Athens	May 15, 1913	1	600
Do	Pinckneyville	Dec. 16, 1912	2	1,200
Indiana	Edinburg	July 1, 1914	1	600
Do	Garrett	Oct. 1, 1914	2	1,200
Do	Hope	Nov. 1, 1913	1	700
Do	Jasonville	Dec. 1, 1914	1	600
Do	Mitchell	Nov. 1, 1914	1	600
Do	Rockport	Jan. 1, 1914	2	1,200
Iowa	Belmond	June 16, 1913	1	600
Do	Coon Rapids	Apr. 15, 1913	1	600
Do	Guthrie Center	June 16, 1913	1	600
Do	Lenox	Mar. 1, 1913	1	600
Do	Seymour	June 16, 1913	1	600
Do	West Liberty	do	1	600
Kansas	Minneapolis	Oct. 1, 1913	2	1,200
Do	St. Johns	Jan. 1, 1913	1	600
Do	Wamego	Oct. 1, 1912	1	800
Kentucky	Carlisle	Feb. 1, 1913	1	900
Do	Carrollton	Sept. 1, 1914	1	600
Do	Falmouth	June 1, 1914	1	600
Do	Russellville	May 15, 1913	2	1,200
Do	Sanford	Sept. 1, 1914	1	480
Louisiana	Mansfield	Feb. 1, 1913	1	720
Maine	Kennebunk	Nov. 1, 1912	2	1,200
Maryland	Princess Anne	Dec. 1, 1912	1	600

[1] No change; served by rural carrier.

Village delivery service in operation Dec. 1, 1914—Continued.

State.	Office.	Date established.	Number of carriers.	Annual cost.
Massachusetts	Baldwinsville	Mar. 1, 1913	1	$600
Do	Indian Orchard	Nov. 16, 1912	2	1,440
Do	Yarmouthport	Mar. 1, 1913	1	600
Michigan	Durand	Dec. 1, 1912	2	1,200
Do	Fremont	Mar. 1, 1913	2	1,200
Do	Morenci	Jan. 1, 1913	2	1,200
Do	Plainwell	June 16, 1913	1	600
Do	Reed City	Mar. 1, 1913	1	600
Minnesota	Ada	Dec. 16, 1912	1	600
Do	Zumbrota	Oct. 16, 1912	1	700
Mississippi	Booneville	Feb. 17, 1913	1	600
Do	Ittabena	Dec. 1, 1912	1	600
Missouri	Edina	Mar. 17, 1913	1	600
Do	Festus	May 1, 1914	1	600
Do	Jackson	Mar. 1, 1913	1	600
Do	Lebanon	Oct. 16, 1912	1	800
Do	Pierce City	Aug. 1, 1913	1	600
Do	Plattsburg	Jan. 1, 1913	1	600
Do	Salisbury	Aug. 1, 1913	1	600
Do	Savannah	Apr. 1, 1913	1	600
Nebraska	Pierce	Sept. 1, 1913	1	600
Do	Wymore	Nov. 16, 1912	2	1,200
New Hampshire	Woodsville	Apr. 15, 1913	2	1,200
New Jersey	Leonia	Jan. 16, 1913	2	1,068
Do	Pleasantville	Nov. 1, 1914	2	1,200
New York	Dundee	Nov. 16, 1912	1	600
Do	Lancaster	June 1, 1914	2	1,200
Do	Mayville	Nov. 16, 1912	1	600
Do	Norwood	Apr. 15, 1913	1	600
Do	Painted Post	July 1, 1913	1	600
North Carolina	Newton	Apr. 15, 1913	1	600
North Dakota	Enderlin	Nov. 16, 1912	1	600
Ohio	Jeffersonville	Mar. 1, 1913	1	600
Do	Loudonville	Sept. 15, 1913	2	1,200
Do	Paulding	Dec. 1, 1912	2	1,200
Do	Swanton	Nov. 16, 1912	1	600
Oklahoma	Dewey	Apr. 1, 1913	1	600
Do	Edmond	Apr. 15, 1913	1	600
Do	Sulphur	Feb. 1, 1913	2	1,200
Do	Wynnewood	Mar. 1, 1913	1	600
Pennsylvania	Ephrata	Oct. 16, 1912	2	1,200
Do	Freeland	Nov. 16, 1912	3	1,800
Do	Palmerton	Mar. 17, 1913	2	1,200
Do	Peckville	Aug. 15, 1913	3	1,800
Do	Spring City	May 15, 1913	2	1,200
Do	Tunkhannock	Feb. 17, 1913	2	1,200
Do	White Haven	Nov. 16, 1912	1	900
Do	Wrightsville	Feb. 1, 1913	1	600
Rhode Island	Pascoag	Mar. 1, 1913	1	600
South Carolina	Belton	Sept. 1, 1913	1	600
Do	Blackville	Apr. 15, 1913	1	600
Do	Branchville	Jan. 16, 1913	1	600
Do	Hartsville	June 1, 1914	1	600
Do	Lancaster	Mar. 1, 1913	2	1,200
Do	Winnsboro	Aug. 1, 1913	1	600
Do	Woodruff	Apr. 1, 1913	2	1,140
South Dakota	Gregory	Dec. 1, 1912	1	600
Do	Miller	June 16, 1913	1	600
Tennessee	Elizabethtown	Feb. 17, 1913	1	600
Do	Gallatin	May 1, 1913	2	1,200
Do	Kenton	Nov. 1, 1913	1	600
Do	Lenoir City	Mar. 1, 1913	1	600
Tennessee	McKenzie	May 1, 1913	1	600
Do	McMinnville	Oct. 6, 1912	2	1,200
Do	Newport	Jan. 6, 1913	1	600
Texas	Caldwell	May 15, 1913	1	600
Do	Elgin	Nov. 16, 1912	1	900
Do	Whitesboro	Jan. 1, 1913	1	600
Vermont	Ludlow	July 1, 1913	1	600
Virginia	Berryville	Jan. 1, 1913	1	600
Do	Cape Charles	Feb. 1, 1913	2	1,200
Do	Marion	Sept. 15, 1913	2	1,200
Do	Phoebus	Nov. 1, 1913	2	1,200
Washington	Kent	Dec. 1, 1912	2	1,440
West Virginia	Princeton	Feb. 17, 1913	2	1,400
Wisconsin	Dodgeville	Feb. 1, 1913	2	1,200
Do	Durand	Sept. 1, 1913	1	600
Do	Evansville	Nov. 20, 1912	2	1,200
Do	Kewaunee	July 16, 1913	1	600
Do	New Lisbon	Feb. 1, 1913	1	600

Mr. PENROSE. The question was asked of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General:

How are these villages selected for the installation of free-delivery service?

And he replied:

This appropriation was transferred to our supervision by the First Assistant Postmater General in April last, and the policy of the department in connection therewith was to establish one village delivery service in each congressional district in the country if possible.

Now, I have found the author of the first congressional district proposition. I had not seen it before. It exists in the imagination of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General. But he goes on to say:

As soon as a petition from patrons is received it is investigated, and the conditions relative to the equipment of the community in the way of sidewalks, streets, lights, etc., are ascertained. If it is shown that there are good grounds for its establishment, it is taken care of forthwith.

There is nothing in the act of Congress or in the report of the Postmaster General to indicate this proposition is more

than an experiment. That it is to be extended into every congressional district seems to exist only in the imagination of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, and that would clearly be dependent upon whether the experiment is a success or not.

If it is a success, Mr. President, why should not the Government go on with it? I do not know whether the Senator from Florida has any idea of the number of people who would be benfited by this free delivery, but the statement has been made that not less than 15,000,000 people are directly concerned in the success and permanence of town and village mail delivery. That is quite a number of people to be considered when it comes to extending the facilities and the conveniences of the Postal Service. That is a considerable number of people to be discriminated against when the inhabitants of cities and the inhabitants on farms have the mails delivered at their doors and at their gates.

It is all the more important that this paragraph be left in unless the service is abolished entirely, because, as I understand it, the Senate has agreed to the committee amendment striking out the provision in section 22 which empowered the Postmaster General—

to pay an additional compensation to rural carriers, out of the appropriation for village delivery service, a sum not to exceed $150 per annum in any individual case for delivering mail at second and third class post offices not now by law entitled to free-delivery service.

That having been stricken from the bill, as far as the Senate is concerned, should the House concur in the amendment, this very interesting experiment, so potential for good to the villages which enjoy these privileges and of so much possibility for 15,000,000 people inhabiting them throughout the country, will absolutely be wiped out of the bill by this Congress, giving no relief even in the way of continuing the experiment through the Rural Delivery Service.

I do not think, Mr. President, that I ought to detain the Senate much longer on this matter.

Mr. GRIEST, the author of this legislation in the House, took occasion to communicate with a large number of Representatives who had this experimental service started in their districts, and the testimonials in favor of the service are remarkably unanimous and highly favorable to this form of delivery. They are taken from Representatives regardless of party, and they furnish a striking comment in favor of this experimental delivery from Ephrata, in Pennsylvania, to Willits, in California—from the district of Mr. WILLIAM W. GRIEST to the district of Mr. WILLIAM KENT in the State of California.

I hope that the Senate will not start to economize in this bill by striking out this small sum of $150,000.

I ask permission to insert certain matter in the RECORD without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Class of towns which should be made eligible to receive a permanent mail-carrier service.

State.	Post office.	Gross postal receipts.	Population.	In congressional district of—
Alabama	Florala	$5,711	2,439	Hon. S. H. Dent, jr.
Do	Piedmont	3,624	2,226	Hon. F. L. Blackmon.
Do	Russellville	4,301	2,400	Hon. John L. Burnett.
Arizona	Tempe	6,608	1,800	Hon. Carl Hayden.
Arkansas	Benton	5,110	2,400	Hon. Samuel M. Taylor.
Do	Harrison	7,702	2,000	Hon. John C. Floyd.
Do	Clarksville	5,054	1,700	Hon. H. M. Jacoway.
Do	Morrillton	6,293	2,900	
Do	Van Buren	9,356	4,500	Hon. Otis T. Wingo.
California	Willits	6,695	2,000	Hon. William Kent.
Colorado	Littleton	7,017	1,600	Hon. George J. Kindel.
Connecticut	Guilford	6,150	1,475	Hon. Thomas L. Reilly.
Florida	Monticello	5,032	2,000	Hon. Emmett Wilson.
Georgia	Calhoun	5,617	1,850	Hon. Gordon Lee.
Do	Forsyth	8,320	2,500	Hon. Charles L. Bartlett.
Do	Decatur	6,807	3,000	Hon. William S. Howard.
Do	Sylvania	5,234	1,500	Hon. Charles G. Edwards.
Idaho	St. Maries	7,516	1,500	Hon. B. L. French. Hon. A. T. Smith.
Illinois	Carterville	5,212	3,100	Hon. Robert P. Hill.
Do	Pinckneyville	6,010	2,800	
Do	Dundee	8,517	3,000	Hon. Ira C. Copley.
Do	Georgetown	3,909	3,000	Hon. Frank T. O'Hair.
Do	Homer	3,219	1,130	Hon. Charles M. Borchers.
Do	Le Roy	5,507	1,702	Hon. Louis FitzHenry.
Do	New Athens	2,799	1,200	Hon. William N. Baltz.
Indiana	Hope	4,433	1,400	Hon. Lincoln Dixon.
Iowa	Belmond	5,051	1,350	Hon. Maurice Connolly.
Do	Coon Rapids	4,522	1,200	Hon. Frank P. Woods.
Do	Lenox	4,628	1,274	Hon. H. M. Towner.
Do	Seymour	5,206	2,200	
Do	Guthrie Center	7,063	1,600	Hon. William R. Green.
Do	West Liberty	6,154	1,666	Hon. I. S. Pepper (dead).
Kansas	St. Johns	6,494	1,800	Hon. George A. Neeley.
Do	Minneapolis	7,979	1,925	Hon. Guy T. Helvering.
Do	Wamego	5,675	1,900	Hon. Dudley Doolittle.
Kentucky	Carlisle	5,656	1,433	Hon. William J. Fields.
Do	Russellville	8,160	3,300	Hon. Robert Y. Thomas, jr.

Class of towns which should be made eligible to receive a permanent mail-carrier service—Continued.

State.	Post office.	Gross postal receipts.	Population.	In congressional district of—
Louisiana	Mansfield	$8,163	2,600	Hon. John T. Watkins.
Maine	Kennebunk	7,093	2,300	Hon. Asher C. Hinds.
Maryland	Princess Anne	7,173	1,009	Hon. J. H. Covington.
Massachusetts	Baldwinsville	4,669	2,000	Hon. C. DeWitt Paige.
Do	Yarmouth Port	2,463	800	Hon. T. C. Thacher.
Do	Indian Orchard	8,104	6,000	Hon. F. H. Gillett.
Michigan	Durand	7,310	2,315	Hon. J. W. Fordney.
Do	Fremont	8,660	2,000	Hon. James C. McLaughlin.
Do	Morenci	5,110	1,700	Hon. S. W. Beakes.
Do	Reed City	8,516	1,630	Hon. Francis O. Lindquist.
Do	Plainwell	5,616	1,600	Hon. E. L. Hamilton.
Minnesota	Ada	5,554	1,432	Hon. Halvor Steenerson.
Do	Zumbrota	5,535	1,200	Hon. C. R. Davis.
Mississippi	Boonville	4,958	1,378	Hon. E. S. Candler, jr.
Do	Itta Bena	4,221	1,800	Hon. B. G. Humphreys.
Missouri	Edina	5,117	1,562	Hon. James T. Lloyd.
Do	Jackson	6,036	2,300	Hon. J. J. Russell.
Do	Lebanon	8,403	2,500	Hon. T. L. Rubey.
Do	Plattsburg	5,870	1,960	Hon. J. W. Alexander.
Do	Pierce City	5,356	2,000	Hon. P. D. Decker.
Do	Salisbury	7,673	1,834	Hon. W. W. Rucker.
Do	Savannah	6,256	1,860	Hon. Charles F. Booher.
Nebraska	Pierce	4,276	1,500	Hon. D. V. Stephens.
Do	Wymore	6,181	2,613	Hon. Charles H. Sloan.
New Hampshire	Woodsville	8,379	2,000	Hon. R. B. Stevens.
New Jersey	Leonia	3,617	2,200	Hon. A. C. Hart.
New York	Dundee	5,778	1,227	Hon. S. E. Payne.
Do	Mayville	5,136	1,200	Hon. Charles M. Hamilton.
Do	Norwood	5,436	2,000	Hon. Edwin A. Merritt, jr.
Do	Painted Post	5,542	1,400	Hon. E. S. Underhill.
North Carolina	Newton	6,337	3,000	Hon. E. Y. Webb.
North Dakota	Enderlin	5,540	1,540	Hon. Henry T. Helgesen.
Ohio	Eaton	8,913	3,187	Hon. Warren Gard.
Do	Jeffersonville	2,725	628	Hon. James D. Post.
Do	Loudonville	6,505	1,800	Hon. William G. Sharp.
Do	Paulding	9,082	2,500	Hon. T. T. Ansberry.
Do	Swanton	5,434	1,200	Hon. I. R. Sherwood.
Oklahoma	Dewey	6,841	2,400	Hon. James S. Davenport.
Do	Edmond	6,835	2,090	Hon. Dick T. Morgan.
Do	Sulphur	8,053	3,225	Hon. Charles D. Carter.
Do	Wynnewood	5,080	2,002	Hon. Scott Ferris.
Pennsylvania	Ephrata	7,608	3,300	Hon. W. W. Griest.
Do	Freeland	7,599	7,300	Hon. John J. Casey.
Do	White Haven	7,972	1,500	
Do	Palmerton	6,464	5,200	Hon. A. Mitchell Palmer.
Do	Peckville	4,141	4,000	Hon. John R. Farr.
Do	Spring City	6,924	3,000	Hon. Thomas S. Butler.
Do	Tunkhannock	8,022	2,100	Hon. W. D. B. Ainey.
Do	Wrightsville	3,785	2,025	Hon. A. R. Brodbeck.
Rhode Island	Pascoag	4,334	2,500	
South Carolina	Blackville	4,154	2,400	Hon. J. F. Byrnes.
Do	Belton	4,490	1,650	Hon. Wyatt Aiken.
Do	Branchville	2,713	2,500	Hon. A. F. Lever.
Do	Lancaster	8,004	2,200	Hon. D. E. Finley.
Do	Winnsboro	6,061	2,000	
Do	Woodruff	3,077	2,000	Hon. J. T. Johnson.
South Dakota	Gregory	5,424	1,142	Hon. E. W. Martin.
Do	Miller	5,597	1,202	Hon. Charles H. Burke.
Tennessee	Elizabethton	5,937	2,478	Hon. Sam R. Sells.
Do	Newport	6,293	2,003	
Do	Gallatin	8,680	3,000	Hon. Cordell Hull.
Do	Kenton	3,061	1,200	Hon. F. J. Garrett.
Do	Lenoir City	5,875	3,392	Hon. R. W. Austin.
Do	McMinnville	7,796	2,399	Hon. J. A. Moon.
Do	McKenzie	5,415	2,000	Hon. T. W. Sims.
Texas	Caldwell	5,558	1,600	Hon. J. P. Buchanan.
Do	Elgin	7,280	2,000	
Do	Whitesboro	4,821	1,500	Hon. Sam Rayburn.
Vermont	Ludlow	6,078	1,700	Hon. Frank Plumley.
Virginia	Berryville	5,378	1,150	Hon. James Hay.
Do	Cape Charles	7,481	3,000	Hon. William A. Jones.
Do	Phoebus	6,016	2,200	
Do	Marion	8,105	3,000	Hon. C. B. Slemp.
Washington	Kent	7,223	2,400	Hon. William E. Humphrey.
West Virginia	Princeton	8,945	5,000	Hon. J. A. Hughes.
Wisconsin	Dodgeville	6,775	2,500	Hon. John M. Nelson.
Do	Durand	7,038	1,503	Hon. James A. Frear.
Do	Evansville	8,581	2,250	Hon. Henry A. Cooper.
Do	Kewaunee	8,112	2,000	Hon. Thomas F. Konop.
Do	New Lisbon	3,949	1,074	Hon. John J. Esch.

[Appendix to remarks of Hon. WILLIAM W. GRIEST on the bill (H. R. 11338) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes.]

Mr. GRIEST. Mr. Speaker, supplementary to my remarks on town and village mail delivery, delivered in the House January 16, 1914, I desire to present additional testimonials which have been received by courtesy of and through Members of the House in commendation and indorsement of the experimental mail delivery now in operation in the districts of these Members. These letters, taken in connection with those previously presented, show that the experimental mail-delivery system is a pronounced success, and they refute the information received by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], who on the day of the adoption of the paragraph in the Post Office appropriation bill relating to town and village mail delivery is reported in the RECORD as saying:

"Representatives in the House who live in such communities have informed me that they know this service is of no special benefit."

Among the 114 Members who have this service in their districts I have been unable to discover a single one who does not commend it and demand its retention by the Government. The letters now presented for publication, and those heretofore published, indicate a unanimous desire on the part of "Representatives who live in such communities"

for the permanent establishment of a service which, it is now demonstrated, is regarded as indispensable and to the benefits of which from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 are of right entitled.

Hon. Sereno E. Payne, representing Dundee, N. Y., writes:

"I certainly think this service should be extended to villages of the same class where a single carrier can do the work and larger ones where two carriers can do it."

Congressman Payne also furnishes a letter from Mr. E. Vreeland, of Dundee, who says:

"The people appreciate the service and desire to have it continued and improved. The residences should be ordered numbered and collection boxes erected. Should the service be taken away a vigorous protest will result. With the constant increase of postal business, especially the growth of parcel post, it is almost imperative that a way be provided for the quick disposition of mail matter. Otherwise larger quarters and additional help will be needed to properly conduct the business even in a third-class office."

Hon. H. H. SELDOMRIDGE, representing Littleton, Colo., writes:

"I have just received a letter from the postmaster at Littleton, Colo., which substantially confirms the report made by the postmaster at Ephrata, Pa. The postmaster states that the service has been satisfactory in every way. The carrier there is handling over 18,000 pieces of mail each month. The service has grown to the extent that over 780 patrons are being served. There has been full and complete cooperation between the people and the postmaster, and a discontinuance of the service would be greatly deplored."

Hon. SAM R. SELLS, representing Elizabethton, Tenn., writes:

"I have been to Elizabethton a few days ago and find that the statements of the postmaster with reference to this service are correct. The patrons of the office are very much in favor of the continuance of this delivery, and I trust that arrangements to that effect may be provided for in the annual Post Office appropriation bill."

Congressman SELLS also submits a letter from Mr. E. E. Hathoway, who says:

"The patrons are well pleased with the village free delivery that we have at this office and ask that you use your influence to make it permanent. I believe that it has increased the receipts of this office. I have had a number of the patrons who are served by this delivery to ask that you do what you can to make it permanent, that it saves them time running to the office for the mail, and the business men are more than delighted with it. I hope you will do all you can for us."

Hon. THOMAS L. RUBEY, representing Lebanon, Mo., transmits a letter from F. J. Swett, who says:

"In reply, permit me to say that my experience with the establishment of five rural routes justifies me to believe that the attempt to deliver mail in towns of this size, in view of the time established, is an absolute success. In other words, if this service is made permanent, in a few years there will be no demand at the general-delivery window except by transients. My conclusion regarding the delivery of mail in Lebanon is as follows: The certainty of receiving and collecting mail at regular hours will have a most beneficial effect upon the patrons of the office in saving them time and systematizing their mail, and without additional expense to the service."

Hon. JAMES A. HUGHES, representing Princeton, W. Va., writes:

"I want to say that the postmaster, the city council, and all of the business interests at Princeton are enthusiastically in favor of this service, and, in fact, this service now has become a necessity. This particular town is strung out about 3 miles in length."

Congressman HUGHES submits a latter from Mr. Wirt A. French and a resolution signed by Mayor J. D. Scott as adopted by the City Council of Princeton.

Mr. French writes:

"We have between 6,000 and 7,000 inhabitants within our corporate limits at this time, and I should say that the post office serves at least 7,500 people in and out side of the corporate limits. I beg to report further that the delivery system in use in our city has been of the greatest benefit to all our citizens, and we feel that if anything should occur to deprive us of same that it would indeed be the worst calamity that could possibly befall us."

The resolution reads:

"Whereas it appears that our present city delivery of mails is only temporary and dependent upon the Congress of the United States for an appropriation for its continuance; and

"Whereas that city delivery has been in use in our city for about 11 months, and has proven so entirely satisfactory that our business concerns and residents have become dependent upon same to such an extent that to discontinue same would, in our opinion, be nothing short of a calamity, and would result in irreparable injury to the best interests of our city and the whole citizenship of same * * *.

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our city, and that the recorder be requested to furnish two copies of same to Wirt A. French, postmaster of our city, with the request that he forward same to our Senators and Members of Congress."

Hon. BURTON L. FRENCH, representing St. Maries, Idaho, advises:

"I would say that as far as the experiment has gone I am advised that it has proven a decided success. The experiment has been seriously handicapped on account of the fact that the service has been allowed but one carrier, and he has not been provided with equipment such as mail bags, etc., that would have best served him as carrier. There has been no provision made for street letter boxes, and as a result of this many people have had to go to the St. Maries post office to mail their letters who had no other reason for making the trip. The postmaster at St. Maries, Mr. Edgar T. Hawley, advises me that it is his judgment that the delivery system that has been tried experimentally at St. Maries would be a decided success in such post offices if a sufficient number of carriers with equipment could be provided and letter boxes for the collection of mail placed at suitable points. He advises that he believes that the public at St. Maries have been profited far beyond the cost of maintaining the system there, and that the general idea is a good one."

Hon. E. A. Merritt, jr., representing Norwood, N. Y., writes:

"For the past two years the village of Norwood, N. Y., in the congressional district which I represent, has been designated as one of those for experimental test of mail-delivery service in towns and villages not eligible under the present law to receive city delivery service. The service in Norwood has proven highly satisfactory to the patrons of the office, has been of great assistance to the business men of the town, and I am informed that the postal receipts since its inauguration have increased. I therefore am most heartily in favor of that item in the Post Office appropriation bill appropriating $200,000 for continuation of this service, and also would favor any plan providing for the proper extension of this service so that all villages where it would be beneficial might be included. Therefore any assistance that I can render to that end I shall be most pleased to do."

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES, representing Blackville, S. C., sends a letter from Mr. B. J. Hammet, who reports:

"It affords me pleasure to state that the patrons of this office are much pleased and delighted with the city delivery service."

Hon. JAMES A. FREAR, representing Durand, Wis., incloses letters from Messrs. August Ender and H. A. Miles, who say that the mail-carrier service "is highly satisfactory to the patrons."

Mr. Ender writes:

"In regard to your interesting inquiry, will say the city delivery is working wonders here, and our people could hardly get along without it. The revenues of the local post office have increased, and there is such a friendly feeling that we have used our paper to urge people to be still better patrons of Uncle Sam."

Mr. R. P. Wilton, chief burgess of Wrightsville, Pa., writes:

"Learning of the contemplated plan of the Post Office Department to discontinue the free mail-delivery service established in 114 towns and villages throughout the United States, and realizing that the discontinuance of this service would seriously affect the welfare of the town, I called a special mass meeting of citizens to protest the action of the department and to petition Congress. This mass meeting was held Tuesday evening, January 20, and the inclosed sworn copy of resolution will convey, in a measure, the sentiment of the town. Surely, a resolution signed enthusiastically by more than 700 citizens must carry great weight."

The resolution, signed by 751 citizens of Wrightsville, reads:

"Realizing that the discontinuance of free mail-delivery service established in Wrightsville, Pa., in February, 1913, would interfere seriously with the growth and welfare of the borough, and to express our appreciation of this service as now enjoyed and found necessary, it is

"*Resolved*, That we, the citizens of Wrightsville, Pa., in special mass meeting assembled, do petition Congress and the Post Office Department to take such action that will insure a continuance of this very valuable and appreciated service."

Hon. R. W. AUSTIN, representing Lenoir City, Tenn., presents the following from S. F. Carroll:

"The village delivery service for Lenoir City has proven entirely satisfactory in every respect and has been well received and patronized. The receipts of the office has increased over last year."

Hon. FRANK PLUMLEY, representing Ludlow, Vt., after careful inquiry, writes:

"Extending my answer of the 7th instant to yours of the 29th ultimo, wherein you sought information concerning the operation of the experiment of mail delivery service in towns and villages, in the town or village of Ludlow, Vt., being one of those experimental tests made by the Post Office Department, I am now prepared to say to you that careful inquiry disclosed the fact that beginning with July 4,483 pieces were delivered; August, 7,186; September, 8,310; October, 10,536; November, 9,919; December, 13,600, being a progressive and rapidly increasing use of the facility offered, and constituting a total for the six months ending December 31 of 54,034 pieces. This service was all rendered by one man, except on Christmas week, when a clerk was furnished and a team to help out a carrier, and with this assistance everything was kept cleared up each day. Collections were made by the carrier, as patrons handed him their mail as he passed by.

"It being known that I was making some inquiry to get information concerning the operation of this method of helping out in their village, and a rumor having started that there was danger that the village would lose the privilege they had through it, voluntary letters have come to me from merchants and business men and citizens expressing strong commendation of the service, saying that many of the merchants patronized it; that it is the greatest benefit to ladies and people living a long distance from the office; that the village is served by a very efficient carrier, and everybody would hate very much to give up their great accommodation, and further saying that if Congress wants to take the free delivery away the people in Ludlow must enter a protest. Another asks me most earnestly to support the retention of the free-delivery proposition for Ludlow and other places like it; it is said by this person that 'the experiment here is proving a great convenience and is appreciated by all our people. We hope you will see your way clear to indorse the privilege recently granted.' Another says: 'I certainly hope that the appropriation bill for letter carriers in towns like Ludlow will be carried through. I certainly have enjoyed having my mail and parcel post delivered. It would be a great disappointment to me to have our carrier discontinued. It saves time and is so convenient. I am sure this is the case with everyone in town. Any part you may take in favor of continuing our carrier will be appreciated by me and everyone in town.' Another says: 'I find upon investigation that a goodly number are taking advantage of the arrangement. I feel that there will be much inconvenience felt by a goodly number should the present arrangement be discontinued. One of the rural free delivery carriers stated that if the increase in the use continued it would not be long before a second carrier would be needed.'

"I will say, further, that the other information which I have from Ludlow is along the same line, and substantiates fully the quotations which I have made, and having a deep interest in every step which brings to the people their mail most readily and efficiently, and which tends, as I believe, to the development and betterment of the conditions in our towns and villages of modern size, I heartily favor the continuance and extension of village mail delivery.

"If there is anything which I can do to aid you in your appreciated efforts along this line, I offer my services."

Hon. WILLIAM KENT, representing Willits, Cal., submits a letter from Mr. Charles Whiteel, who writes as follows:

"Relating to experimental city delivery, would state that it is giving good satisfaction, and if it is not made permanent it will be a great disappointment to the patrons of the delivery. It has increased the receipts and made the service more thorough."

Hon. SCOTT FERRIS, representing Wynnewood, Okla., transmits an interesting letter from Mr. H. S. Shackelford and a largely signed petition from patrons of Wynnewood, which reads:

"We, the citizens of Wynnewood, Okla., patrons of the Wynnewood post office, now being served as such through the experimental village free delivery, respectfully petition your honor to work for and aid in securing the continuation of same for this as well as other villages and towns of like size. We are decidedly in favor of this branch of the service, because it enables us to enjoy the same privilege that our rural neighbor enjoys, as well as our neighbors living in a city where the receipts of the office are such that they are permitted to have regular free-delivery service because of said regulations.

"The service in this town has been very efficient and has proven beyond a doubt that the Post Office Department has made no mistake in

establishing said service, and we are loath to give up this highly appreciated service."

Mr. E. E. Norvell, of Wynnewood, Okla., also writes as follows:

"This service has been in operation in this city since March 1, 1913, and recently a petition was circulated for its continuation, and only one man in the whole city refused to sign the petition, yet his wife was very enthusiastic in asking for the continuation of the service.

"This service fills a long-felt want by the women and children of these towns and cities, which enables them to get the daily papers, instead of them being carried to the business houses and thrown down, and perhaps never carried to the residences by their husbands and fathers, thereby depriving them of the educational advantages they would get by the reading of the daily newspapers.

"The women and children of our city are the loudest in their praises of the service they are getting through this branch of the service. We have a population of 2,800, and practically the entire town is being served by the village carrier and the two R. F. D. carriers out of this office. We have been unable to ascertain whether the collection of mail has been greater than would have been mailed at the post office or not because the department has failed to furnish mail boxes for the streets.

"I shall soon retire from the service as postmaster of this city, but I am very enthusiastic in my support of the village delivery service for small towns. I also take a pride in the fact that my office was the second in the State of Oklahoma to have this service established."

I also present a letter from Hon. Daniel C. Roper, First Assistant Postmaster General, who has kindly submitted data as to the number of different towns represented by applications, petitions, and inquiries filed in the Post Office Department concerning the establishment of town or village mail-delivery service.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, January 23, 1914.

Hon. W. W. GRIEST,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. GRIEST: Referring to your letters of December 22, 1913, and January 19, 1914, I take pleasure in inclosing the data relative to experimental mail delivery service you request, showing by States the number of applications received for the institution of the service on which no action has been taken, and the number of inquiries received on the subject of delivery at the different towns.

I very much regret that through a misunderstanding this data was not furnished you more promptly.

Yours, very truly,

DANIEL C. ROPER,
First Assistant Postmaster General.

Applications filed in Post Office Department in re experimental mail-delivery service on which no action has been taken.

State.	Number of petitions filed.	Number of applications received.	Number of inquiries received.	Total communications regarding service at different offices.
Alabama	1	11	1	13
Arizona		1		1
Arkansas	1	17		18
California		8	0	8
Colorado		2	0	2
Connecticut		6	0	6
Delaware	1	1	0	2
Florida		5		5
Georgia	3	22	1	26
Idaho		1		1
Illinois	1	35	7	43
Indiana	5	32		37
Iowa	1	19		20
Kansas		14		14
Kentucky		18	1	19
Louisiana	2	2		4
Maine	1	12	2	15
Maryland	2	11		13
Massachusetts	2	19	1	22
Michigan	2	21	18	41
Minnesota		8	6	14
Mississippi	4	26		30
Missouri	11	68	12	91
Montana		1		1
Nebraska	3	14		17
New Hampshire		3	2	5
New Jersey	1	21		22
New Mexico		2		2
New York	3	31	9	43
North Carolina	1	18		19
North Dakota		2		2
Ohio	2	29		31
Oklahoma		9	3	12
Oregon		5		5
Pennsylvania	6	57	3	66
Porto Rico		2		2
South Carolina	4	17	3	24
South Dakota		4		4
Tennessee	1	25	4	30
Texas	4	41	5	50
Utah		3		3
Vermont	1	4		5
Virginia		6	2	8
Washington	1	1		2
West Virginia		5	2	7
Wisconsin	2	17		19
Wyoming		1		1
Total	66	677	82	825

NOTE.—By "application" is meant the number of different towns requesting institution of the service. By "petitions" is meant the formal request by a number of citizens for the service. By "inquiries" is meant the number of communications received in addition to the petitions and applications.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word before the vote is taken upon this amendment.

It seems that the revenues of the Post Office Department, as estimated for the coming year, would be from $20,000,000 to $30,000,000 short of the expenditures. If there ever was a time, it is important now that we should at least curb those appropriations which indicate that in the future will produce great expenditure. The Senator from Florida has stated that, in his judgment, if the experiment is extended from free-delivery village, as now named, to the thousands of the same size in the United States, that it would ultimately make an expenditure of probably $20,000,000 a year.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that in these times we should not make these expenditures. It is not of any great benefit. Everyone knows that in villages less than 2,000, and that is the size which the Postmaster General has said is the limit upon which any delivery of this kind has been established, that the people desire to go to the post office for their mail. It is not any great inconvenience for them to go, because the distance is only a few blocks. Considering the enormous expense it is likely to develop, and the fact that it is not any great convenience to the people, and that we have a deficit in the treasury of the Postal Service, it seems to me that we ought to vote in favor of striking out this appropriation.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Colorado a question?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Certainly.

Mr. GRONNA. I want to ask the Senator from Colorado if it would not be well to commence economy on the extension of the parcel post?

Mr. SHAFROTH. It is mighty hard to tell——

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator will permit me to finish my statement, I desire to say that the Senator knows that the department has lost large sums of money this year on account of the classification that has been made; and only such people as Sears, Roebuck & Co., Montgomery Ward, and other catalogue houses have profited by it. It is only recently that Sears, Roebuck & Co. declared a dividend of more than $20,000,000. Why not commence economy there, instead of cutting down on these little items which give the people of this country valuable and needed service?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will suggest to the Senator that men will differ as to which item of an appropriation bill is the more important. I am satisfied that the parcel post has produced a great reduction in express rates for the people, though maybe that is a service that ought to be curtailed somewhat; but here we are branching out into a new experiment, which it is supposed will in time develop into an enormous expenditure. The Senator from Florida has estimated it at $20,000,000. To start that now at a time when we will have a deficit in the postal receipts seems to me to be very wrong.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President——

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. I agree with the Senator from Colorado that it is desirable to limit expenses, this year especially, so far as possible, but the Senator himself has just voted for a proposition that added $2,700,000 to the bill as reported by the committee, and now he wants to save $150,000 in some other way. Why did he not vote to save the $2,700,000?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, 62 Senators voted in favor of that appropriation and only 10 voted against it. That is pretty good evidence of the fact that it was a needed appropriation; but that was a different proposition from establishing and extending a new branch of the service that will involve large expenditures in the future. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the amendment of the Senator from Florida ought to be agreed to and that the provision in the bill ought to be stricken out.

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gallinger	Nelson	Shields
Bankhead	Gore	Norris	Simmons
Brandegee	Gronna	Oliver	Smith, Md.
Bristow	Hardwick	Page	Sterling
Bryan	James	Penrose	Swanson
Burleigh	Johnson	Perkins	Thomas
Camden	Jones	Pittman	Thompson
Catron	Kern	Poindexter	Townsend
Chamberlain	Lane	Pomerene	Walsh
Chilton	Lewis	Ransdell	Weeks
Clapp	Lippitt	Robinson	White
Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Root	Williams
Culberson	McCumber	Saulsbury	
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Shafroth	
Fletcher	Myers	Sheppard	

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

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, just a word in reference to this amendment. If I understand correctly, the Senator from Florida has moved to strike out the provision for experimental village delivery. I have not listened to all that has been said on the subject, but I wish to submit this thought, which comes to me from practical experience in matters of this kind. This delivery service is only provided in sizeable towns, not small towns but good-sized towns, which are a little too small for ordinary city delivery. I know of many cases where on the outside of the line between a corporate village and the country are families who are served with free rural delivery, while on the inside of the line the patrons have to go to the post office for their mail. That is a hard matter to explain, and it is almost impossible to satisfy those people.

It has occurred to me that the people on the inside, or the village side of the line, are quite as much entitled to delivery as those who live just across the road. That point is emphasized over and over again in all of the cases where we have this delivery; and therefore it seems to me that, until this experiment shall determine the feasibility of the project, we can afford to continue it, having started upon it and not having appropriated any larger amount, until we are satisfied that it is either good or bad.

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

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

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

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair as on the last vote, and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES], and therefore withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. VARDAMAN (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY], but I understand if he were present he would vote as I have voted, and so I will let my vote stand.

Mr. STERLING. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CULBERSON (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CHILTON (after having voted in the negative). I inquire whether the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] has voted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. CHILTON. I have a pair with that Senator, but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am requested to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. HUGHES] on account of illness in his family, and to state that he is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING].

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bristow	Hardwick	Poindexter	Stone
Bryan	Jones	Ransdell	Thomas
Burton	Kern	Robinson	Thompson
Camden	Martine, N. J.	Root	Walsh
Catron	Myers	Shafroth	White
Clapp	Nelson	Sheppard	
Fletcher	Norris	Smith, Ga.	
Gore	Overman	Smoot	

NAYS—36.

Ashurst	Gronna	Martin, Va.	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	James	Oliver	Smith, Mich.
Burleigh	Johnson	Page	Sterling
Chamberlain	La Follette	Penrose	Swanson
Chilton	Lane	Perkins	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Pomerene	Vardaman
Culberson	Lodge	Saulsbury	Warren
Dillingham	McCumber	Simmons	Weeks
Gallinger	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	Williams

NOT VOTING—31.

Bankhead	Fall	Lewis	Shively
Borah	Goff	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Brady	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Stephenson
Clarke, Ark.	Hollis	Owen	Sutherland
Colt	Hughes	Pittman	Thornton
Crawford	Kenyon	Reed	Tillman
Cummins	Lea, Tenn.	Sherman	Works
du Pont	Lee, Md.	Shields	

So Mr. BRYAN'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I judge from the length of debate over this item of $150,000 for village delivery and from the statement of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] that there is a $20,000,000 deficit in the department, that the committee would not object to any suggestion that would curtail the expenses of the department without interfering with its efficiency. I want to submit an amendment in a moment, and I hope that, in view of the situation of the department as to its revenues, there will not be any point of order made against it by the committee, and that it will at least not be opposed by the committee. The amendment is to take the first-class and second-class post offices out of the control of politics and to put them on a business basis.

This is not a new matter by any means. I do not claim any virtue of discovery or originality in suggesting it. It is a matter that has been very carefully investigated by Government commissions, and I want to read in a moment short extracts from several messages of the President of the United States in a former administration, urging the adoption of this change in the official arrangement for the conduct of the first and second class post offices.

The first and second class post offices are not, or at least ought not to be, political institutions. They are business institutions, the purpose being to receive the mail which comes into the post office, to distribute it, to sell the stamps and money orders, to receive the revenues, and to make the proper accounting for them. It is perfectly obvious, it does not need any argument to convince any reasonable man, that so far as the purposes of these offices are concerned the same economy and the same business efficiency ought to be applied that is applied in any private concern. There can be no object whatever in allowing the desire of a political party to prevail in the country to turn these offices over as the muniments of war of political campaigns.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, may I address an inquiry to the Senator?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator certainly does not mean to insinuate that that has been the practice under the present administration. Does he?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; I do not make any insinuation.

Mr. PENROSE. I am very much gratified to know that.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator has been here and has observed the amount of time the Senate has spent in discussing the wholesale change of first and second class postmasters, he realizes that I would not make any such insinuation. These changes have been based altogether upon the political partisanship of the man receiving the appointment, having nothing whatever to do with their efficiency in the Government business. It is corrupting in its influence and embarrassing to the proper independence of the Senate.

Mr. President, even if there were no saving in the cost of operation, the office ought to be run solely for the purposes of the Post Office Department; but when it costs more to the extent of at least $6,000,000 a year to put them under political control, there is an additional reason why politics ought to be eliminated from it.

In practically every first and second class post office there is both a postmaster and an assistant postmaster.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington what his proposed amendment is?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will read it to the Senator. I was just going to state the substance of it, in the first place. The substance, before reading the amendment, is to consolidate the two offices of postmaster and assistant postmaster in first and second class offices, and to change the name of the assistant postmaster to superintendent, and put it in the classified civil service.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to have the Senator read the amendment to the Senate, so that I can understand it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I propose to add, at the close of the bill, this——

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is about to read what he now offers?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes; what I will offer in a moment.

The offices of postmaster and assistant postmaster are hereby abolished in first and second class offices, and in lieu thereof is created the office of superintendent of post office. Each post office of the first and second classes shall be in charge of a superintendent, to be appointed by the Postmaster General. In each such office where there is an assistant postmaster such assistant postmaster shall be appointed to the office of superintendent of post office, if qualified therefor, and shall hold the same subject to the laws and regulations of the classified civil service. Thereafter all appointments to the office of superintendent of post office shall be made upon merit, and where practicable by promotion or transfer from the employees of the Postal Service, and shall hold the office without regard to politics or political recommendations, upon the terms and conditions and subject to such tenure as is provided by the laws and regulations governing the classified permanent civil service. For compensation to such superintendents of post offices there is hereby appropriated $3,613,279. This section shall not apply to postmasters or assistant postmasters now in office whose terms have not expired, but they shall be allowed to serve out the term for which they were appointed. All acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington pardon some inquiries?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CLAPP. It is needless, of course, for me to say that I am in hearty sympathy with the spirit of the proposed amendment, but it seems to me to leave the matter incomplete in some respects.

First, it makes no provision for the salaries of these superintendents.

Second, wherever there is to-day a postmaster and an assistant postmaster, theoretically at least the services of the two are required, and dispensing with the one, as this amendment would do, would leave the offices short one assistant or one man who would ordinarily take the place of the assistant. It seems to me that the amendment ought to cover those two points.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

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

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will ask the Senator from Kansas to pardon me just a moment. I am very glad that the Senator from Minnesota made his inquiry. He is mistaken, however, as to the amendment not providing for the salary of these superintendents.

Mr. CLAPP. There is a gross appropriation; but the Senator does not say, in the amendment, what the salary of the superintendent at a given point would be. It does not even continue in force the rate of salary which either the assistant or the postmaster at present is receiving. It is true that the amendment makes an appropriation of some $3,000,000 for salaries.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It would leave it, until corresponding changes are made in the classified service, in the discretion of the Postmaster General to fix the salary of these superintendents, which as a matter of probability would be based upon the present salary of the assistant postmaster.

Mr. CLAPP. If this amendment were adopted, and the term of office of the postmaster in some given post office should expire, the assistant then would become, if qualified, under this amendment, the superintendent. In the absence of any express provision, would the Postmaster General have any authority to fix the compensation of that superintendent? It does not seem to me that he would. If he has, then that point is covered.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think he would have authority to fix the salary, but if not that is a detail which could be very easily taken care of. It has been estimated by those who have given some attention to the subject that the additional responsibilities and services that would be required of those employees who are now assistant postmasters, in case they took charge of the office and performed the duties that are now performed by the postmaster and the assistant postmaster, would be reasonably compensated by an increase of approximately 20 per cent in the salaries which they now receive.

Mr. CLAPP. That is merely an estimate; but the question is, Does the authority exist? If it does not exist, it seems to me that if this amendment is to be adopted at this time the authority ought to be conferred or some rule given for fixing the salary.

The other point is this: Take a position where to-day there is a postmaster and an assistant postmaster. Under this amendment, if it is adopted, the postmaster will go out at the end of his term and the assistant will be advanced to the office of superintendent. Now, is there any authority anywhere to-day in the law—I am making the inquiry because I am not familiar with the facts—under which the additional help could be appointed, designated, and employed that would be rendered necessary by eliminating one of these officials?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes; the Postmaster General has authority to allow additional employees in offices. My opinion is that there probably would be very little need for additional help.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BRISTOW. The last remark of the Senator is just what I wanted to call his attention to. In my opinion you could drop out of existence, according to the provisions of this amendment, every postmaster in the United States, leaving the assistant postmaster and the superintendent at their present salaries; and, so far as the effectiveness and the efficiency of the service is concerned, the people would never know anything about it.

Mr. CLAPP. In the main that is probably true.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I agree with the Senator as to that, but still there would be a saving of many millions of dollars even if we increased to some extent the salaries of the present assistant postmasters, say, to the extent of 20 per cent. At the present time the salaries of postmasters in first-class offices amount in the aggregate to $1,731,800, and of the postmasters in second-class offices to $4,682,500, being a total of $6,414,300 as the salaries of the postmasters of first and second class offices. All of that would be saved, because the office of postmaster would be abolished. The salaries of assistant postmasters in first-class offices aggregate $846,600, and those of assistant postmasters in second-class offices $2,164,466, or a total of $3,011,066. If the salaries of the assistant postmasters be raised 20 per cent on account of the increased responsibility of having charge of the office, that would amount to $602,213; and if that amount is deducted from the total salaries of the postmasters at the present time it will give a result of $5,812,087, which would be directly saved by this change; but it is estimated that the indirect saving in the increased efficiency of the office by having it in charge of competent superintendents, who are chosen for merit and for experience, would be as great as the direct saving.

I referred a moment ago to the recommendation of the President of the United States. One of the good things that the former President, Mr. Taft, did was to advocate a budget system for the finances of the Government. He gave a great deal of attention and study to it. I do not think he ever received the credit to which he was entitled for the work he did in behalf of the economical administration of the enormous revenues of the United States; but in pursuance of that plan he discussed this question of putting the first and second class post offices upon a business basis and conducting them as they ought to be conducted, in the interest of the service for which they are established.

Mr. President, the reason why there are assistant postmasters in most of the offices is because when some local politician receives the reward for the services which he has rendered to the party that won out in the election, and he is appointed postmaster, he does not know anything about the duties of the office and he has to get somebody to run the office for him. That is the reason why there are assistant postmasters. The assistant postmaster is the man who runs the office. The assistant postmasters could run it just as well, in many cases, if there were not any postmaster there.

Mr. Taft in a message to the Senate and the House of Representatives said.

I have several times called attention to the advantages to be derived from placing in the classified service the local officers under the departments of the Treasury, of the Post Office, of Justice, of the Interior, and of Commerce and Labor. In my message submitted to the Congress on January 17 I referred to the loss occasioned to the Government because of the fact that in many cases two persons are paid for doing work that could easily be done by one. In the meantime I have caused an inquiry to be made as to the amount in money of this loss. The results of this inquiry are that the loss amounts to at least $10,000,000 annually.

That is worth saving, Mr. President, at a time when there is a deficit in the revenues and when you are seeking to recoup those losses out of the salaries of rural carriers and by cutting off the extension of the rural service, of new rural routes. Instead of meeting the deficit in the revenues by a deterioration in the service of the department, you can meet it, in large part, by the changes which I refer to without interfering in the slightest degree with the quality of the service, and, in fact, improving it.

Mr. Taft says:

For example, it appears that a very substantial economy would result from putting experienced and trained officers in charge of the first and second class post offices instead of selecting the postmasters in accordance with the present practice. As the annual operating expenses of the first and second class offices aggregate the enormous sum of more than $80,000,000, undoubtedly if the postmasters of these offices were embraced in the classified service and required to devote all their time to the public service the annual savings would eventually represent many millions of dollars. The saving in salaries alone, not taking into account any saving due to increased efficiency of operation, would amount to about $4,500,000. At the present time the salaries of postmasters of the first and second class amount to $6,076,900, while the salaries of assistant postmasters of the same classes amount to $2,820,000.

Those aggregates have increased since the date of that message and are now the figures which I cited a moment ago. Then the former President proceeded:

If the position of postmaster were placed in the classified service and those officers were given salaries equal to 20 per cent more than

the salaries now given to the assistant postmasters, the latter position being no longer required, there would be a saving in salaries to the Government of $4,512,900. In the case of postmasters at offices of the third class a large annual saving could be made.

He repeated that recommendation in another message February 26, 1913, in which he said:

With respect to the first class I have already submitted recommendations to Congress in several messages transmitting reports in which it is estimated that the direct salary cost of the Government may be reduced not less than $4,500,000 a year—this to be done by placing a large proportion of presidential appointments in the classified service. The salaries of postmasters of the first and second classes amount to over $6,000,000, while the salaries of assistant postmasters of the same classes amount to $2,820,000. If the position of postmaster were placed in the classified service, and these officers were given salaries equal to 20 per cent more than the salaries now given to assistant postmasters, the latter positions being no longer required, there would be a saving of $4,512,000. Besides this direct reduction that might be immediately made in the estimates, there would also be very large indirect reductions of cost that might be availed of in future estimates—reductions that can not be realized so long as appointments are on a partisan basis. These unnecessary indirect costs are due to the fact that a considerable part of the services outside of Washington can not be properly brought within the discipline of administrative officers. So long as high salaried local officers owe their appointments to local influence it may be assumed that their tenures will be fairly secure, regardless of their efficiency. This is discouraging to those in equally responsible positions who are rendering efficient service, but who, by reason of the nonpartisan character of the appointment, receive not more than half the amount of salary; it tends to destroy the esprit de corps, especially with subordinates; it carries with it expenditures that in many instances are unwisely made. Altogether, in the opinion of those who are best acquainted with the service, the indirect saving to the Government amounts to more than the direct saving indicated.

Those conclusions of the former President were not based upon mere surmises, but they were based upon the most careful and long-continued examination by a board or a commission created for that purpose called the Commission on Economy and Efficiency. In their report of December 15, 1911, while there are many things in the report that I do not agree with, there are many things that I do agree with. One of those that has merit is this recommendation:

That it be provided by law that all local officers under any of the executive departments (such as customs officers, internal-revenue officers, postmasters—

Mark you—

marshals, supervising inspectors in the Steamboat-Inspection Service, commissioners of immigration, registers and receivers of district land offices, surveyors general, pension agents, etc.), who are now appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, be appointed by the President alone.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I simply want to say that nothing has been urged against this proposition. I do not think it can be successfully maintained that the efficiency of the service would be interfered with or that the saving which I have stated can not be effected. That being so, I am very much in hopes that there will not be any objection to the amendment which I now offer and ask the Secretary to read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Insert, at the end of the bill, the following:

The offices of postmaster and assistant postmaster are hereby abolished in first and second class offices, and in lieu thereof is created the office of superintendent of post office. Each post office of the first and second classes shall be in charge of a superintendent, to be appointed by the Postmaster General. In each such office where there is an assistant postmaster, such assistant postmaster shall be appointed to the office of superintendent of post office, if qualified therefor, and shall hold the same subject to the laws and regulations of the classified civil service. Thereafter all appointments to the office of superintendent of post office shall be made upon merit, and, where practicable, by promotion or transfer from the employees of the Postal Service, and shall hold the office, without regard to politics or political recommendations, upon the terms and conditions and subject to such tenure as is provided by the laws and regulations governing the classified permanent civil service. For compensation to such superintendents of post offices there is hereby appropriated $3,613,279. This section shall not apply to postmasters or assistant postmasters now in office whose terms have not expired, but they shall be allowed to serve out the term for which they were appointed. All acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is new legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GORE. I desire to offer an amendment to the pending bill, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 35, after line 9, insert as an additional section the following:

SEC. 11. That all pamphlets and other matter relating to elections published by any State or municipal government for use at such elections shall be mailable at second-class mail rates of 1 cent per pound under rules and regulations fixed by the Postmaster General.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I make a point of order against that amendment. It is new legislation and changes existing law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I have just this moment received a telegram, and as it relates directly to the business of the department to which the pending bill refers, I ask that it be read. It is from the editor of the Philadelphia Public Ledger, and is a short telegram. I have also an editorial and a short article from the same paper relating to the same subject, the service in the Philadelphia post office. I simply ask that the newspaper articles be inserted in the RECORD, without reading, and that the telegram be read.

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

[From the Philadelphia Public Ledger, February 23, 1915.]

SLOW MAIL DELIVERIES.

An attempt is made by the post-office authorities to explain—for they can not justify—the slow delivery of mail in Philadelphia by a reference to the operation of the eight-hour law. It is claimed that there are not enough carriers to arrange for late as well as early deliveries, because the man who begins work at, say, 7.30 in the morning has finished his day by half past 3 or 4, and the number of carriers is too small to permit of two shifts. Moreover, the further explanation is offered that "90 per cent of the mail is ready for the early morning delivery," that the work calls for the full force at that hour, and that it would be bad policy to hamper the early delivery of 90 per cent of the mail for the 10 per cent distributed during the remaining hours of the day.

It is obvious to everyone that this argument is fallacious. Mail accumulates in great volume in the morning, it is true, because many business concerns habitually deposit their mail at the close of the day, but it is also true that if the postal authorities deliberately add to this natural accumulation all the mail which under more scientific methods would be delivered at the close of the day throughout the greater part of the city, that 90 per cent represents a great deal more than the legitimate volume of mail for morning delivery.

The omission of provision for an evening delivery is a serious inconvenience, an admission of inadequacy of service, which no first-class city ought to tolerate. And Philadelphia should insist upon a mail service at least equal to that given by the postal authorities in the larger cities of the world. We are in the habit of lauding American efficiency in business affairs, but the Postal Service is a sorry commentary upon the demoralizing results of an admixture of politics and business in what ought to be one of the most perfectly organized services, so vital is it to the welfare of the people and to the success of their commercial undertakings. Whether the fault lies with local or national mismanagement, it calls aloud for immediate correction.

[From the Philadelphia Public Ledger.]

ADVERSE CRITICISM OF POST OFFICE HERE BECOMES GENERAL OVER ENTIRE CITY—BUSINESS MEN COMPARE PHILADELPHIA SYSTEM TO THAT OF ALASKA DURING CLOSED WINTER SEASON.

Letter tests showing inefficiency in delivery system.

Where mailed.	Destination.	Time mailed.	Time received.
Main post office	3014 Salmon Street.	Feb. 16, 1 p. m.	Feb. 17, 1.30 p. m.
Do	2135 West Ontario Street.	do	Feb. 17, 8.40 a. m.
Do	1531 Erie Avenue	do	Feb. 17, 7.30 p. m.
Do	115 South Fifty-fourth Street.	Feb. 18, 2 p. m.	Feb. 19, 9 a. m.
Do	4926 Pulaski Avenue.	do	Feb. 19, 8.15 a. m.

Criticism against the apparent inability of the local post-office authorities to promptly distribute first-class mail in this city continues to pile up from business men and private individuals, who, by pointing to letters mailed here, some of which were 24 hours in transit, compare the Philadelphia system to that of Alaska during the closed winter season.

The charge by a former employee of the department that mail is permitted to accumulate is borne out by test letters sent by the Public Ledger a few days ago. A case in point is that of a letter mailed at the central post office, Ninth and Chestnut Streets, shortly after 12 o'clock on the noon of February 16, designated for 3014 Salmon street, in the northeastern section of the city. This was received at 1.30 o'clock the following afternoon, being more than 24 hours in transit. The address is within a few squares of the Bridesburg substation, into which, says the department, the mails are carried by trolley.

Another complaint received yesterday declared that a letter posted at the central station at 1 o'clock on Friday for Sixtieth and Market Streets was not received until Monday morning.

The poor showing of Philadelphia in the matter of deliveries as compared with other first-class cities of the country was the subject of a letter from Walter Lippincott, the publisher, who said:

"I read with much interest your article on the inefficiency of the management of our post office, and I am glad the Public Ledger has taken notice of this crying evil. As one of the sufferers I thank you for your effort in their behalf.

"The reason given to me by the post-office officials for the curtailment of deliveries was that the working hours had been reduced from 10 to 8 hours without any increase in the force.

"Furthermore, I learned that New York had three deliveries per day more than Philadelphia, and while the last delivery in Philadelphia was made a little after 4 o'clock, the last delivery in New York was made between 7 and 8 o'clock."

Officials at the post office refused yesterday to discuss the situation. Postmaster Thornton issued a statement that he was preparing an answer from the standpoint of the local department which he would soon make public.

Former officials of this office admit the service manifestly is inefficient and infer that much of the trouble is caused by the "niggardly policy of economy" as enforced by the Post Office Department at Washington, which was, they said, the natural course in view of the recently announced deficit of $30,000,000 in the widespread conduct of the business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read the telegram.

The Secretary read as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *February 24, 1915.*

Hon. GEORGE T. OLIVER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Will you kindly use your influence with President, Postmaster General, and proper officials to secure an adequate and efficient postal

service for the city of Philadelphia, which is now without free delivery after 2 o'clock each afternoon? This works great injury to business and inconvenience and loss to residents.

EDITOR PUBLIC LEDGER.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I desire in connection with this bill, which brings up the subject properly, to call the attention of the Senate to the importance of some provision for the retirement of postal employees.

I confess, Mr. President, that in the beginning I was opposed to this proposition. It did not seem to me that the Government ought to go into the business of what has been described as a term of opprobrium as a civil pension list. Then, after I looked into the matter a little further it seemed to me that if the Government did adopt a retirement system, accompanied by some half pay or some proportion of pay, the fund should be made up by contributions in the nature of a relief fund or pension fund made by monthly or periodical payments by the employees.

Then I got a little further, Mr. President, in the lapse of years, and I suppose with wise men it is not an evidence of lack of wisdom to develop and progress and change one's mind, until I became convinced that the only practical system was a system of flat, straight, direct retirement and pension.

I was led to that conclusion also by noticing the development of the corporations of the country, representing large aggregations of capital employing an army of men, who, it seemed to me, according to my study and observation, gradually evolved and developed into the conclusion of a flat, direct retirement system.

In the early days of retirement systems, inaugurated originally, I suppose, by the railroads of the country, we had the relief system and the system of periodical payments on the part of the employee. Those systems have been quite elaborately worked out, and I have no doubt have been beneficent in their results. But we live in an age of rapid development, and the most recent systems adopted by the great corporations of the country have evolved beyond this contributory plan and embody a program of flat retirement.

The United States Government, I might say by way of a preliminary, is the only Government of all the leading civilized Governments in the world that has no system of retirement for its superannuated civil-service employees. The custom or practice of all governments, whether national, State, or municipal, in their dealings with their people and employees certainly should furnish some precedent and example for the Federal Government of the United States. Instead of having the distinction of taking the lead in this kind of legislation and setting the example to States and municipalities, of school boards and corporations, we have invited much harsh criticism and have not in any way taken the initiative in this kind of legislation for the relief of the vast army of the employees under the civil service in the Government.

I will call the attention of the Senate to a few instances of retirement plans for the benefit of employees at present in force. The list includes teachers, firemen, and police pension funds without contributions from salaries. In Maryland we have a teachers' retirement list under the jurisdiction of the State board of education; in Boston, Mass., a permanent pension fund; in New Jersey the entire State has such a system; in New York there is a retirement fund for the College of the City of New York. In Philadelphia we have a private foundation looking to the same end. These are educational. So I might go down the list.

Then we have the list with reference to the firemen's pension fund. We have it in Oakland and San Francisco, Cal.; in New Britain and New Haven, in Connecticut; and so on in a number of towns, which I will ask to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks if there be no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

This list includes teachers, firemen, and police pension funds without contributions from salaries.

I will first take up the teachers:

Maryland: Teachers' retirement list, State board of education; Annapolis; entire State.
Massachusetts: Boston; permanent pension fund.
Nebraska: Omaha.
New Jersey: The entire State.
New York: Retirement fund for the College of the City of New York.
Pennsylvania: Philadelphia; Elkin fund.
Rhode Island: The entire State.
South Carolina: Charleston.

The list with reference to the firemen pension funds is as follows:

California: Oakland and San Francisco.
Connecticut: New Britain and New Haven.
Georgia: Savannah.
Maryland: Baltimore.
Massachusetts: Boston, Cambridge, Holyoke, Lowell, and Springfield.
Michigan: Detroit, Grand Rapids, and Jackson.
Nebraska: Omaha.
New York: Albany, Buffalo, Elmira, and New York City.
Ohio: Canton, Columbus, Springfield, Toledo, and Youngstown.
Pennsylvania: Pittsburgh.
South Carolina: Charleston.

The pension list with reference to policemen is as follows:

Connecticut: Hartford, New Britain, and Waterbury.
Florida: Jacksonville.
Georgia: Augusta and Savannah.
Louisiana: New Orleans.
Maine: Portland.
Massachusetts: Boston, Cambridge, Fall River, Holyoke, Lowell, Lynn, Somerville, and Springfield
Michigan: Grand Rapids, Jackson, and Saginaw.
Minnesota: Duluth.
New Jersey: Bayonne and Hoboken.
New York: Buffalo and Elmira.
Ohio: Akron, Columbus, Springfield, and Youngstown.
South Carolina: Charleston.

Retirement under the above funds is in the majority after 20 years of service and over, upon half pay, with disability provision.

I now desire to take up a number of commercial corporations having pension funds without contribution from salaries of the employees.

First is the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., employing 120,311 employees; retired at 60 years of age, with 20 or more years of service, continuously, upon 1 per cent of salary during the 10 years preceding retirement. Disability provision after 10 years or more of continuous service.

American Sugar Refining Co.: Number of employees, 7,500; retired at 60 to 70 years of age, with 20 or more years of service, upon 1 per cent of salary during the 10 years preceding retirement. One reason for deciding against the type of plan which requires contributions from employees was the high cost of living, which would make any tax on salaries a hardship. This is a statement of the directors of the company.

Carnegie Foundation: This grants pensions to teachers of universities, colleges, and technical schools, $15,000,000 having been provided for the purpose. The average retirement allowance is $1,628.41; the maximum allowance is $4,000.

The Consolidated Gas Co., of New York, gives retirement after 35 years' service upon 1 per cent of salary during the five years preceding retirement.

Mr. PENROSE. These systems were started a number of years ago, and furnish a precedent for what there is an increasing demand for every year, and that is for similar action on the part of the Federal Government.

Then, in addition to the pensions for teachers and firemen and policemen, we have the long line of corporations to which I partially referred. We have the Carnegie Foundation giving a pension to teachers in universities, colleges, and technical schools, $15,000,000 having been provided for that purpose. The average retirement allowance is $1,628. The maximum allowance is $4,000.

The Consolidated Gas Co. of New York gives retirement after 35 years' service upon 1 per cent of salary during the 5 years preceding retirement.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. BRISTOW. Let me inquire if there is any more reason why an American citizen who is employed by the Government should have a pension when he arrives at a certain age than there is that the citizen who is not employed should have a pension? Should not an old-age pension, if we are going into that policy, be applied to the man who is employed in private life as well as the man employed by the Government, when the money is raised by taxation that furnishes the pension or retired pay?

Mr. PENROSE. Without wanting to depart from the specific subject which is before the Senate and which I have in mind, which is a system of retirement for a definite class of employees, I will depart for a moment to answer the Senator and say that I will be willing to vote at any time for a moderate and conservative old-age pension in the United States. I am not prepared to say that the Federal Government should inaugurate this system, but that rather it should be a matter within the province of the States. But whether it be taken up by the States or by the Federal Government, and the trend nowadays seems to be to throw everything on the Federal Government and ignore the States, I can assure the Senator from Kansas that I am in hearty sympathy, and I believe that some day we may come to it to have a properly guarded old-age pension in this country. They have it in most of the nations of Europe.

It may be that we have not reached the stage in our civilization which renders the need so pressing in America as it is in Germany or in England, but of one proposition I am convinced, that it is better to give a small pension to a superannuated man or woman thrown upon the cold hospitality of the world in their old age, unable to make a living; that it is better to provide for them a small annuity and in the end it will be cheaper than to board them in the poorhouse; that rather we should give them a little provision for the one, two, or three years, the brief period which they may have to remain on earth, so that they may get along as best they may with their families, their relatives, or friends.

There is already in the United States some little beginning of such a system in many of the States in what is known as mothers' pensions. In the State of Pennsylvania the legislature

at the last session passed a law providing for a commission in any county in the State and a certain appropriation where the county made an equal appropriation for the support of widows with families, on the ground that it was not only an act of justice and propriety, but that it was better and cheaper for the community, in the long run, than to have the mother and the children go to the poorhouse. But that is neither here nor there; it does not affect the argument which I have in mind.

The Consolidated Gas Co., of New York, gives retirement after 35 years' service upon 1 per cent of salary during the five years preceding retirement. Then the Provident Loan Society, of New York; the Public Service Corporation, of New Jersey; the Standard Oil Co.; and Yale University all have pension systems under the jurisdiction of their boards of trustees. The United States Steel Corporation and the Carnegie Pension Fund involves employees to the number of 225,000 who are retired under various definitions and schedules at certain ages. The railroads I have briefly referred to. I shall not take the time of the Senate by reading the list, but ask that it may be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list referred to is as follows:

Railroads having pension systems without contributions from the salaries of the employees are as follows:

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.
Bessemer & Lake Erie Railroad.
Brooklyn Rapid Transit Railroad Co.
Buffalo, Rochester & Pittsburgh Railway Co.
Chicago & North Western Railway Co.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway.
Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway.
Cleveland Valley & Terminal Railroad.
Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad.
Illinois Central Railroad.
Lake Shore & Michigan Southern Railway.
Michigan Central Railroad.
Newburg Railway Co.
New York Central & Hudson River Railroad.
New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad.
New York Railways Co.
Oregon Railroad & Navigation Co.
Oregon Short Line Railroad.
Pennsylvania Railroad, lines east of Pittsburgh.
Pennsylvania Lines, west of Pittsburgh.
Philadelphia & Reading Railway.
Southern Pacific Co.
Union Pacific Railroad.
Washington, D. C., street railway companies.

Mr. PENROSE. They include the Pennsylvania Railroad lines east of Pittsburgh and the Pennsylvania Railroad lines west of Pittsburgh, and the Philadelphia & Reading Railway system in Pennsylvania. The pension allowances granted to employees of these railroads are from 1 to 2 per cent of the average salaries for the 10 years preceding retirement.

Mr. President, I think perhaps that one of the most complete and liberal systems of retirement and pension was inaugurated a year or so ago, on January 1, 1913, according to the prospectus I hold in my hand, by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. I have here "a plan for employees' pensions, disability benefits, and insurance," and I understand the system is in successful operation. Regarding pensions, the prospectus reads as follows:

5. PENSIONS.

1. On and after January 1, 1913:

(a) All male employees who have reached the age of 60 years and whose term of employment has been 20 or more years, and all female employees who have reached the age of 55 years and whose term of employment has been 20 or more years, may, at their own request, or at the discretion of the committee, be retired from active service and become eligible to pensions.

(b) Any employee whose term of employment has been 30 years or more, or any male employee who has reached the age of 55 and whose term of employment has been 25 or more years, or any female employee who has reached the age of 50 years and whose term of employment has been 25 or more years may, on the approval of the president or designated vice president, be retired from active service and granted a pension allowance.

What are these pensions?

2 The annual pension allowance for each employee retired with a pension on account of age or length of service shall be as follows:

For each year of active service 1 per cent of the average annual pay during the 10 years next preceding retirement, provided, however, that the committee may at its discretion base such pension upon the average annual pay of the 10 consecutive years of service during which the retired employee was paid the highest rate of wages. The minimum pension shall be $20 per month.

Certainly a liberal provision on the part of one of the great corporations of the United States.

3. Pensions shall continue from date of retirement to death of pensioner and the committee may in its discretion continue pensions to dependents until end of third calendar month following death.

Then there are other provisions, Mr. President, regarding this system which I do not wish to read to the Senate, because it would delay this discussion, which perhaps has been unduly prolonged, and I feel that the bill can be soon passed, so I will make my remarks brief. This prospectus, however, shows that the system provides for very liberal accident disability benefits, sickness disability benefits, and life insurance. The whole system of this and other corporations having similar systems inaugurated within the last two or three years are well worthy of the careful study of every Member of Congress who may have to pass upon the question of the retirement of Federal employees.

I have here a copy of some hearings held by the House of Representatives in the Sixty-second Congress, in January, 1912, containing the report of an actuary regarding civil-service pensions, addressed to the then president of the United States Civil Service Retirement Association in Washington. This report is, in my opinon, of great value; and as the hearings may not be available at the present time I ask unanimous consent—the report is not very long—to insert the report as an appendix to my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PENROSE. During the past year, Mr. President, many of the old employees of the Government, particularly in the Post Office Department, have been discharged and removed. Many have been removed because of the charge of being incapacitated for duty, the penalty of getting old. As an illustration, I have here an article from the Washington Star of December 27, 1914, reciting the case of John W. Grice, who was employed as a watchman in the Post Office Department in 1873, at a salary of $720 a year. In all of that time he had never received one penny of promotion; but, on the contrary, had been for some years subjected to a reduction of pay. On the 14th of December, 1914, he was dismissed from the Government service on account of incapacity due to old age.

He had saved no money, having been singularly thriftless in the management of his munificent stipend of $60 a month, and now he is an object of public charity.

The case is not exceptional. There are many men in the Government service to-day who are getting just the same pay that they got years ago, who have been giving their best years and best energies to their employment, and who are utterly unable to save anything out of their meager pay. They have no prospect of promotion, no chance for outside occupation, and no hope of honorable retirement on a living income.

It is to be doubted whether the average business institution would retain a faithful worker on its pay roll for over two-score years and then drop him without thought for his future care. Yet this is what the United States is doing right along. Watchman Grice, it is explained officially, was treated with consideration, as he had been kept on the rolls for some time when he was of but little use. But that consideration does not avail him now that he has been turned out to become a public charge.

Departmental retirement is said to be unpopular back in the congressional districts. It may be questioned whether the subject has ever been properly stated outside of Washington or the immediate circles of Government employment in other cities—

This reflection on the congressional districts is a quotation from the Washington Star. I quote again:

The American people are not hard-hearted and they surely can not desire to see the public service run on a "Scrooge" basis. Where there is no sympathy for the governmental retirement it is because of a lack of understanding. The case of Grice, if plainly stated to the average American voter, would probably make him feel that the United States is negligent in the matter of making provision for its faithful veteran employees.

I have here, Mr. President, an article from the Inquirer of February 10, 1915, a paper of large circulation in Philadelphia and in the State of Pennsylvania. It is an editorial, and is entitled "Cruel treatment of aged employees." I will not detain the Senate by reading it, but will ask to have it inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

CRUEL TREATMENT OF AGED EMPLOYEES.

The dismissal of five aged employees from the Chicago post office on account of superannuation and the threatened dismissal of five others at Sioux City for the same reason must cause a feeling of shame to all who believe in justice and fair play, if not in common humanity. That these men should be so ruthlessly cast aside in their declining days is a reflection upon our system of government.

The saddest part of it is that the instances named are not isolated cases. There is no reasonable doubt that hundreds of men have been dismissed recently for the crime of becoming old, and by the representatives of a Government which constantly boasts of how far we are ahead of other nations in furthering the cause of humanity. The remedy for this sort of thing lies in the passage of a fair and reasonable retirement bill. No one believes that men who have outlived their usefulness should be permanently carried on the public pay rolls, but every reasonable person will agree that employees who have given the best years of their lives to the public service and who have a record of efficiency and faithfulness should be cared for in their declining years.

It seems like irony that the Government should be dismissing men for old age at the very moment when big private corporations, which are popularly supposed to have no souls, should be perfecting and putting into practice plans for caring for those who have served them faithfully for a specified term of years. Thus on the very day that we read of the dismissal of the postal employees in Chicago we learn that one of the great telephone companies had paid out in one year the sum of a million dollars for pensions, disability, sickness, and accident. It is

said that the cost of maintaining the pension system of that company has been only a little more than 1 per cent of the amount of the pay roll. It is regarded as a great success from every standpoint, because the retirement of the old and infirm employees brings new blood into the establishment and improves the efficiency of the concern.

It is a great pity that a private corporation should be able to do so much better than the United States Government.

Mr. PENROSE. Now, Mr. President, I deny that some such provision as this is in any way in the nature of a gratuity or a gift. I claim that it can be proven by figures to be not only in the interest of greater efficiency, but in the interest of economy in the administration of the Post Office Department. How does the Government gain by retaining on the pay rolls superannuated employees who are unable to do any work, but whom no one has the brutality or the heart to discharge and render public charges on the community? The Government can not gain by such a system as that, whereas, on the contrary, if the superannuated employee could be retired at half pay, or on any other proper basis, and some active young man or woman, most likely on a salary lower than that which the superannuated employee was receiving, could be assigned to his work and perform his duty to the Government, taking into consideration the zealous, active work of the young man, even though working on a lower salary, and the fact of the Government being relieved of the useless services of the superannuated employee, retired at a much lower compensation than he had been receiving on the active list, the Government certainly might be the gainer, and clearly would not be much the loser from a financial point of view.

Mr. President, on numerous occasions in the last three or four years I have delivered speeches in Pennsylvania and elsewhere advocating these views, which I finally arrived at after starting my study of the question with a prejudice against the proposition based on my ignorance of the facts and the conditions. I feel entirely satisfied from my own experience that anyone who will give the subject the same study that I have done will at least have his views regarding a retirement system much modified, if any prejudice may exist in his mind regarding it.

As long ago as December 8, 1912, I delivered a speech in Philadelphia advocating the proposition which I am now urging on the Senate. In that speech I declared that—

"The United States Government is the only one of the leading Governments of the world that has no system of retirement for its superannuated civil-service employees. In one respect this fact has been unfortunate, because the American Government can well be expected to lead the way in advanced legislation for the good of the people. On the other hand, this advantage has resulted, that we are able to profit by the errors and mistakes and experiments in this and other countries and can perhaps now see our way more clearly than ever before as to the logical lines on which legislation for the retirement of employees in the civil service should be framed.

"It is true that in many respects the Federal Government has been liberal to a degree unparalleled in history in pensions for the soldiers who have fought in the several wars in which the country has been engaged. Nearly $200,000,000 will this year be appropriated for military pensions. Moreover, many of the large industrial corporations in the United States and many more railroads have for a number of years been developing relief pensions and retirement systems. Considerable advance has also been made in the United States in our municipalities and educational systems, particularly in reference to provision for teachers, firemen, and police pension funds. The general question as supplied to the community at large demands thoughtful consideration and practical action, but we now have before us the pressing and specific proposition of adequate provision for the retirement of employees in the civil service. The consideration of this question can no longer be postponed by the American Congress. The time has come when it must be taken up in the light of experience in this and other countries and solved on practical and effective lines. I have every reason to believe that the time is not far distant when some legislation providing for such retirement of a satisfactory character will be enacted by Congress.

"On this as on other questions it has been necessary for the public mind to undergo a considerable education. There has existed among the people a prejudice against a civil pension list. While there has been no difficulty in getting legislation for the well earned and deserved pensions for the veterans of our wars, opposition has frequently developed to any bill providing for pensions for civil employees, and the furthest progress that was made in this direction for a long time was an occasional and often inadequate provision for the pension and retirement of our judges. Opposition has even existed in the ranks of the employees themselves to pension systems proposed by corporations, sometimes based on the terms upon which the pensions were offered and sometimes from the suspicion that in some way a motive existed behind the proposition of coercion, intimidation, or undue control. Gradually, however, these prejudices and misunderstandings are disappearing. The large corporations are rapidly coming into line with pension propositions and provisions, and each new arrangement seems to be more liberal than any of the preceding ones.

"Where all have admitted the desirability of a pension system there has remained one serious difference of opinion as to whether the retirement of the civil-service employees should be based on contributions from salaries or whether it should be a straight retirement and pension without any such contribution or deduction. It is argued that the adoption of a civil-service retirement system should have a contributory feature to it, so as to reduce to the minimum the cost to the Government of the pensions to be paid, but the more we consider the subject and the more carefully we look at the experience of contributory plans which characterize the earlier efforts in this direction, and the further we witness the latest systems of large corporations, the plans of which have been most carefully worked out, the more firmly we are led to the logical conclusion that the civil-service retirement system should be borne and paid for by the Government without any contribution or deduction from salaries, and the retirement should be based upon such length of service and percentage of salary and age as shall be defined by the experts who have studied the question.

"It would be undue hardship, which they could hardly afford, to compel the Government employees, and particularly those in the Postal Service, to pay asessments for the contributory system. The salaries which a large number of them now receive would not permit this on any lines that would meet the requirements of the situation. It is not expected that a satisfactory retirement at the expense of the Government would cost a great deal of money, because the vacancies caused by the retirement of the superannuated would be filled from the lower salaried employees, who would begin at the lowest grades upon entering the service. On the other hand, the Government would be enabled to retire employees who are no longer able, by reason of age, to discharge fully the duties of their position, and many of whom are really only retained now in the service because no provision is made for their retirement.

"The latest and most liberal system of retirement made by a corporation is that of the Bell Telephone system, under which a fund of $10,000,000 for pensions, sick benefits, and life insurance will be available on January 1 for the 175,000 employees of the system. This provision is made entirely at the expense of the various companies interested, without contributions of any kind from the employees themselves. The application of these various benefits will be for the benefit of all employees of every rank. The total yearly pay for the whole group of employees of the Bell system amounts to some $115,000,000. The amount of the pension is automatically based on the years of service and the amount of pay and will be 1 per cent of the average annual pay for 10 years multiplied by the number of years of service.

"Therefore a man who had been 30 years in service would get 30 per cent of the average salary which he had been receiving during his last 10 years of service. No person will be less than $20 per month. Accidents, disability, and death are also liberally provided for, and if any State statute provides for more lieral compensation than is provided under the benefit plan, the statutory provision will prevail. This system will go into effect on January 1 of next year, and I refer to it here because it is the latest and most liberal and comprehensive plan yet advanced by any corporation in the United States.

"I have had, as chairman and member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the Senate for many years, opportunity to realize that the pension system for postal employees is specially desirable. They are out in all kinds of weather, often exposed to the dangers of travel, and the work is exacting and it is by no means overpaid. It requires a high order of men, and, in many branches, much higher educational qualifications than the public have any idea of.

"Another notion which has gradually been given up, but which once prevailed generally and still exists in places, is that in some way the pension system tends to enervate and emasculate employees and causes them to lose zeal or ambition in their work. Experience has shown, however, that the contrary condition results. The employee is supplied with every motive to serve the Government loyally, zealously, and industriously, and to earn by merit such promotion as he can with the assurance that at the end of a period of long and faithful service, as old ages causes his energies to relax, he may have confidence that he will be fully and adequately provided for.

"Many publicists and students of industrial questions, and particularly of industrial insurance systems, have even claimed that the admitted preeminence of Germany in all industrial

activities, largely the development of the last 25 years, has been to no small extent due to the system of industrial insurance and pension which the German people were among the earliest to take up and have been the most progressive in perfecting.

"The old-fashioned idea of a pension as an annuity for a stated amount paid when the retiring age is reached and based on contributions from employees, private gifts, and perhaps appropriations by the Government is conceded to be ineffective and unsatisfactory and gives no assurance of solvency. This plan is being supplanted everywhere by the service pension, wherein the allowance made to the employee is a percentage of his average salary for the preceding term of years, multiplied by the number of years of service. The evolution from the contributory plan to the service-pension system is gradually coming to be realized, and the straight retirement and pension at the expence of the Government and without contribution from the employees is the only one that will in the end prove satisfactory and give assurance of solvency."

Mr. President, I hope I have made a sufficient impression on the chairman of the committee, so that he will not raise a point of order on the amendment I am about to offer. It is calculated to give great satisfaction to the employees of the Postal Service, and it is moderate and conservative in its provisions.

APPENDIX.

REPORT OF MR. ABB LANDIS, ACTUARY.

IN RE CIVIL-SERVICE PENSIONS.

A. W. MCKEE,
President United States Civil Service Retirement Association,
945 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Pursuant to engagement I have made an estimate of payments proposed for the retirement of employees in the civil service as provided in House bill 9242, introduced by Mr. HAMILL in 1911.

1. The data available for the estimate were the statistics contained in Bulletin 94 (1907) of the Census Bureau. Information in greater detail and more suitable for the computations were prepared in the office of the Director of the Census and furnished to others for similar computations, and in your behalf I made personal request for copies of that data. After much delay in the decision as to whether or not the statistics were at the disposal of the bureau, the information was given the latter part of December that I could have access to photographic copies, provided I came to Washington to see and use them. This statement is made to explain why I used the published statistics in Bulletin 94. Approximate accuracy in the estimate is obtainable from that data, and for all practical purposes reliance may be placed in the results properly deduced from the statistics of that bulletin.

2. The bill could be made clearer in respect of provisions for disabled employees and in regard to compulsory retirement at age 70. I have taken the liberty to construe the provisions of the bill where not clear or specific to accord with general experience and to make possible positive estimates.

3. The computations were made upon the assumptions to follow:

(a) The central age of each age group was taken to represent the age for the group.

(b) That employees will continue until completion of 30 years in service or to attaining age for compulsory retirement on a service pension or previously become eligible for a disability pension.

(c) That high disability rates be employed at ages between 60 and 70 to offset the earlier payments that might be made under the provisions of the bill on account of voluntary retirements at less than 50 per cent of the salary.

(d) That all present employees at attained ages 70 and above and in the service 20 to 25 years are to be retired as disabled on 50 per cent of average salary, those of like attained ages and 15 to 20 years in the service be retired on 45 per cent, and those in service 10 to 15 years at 40 per cent, and those of 5 to 10 years in service and 70 years of age and above be retired at 30 per cent of the average salary; that those employees in the service less than five years and at ages 70 and above be retired at 30 per cent of average salary.

(e) Assume that total and permanent disablement is meant by the words "has became disabled."

(f) That the "average annual salary received for the five years next preceding retirement" be the mean of the average salary for the current period and the average salary for the five years next preceding.

(g) That the computation for disability payment be based upon the salary of the current period and not upon the average salary of the past five-year period, nor the mean of the averages for the current and last five-year periods.

4. The reason for the first (a) assumption is obvious. The method would be more refined to take the central age plus one-half year, but the difference in results would not justify the time consumed in extra computations, even were time allowed before the hearing.

5. The second (b) assumption was necessary and advisable for several reasons. Necessary because there are no voluntary retirement statistics available upon which to estimate the number who would give up a full salary to accept 40 or 45 per cent of a reduced amount in the way of pension. Advisable because common experience and observation force the conclusion that efficient and satisfactory employees render service to secure the stipulated compensation for the support of themselves and their dependents, and few would voluntarily retire to secure 40 or 45 or 50 per cent of an average salary less than that they could earn by continuing at work. We know that the ordinary and general financial condition of those in the civil service is not such as to enable them to voluntarily dispense with 50, 55, or 60 per cent of their present pay. We have reason to believe that those who can render efficient service will continue to do so to the time for compulsory retirement. In this connection it may be stated that this argument (which I hold as sound) tempted me to reduce the estimate of immediate payments, because many who have attained ages 60 and above and in service 30 or more years will not voluntarily retire on 50 per cent of the average salary. I have ignored the possible voluntary retirements at 40 and 45 per cent, but have taken precaution to offset such resulting additional payments by the assumption of a disability rate in excess of the expected at advanced ages, as stated in the third (c) assumption.

6. The fourth (D) assumption is necessary because of the facts that will be developed in actual service under the disability provision, and because of failure in the bill to make provision for retirement allowance at age 70, after attaining which no employee is to be retained. Reference to the probabilities of becoming disabled at age 70 will explain the selection of the retirement percentages given in the fourth assumption.

7. I have been informed that the meaning assigned to "disabled" was intended by the author of the bill.

8. The sixth (F) assumption was considered advisable because the average salary for the "preceding five years," as obtained from the Bulletin, would have been less than the actual average. The average for the current five-year period would have been in excess of the actual, hence the mean between these averages appeared to represent what would be obtained from the facts.

9. The seventh (G) assumption is to produce larger estimates of disability payments as an offset against any payments to those who might enter the service and become disabled between the present date and the future date for which the estimate is made. Where 10, 15, or more years intervene the overstatement is considerable and will exceed the actual payments to entrants during the period and who become disabled. Nevertheless, it is preferable to over rather than under estimate future payments.

10. The treatment of the statistics involved determination of—

(a) The number of employees subject to immediate retirement and the amount of service pensions payable the first year.

(b) The amount of additional service pensions to those continuing from the first year payable in the fifth and any subsequent year.

(c) The amount of disability payments in the fifth (and any subsequent) year on account of previous disablement.

11. That you may be fully advised in regard to the procedure I submit the formulas for the computations:

Immediate pensions.—Payable the first year are the number of pensionable employees multiplied by the per cent of the average salary, determined as heretofore explained. Pensions payable the fifth (or nth) year are the number of present employees multiplied by the probability of surviving to receive the pension $\left(\frac{l_{x+n}}{l_x}\right)$ multiplied by the average salary determined for the nth year (x represents the immediate pension age).

Future pensions.—Payable in the nth year to present active employees were obtained from the formula:

Average salary at age $x+n$ multiplied by number of employees at age x by

$$\left(\frac{l_{x+n}}{l_x^{aa}}-\frac{l_{x+t}^{ii}}{l_{x+x}^{i}}\right)\times\frac{l^{i}}{l_x^{aa}}$$

where x is the present age; $x+t$ is the retirement age, and where n is greater than t; and l is the number of living according to the selected mortality table; l^{i} the number living according to the table of disabled lives; l^{aa} the number of surviving active employees and l^{ii} the number of surviving disabled employees—the sum of the two last $(l_x^{aa}+l_x^{ii})$ being equal to the assumed number living (l_x) according to the selected mortality table.

Future disability payments.—Due in the nth year to present active employees who become disabled requires the following formula:

Number of employees multiplied by average salary by

$$\left(\frac{l_{x+n}^{ii}}{l_{x+n}^{i}}-\frac{l_x^{ii}}{l_x^{i}}\right)\times\frac{l_{x+n}^{i}}{l_x^{aa}}$$

where $x+n$ is not greater than the age of retirement.

Where it is greater, then the probability that an active employee at age x will be on the retired list n years hence on account of total and permanent disability is

$$\left(\frac{l_{x+t}^{ii}}{l_{x+t}^{i}}-\frac{l_x^{ii}}{l_x^{i}}\right)\times\frac{l_{x+n}^{i}}{l_x^{aa}}$$

12. I selected the National Fraternal Congress Table of Mortality, because it would eliminate a less number on account of death than other standard tables, and thus would tend to prevent an underestimate of future pension payments.

13. I employed probabilities of disability amongst active employees derived by me directly from personal investigation of the disability experience of a number of large American fraternal societies.

14. I employed probabilities of death amongst disabled persons which were derived from the statistical cards secured by me from four American societies.

15. The combined tables were especially prepared for the computations necessary for this report.

16. At this point it may be well to warn against the error of assuming that the disability payments will continue from date of disability to the age of retirement, excepting through discontinuance on account of deaths, as expected from any standard mortality table. The death rate amongst disabled persons is very, very much higher than assumed by the American experience or other ordinary mortality tables. The error would lead to a large overstatement of future disability payments.

STATISTICS.

17. Bulletin 94 gives the statistics concerning 185,874 employees in the civil service, and of these 6,463 might be considered as eligible for pensions under the provision of H. R. 9242.

18. Such an estimate, in my opinion, would overstate largely the amount for which the Government would be called on to pay.

19. I have proceeded on the theory that you desire an estimate that will be reasonably near the facts as developed under the provisions of the bill should it become a law.

20. This procedure will not allow unreasonable assumptions in either direction.

21. It is not reasonable to assume that every employee, who could retire on 40 or 45 per cent of an average salary, will surrender his present pay and leave the service.

22. It is a violent assumption to estimate that all who can retire on 50 per cent of the average salary will quit, while capable of efficient and satisfactory service.

23. Some of the efficient employees, who could secure any rate of pension and be convinced that they could engage in other vocations at

a compensation greater than the forfeited Government pay, would leave the service.

24. Probably those who could not render efficient service, or whose necessities would be provided for by the pension to which they would be entitled, would accept the provisions of the bill.

25. After careful consideration, I am convinced that no attempt should be made to directly estimate the probable service-pension payments under the 40 and 45 per cent provisions. Certainly it would be a gross exaggeration to assume that all who could claim such pensions would do so.

26. A study of all the facts and circumstances leads me to believe that ample provision will be made for the payments to those claiming pensions under the provisions for 45 and 40 per cent of average salary by assuming—

First, that all will make claim under the 50 per cent provision, and thus overstate the actual pensions by the amount allowed for those who will not retire; and

Second, that the estimated disability payments will exceed the actual at the pension ages (from 60 to 70 years of age).

27. Of course there will be an underestimate of the aggregate amount of pension and disability payments proportionate to the understatement of the actual number of employees in the civil service.

28. Census Bulletin 94 (in the tables used in my computations) gives the total of 185,874 civil-service employees. A more recent document issued by the Civil Service Commission gives the number as 222,278. Senate Document 745 credits the Official Register with the statement of 286,902. I am informed by you that the actual number is about 250,000, or probably 260,000.

29. Whatever be the true number, the relation will hold between that and the number assumed in the computations, and it will not be difficult to make the estimate for the larger number if the results are reliable when based upon the smaller number.

30. To assure greater reliability in the statistics, I excluded the "unreported" and those on "piecework," aggregating 1,575, thus leaving subject to treatment 184,299 employees at the various rates of compensation and years and ages of service.

31. The statistics being recorded by age groups, it was impossible to accurately determine the number who might retire at age 62 after 25 or more years of employment. The best estimate was to assume that three-fifths of the number in the age group 60–64 were entitled to the 45 per cent pension.

32. After excluding the 1,575, it was found that the number who might be entitled to service pensions under the 50, 45, and 40 per cent provisions was 5,983, and the possible payments in the first year $3,307,200 on estimates of 50, 45, 40, and 30 per cent of an average annual salary of $1,260, as follows:

Years of service.	Present age.	Average salary.	Annual pension.	Amount of pensions.
30 and over	60 and above	$1,260	$630	$1,906,380
25 to 29	62 and above	1,260	567	564,732
20 to 24	65 and above	1,260	504	496,440
	70 and above	1,260	348	339,648
Total possible payment				3,307,200

33. The total annual salaries of the 184,299 employees amount to $172,829,000, or an average of $938 a year.

34. It would be an error to base estimates upon this general average for the reason that salaries are increased with duration of service. For instance:

Period of service.	Average salary.	Period of service.	Average salary.
Under 5 years	$832	25 to 29 years	$1,195
5 to 9 years	963	30 to 34 years	1,227
10 to 14 years	1,036	35 to 39 years	1,269
15 to 19 years	1,092	40 years and over	1,386
20 to 24 years	1,156		

35. The large number of employees in the service less than 15 years causes an average salary amongst the 184,299 of $938. But the service pension is to be a percentage of the average salary during the five years preceding retirement, and hence much in excess of the general average.

36. The retirement provisions make 60 years the minimum age, and that provision, as well as the one for 20 years or more of service, enters into the determination of the average salary. It has required the expenditure of much labor to work out the requisite averages, since the age attained and the period of service entered into the determination of the average salary as a basis for disability payments. It is not my purpose to burden the record with statistics, but a few examples may prevent conclusions from estimates on general averages:

Present age (years).	Period of service.	Average salary.	Period of service.	Average salary.
20-24	Under 5 years	$773		
25-29	do	838		
30-34	do	857		
35-39	do	859		
40-44	do	861		
45-49	do	870	20-25 years	$1,247
50-54	do	874	do	1,218
55-59	do	884	do	1,155
60-64	do	876	do	1,186
65-69	do	881	do	1,182
70-74	do	983	do	1,126
75-79	do	928	do	1,169
80	do	850	do	988
60-64	35-39 years	1,289	40 years and over.	1,458
65-69	do	1,262	do	1,434
70-74	do	1,206	do	1,329
75-79	do	1,132	do	1,182
80	do	1,244	do	1,068

IMMEDIATE PENSIONS.

37. Under the assumptions heretofore stated, the number of employees estimated for immediate payments was found to be 4,384, and the first year's pensions $2,440,820, as follows:

Age and length of service.	Number of employees.	Per cent of average salary.	Average pension.	Immediate total pensions.
Present age, 60 to 64 years:				
30 to 34 years	505	50	$603	$305,118
35 to 39 years	369	50	628	231,732
40 years and more	292	50	687	200,604
Present age, 65 to 69 years:				
30 to 34 years	378	50	603	227,934
35 to 39 years	323	50	614	198,322
40 years and more	364	50	674	245,336
Present age, 70 to 74 years:				
Under 5 years	149	30	295	43,955
5 to 9 years	219	30	291	63,729
10 to 14 years	221	40	392	86,632
15 to 19 years	147	45	453	66,591
20 to 24 years	155	50	546	84,630
25 to 29 years	177	50	575	101,775
30 to 34 years	148	50	587	86,876
35 to 39 years	128	50	607	77,696
40 years and more	209	50	634	132,506
Present age, 75 to 79 years:				
Under 5 years	32	30	278	8,836
5 to 9 years	54	30	278	15,012
10 to 14 years	59	40	372	21,948
15 to 19 years	45	45	463	20,835
20 to 24 years	40	50	559	22,360
25 to 29 years	49	50	566	27,734
30 to 34 years	49	50	569	27,881
35 to 39 years	53	50	560	29,680
40 years and more	81	50	579	46,899
Present age, 80 years and over:				
Under 5 years	2	30	265	530
5 to 9 years	23	30	278	6,394
10 to 14 years	20	40	422	8,440
15 to 19 years	5	45	545	2,725
20 to 24 years	12	50	603	7,236
25 to 29 years	18	50	520	9,360
30 to 34 years	13	50	484	6,292
35 to 39 years	9	50	548	4,932
40 years and more	35	50	578	20,230
Grand total	4,384	46	557	2,440,820

PAYMENTS IN THE FIFTH YEAR.

38. At the end of the fifth year after the proposed plan goes into effect the service pensions and disability payments are estimated as follows:

To the survivors of those 60 to 64 in first year	$627,230
To the survivors of those 65 to 69 in first year	519,980
To the survivors of those 70 to 74 in first year	494,440
To the survivors of those 75 to 79 in first year	112,430
To the survivors of those 80 in first year	207,750
To the survivors of the immediate pensions	1,961,830
To retired during 5 years from group:	
Under 5 years	131,310
5 to 9 years	212,010
10 to 14 years	187,040
15 to 19 years	200,910
20 to 24 years	164,240
25 to 29 years	847,190
30 to 34 years	260,820
35 to 39 years	121,790
40 and more years	37,183
	2,162,493
Total service pensions in fifth year	4,124,323
To disability payments to disabled in group:	
Under 5 years	62,036
5 to 9 years	82,189
10 to 14 years	46,966
15 to 19 years	44,771
20 to 24 years	34,393
25 to 29 years	28,735
30 to 34 years	9,313
35 to 39 years	3,234
	311,637
Total payments at end of the fifth year	4,435,900

39. The amount of disability payments in the fifth year will probably be nearer $400,000 than $311,637, for the reason that the inefficient and partially disabled, who could not legally come within the provisions for service pensions, will be considered "disabled" and entitled to disability payments. Under such a construction the Government will receive advantage, because such employees are now retained on the rolls at average salaries much in excess of the disability payments on which they might be retired. The difference between such salaries and the disability pensions probably would cover the salaries for new and fewer employees sufficient to perform the work of those who retire. An additional $100,000 may be added to the estimated disability payments and the amount would remain within reason and be for the good of the service.

40. It may be of value to show the continued payments to those pensioned in the first year to indicate the progress toward extinction of pensions after they have been incurred:

Payments in the first year	$2,440,820
Payments in the fifth year	1,866,000
Payments in the tenth year	1,259,200
Payments in the fifteenth year	707,850

Payments in the twentieth year	$296,470
Payments in the twenty-fifth year	77,773
Payments in the thirtieth year	8,757

41. While pensioners are going on the list, they are also going off, and ultimately the service and disability annual payments will become constant, assuming a constant number of employees. It is probable that this Government will continue to grow and prosper and that the number of employees in the civil service will continue to increase and the aggregate pensions may continue to increase, but that fact does not change the relation of the Government to its servants. If it be right and just and expedient to have a pension scheme for 200,000, it is expedient and just and right to continue the plan for 300,000, when the Government service requires that number of employees.

42. In coming to some conclusion in regard to the liability involved by inaugurating such a scheme as proposed in House bill 9242 it is permissible and necessary to assume an ultimate constant number of employees. The resources of the Government are also assumed to remain constant. If there be a continued increase in employees, there will be a corresponding increase in the importance of governmental affairs.

43. To forecast the future expenditures for service and disability payments, it should therefore be assumed that the same number of employees enter and leave the service each year.

44. Of the total exits it may be assumed (from experiences of pension funds) that 57 per cent will be from withdrawals, 30 per cent from retirements, and 13 per cent from deaths.

45. While pensions tend to persistency in service, this applies more especially to those who have remained upward of 10 years in the work. A pension of 40, 45, or 50 per cent at the end of 20, 25, or 30 years, and at no age under 60 years, is too far removed and not sufficiently alluring to hold young and recent entrants who believe they can improve their condition by withdrawal.

46. The employees advanced in age and period of service will persist, but the experience in the operation of pension funds shows a heavy withdrawal rate in early years of service.

47. This fact is important in estimating the future number of pensioners.

48. Ultimately, when the number of employees becomes practically constant, and the entrants and exits are equal, it will be found that about 57 per cent of the total exits is due to withdrawals, 30 per cent to retirements, and 13 per cent to deaths while in the service.

49. The per cent of total service pensioners to the total of employees will always be small. Any computation that ignores the withdrawal rate will greatly exaggerate the ultimate pension payments when undertaking to forecast the future cost of any pension scheme.

50. To attempt to estimate the amount of pension payments 20, 30, or 50 years hence by reduction of present employees through deaths only will produce results far in excess of those actually realized.

51. The proportionate distribution of employees according to ages and years of service will not be greatly different in the next 30 years from that now existing, whether or not we have any pension scheme. The present distribution shows a very low average age for employees, as indicated below:

Age distribution.

Age.	Number at entry ages into service.	Number at present ages.
Under 20 years of age	6,866	3,175
20 to 24 years of age	34,960	18,681
25 to 29 years of age	44,654	29,341
30 to 34 years of age	35,169	31,793
35 to 39 years of age	23,639	29,019
Total	145,288	112,009
40 to 44 years of age	14,392	21,398
45 to 49 years of age	10,185	17,879
50 to 54 years of age	6,893	11,771
55 to 59 years of age	4,070	7,917
60 to 64 years of age	2,258	6,816
65 to 69 years of age	933	4,357
70 to 74 years of age	223	1,553
75 to 79 years of age	55	462
80 and over	2	137
Grand total	184,299	184,299

52. It will be observed that 145,288 of the total of 184,299 entered the service under 40 years of age, being 78.83 per cent, while 112,009 (61.25 per cent) are at present ages under 40. The number in service less than 20 years is 91.53 per cent of the total as shown below:

Service distribution.

Under 5 years in service	89,395
5 to 9 years in service	45,034
10 to 14 years in service	19,065
15 to 19 years in service	15,198
Total	168,692
20 to 24 years in service	7,385
25 to 29 years in service	3,825
30 to 34 years in service	2,118
35 to 39 years in service	1,229
40 years in service	1,050
Grand total	184,299

53. In Senate Document No. 745 an official is quoted as stating that 8,082 civil-service employees are stricken from the rolls each year on account of deaths, withdrawals, and removals. I think it is within the facts to assume that not exceeding 1,050 exits are due to death, leaving about 7,000 loss to the service from withdrawals and removals. It can be safely assumed that retirement on pension would be substituted for present removals for inefficiency where physical condition, age, or service allowed the pension.

54. There is little doubt of the further fact that many aged and physically infirm, now carried on the rolls through sympathy and whose salaries are in the nature of compassionate allowances, would be retired as disability pensioners to the benefit of the service and to the saving of from 50 to 70 per cent of the salaries of the large majority thus affected.

55. The result of inaugurating a pension plan, as proposed in House bill 9242, would be to somewhat reduce the rate of removal for inefficiency due to inability to perform duties on account of physical condition, and would greatly improve the service by permitting supervising officials (with human sympathy and compassion) to retire those physically inefficient who are now carried at salaries in excess of the value of service rendered, and in excess of the disability retirement pension provided in the bill.

56. From a comparison of average salaries at the advanced ages with those for younger ages, on the same length of service, it would appear that supervision now tends to a reduction of pay where the latter is in effect a pension. No doubt this now is accomplished through transfer from one position to another of less responsibility or simpler duties and with correspondingly reduced pay. A similar (and just) method of treatment would induce retirements on pensions of 30, 40, and 50 per cent of average salaries in cases where the employees did not appreciate their failing powers and did not voluntarily retire.

57. The disability provision in the bill is most commendatory in the way of granting relief to the comparatively few at younger ages who become totally and permanently disabled, and is one of the most important provisions in the way of promoting efficiency without violating the promptings of human sympathy and compassion. Men who are accepted by the Government as servants and become inefficient by virtue of age before the period of service entitles them to a service pension should not be, and are not, summarily discharged. However, they now become a clog upon efficiency and an expense to the Government. The disability provision in the bill would do justice to the aged employees and benefit the service by a relief not otherwise obtainable.

58. Because there are comparatively few cases of total permanent disability amongst the great mass of active employees there appears a disposition to slight or ignore the disability provision of the bill, which is one of its most important features (most important in so far as it affects the humanitarian treatment of employees, in ridding the service of the inefficient from physical disability, especially due to advanced age).

59. Excepting for the fact that I have given the question thought and consideration, there would be no material value to any general opinion expressed by me, and I assume your request for an expression is based upon a presumed knowledge of pension schemes.

60. For many years pension funds have existed and actual experience has demonstrated the need for them in public and private service.

61. The relations between the private employer and his employee differ from those of the Government toward the public servant, and there should be a different pension scheme in respect of these two classes of employees.

62. The Government should provide a direct pension for its civil-service employees, but the payment should not be based on the value of service rendered by the active employee.

63. As servants of the Government men are of varying value, according to natural ability, experience, skill, peculiar personal fitness, alertness, and general intelligence.

64. As pensioners of the Government all should have equal consideration as human beings deserving of retirement from long service into a comfortable state of existence for the remainder of life.

65. The amount necessary for a comfortable existence to the average aged or disabled person should be determined, and that amount should fix the pension for every retired employee. Each and every pensioner is a human being and a citizen, and no one of them should be favored above another.

66. Those capable of commanding large compensation while in active service naturally accustom themselves to conditions that require larger expenditures than demanded by the conditions of those receiving smaller pay. Undoubtedly it would be a greater personal sacrifice for those of the first class than for those of the second to adapt themselves to a moderate pension. That fact, of previous personal expenditures and previous pay received for valuable services, has influenced legislators in taking the salary as the basis for pensions.

67. There is no relation between the compensation to which an employee is entitled and the pension he should receive in order to prevent him from becoming an object of charity after devoting the energies of a lifetime to the public service.

68. No employee should be influenced by the character and amount of pension to the belief that he has any "vested interest" in the payment that might be made to him. He should not be led to consider it as "deferred payment" through basing the assurance of it upon the salary he may now or hereafter receive.

69. Every employee should receive a salary commensurate with service rendered.

70. After faithful and efficient service has been rendered for a sufficient period of time, the Government should retire every employee under the guaranty of a comfortable existence for the remainder of life.

71. Those who have been able to earn a large salary should be held responsible for its proper expenditure. Knowing that the pension would be moderate and uniform for all pensioners, these employees would realize the necessity of saving for the future a portion of current salary if they desired to continue the luxuries of life after retirement.

72. The evils that have developed under direct-pension plans have arisen from the erroneous basis of pension payments.

73. To grade the pension by previous salary begets extravagance amongst those who receive large salaries.

74. To grade the pension by previous salary leads to the idea that the pension is "deferred pay," with resulting abuses.

75. To grade the pension by previous salary produces a wrong conception of the true nature of retirement allowances and the real purpose for which pensions are granted.

76. A fair and adequate salary is the due of everyone who can render efficient and satisfactory service.

77. A moderate pension assures comfort in old age, and this should be the last situation of every man and woman, regardless of past condition or previous service.

78. A universal pension is the social need.

79. In the absence of a governmental pension scheme for the whole body politic, the justice of a plan for those who spend their lives and energies in the public service is generally recognized.

80. The basic principles underlying the limited plan should not differ from those of a universal scheme along the lines of the recent superannuation plan adopted in Great Britain.

81. I am well aware that this opinion concerning the determination of a pension is not in accord with prevailing practices or proposed measures.

82. In providing the money for salaries the people at large pay for value received in the way of service.

83. In providing the money for pensions the people would contribute toward the maintenance in comfort of faithful servants. These contributions would be made in the spirit that has prompted recognition from just men since the beginning of service by one person to another.

84. After having received fair compensation for work performed, employees should not ask for more than the assurance of a comfortable and modest living after their retirement.

85. The people would commend an act of the Congress which made reasonable and moderate provision for superannuated and disabled civil-service employees.

86. On the other hand, it is doubtful whether or not the act would meet popular approval if the pension is virtually to replace the salary paid for service.

87. The employees should not permit selfish desire to get the better of sound discretion in the advocacy of pension payments.

88. They should look at the question from the viewpoint of the people who are to provide the funds.

89. The objections against direct pensions (many of which are vigorously presented in S. Doc. No. 745) logically could not be urged if the tendency to abuse were removed by making the retirement allowance unattractive except as a protection against want and destitution after earning capacity has failed.

90. A provident spirit and a habit of saving and a feeling of independence would be instilled, promoted, and encouraged when employees felt that they must lay by something for the future if they wanted more than a modest, comfortable living after retirement.

91. I dwell upon this thought because I believe it is the interest of employees to favor an act of the Congress which will meet popular approval and keep the ultimate annual payments within a reasonable amount not burdensome to the taxpayers. I try faithfully to serve those who employ me, my advice being according to my convictions, hence the earnestness of these lengthy comments.

THE CONTRIBUTION PLAN.

92. The Congress should not adopt any "savings-bank and annuity" plan, as proposed in S. 1944, H. R. 22013, or H. R. 729, or any other proposition which makes the Government the caretaker of money belonging to individuals, under a compulsory system of deposits. It is of questionable policy and a doubtful constitutional procedure.

93. Theoretically the plan may be indorsed as actuarially sound.

94. From the practical viewpoint I doubt if many actuaries would commend the plan to our Government for three reasons:

First. The accumulation of a few thousand dollars subject to draft would cause men to withdraw to enter inviting (or apparently inviting) pursuits where efficiency coupled with a small capital would offer (or appear to offer) greater opportunities than continuing in the service. The tendency would be to lose the efficient and force the retention of the less efficient in the Government employ.

Second. When employees observed the working of the annuity plan very few would enter upon their pensions, but would demand cash payment on attaining the retirement age. Only those in good health and with the anticipation of many years of life would have any inducement to purchase an annuity with their accumulation.

To enter upon the pension (as proposed in bills before the Congress) would mean a forfeiture of the accumulation not consumed in pension payments prior to death. It would not be long before employees would condemn the annuity plan, when they saw retired associates, with $6,000 or $7,000 of accumulation, draw $75 or $1,000 in pensions and then die and have the remainder of the fund forfeited to the Government to enable it to continue payments to other pensioners. A general repudiation of the annuity and a demand for cash settlement at age of retirement would cause the failure of the annuity scheme by subjecting the Government to loss on the persistent lives that entered upon their pensions. The life insurance companies of America and the Government of Great Britain have been losers through granting annuities.

Third. Fifty, sixty, or seventy years is a short period in the life of a republic which is expected to exist forever. At the end of some such period, in the progress of the "saving bank and annuity" scheme, the Government would be in the position of a billionaire investor under the necessity of continually and forever holding safe securities in an amount equal to the enormous accumulation of its employees, and yielding interest income sufficient to enable it to keep its pledges with its enforced depositors. The mere suggestion of this future position condemns the policy as one wholly unsuited to any government, especially one under republican form.

95. It is conceded that the great majority of employees from their present salaries could not afford the required deductions as proposed. It is further conceded that an increase in salaries is necessary to make the plan practical.

96. An increase of salaries to make the plan workable means that the Government must in fact provide for the annuities.

97. It is contended that even though this is true, the fact that the amount of the salary increase is invested gives the advantage of interest accumulation and makes the salary increase much less than the annual pension payments, and therefore is a saving over the direct-pension plan.

98. The contention is supported by fact in the statement that it would require a smaller annual appropriation for each year during the accumulation period than for each year thereafter for annuity or pension payments (provided all of the retiring employees entered upon the pensions).

99. To secure this conditional saving the Government must tax the people for 20 to 50 years before the income is needed for distribution, and in the meantime must assume the responsibility of safely investing hundreds of millions of dollars with required interest income of doubtful realization.

100. It would be better governmental policy and more nearly in accord with popular sentiment amongst the employees and the people to make direct appropriations as needed, rather than anticipate some saving many years hence at the risk not only of financial loss incident to the investment of such vast sums, but at the risk of graft and of political demoralization resulting from the handling of the millions of accumulation, to say nothing of the moral and ethical nature of a political system which assumes control of the funds of individuals, nolens volens, and places them at the possible disposition of party manipulators.

101. Accepting assumptions and methods of computations set forth in public documents of the House and Senate, and using the data of Census Bulletin 94, it would appear that the total accumulation under proposed contribution plans ultimately would not fall much short of $1,000,000,000.

102. A rough estimate easily may be made from figures given in this report. Assuming an average annual salary of $1,200, an interest rate of 3½ per cent, an average monthly deduction from salary of $6, and total employees of 184,299, the accumulation in 22 years would be about $444,000,000.

103. The accumulation would reach its maximum when the annual contributions by employees plus the annual interest income from invested funds equal the total annual payments, or somewhere between 50 and 80 years, according to circumstances affecting the accumulation arising out of interest accretions, management of the fund, and conditions in the service.

104. I present a rough (though accurate as to scale) diagram which graphically illustrates the progress of accumulation in a pension fund and will reflect the general situation that may develop under proposed contribution plans.

105. The age of the fund is represented by the base line from 0 to 90 years.

106. The amounts of the accumulation, the payments, and the contributions are indicated by the points on the scale from 0 to 65; that is to say, the line from A to F represents the maximum accumulation; A to P the constant annual payments to pensioners; A to C the constant annual contributions; and C to P the constant annual interest income.

107. The diagram makes plain the necessity for an enormous accumulation, where the annual pension payments are large, by showing the relative amounts of annual contributions and annual interest income. The accumulation must be large to steadily and continuously produce the annual interest income, which latter will be from 8 to 11 times the amount of the annual contributions, according to the rate of interest earned.

108. The people would never sanction a scheme that contemplated such accumulation as needed for the proposed "Savings bank and annuity" plans. The plan is not within the legitimate functions of government, and the presence of the fund would invite abuses certain to develop.

ABB LANDIS, *Nashville, Tenn.*

JANUARY 17, 1912.

(Diagram and Exhibit A omitted. See Hearings No. 4, 1912, before the House Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.)

EXPLANATION OF EXHIBIT A.

Attached hereto is a sheet of statistics showing the number of employees according to Census Bulletin 94 as of present ages, as of entry ages, and according to years of service. The totals for the numbers on the horizontal lines are given below, showing the employees at present ages. The totals for the columns (vertical summation) show the employees by years of service; the totals by diagonal summation show the number of employees by ages of entry into the service. The totals for the last column on the left-hand margin on the sheet show the employees subject to pensions immediately, and 5 years hence, 10 years hence, etc.:

Horizontal summation.

Employees at present ages:	
Under 20 years	3,175
20 to 24 years	18,681
25 to 29 years	29,341
30 to 34 years	31,793
35 to 39 years	29,019
40 to 44 years	21,398
45 to 49 years	17,879
50 to 54 years	11,771
55 to 59 years	7,917
60 to 64 years	6,816
65 to 69 years	4,357
70 to 74 years	1,553
75 to 79 years	462
80 years	137
Total	184,299

Diagonal summation.

Employees by entry ages:	
Under 20 years	6,866
20 to 24 years	34,960
25 to 29 years	44,654
30 to 34 years	35,169
35 to 39 years	23,639
40 to 44 years	14,392
45 to 49 years	10,185
50 to 54 years	6,893
55 to 59 years	4,070
60 to 64 years	2,258
65 to 69 years	933
70 to 74 years	223
75 to 79 years	55
80 years	2
Total	184,299

Vertical summation.

Employees by years of service:	
Under 5 years	89,395
5 to 9 years	45,034
10 to 14 years	19,065
15 to 19 years	15,198
20 to 24 years	7,385
25 to 29 years	3,825
30 to 34 years	2,118
35 to 39 years	1,229
40 years	1,050
Total	184,299

Totals on left-hand margin.

Employees at present ages subject to pension:	
80 years and over	137
75 to 79 years	462
70 to 74 years	1,553
65 to 69 years	1,065
60 to 64 years	1,167
55 to 59 years	5,401
50 to 54 years	8,623
45 to 49 years	13,442
40 to 44 years	18,940

Employees at present ages subject to pension—Continued.

35 to 39 years	31,750
30 to 34 years	50,562
25 to 29 years	29,341
20 to 24 years	18,681
Under 20 years	3,175
Total	184,299

I ask to have the Secretary read the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 34, line 26, it is proposed to insert:

An employee in the Postal Service who has served for a period of 25 years or more can be recommended by the postmaster of the city in which he is employed, or other authorized officer, for indefinite leave of absence to the Postmaster General under the following conditions: An employee who has become incapacitated from performing his duties through superannuation shall appear before a board of examiners appointed by the Postmaster General, who shall serve without compensation, with the exception of a physician, who must examine the applicant and make minute inquiry into his physical condition, and make a report of their findings to the Postmaster General. If the application for indefinite leave of absence is recommended by the board of examiners and approved by the Postmaster General, the applicant shall be granted an extended leave of absence, together with an allowance of $600 per annum. This allowance shall be divided pro rata into equal daily installments and shall be payable monthly. If it is found necessary to employ a substitute to fill the place of an employee who has been granted an extended leave of absence, said substitute shall be paid at the rate allowed for vacation work: *Provided, however,* That this will in no way interfere with the substitute's promotion provided a vacancy in the regular force occurs and said substitute is in line for promotion by virtue of his standing on the substitute list: *Provided further,* That the Postmaster General can order an employee who is on an extended leave of absence to report for duty at the office in which he was last employed during seasons of the year when the mail is extraordinarily heavy and the services of the employee could be utilized to good advantage: *Provided further,* That in the event of an employee being required to perform duty during such emergency periods he shall not receive any extra compensation for such service other than the allowance granted him while on an extended leave of absence.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I make the point of order that the amendment is new legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

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

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DISTRICT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I ask unanimous consent that the report of the conference committee on the District of Columbia appropriation bill (H. R. 19422) may be taken up and agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Maryland what points of difference still exist between the conferees?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will state to the Senator from Kansas that the conference report has been printed. Quite a number have been agreed to, and there are only three items upon which the conferees have disagreed.

Mr. BRISTOW. What are those items? That is the inquiry I am making.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The items on which there is still a disagreement are the half-and-half principle, the comfort station, and the appropriation for the Emergency Hospital. Those are the three items upon which the conferees have been unable to agree. We desire to have the items upon which they have agreed adopted by the Senate, so that the report may go over to the House and the other matters may be taken up.

Mr. BRISTOW. As I understand, then, the Senator asks that the agreements at which they have arrived shall be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. BRISTOW. Approved by the Senate, and that the three items referred to are still in conference?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Still in conference, and that conferees may be appointed to act upon those matters.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I have no objection at all to agreeing to the items, so far as the committee has agreed, but I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland in relation to the appropriation for the Emergency Hospital. Is the cause of the disagreement that the House disagrees in toto to any appriation at all being made?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The House has disagreed upon the amount. Of course, I do not know what they may do, but they disagreed upon the amount that the Senate committee put in, and also upon the item for the comfort station and the item relating to the half-and-half principle.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments and ask a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. LEA of Tennessee, and Mr. GALLINGER conferees at the further conference on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask unanimous consent to take up and consider Order of Business No. 899, being Senate bill 6493, for the appointment of an additional judge in the fifth judicial circuit of the United States. It is a unanimous report from the Committee on the Judiciary, and is an urgent matter.

Mr. PENROSE. What is it about?

Mr. CULBERSON. It is a bill for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the fifth circuit of the United States. It is a unanimous report from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PENROSE. I have no objection.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be in the fifth judicial circuit of the United States an additional circuit judge, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall possess the same qualifications and have the same powers and jurisdiction and entitled to the same salary now provided by law in respect to the present circuit judges therein.

SEC. 2. That in the event of a vacancy after such appointment in the office of any of the circuit judges of said fifth judicial circuit of the United States such vacancy shall not be filled by appointment until the number of judges who are able to serve actively shall be reduced to less than three.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask that the report of the Committee on the Judiciary may be printed in the RECORD without reading.

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

The report is as follows:

[Senate Report No. 1017, Sixty-third Congress, third session.]

ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT JUDGE, FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT.

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

The Committee on the Judiciary, which has had under consideration the bill (S. 6493) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge in the fifth judicial circuit of the United States, report the same back to the Senate and recommend its passage without amendment.

As showing the necessity and urgency of the passage of this bill there are appended hereto, first, a letter from the Attorney General of the United States dated September 19, 1914; and, second, two letters from the clerk of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, one dated October 3, 1914, the other dated November 9, 1914.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., September 19, 1914.

Hon. CHARLES A. CULBERSON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: I herewith inclose draft of a bill (S. 6493) introduced by Senator SHEPPARD. He has asked me to send you a copy of it and give you a statement of the conditions requiring its passage. The following situation exists in the fifth judicial circuit of the United States:

Judge A. P. McCormick will be 82 years old next December and has not been upon the bench for some 18 months. He has been in an invalid's chair for a year or more and is wheeled around by an attendant. He has been living at Waco, Tex., during the period referred to and will never occupy the bench again. I am reliably informed that he admits that fact, but says he will not retire. Judge Pardee was 77 years old last March, and Judge Shelby died a few weeks ago and his successor has not been appointed.

During the long absence of Judge McCormick from the bench the business of the court has been very badly demoralized. The two circuit judges frequently constitute the entire court, and district judges are from time to time sent to occupy the chair of Judge McCormick. This has likewise resulted in disorganization in the districts of the circuit and has been quite expensive to the Government. I am reliably informed that Judges Pardee and Shelby have earnestly urged some arrangement which would improve this unfortunate state of affairs.

Under these circumstances I unqualifiedly approve this bill and hope that it may be passed at as early a date as practicable.

I understand that a similar bill has been introduced in the House by Congressman SLAYDEN. My recollection is that a bill of this kind was passed by Congress when Judge Rector, of the northern district of Texas, became incapacitated by serious illness from performing the duties of his office.

Respectfully, T. W. GREGORY, *Attorney General.*

UNITER STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, FIFTH CIRCUIT,
New Orleans, La., October 3, 1914.

Hon. C. A. CULBERSON,
Chairman, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your two telegrams of even date. In reply thereto I beg to say:

The number of cases filed per annum for the past five years, the number of cases disposed of, and undisposed of during the same period, as reported to the Attorney General, at the close of the fiscal years, were as follows:

Year.	Filed.	Disposed of.	Undisposed of.
1910	138	149	89
1911	144	127	106
1912	142	158	85
1913	145	141	89
1914	140	131	98

The number of cases undisposed of on June 30, 1914, as per my report to the Attorney General, amounted to 98. Since then 43 have been filed, making a total of 141 cases undisposed of at this date. The court meets at Atlanta, Ga., on October 5; at Montgomery, Ala., on October 19; and at Fort Worth, Tex., on November 2, 1914, during which sessions 82 cases, out of said total of 141 remaining undisposed of at this time, are assigned for hearing. The balance will be assigned at New Orleans at the session set for the third Monday in November.

The time required to dispose of a case after it is filed depends largely upon when it is filed before the session of the court at which it is returnable. If filed as early as two weeks, or, in some instances, a week, before the term begins, if the record is ready, and application therefor is made, it is assigned at the term about to begin. If this can not be done, the case may, on stipulation of the parties, filed with the clerk and approved by the court, be assigned for hearing at any other place or session of the court.

The court keeps up pretty well with its docket. The bulk of the cases undisposed of, as per the reports to the Attorney General, are usually cases that come in after the terms at Atlanta, Montgomery, and Fort Worth have been held, and no request is made for their transfer, the parties desiring to await the sessions at said places.

Respectfully,

FRANK H. MORTIMER, *Clerk.*

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, FIFTH CIRCUIT,
Fort Worth, Tex., November 9, 1914.

Hon. C. A. CULBERSON,
Chairman Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your communication of the 3d instant, forwarded here, where the United States circuit court of appeals is now sitting, asking answers to the following queries:

First. The last time Circuit Judge A. P. McCormick took part in any case pending in the circuit court of appeals?

Second. What effect on the disposition of cases pending in that court has his failure to take part had?

Third. What additional cost to the Government has his absence entailed?

In answer to the first, I would say that the last time Judge A. P. McCormick sat in the circuit court of appeals, as shown by the minutes of the court, was March 5, 1912. The last time he took part in any case pending in said court was on September 5, 1914, when he granted an order staying proceedings in the District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi in the bankruptcy case of Clark, Herrin & Campbell Co., petitioner, *v.* H. B. Claflin & Co. et al., respondents, until the disposition in this court of the petition to superintend and revise therein.

In answer to the second query I can only reply that Judge McCormick's absence from the circuit court of appeals during the last two or three years has made it requisite to call district judges from parts of the circuit to sit in his stead. This has resulted in some delays in the final disposition of cases, as the judges called in could only be spared from the districts for a short time, and sometimes the necessary consultations were delayed or were carried on by correspondence.

I have no data upon which I can answer the third query.

Yours, very truly,

FRANK H. MORTIMER, *Clerk.*

NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT, GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably with amendments the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 238) giving authority to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make special regulations for the occasion of the forty-ninth national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held in the District of Columbia in the months of September and October, 1915, and for other purposes incident to said encampment, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate act upon it at this time.

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

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have the joint resolution read.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Utah that this is exactly the same resolution that was passed five years ago, and it is to regulate the affairs of the District of Columbia during this encampment the same as was done at that time.

Mr. SMOOT. I will simply ask that the resolution may be read for information before giving consent to its consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to make such special regulations for the occasion of the encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, which will take place in the District of Columbia from September 27 to October 2, 1915, as they shall deem advisable for the preservation of public order and the protection of life and property, to be in force one week prior to said encampment, during said encampment, and one week subsequent thereto. Such special regulations shall be published in one or more of the daily newspapers of the District of Columbia, and no penalty prescribed for the violation of such regulations shall be enforced until five days after such publication; and said commissioners are authorized and directed to establish a special schedule of fares, applicable to public conveyances in said District, during the period aforesaid. Any person violating any of the aforesaid regulations or the aforesaid schedule of fares shall, upon conviction thereof in the police court of the said District, be liable for such offense to a fine not to exceed $100, and in default of payment of such fine to imprisonment in the workhouse (or jail) of said District for not longer than 60 days. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its approval, and the sum of $11,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary, payable from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and from the revenues of the District of Columbia, in equal parts is hereby appropriated to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to carry out the provisions of this section 1 of this joint resolution, $1,000 of which shall be available for the construction, maintenance, and operation of public-comfort stations and information booths, under the direction of said commissioners.

SEC. 2. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to permit the committee on illumination of the citizens' executive committee for the entertainment of the forty-ninth national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to stretch suitable conductors, with sufficient supports wherever necessary, for the purpose of effecting the said illumination within the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the said conductors shall not be used for the conveying of electrical currents after October 2, 1915, and shall, with their supports, be fully and entirely removed from the streets and avenues of the said city of Washington on or before October 20, 1915: *Provided further*, That the stretching and removing of the said wires shall be under the supervision of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who shall see that the provisions of this resolution are enforced; that all needful precautions are taken for the protection of the public; and that the pavement of any street, avenue, or alley disturbed is replaced in as good condition as before entering upon the work herein authorized: *Provided further*, That no expense or damage on account of or due to the stretching, operation, or removing of the said temporary overhead conductors shall be incurred by the United States or the District of Columbia: *And provided further*, That if it shall be necessary to erect wires for illumination purposes over any park or reservation in the District of Columbia that the work of erection and removal of said wires shall be under the supervision of the official in charge of said work or reservation.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy be, and they are hereby, authorized to loan to the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of street decorations, or his successor in said office, for the purpose of decorating the streets of the city of Washington, D. C., on the occasion of the encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, 1915, such of the United States ensigns, flags (except battle flags), signal numbers, etc., belonging to the Government of the United States, as in their judgment may be spared and are not in use by the Government at the time of the encampment. The loan of the said ensigns, flags, signal numbers, etc., to said chairman shall not take place prior to the 15th day of September and shall be returned by him by the 15th day of October, 1915.

SEC. 4. That for the protection and return of said ensigns, flags, signal numbers, etc., the said chairman, or his successor in office, shall execute and deliver to the President of the United States, or to such officer as he may designate, a satisfactory bond in the penalty of $50,000, to secure just payment for any loss or damage to said ensigns, flags, and signal numbers not necessarily incident to the use specified.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to grant permits to the citizens' executive committee for the entertainment of the Grand Army of the Republic for the use of any reservation or other public spaces in the city of Washington on the occasion of the forty-ninth national encampment, in the months of September and October, 1915, which, in his opinion, will inflict no serious or permanent injuries upon such reservations or public spaces, or statuary therein; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may designate for such and other purposes on the occasion aforesaid such streets, avenues, and sidewalks in said city of Washington as they may deem proper and necessary: *Provided, however*, That all stands and platforms that may be erected on the public spaces aforesaid shall be under the supervision of the said citizens' executive committee and in accordance with plans and designs to be approved by the Architect of the Capitol, the Commissioner of Public Buildings and Grounds, and the building inspector of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to loan to the chairman of the medical department of the *forty-ninth national* encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, or his successor in said office, for the purpose of caring for the sick, injured, and infirm on the occasion of the encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic in the months of September and October, 1915, such hospital tents and camp appliances and other necessaries, hospital furniture, and utensils of all descriptions, ambulances, horses, drivers, stretchers, and Red Cross flags and poles belonging to the Government of the United States as in his judgment may be spared and are not in use by the Government at the time of the encampment: *Provided*, That the said chairman, or his successor in said office, shall indemnify the War Department for any loss to such hospital tents and appliances as aforesaid not necessarily incident to such use.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection, Mr. President. I understand that a similar resolution was passed five years ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments proposed by the committee will be stated.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 23, before the word "section," to strike out "this," so as to read:

This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its approval, and the sum of $11,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary, payable from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and from

the revenues of the District of Columbia, in equal parts, is hereby appropriated to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to carry out the provisions of this section 1 of this joint resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 6, to strike out the word "work" and insert the word "park," so as to read:

That if it shall be necessary to erect wires for illumination purposes over any park or reservation in the District of Columbia that the work of erection and removal of said wires shall be under the supervision of the official in charge of said park or reservation.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

HENRY WEAVER.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to make a report from the Committee on Claims on House bill 16305, to reimburse Henry Weaver, postmaster at Delmar, Ala., for money and stamps stolen from said post office at Delmar and repaid by him to the Post Office Department. It is a small claim bill, and I ask for its immediate consideration. It involves less than $100.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Henry Weaver, of Delmar, Ala., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $94.67, the amount of money and postage stamps stolen from the post office at Delmar, Ala., on the night of September 26, 1910, while he was postmaster at Delmar, and which money and stamps belonged to the said post office, and which said sum he was required to repay, and did repay, to the Post Office Department of the United States.

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

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wish to ask unanimous consent to take from the calendar for present consideration certain omnibus pensions bills which are awaiting action by the Senate.

I ask the Senate to consider Senate bill 7509.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pension the following-named persons at the rates stated:

Charles F. Schantz, late of Company I, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, $12 per month.

Arthur W. Martin, late of the U. S. S. *Yale* and *Chicago*, United States Navy, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Blanche Wood, widow of Benjamin F. Wood, late chief engineer, United States Navy, with the rank of commander, $30 per month, and $2 per month additional for each of the minor children of said Benjamin F. Wood until each reaches the age of 16 years.

Jane M. Brown, widow of Joseph E. Brown, late of U. S. S. *Wabash*, United States Navy, $12 per month.

Andrew F. Venable, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Anna L. Power, widow of John T. Power, late of United States Navy and Marine Corps, $20 per month.

Charles M. Gregory, late of Company C, Thirty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Patrick J. Hyde, late of United States Navy, Regular Establishment, $12 per month.

Benjamin F. Klippert, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, $20 per month.

Reinhard Anschuetz, alias Charles Reinhard, late of Troop L, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, $12 per month.

Odelon Valcour, late of Twenty-fourth Company United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, $20 per month.

James N. Yates, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry P. Logsdon, dependent father of Mathias Logsdon, late of Troop G, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, $20 per month.

William C. Campbell, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, $12 per month.

Edward Louden, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, $12 per month.

Joseph H. Dawson, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jennings J. Pierce, late second lieutenant Company I, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Wilhelmina Myer, widow of Albert L. Myer, late brigadier general, United States Army, Regular Establishment, $30 per month.

Raymond S. Sheldon, late of Company B, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Willard D. Cook, late of Battery A, First Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George P. L. McCarty and Mildred G. McCarty, minor children of Willard A. McCarty, late of the U. S. S. *Buffalo*, United States Navy, War with Spain, $12 per month with $2 per month additional on account of each of said children until they reach the age of 16 years.

Edward F. Collins, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Winfield S. Taylor, late of Company C, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $16 per month.

William G. Taliaferro, late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Minnie Lord Henderson, widow of Richard Henderson, late commander, United States Navy, and captain, United States Navy, retired, $30 per month.

Allan E. Pugh, late of U. S. S. *Buffalo*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, $17 per month.

Eugene Helm, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, $17 per month.

David Roach, late of Company G, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Sarah A. Boll, widow of George T. Boll, late of the Thirtieth Company United States Coast Artillery, $12 per month, and $2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said George T. Boll until they reach the age of 16 years.

William A. Taylor, late of Company I, First Territorial Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $20 per month.

Edward M. Booe, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $16 per month.

Alice Pollock, widow of Jacob Pollock, late of Company H, Palmetto Regiment South Carolina Volunteers, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mary R. Kendall, widow of Henry M. Kendall, late captain, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, and lieutenant colonel, United States Army, retired, $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Caro G. Moore, widow of William S. Moore, late captain, United States Navy, and commodore, United States Navy, retired, $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Robert H. Trollinger, late of Company E, First Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, and Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, $12 per month.

John Johnson, No. 2, late of the U. S. S. *Saranac*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, $12 per month.

Louisa M. Fletcher, widow of William Fletcher, late of Company G, First Regiment Ohio Volunteers, War with Mexico, and captain, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, and major, United States Army, retired, $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Alice S. C. McNaught, widow of John S. McNaught, late captain, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, and major, United States Army, retired, $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I ask the Senate to consider Senate bill 7566.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pension the following-named persons at the rates stated:

Mary A. Attmore, widow of William H. Attmore, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment New York State Militia Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Josiah L. Burton, late of Company H, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles L. Greene, helpless and dependent son of Milton M. Greene, late of Company D, Two hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Ida A. Mitchell, widow of Ela Mitchell, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Mary J. Forbes, former widow of Horace A. Egbert, late first lieutenant Company I, Forty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Sarah E. C. Emerson, widow of George A. Emerson, late acting assistant paymaster, United States Navy, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John A. Churchill, late of Company A, Thirty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Richard Woods, late of Companies K and C, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserves Volunteer Infantry, and Third Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Banks, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mollie C. Warren, widow of Edward M. Warren, late of Company I, One hundred and sixty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Lucinda Traub, widow of Albert Traub, late second lieutenant Company B and captain Company C, Twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Samuel W. Harden, late of Company E, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Albert N. Raymond, late of Company B, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles R. Gentner, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rodney Jones, late of Company I, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Cavalry, and Company G, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

David H. Hall, late acting master's mate, United States Navy, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Moses H. McLaughlin, late of the U. S. S. *North Carolina*, *San Jacinto*, and *Savannah*, United States Navy, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Robert I. Morrison, late of Company A, Third Battalion District of Columbia Militia Infantry, $12 per month.

Lou E. Hecox, widow of Charles L. Hecox, late of Company G, One hundred and twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Peter L. Miles, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, $18 per month.

Thomas Hickman, late of Company K, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Eliza J. Arthur, former widow of David S. Arthur, late of Company H, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Bettie Dodge, former widow of Augustus B. Stevens, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Maria Love, former widow of Philip Gunckel, late of Company D, Eighty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Robert Degray, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Luther Curtis, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Orlando L. Daugherty, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Martha E. Messenger, widow of Sherman Messenger, late of Company F, Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Minna Schue, widow of Nicholas Schue, late of Companies E and D, Thirteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Gordon P. Ostrander, late of Company G, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Engineers and Mechanics, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William W. Chew, late of Company B, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Minerva M. Walsh, widow of Mathew M. Walsh, late second lieutenant Company C, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Ellen Garlick, widow of Charles D. Garlick, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Sarah E. H. Bartlett, widow of George L. Bartlett, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

George Schmidt, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George Fulford, late of Company E, Seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George F. Weitzel, late of Company H, One hundred and first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William M. Allen, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Catherine C. Abbott, widow of Wade Abbott, late of Company I, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

Samuel Lilly, late of Company G, One hundred and sixty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edwin Forbes, late of Company G, Ninety-second Regiment, and Company E, Forty-seventh Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James W. Toler, late of Company M, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George Wort, late of Company K, One hundredth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Markland, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William A. Rusie, late of Company C, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Reuben F. Longley, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Anna Mott, widow of Albert P. Mott, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Thomas Shapley, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Cleora A. Carver, widow of William L. Carver, late of Company B, Seventeenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mary A. Lowry, widow of Larkin P. Lowry, late of Company B, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Wiley Whicher, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Amos Poe, late captain Company F, Thirty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Martin Perkins, alias Charles Shepherd, late of Company K, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and Company M, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, $17 per month.

Florence Ada Tinney, helpless and dependent child of George Tinney, late of Company C, Maine Coast Guards, $12 per month.

Susan J. Alexander, widow of Bradford Alexander, late of Companies D and B, Third Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John H. Van Meter, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lewis C. Lame, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Imogene M. Burk, widow of Marshal B. Burk, late captain Company C, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

H. B. Crouch, late of Company L, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and Company H, Fourteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mathew Crawford, late of Company F, Ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph Raphile, late of Company B, Forty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jonathan Sargent, late of Company E, Third Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John P. Simpson, late of Company F, Forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Albert Baur, late of Company A, One hundred and second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas T. Jones, late of Company B, Thirty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

David Cox, late of Company E, Fifty-second Regiment, and Company F, Seventeenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Richard Dobson, late of Company G, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Light Artillery, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph H. Dearborn, late of Company C, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah L. Hammerton, widow of Elias Hammerton, late of Company D, Ninety-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of John L. Sullaven, late of Company A, One hundred and ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Theresa L. Breese, widow of Sidney A. Breese, late captain Company G, Sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Thomas E. Dunbar, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ephraim D. Edwards, late of Company C, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Nelson B. Tool, late of Company M, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Josiah Hasbrook, late of Company B, Twenty-sixth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Irena Ward, former widow of Andrew B. Seaver, alias Anselmos Bracey, late of U. S. S. *Ohio*, *Iuka*, and *Mahaska*, United States Navy, $12 per month.

John W. Fletcher, late of Company F, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James Menaugh, late of Company H, One hundred and seventy-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Michael Kirk, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Windell, late captain Company K, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Benjamin F. Shepherd, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William R. Minert, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Allen C. Goodwin, late of Company B, Twenty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Daniel H. Pettengill, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Olive Lunn, widow of Henry Lunn, late unassigned, Eighth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Harriett S. Crooks, widow of William Crooks, late colonel Sixth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

William H. McKinley, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James F. Hobbs, late of Company M, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Cavalry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Evander V. Turner, late of Company H, Twenty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and second lieutenant Company I, One hundred and ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary E. Clark, widow of Arthur E. Clark, late second lieutenant, First Independent Battery Connecticut Volunteer Light Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Elizabeth M. Norton, widow of Roswell Norton, late unassigned, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Alicen W. Poe, late of Company M, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary E. Searle, widow of Edward L. Searle, late of Company A, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Thomas M. Wall, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hugh M. Cory, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Madison T. Trent, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment, and Company E, Eighth Regiment, Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rose Barnes, widow of Harrison A. Barnes, late of Company K, Thirty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and former widow of Joseph Fredenburg, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Lewis A. Huffaker, late of Capt. Smith's company, Utah Volunteer Cavalry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

David Parker, late of Company C, Fourteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edward Dudevoire, late of Company A, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Hawkins, late of Company L, Twenty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company L, First Regiment New York Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. JOHNSON. I offer the following amendment for the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 11, line 13, strike out the initial "H." in the name of "H. B. Crouch" and in lieu thereof insert the name "Horace."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I ask the Senate to consider Senate bill 7598.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pension the following-named persons at the rates stated:

Nancy M. Vinton, former widow of Van Buren McKinstry, late of Company G, Thirty-sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Edward W. Anderson, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Josephus Steller, late of Company E, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James J. Boothe, late second assistant engineer U. S. Army gunboat *Smith Briggs*, $20 per month.

Effie M. Bing, widow of John E. M. Bing, late of Company E, Fifty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Porter E. Nash, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Laura Garriett, widow of Watson C. Garriett, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Irvin M. Hill, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Laura M. Goodwine, former widow of Samuel A. Lowry, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Mary J. White, widow of John White, late of Company K, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John L. Russell, late of Company A, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah A. Ferguson, widow of Andrew Ferguson, late of the U. S. ram *Lioness*, Mississippi Marine Brigade, $12 per month.

Isabelle E. Jones, widow of Lemuel A. Jones, deceased, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Mary A. Conway, widow of Patrick Conway, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Georgianna Thomas, widow of Jacob Thomas, alias Doutha, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

William C. Pope, late of Company B, Twenty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah J. Deloe, widow of William W. Deloe, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Jesse Franklin Cochran, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Mary A. Flynn, widow of Patrick Flynn, late of Company F, One hundred and twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Twenty-first Battery Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Leona B. Haucke, widow of Albert Haucke, late of Company D, Fifty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mary B. Jenks, widow of George W. Jenks, late captain Company F, Thirty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mary A. Harrington, widow of Joseph W. Harrington, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Amelia M. Payson, widow of Ebenezer F. Payson, late of Company E, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Ida Ingraham, widow of Edwin Ingraham, late of the United States Navy, $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Amos T. Phares, late of Company B, Seventieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Louis M. Lea, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Johnson G. Trask, late of Company A, Fifteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William H. Langdon, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Catherine Curry, widow of Patrick Curry, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, and of Company E, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

David Delehanty, late of Company E, One hundred and seventy-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James H. Clark, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John F. Thomas, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph C. Townsend, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rhoda C. Freeman, former widow of Joseph G. Freeman, late of Company A, One hundred and eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Archie C. Fisk, late captain and assistant adjutant general, United States Volunteers, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Killin, late of Company E, First Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mack Carr, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry Reed, late of Company F, One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary A. Richards, widow of Moses Y. Richards, late of U. S. S. *Ohio*, *Minnesota*, and *Princeton*, United States Navy, $12 per month.

William D. Bonar, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rosalie A. Partridge, helpless and dependent child of William L. Partridge, late of Company K, Twenty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Andrew C. McCorkle, late of Company B, Seventy-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Eli Samson, late of Company L, Second Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas J. Gwin, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah McDowell, widow of Augustus McDowell, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Sadie Hatch, widow of Charles S. W. Hatch, alias Samuel W. Hatch, late of Company F, Thirty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Miles Matthews, late of Company C, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas Clark, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment, and Company A, Seventh Regiment, Delaware Volunteer Infantry, $21 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Margaret J. Howell, widow of Horatio S. Howell, late captain Company B, Fourth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John Jones, late of Company A, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Semantha M. Hudson, widow of Josiah K. Hudson, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment, and Company G, Fiftieth Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

George T. Moulton, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph Lieber, late of Company A, Backof's battalion, Missouri Volunteer Artillery, $12 per month.

James Gorman, late of U. S. S. *Ohio*, *Brooklyn*, and *Fort Jackson*, United States Navy, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William A. N. Clare, late of Company K, Forty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Clara McGaughey, helpless and dependent daughter of William McGaughey, late of Company B, Seventy-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Edward H. Baldwin, late pilot, U. S. S. *Sovereign*, *General Sterling Price*, and *Mound City*, Mississippi Squadron, United States Navy, $20 per month.

John J. White, late of Company D, Twenty-ninth Regiment, and Company D, Sixty-first Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month, the same to be paid to him without deduction or rebate on account of former alleged overpayments or erroneous payments of pension.

John R. Lindaberry, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel J. Bingham, late of Company F, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and Company A, Seventeenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Peter S. McIntosh, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James H. Gallup, late of Company A, One hundred and seventy-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Arthur Mahar, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ziba Fry, late of Company A, Nineteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles C. Moulton, late of Company K, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Parson B. Mix, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mabel Turton, helpless and dependent daughter of Robert Turton, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

William Dougherty, late of Company B, Eighty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alonzo Cole, late of Company F, Twenty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Vogel, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph A. Fisher, late of Capt. Lot Smith's company, Utah Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edwin W. Moody, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary L. Lowe, widow of Edward Lowe, late of Company E, Third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Lydia A. Brockway, widow of Henry Brockway, late of Company B, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Maggie Brockway, helpless and dependent child of said Henry Brockway, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Lydia A. Brockway the name of the said Maggie Brockway shall be placed on the pension roll at $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Lydia A. Brockway.

Elisha Thomas, late of Company H, Twenty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James B. Kitts, late of U. S. S. *Naiad*, *Grampus*, and *Clara Dolsen*, United States Navy, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James M. Palmer, late of Company H, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jackson Smith, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Job Ingram, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and chaplain First Territorial Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alice C. Cox, widow of Joel E. Cox, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

John Jenkins, late of Company I, Forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles Woodward, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hattie E. Lawton, widow of William H. Lawton, late of Company D, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John L. Epperson, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William D. Eudy, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Annia Clark, widow of Andrew Clark, late unassigned, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Isaac Clark, helpless and dependent child of said Andrew Clark, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Annia Clark, the name of the said Isaac Clark shall be placed on the pension roll at $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Annia Clark.

Mary L. Taylor, widow of James P. Taylor, late colonel Twenty-second Regiment Kansas State Militia and first lieutenant Company C, Sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month.

John Lampke, late of Company H, One hundred and nineteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Herbert A. Oliver, late of Company H, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry C. Jordan, late of Company A, Twenty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hazlett A. Jacobs, late of Company I, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Elias Lloyd, late of Company C, Fourteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John E. Graham, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John McEathron, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Gilbert W. Potter, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sumner P. Boies, late of Company F, Third Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $21 per month.

Joann P. Libby, former widow of Cyrus Swift, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Anna Trickey, former widow of William Brewster, late of Thirty-fourth Independent Battery, New York Volunteer Light Artillery, $12 per month.

Mary E. Walker, widow of Samuel H. Walker, late captain Company D, Third Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Henrietta C. Stanton, widow of Jerome A. Stanton, late scout and master of transportation, Seventh Corps, United States Army, $12 per month.

The SECRETARY. On page 17 the committee proposes to strike out all of lines 13, 14, 15, and 16, in the following words, the soldier having died:

The name of Hazlett A. Jacobs, late of Company I, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill the committee proposes to insert:

The name of Charles H. Nelson, late of Company G, Nineteenth Regiment, and Company F, Twelfth Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The committee also proposes to insert the name of James H. Loughman, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The committee also proposes to insert the name of Roderick O'Connor, late of Company C, One hundredth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I ask to have inserted in the RECORD the following report of the committee.

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

S. 7569. Charles H. Nelson, of Waterville, Me., is shown by the War Department records to have enlisted August 2, 1862, as a private in Company G, Nineteenth Maine Infantry, and to have been discharged

March 17, 1863, for physical disability, namely, phthisis pulmonalis. He again enlisted February 2, 1865, in Company F, Twelfth Maine Volunteer Infantry, and was honorably discharged, with rank of sergeant, March 3, 1866.

Soldier filed and established a claim for pension under the general law for chronic diarrhea and disease of lungs, and was originally pensioned therefor at $6 per month from discharge; increased to $8 October 12, 1881, and to $10 May 9, 1900. He is now pensioned under the age-and-service act of May 11, 1912, at the rate of $21.50 per month. (Certificate No. 199519.)

This soldier is now 72 years of age. He has not been examined by a board of surgeons since May 9, 1900, when he was rated $10 on chronic diarrhea, impaired digestion, and piles; $6 on disease of lungs, and $4 on disease of heart. Medical evidence filed with this committee shows that claimant is at present in a helpless condition, requiring the constant services of an attendant. The following being the report of the physician:

"That he is now and has been for some time totally incapacitated, requiring the constant services of an attendant, and in my opinion he never will be any better. He is now suffering from a complication of diseases and general breakdown."

Neighbors testify that soldier is entirely helpless and requires the constant care of an attendant, and that he has no property whatever. His case is worthy of favorable consideration, and your committee recommend increase of pension to $50 per month, as proposed in the bill.

S. 7670. James H. Loughman, of South Bend, Ind., was a private in Company B, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry. He enlisted May 2, 1864, and was honorably discharged and mustered out June 25, 1865. The records show that he was taken prisoner in action at North Mountain, Va., July 3, 1864, and confined in Andersonville Prison for nearly 10 months, being paroled June 25, 1865.

Soldier filed and established a claim for pension under the general law for disease of rectum, and was originally pensioned therefor at $2 per month from June 26, 1888, increased to $6 March 2, 1895, and to $8 September 26, 1906. He might have drawn pension from discharge had he applied in time, but he refused to file his claim until after the expiration of the "arrears" act, and so saved the Government some hundreds of dollars. He is now pensioned under the age-and-service act of May 11, 1912, at the rate of $20 per month. (Certificate No. 917382.)

This soldier is now upward of 70 years of age. He has not been examined by a board of surgeons since September 26, 1906, when he was rated $8 on disease of rectum, $6 on disease of heart, $6 on rheumatism, and $6 on diarrhea, and the examining surgeons reported in direct terms that he was not physically able to perform manual labor. Papers filed in the claim at the Pension Bureau show that claimant suffered a stroke of apoplexy in April, 1914, and since then has been paralyzed and helpless, confined to his room and bed, unable to walk or feed himself, and requiring the constant services of an attendant night and day. The chairman of the committee is also reliably informed that claimant is helpless from paralysis and requires the aid and attendance of other persons at all times; that he is also poor and without means and is worthy and deserving of relief. His case excites great sympathy, and your committee report the bill favorably with recommendation for increase of pension to $50 per month.

S. 7657. Roderick O'Connor, of Buffalo, N. Y., served in the Civil War as a private and corporal in Company C, One hundredth New York Volunteer Infantry. He was a good soldier and has a first-class record, having enlisted July 31, 1862, and being honorably discharged June 15, 1865, after nearly three years of continuous service. He has a record of wound in action at Darbytown Road, Va., October 27, 1864.

Soldier filed and established a claim for pension under the general law and is pensioned by certificate No. 174654 at $20 per month for gunshot wound of nose and resulting catarrh, causing severe deafness of left ear and slight deafness of right ear. He was originally pensioned at the ridiculously small rate of $1 per month from discharge; increased to $4 February 2, 1881; to $8 December 11, 1889; and to $20 November 19, 1890. It has thus been 24 years and more since he has had any increase at the Pension Bureau.

Soldier is 68 years of age and, as the evidence shows, totally disabled and in destitute circumstances. The following affidavits accompany the bill:

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 29, 1914.*

To the Senate and House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

GENTLEMEN: Your petitioner, Roderick O'Connor, was a corporal in Company C, One hundredth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, during the Civil War, and is 68 years of age. His post-office address is 149 Parkdale Avenue, city of Buffalo, State of New York, county of Erie. He is a pensioner of the United States for disability and draws a pension of $20 per month, granted March 28, 1891. (Certificate No. 174654.) He was wounded in the nose on October 27, 1864, in front of Richmond, the bone or bones of his nose being shattered. He was taken to the hospital at City Point, Va., where fever ague developed, remaining there eight days, and from there sent to the hospital at Fortress Monroe, where erysipelas developed and was kept there six weeks.

The above facts are given to show that while he suffered from the above ailments proper attention could not be given to the gunshot wound and the bone of the nose was not removed at that time or since. The advice of eminent surgeons has been not to atempt an operation. He has been unable to breath through his nose these past 50 years, and this condition has caused him to become deaf and has impaired his eyesight. He is now suffering from rheumatism and is wholly incapacitated and unable to work.

His physical condition is due to the wound and sickness contracted in the Army.

He enlisted in Buffalo, July 18, 1862, and was discharged in June, 1865, in Richmond, Va.

Therefore he asks that his pension be increased to at least $50 per month by special act of Congress, so as to enable him to secure proper medical treatment and other necessaries of life for himself and aged wife.

RODERICK O'CONNOR,
149 Parkdale Ave., Buffalo, N. Y.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th day of June, 1914.
[SEAL.] THEODORE LORENTZ,
Notary Public.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 29, 1914.*

I hereby certify that Mr. Roderick O'Connor, 149 Parkdale Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y., has been a patient under my care for the past two years; that he has been and is now suffering from necrosis of the nasal and turbinated bones, due to gunshot wound received 50 years ago. The bones were fractured and driven into each other in such a manner that their removal would be fatal.

These fractured bones have so obstructed the nasal passages and pressed upon adjacent tissues that the hearing has become very defective; the sense of smell and taste very much impaired. There is a constant discharge of irritating pus and mucus from the nostrils. He suffers from headache and general debility, loss of appetite, sleeplessness, and is very nervous. He is totally unfit to perform any mental or physical labor.

DAVID F. WHITE, M. D.,
287 Lafayette Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th day of June, 1914.
[SEAL.] THEODORE LORENTZ,
Notary Public.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *July 1, 1914.*

To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that Mr. Roderick O'Connor, of 149 Parkdale Avenue, has been under my care on and off for the past 10 years, suffering from chronic cystitis; also rheumatism, especially lower limbs, with severe pains in head, affecting the eyesight and hearing, therefore rendering him unfit to follow his usual occupation.

Yours, respectfully,

H. E. LONG, M. D.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 1st day of July, 1914.
[SEAL.] THEODORE LORENTZ,
Notary Public.

Evidence of neighbors shows that soldier has no means and is dependent upon his pension for the support of himself and wife, and needs the care and attention of another person.

It is believed that soldier's condition is such that increase to $40 is warranted, his disabilities being partly of service origin; he is not totally helpless and no greater increase is warranted.

Mr. JOHNSON. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 7597.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pension the following-named persons at the rates stated:

William E. McGee, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Charles F. White, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Warren W. Norton, late of Battery C, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Daniel Howery, foster father of William Murphy, late of Company I, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

William H. Hart, late fireman, second class, United States Navy, War with Spain, $12 per month.

William M. Miller, late of the Thirty-first Company United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, $20 per month.

Alpheus W. Clark, late of Company D, First Battalion Nevada Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Charles R. Conger, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, War With Spain, $17 per month.

Fred F. Harris, late of Battery A, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, War with Spain, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Benjamin Matlock, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

John B. Turner, late of the United States Marine Corps, Regular Establishment, $12 per month.

Jeremiah C. Foley, late of the Fourteenth Company United States Volunteer Signal Corps, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Joseph L. Addison, late of Troop M, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, $20 per month.

Bernard Christianson, late of the U. S. S. *Hercules*, United States Navy, War with Spain, $24 per month.

Lee Jenkins, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Katherine H. McDonald, widow of Ray S. McDonald, late lieutenant United States Navy, Regular Establishment, $35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and $2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Ray S. McDonald until he reaches the age of 16 years.

John H. Hopewell, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, $12 per month.

William Bowen, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $17 per month.

Todd L. Wagoner, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The SECRETARY. The committee reports at the end of the bill to insert the name of Thomas H. Jones, late of Company D,

Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The committee also proposes to insert the name of Etta Adair Anderson, widow of J. Patton Anderson, late lieutenant colonel Battalion Mississippi Rifles, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The committee also proposes to insert the name of Annie R. Chaffee, widow of Adna R. Chaffee, late lieutenant general (retired) United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $2,000 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD the following report of the committee.

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

S. 7629. Thomas H. Jones, of Farmington, N. Mex., served as private, artificer, and first sergeant in Company D, Third Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, in the War with Spain. The records of the War Department show that he enlisted April 28, 1898, and was honorably discharged January 31, 1899; also that he was treated in the service for pharyngitis, malarial fever, acute enteritis, constipation, and hepatic engorgement.

He applied for pension May 16, 1912 (No. 1403210), alleging that at Chickamauga Park, Ga., in July or August, 1898, he contracted typhoid fever, resulting in chronic bronchitis, chronic diarrhea, and nervous debility. The application was rejected in January, 1914, on the ground of no record or other satisfactory evidence to prove service origin and continuance from discharge of bronchitis, chronic diarrhea, and nervous debility and claimant's inability to furnish such evidence.

Upon his examination preliminary to discharge claimant stated to the discharging officers that he was suffering from weak lungs, incurred some two years previous in North Carolina. The captain certified that claimant was disabled by weak lungs, when, where, or how incurred not known. The surgeon certified that upon examination he found no disability.

The claim was investigated by special examiners of the Pension Bureau and testimony secured showing that soldier was in good bodily health before enlistment, free from lung trouble or other disability, and was sound and fit for service as a soldier. Two comrades testified to soldier's sickness in service, and there is testimony to the effect that his health has been impaired since discharge from diarrhea and bronchitis, which now incapacitate him for manual labor.

He was examined July 10, 1912, by a surgeon for the Pension Bureau, and the report is as follows:

"Applicant has chronic bronchitis, cough, and considerable expectoration, especially in morning. The sputum is rather thick, with yellowish tinge. He says he has had the cough and expectoration ever since he had the fever in summer of 1898. He understood at the time that he had typhoid fever and was placed in the typhoid ward. There is dullness and tenderness over lower lobe of right lung. Bowels move from four to six times daily, thin, with some mucus; some tenderness over bowels upon pressure. Throat is slightly sensitive, and there is huskiness of voice in the evenings. Liver is slightly enlarged. Spleen normal. Stomach in very good condition. Urinary organs all right. The nervous debility is caused from the bronchitis and chronic diarrhea, and, in my opinion, all these troubles are of tubercular origin. Heart is normal every way except its too rapid action, which I attribute to his tubercular condition.

"I have known applicant for three years, and from my personal acquaintance with him, as well as his present physical condition, will say that his disabilities are not due to nor aggravated by vicious habits. The rapid pulse and respiration, elevated temperature in afternoons, cough and expectoration, diarrhea, loss of flesh—all these applicant has at present and are unquestionable symptoms of tuberculosis."

Soldier is about 39 years of age. Medical and other evidence filed with the bill shows beyond question that he is in very poor health from pulmonary trouble and chronic diarrhea and is wholly incapacitated for the performance of manual labor; also that he is in poor financial circumstances, without property, and has a family dependent upon him for support.

Your committee incline to the opinion that the claim has merit, and so report the bill favorably with recommendation for pension at $20 per month.

S. 7180. Etta Adair Anderson, of Palatka, Fla., is the widow of J. Patton Anderson, late lieutenant colonel Battalion Mississippi Rifles, Mexican War, who served from October 30, 1847, to June 28, 1848, and who died September 20, 1872.

Mrs. Anderson, who is about 78 years of age, was married to the deceased officer April 30, 1853. She is now receiving a pension of $16 per month under special act approved May 17, 1902, and there is no general law under which she can obtain increase. She was originally pensioned at $8 per month (certificate No. 1064) under the Mexican War act of January 29, 1887, granting that rate of pension to all the widows of the soldiers of the Mexican War. The rate of $8 per month provided by the act of 1887 has since been increased to $12 per month by the act of April 19, 1908.

Medical evidence filed with the committee shows that Mrs. Anderson is crippled and helpless from fracture of hip and the infirmities of age, and is in such an enfeebled condition that she can do absolutely nothing toward earning a support, and requires the aid and care of other persons to look after her. She is also shown to be in very poor circumstances, having no property or source of income aside from her pension.

There are many precedents for increasing the pensions of the aged and destitute widows of the soldiers of the Mexican War, and the foregoing facts bring this case fully within such precedents. The bill is reported favorably, with recommendation for increase of pension to $20 per month.

S. 6697. Annie R. Chaffee is the widow of the late Lieut. Gen. Adna R. Chaffee, United States Army.

Gen. Chaffee was born in Ohio in April, 1842, and entered the Army July 22, 1861, as a private in the Sixth United States Regular Cavalry. Two years later, in May, 1863, he was commissioned second lieutenant, becoming a first lieutenant in February, 1865. In October, 1867, he was made captain, and following this was successively promoted through the several grades to the rank of lieutenant general of the Army, to which he was commissioned from January 9, 1904.

Gen. Chaffee had a brilliant career, serving in the Civil War, Indian campaigns, the Spanish War, the Philippine insurrection, and the Chinese Boxer uprising. At El Caney, Cuba, he, having been given command of a brigade, opened the fight, and his men bore the brunt of it throughout the day. In 1900, when fighting began in China, he was selected to command the American forces. After his service in China he was given command of the Philippine forces.

On his return to this country Gen. Chaffee was appointed Chief of Staff, and served in that capacity until 1906. He was in active service continuously until February 1, 1906, when he was placed on the retired list. He served his country faithfully and honorably in the Regular Army for nearly 45 years. We annex a statement of the service of the officer as furnished from the records of the War Department.

Gen. Chaffee died at Los Angeles, Cal., November 1, 1914, of typhoid-pneumonia. As his fatal disease was not contracted during his active service, the Pension Bureau is powerless to grant his widow adequate relief. The only pension she can obtain there is the small sum of $12 per month provided by the act of April 19, 1908, for the widow of an officer or enlisted man who served 90 days in the Civil War.

Mrs. Chaffee married the deceased officer March 31, 1875, is now well advanced in years, and in necessitous circumstances. She has no income from any source.

In view of the long, brilliant, and highly useful service of Gen. Chaffee, the rank he held at the time of his death, and the other facts shown by the evidence, we recommend his widow be paid a pension of $2,000 per year. This is the same amount as that accorded the widows of Gens. McClellan, Hancock, Crook, and Thomas. Mrs. Sheridan received $2,500, and Mrs. Logan, the widow of a Volunteer officer, receives $2,000. There is little likelihood that the case of Mrs. Chaffee will in itself become a precedent. Gen. Chaffee was the last lieutenant general. With his death the rank of lieutenant general dies. It could be revived only by affirmative action of Congress.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 22, 1914.

Hon. BENJAMIN F. SHIVELY,
Chairman Committee on Pensions, United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with the request contained in your letter of the 19th instant for a statement of the military service of the late Lieut. Gen. Adna R. Chaffee, United States Army, for the use of the Committee on Pensions in connection with Senate bill 6697, I have the honor to inform you that the official records show as follows:

Adna R. Chaffee enlisted in the Regular Army July 22, 1861, at Warren, Ohio, to serve three years, and was assigned as a private to Troop K, Sixth United States Cavalry; was appointed sergeant and first sergeant October 1, 1861, and September 26, 1862, respectively, and was discharged May 12, 1863, as first sergeant of that troop and regiment on account of promotion to second lieutenant. His service as a commissioned officer was as follows:

Second lieutenant, Sixth United States Cavalry, May 12, 1863; first lieutenant February 22, 1865; regimental adjutant from November 11, 1864, to December 12, 1866; regimental quartermaster from December 12, 1866, to October 12, 1867, when promoted to captain; major, Ninth United States Cavalry, July 7, 1888; lieutenant colonel, Third United States Cavalry, June 1, 1897; brigadier general, United States Volunteers, May 4, 1898; major general, United States Volunteers, from July 8, 1898, to April 13, 1899; brigadier general, United States Volunteers, April 13, 1899; colonel, Eighth United States Cavalry, May 8, 1899; major general, United States Volunteers, July 19, 1900; major general, United States Army, February 4, 1901; lieutenant general, United States Army, January 9, 1904, and was retired as such February 1, 1906. He died November 1, 1914, at Los Angeles, Cal.

He was brevetted as follows: First lieutenant, July 3, 1863, for gallant and meritorious services in the Battle of Gettysburg, Pa.; captain, March 31, 1865, for gallant and meritorious services in the Battle of Dinwiddie Court House, Va.; major, March 7, 1868, for gallant and efficient services in engagement with Comanche Indians at Point Creek, Tex.; and lieutenant colonel, February 27, 1890, for gallant service in leading a Cavalry charge over rough and precipitous bluffs held by Indians on the Red River of Texas August 30, 1874, and gallant service in action against Indians at Big Dry Wash, Ariz., July 17, 1882.

Following is a detailed statement of this officer's service: Served with his regiment in the Army of the Potomac until wounded in the Gettysburg campaign at Fairfield, Pa., July 3, 1863; absent on account of wound to September, 1863; commanding troop to October 11, 1863, when wounded at the battle of Brandy Station, Va.; absent, sick, to November, 1863; with regiment in Army of the Potomac to August, 1864; in the Shenandoah Valley, Va., to February, 1865, and in the campaign against Richmond, Va., to May, 1865, during which period he participated in all the battles, engagements, etc., in which his regiment was engaged (about 50), from the siege of Yorktown, Va., April, 1862, to Appomattox Court House, Va., April, 1865; with regiment at Frederick, Md., June to October, 1865; en route to and at Austin, Tex. (also depot quartermaster at same place December, 1866, to February, 1868), to February, 1868; commanding troop at Fort Griffin, Tex., to September, 1868, being frequently in field on scout and engaged in action with hostile Indians at Point Creek, Tex., March 6, 1868; commanding troop at Sulphur Springs, Tex., September, 1868, to March, 1869; at Canton, Tex., to July 17, 1869; at Tyler, Tex., to January, 1870; at Corsicana, Tex., to May, 1870; at Fort Griffin, Tex., to September, 1870; at Fort Richardson, Tex., to March 20, 1871, being frequently in field on scout against Indians and engaged in action with them November 14, 1870; commanding troop on the march to and at Fort Riley, Kans., to January 28, 1872; at Oxford, Miss., also commanding post, to December 6, 1872; at Fort Harker, Kans., to April 2, 1873; at Fort Supply, Ind. T., to August 19, 1874; in the field on expedition in Indian Territory and Texas to March 23, 1875, being engaged in action against hostile Indians at Mulberry Creek, Tex., August 30, and near Washita River, Ind. T., October 17, 1874; commanding troop at Fort Supply, Ind. T., March 23 to April 29, 1875; at Fort Dodge, Kans., to August 2, 1875; on the march to and

at Fort Verde, Ariz., to May 30, 1876; at Fort Grant, Ariz., to June 21, 1876, and at Fort McDowell, Ariz., to September 13, 1876; on recruiting service October 23, 1876, to October 1, 1878; rejoined his regiment November 12, 1878, and commanded his troop at Fort McDowell, Ariz., to July 1, 1879; in charge of the San Carlos Agency, Ariz., to May 31, 1880; commanding troop and post of Fort McDowell, Ariz., being frequently in field in active operations against hostile Indians, to September 11, 1882, being engaged in action with them at Big Dry Wash, Ariz., July 17, 1882, and was highly commended for services in the field in General Orders No. 37, Department of Arizona, July 31, 1882; on leave September 11, 1882, to January 5, 1883; commanding troop at Fort McDowell, Ariz., to October 17, 1883, being absent in the field with Gen. Crook in Arizona and New Mexico, operating against hostile Apache Indians March 24 to July 9, 1883; commanding troop and post of Fort Huachuca, Ariz., to June 5, 1884; at Fort Craig, N. Mex., to September 12, 1884; on leave to November 10, 1884; commanding troop at Fort Wingate, N. Mex. (in field and at Fort Cummings, N. Mex., May 22, 1885, to October 19, 1886), to August 8, 1888; joined his regiment (Ninth United States Cavalry) August 28, 1888, and commanded post at Fort Duchesne, Utah, on September 27, 1890; acting inspector general, Department of Arizona, October 6, 1890, to July 6, 1893, and of the Department of Colorado to October 4, 1894; on duty with regiment at Fort Robinson, Nebr. (in the field commanding expedition against Indians in Idaho and Wyoming July 28 to October 29, 1895), to November 7, 1896; on duty as instructor of cavalry at the Infantry and Cavalry School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., November 27, 1896, to April 19, 1898, when he accompanied his regiment to Chickamauga, Ga., where he commanded a brigade to May 20, 1898, a division in the Fifth Army Corps at Tampa, Fla., to June 16, 1898, and in the campaign against Santiago and in Cuba to August 21, 1898.

He was highly commended by Gen. Lawton for especial distinction in successfully planning and attacking the stone fort at El Caney, Cuba, July 1, 1898. From August 21 to September 27, 1898, he commanded his division en route to and at Montauk Point, N. Y.; commanding First Division, Fourth Army Corps, November 1 to December 5, 1898, and Fourth Army Corps to December 14, 1898; chief of staff to Maj. Gens. Brooke and Wood, of the headquarters division of Cuba, Habana, Cuba, December 29, 1898, to May 16, 1900.

He was highly commended by Gens. Brooke and Wood for services rendered in the latter position, the former stating that "the Army has no better example of efficiency" and the latter that "he has filled the position with ability and assiduity rarely seen among public men." He left Cuba May 25, 1900, en route to Washington, and thence to San Francisco, sailing from the latter place July 3 and arriving at Taku, China, July 29, 1900, when he assumed command of the China relief expedition, which he commanded to May 26, 1901, when he proceeded to the Philippines.

He was highly commended by the President and Secretary of War "for the brilliant achievement in which the courage, fortitude, and skill of the American forces under his command in China played so honorable a part."

He arrived at Manila, P. I., June 5, 1901, and after making a tour of inspection of the islands, on July 4, 1901, assumed command of the Division of the Philippines and duties of military governor, and was relieved October 2, 1902; in command of the Department of the East, Governors Island, N. Y., November 21, 1902, to October 26, 1903; member of the General Staff from October 26, 1903, to January 9, 1904, when he became Chief of Staff. He was relieved as Chief of Staff January 15, 1906.

In the case of this officer the medical records show as follows: Wounded, right hip, ball, severe, at Battle of Fairfield, Pa., July 3, 1863; treated, June 10 to 15, 1870, intermittent fever, tertian; August 8 to 12, 1870, intermittent fever; November 1 to 14, 1871, abscess; April 15 to 20, 1873, sprain; December 2 to 4, 1884, quotidian intermittent fever, in line of duty, cured; November 28 to 30, 1893, influenza, in line of duty; December 4 to 13, 1893, epidemic influenza, in line of duty; January 10 to 31, 1894, hemorrhoids; operation, January 10, 1894, removed by clamp and cautery, in line of duty; June 12 to July 3, 1895, sprain, right knee, thrown from horse while on review June 11, in line of duty; hot applications, first; plaster of Paris bandage put on June 13 and removed June 25; at night knee swells slightly after exercising during day, but no pain; returned to duty, cure not complete.

Very truly, yours,

HENRY BRECKINRIDGE,
Assistant Secretary of War.

Mr. JOHNSON. I will not ask the Senator from Oklahoma to yield further to take up the House pension bills. I only wished at this time to call up the Senate bills that had been reported favorably from the Committee on Pensions.

HUNTON ALLEN.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of House bill 17424, for the relief of Hunton Allen. It is a bill which is designed to reimburse a postmaster for a loss caused by burglary.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall not object to the consideration of this bill, but I shall object to any other bills being acted upon or called up from the calendar.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post Office Department is hereby authorized and directed to credit the account of Hunton Allen, the postmaster at Williamson, in the State of Georgia, with the sum of $237.16, the amount and value of postage stamps stolen from said post office by a burglar on May 13, 1913, without any fault on the part of said Allen; and said amount is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

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

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent to have printed as a public document a brief communication which I have received concerning the subject of international arbitration.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not hear the request of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It is a very able communication from a gentleman relative to propositions of peace and of international arbitration. It is a very learned document and one that I think will be read with a great deal of interest.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Who is the author?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Oscar T. Crosby, of Warrenton, Va. I do not ask to have it read, but that it be made a Senate document.

Mr. SMOOT. Will not the Senator agree to have it go to the Committee on Printing?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I am afraid I will not get it out. It is not a long communication.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator ought to take his chances about getting it out. If it is all right, I think the committee will report it out, and I would rather have it go to the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to printing the paper as a document?

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Let it go to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 20415) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma asks that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, before unanimous consent is given, I desire to ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether that provision in the House bill which proposes to appropriate $5,000 for the investigation of the so-called cucumber disease is to be restored in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. The committee amendment referred to is on page 18, and upon information received since the committee acted on the subject my judgment is that the amount ought to be restored. When we reach that point I will, if the occasion requires, state my reasons for it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Then, if I understand the Senator, he is perfectly willing that the appropriation shall be restored by which the department is directed to investigate the cucumber disease?

Mr. GORE. Yes; as far as I am concerned I think the appropriation ought to be restored.

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan if it is a disease of cucumbers or a disease created by the use of cucumbers?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is aimed at the cucumber disease. It occasioned the loss of something like $2,000,000 in the State of Michigan alone last year, and it becomes very important to our people that it should be investigated. With the assurance of the Senator from Oklahoma that the appropriation of $5,000 will be restored I have no objection to the request he has made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being no objection, the bill will be read for amendment and the committee amendments will be first considered.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment was, on page 3, line 12, to strike out "2 watchmen, at $840 each; 42," and insert "44," so as to read:

Forty-four watchmen, at $720 each.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have a few remarks that I wish to make upon this bill, and they may as well be made in reference to this amendment as at any other time. I will discuss what I have to say upon the entire bill in the consideration of this particular amendment.

Mr. President, at the present time, when our minds are filled with the developments of the great war in Europe, it is the part of wisdom for all of our people to give serious consideration to the real and lasting effects of this war upon our own country and its future prospects. I do not mean consideration of the possibility of our Nation becoming involved in the unfortunate struggle. Such a possibility, I believe, is rather remote, and that nothing short of a gross blunder on

our part would involve us in that conflict. No belligerent will court trouble with this country. But the serious consideration which I would invoke is of the great economic effects of the war upon our people. These economic effects are now accomplishing a number of things worthy of note, and the things they will accomplish in the future deserve even more attention.

THE DEMOCRATIC TARIFF AND THE INDUSTRIAL DEPRESSION.

Long before the war broke out a great industrial depression had settled upon our country as a result of the extreme low-tariff legislation insisted upon by the Democratic administration and enacted in the fall of 1913. After this tariff went into effect our imports increased and our exports actually decreased. As this Democratic tariff had included as one of its especial objects the placing of practically all farm products on the free list, its enactment was followed by a great increase in the importation of foreign farm products. Such products came flowing into our American markets from all over the world. From the most remote countries, as well as from the nearest countries, from Australia, China, and Siberia, as well as from Canada and South America, the products of cheaper lands and cheaper labor came freely and abundantly into our American markets, to the consequent displacement or depreciation of the products of the American farmers, obtained from their more costly lands by the more highly paid labor, which is a necessity of their higher standard of living.

It might be well right here, Mr. President, to give a few of the increases in the importation of agricultural products. It will be remembered that the law went into effect on October 4, 1913. I have not the figures here for the particular months preceding and the particular months succeeding, but only for the years, and I would especially call attention to the great increase in the year after the enactment of this law as compared with the year previous.

Imports of agricultural products for 12 months ending Dec. 31, 1912, 1913, and 1914.

	1912	1913	1914
Cattle	$5,296,296	$14,692,916	$19,650,903
Sheep	89,288	312,265	657,388
All other animals, including fowls	656,135	1,115,429	4,495,785
Corn	505,896	3,388,604	9,676,050
Oats	6,099,638	9,820,233	7,845,686
Eggs	.....	376,137	913,688
Beef and veal	.....	2,828,058	22,758,994
Mutton and lamb	.....	46,931	1,824,168
Pork	.....	36,726	2,342,271
Cream	895,061	1,426,122	1,945,497
Milk	88,429	411,034	2,283,084
Butter	235,604	841,712	1,670,522
Wool	.....	28,776,274	58,305,578

For instance, in 1912 the value of all the cattle imported into the United States was $5,296,296. In 1913, with only a few months of this tariff law, it increased to $14,692,916; in 1914 it increased to $19,650,903.

The importations of sheep in 1912 were valued at $89,288; in 1914 at $657,388.

Of all other animals, including fowls, and excepting horses, which remained about stationary, in 1912 we imported $657,135 worth; in 1914 we imported $4,495,785 worth.

Of corn, in 1912 we imported $505,896 worth, and in 1914 $9,676,050 worth. Most of it came from Argentina.

Oats increased from $6,000,000 in 1912, in round numbers, to nearly $10,000,000 in 1913 and nearly $8,000,000 in 1914. It would have been very much more in 1914, except for the great European demand during all the period in which the crop was marketed in the fall of 1914, and also except for the failure of the oats crop in Canada.

Now, coming to beef and veal, I especially call the attention of Senators to the fact that in 1913 we imported, in value, $2,828,058 worth. In 1914 that $2,828,058 grew to $22,758,994, or ten times the amount.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, if I do not disturb the Senator, I should like to know to what he attributes that large increase?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, there is only one cause. We put beef and other meats on the free list.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does the Senator know whether these large importations have affected the prices to the consumer?

Mr. McCUMBER. I know they have not affected the prices at all. I will touch upon that a little later.

Again, we imported mutton and lamb in 1913 of the value of only $46,931, but in 1914 the importations grew to $1,824,160. Remember that every dollar's worth displaced a dollar's worth of the product of the American farmer.

Taking pork, I especially call your attention to the fact that in 1913 we imported pork of the value of only $36,726, but in 1914 that $36,726 grew to an importation amounting to $2,342,721.

Let us take the little article of cream. In 1912 we imported $895,000 worth, in round numbers; but in 1914 we imported $1,945,497 worth.

Of milk, in 1912, we imported—and I call especial attention to this—only $88,429 worth; but in 1914 that $88,429 grew to an importation of $2,283,084 worth.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If it will not interrupt the Senator, I wish to ask, can he tell us where this milk was imported from?

Mr. McCUMBER. It was mostly imported from Canada.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And without a tariff?

Mr. McCUMBER. Without a tariff. We got nothing out of it at all.

Mr. GALLINGER. The cream also came from Canada.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is true; and the New York farmer felt the effect of it, although the consumer in New York did not get his cream any cheaper.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Let me ask the Senator whether or not there is any reciprocal arrangement between Canada and the United States affecting the duty on milk?

Mr. McCUMBER. None at all.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And we are obliged to pay the tariff in the customhouse in Canada to get milk and cream into Canada?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not remember what the tariff is to take those articles over across into Canada; but we do not export any over there.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. We do not export any.

Mr. McCUMBER. But they can send theirs here absolutely free.

Now, let us take butter. In 1912 we imported butter of the value of $235,604, but in 1914 that grew to $1,670,522.

Our wool importations from 1913 to 1914 increased from $28,000,000 to over $58,000,000.

Those are but a few of the products which show an enormous increase under the Democratic tariff.

THE AMERICAN FARMERS' HOME MARKET SACRIFICED.

Mr. President, Democratic legislation had done all that legislation could well do to deprive the American farmers of the American markets. But notwithstanding this severe treatment of our farmers, which the Democratic Party had declared to be necessary for the welfare of the consumers of food products in the cities, these consumers were found to be in no way benefited. The cost of living in the cities was not reduced. It seemed that all that was lost by the farmers was caught up by middlemen and speculators or had in some way disappeared in the course of the distribution of farm products. The Democratic leaders were forced, much to their disgust and humiliation, to admit finally that the cost of living had not been reduced and could scarcely be expected to be reduced as a consequence of the Democratic tariff.

Mr. President, the whole Democratic campaign of 1912 against the then existing Republican tariff as the principal cause of the high cost of living was unfair to the people and untrue to the facts. The higher range of prices, which made up what was called the high cost of living, affected practically all commodities, whether protected or unprotected, and was a notable phenomenon the world over. It was regarded and was being studied by the best economists as a remarkable situation, which was common to the entire world; and it was recognized by them that the remedy, if one could be found, would have to be applied by all the great nations acting in harmony on this subject, as the trouble was world-wide; and it was freely admitted by the leading economists studying this subject that no one nation could alone accomplish anything to lower the high level of prices.

THE INTERNATIONAL HIGH LEVEL OF PRICES AND ITS APPARENT CAUSE.

Prior to the presidential campaign of 1912, Mr. President, the then Republican administration had given attention to this international phenomenon of high prices and had dealt with it in the only honest and fair way—by urging the establishment of an international commission to determine the causes and, if possible, the remedies, and to recommend the prompt adoption of the required remedies by the various nations. This was known to be the only way by which genuine relief could be obtained. In our country the Republican administration was known to be ready to act at the earliest possible moment to apply the true remedy, but would not attempt to mislead the people with a false remedy or engage in a dangerous adventure for the lack of a remedy.

The prevailing opinion among the best economists who have made a special study of the world-wide high prices is that this

feature is a necessary result of the recent extraordinary increase in the world's production of gold. As they point out, gold is the one common measure of value all over the world. All other commodities are exchangeable for gold everywhere, and hence their values are reckoned in terms of gold. Through new discoveries and improved processes of mining, the output of gold throughout the world has increased enormously during the past 15 or 20 years, far more in proportion than the output of the other commodities. Hence a fixed quantity of gold, like a dollar, will exchange for a smaller quantity of the other commodities. And hence a fixed quantity of a certain commodity, like a barrel of flour, will exchange for a larger number of dollars. This is equivalent to saying that the prices of the other commodities are greater than before, because of this universal factor of the gold supply. Of course, the price of gold is what it will exchange for in other commodities, and it would be impossible to note the falling price or depreciation of gold, due to its greater abundance, otherwise than in the rising prices of the other commodities.

Mr. President, I think it quite proper here to insert in the RECORD a table showing the production of gold year by year since the discovery of America, and I ask that it may be inserted here and made a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SWANSON in the chair). Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Production of gold in the world since the discovery of America.

[Source: 1493 to 1885, table of averages compiled by Dr. Adolph Soetbeer; other figures represent estimates of the Director of the Mint.]

Period.	Gold.		
	Total for period.		Annual average for period, value.
	Ounces, fine.	Value.	
1493-1520	5,221,160	$107,931,000	$3,855,000
1521-1544	5,524,656	114,205,000	4,759,000
1545-1560	4,377,544	90,492,000	5,656,000
1561-1580	4,398,120	90,917,000	4,546,000
1581-1600	4,745,340	98,095,000	4,905,000
1601-1620	5,478,360	113,248,000	5,662,000
1621-1640	5,336,900	110,324,000	5,516,000
1641-1660	5,639,110	116,571,000	5,828,000
1661-1680	5,954,180	123,084,000	6,154,000
1681-1700	6,921,895	143,088,000	7,154,000
1701-1720	8,243,260	170,403,000	8,520,000
1721-1740	12,268,440	253,611,000	12,681,000
1741-1760	15,824,230	327,116,000	16,356,000
1761-1780	13,313,315	275,211,000	13,761,000
1781-1800	11,438,970	236,464,000	11,823,000
1801-1810	5,715,627	118,152,000	11,815,000
1811-1820	3,679,568	76,063,000	7,606,000
1821-1830	4,570,444	94,479,000	9,448,000
1831-1840	6,522,913	134,841,000	13,484,000
1841-1850	17,605,018	363,928,000	36,393,000
1851-1855	32,051,621	662,566,000	132,513,000
1856-1860	32,431,312	670,415,000	134,083,000
1861	5,949,582	122,989,000	.....
1862	5,949,582	122,989,000	.....
1863	5,949,582	122,989,000	.....
1864	5,949,582	122,989,000	.....
1865	5,949,582	122,989,000	.....
1866	6,270,086	129,614,000	.....
1867	6,270,086	129,614,000	.....
1868	6,270,086	129,614,000	.....
1869	6,270,086	129,614,000	.....
1870	6,270,086	129,614,000	.....
1871	5,591,014	115,577,000	.....
1872	5,591,014	115,577,000	.....
1873	4,653,675	96,200,000	.....
1874	4,390,031	90,750,000	.....
1875	4,716,563	97,500,000	.....
1876	5,016,488	103,700,000	.....
1877	5,512,193	113,947,200	.....
1878	5,761,114	119,092,800	.....
1879	5,262,174	108,778,800	.....
1880	5,148,880	106,436,800	.....
1881	4,983,742	103,023,100	.....
1882	4,934,083	101,996,600	.....
1883	4,614,588	95,392,000	.....
1884	4,921,169	101,729,600	.....
1885	5,245,572	108,435,600	.....
1886	5,135,679	106,163,900	.....
1887	5,116,861	105,774,900	.....
1888	5,330,775	110,196,900	.....
1889	5,973,790	123,489,200	.....
1890	5,749,306	118,848,700	.....
1891	6,320,194	130,650,000	.....
1892	7,094,266	146,651,500	.....
1893	7,618,811	157,494,800	.....
1894	8,764,362	181,175,600	.....
1895	9,615,190	198,763,600	.....
1896	9,783,914	202,251,600	.....
1897	11,420,058	236,073,700	.....
1898	13,877,806	286,879,700	.....
1899	14,837,775	306,724,100	.....
1900	12,315,135	254,576,300	.....

Production of gold in the world since the discoverey of America—Cont'd.

Period.	Gold.		
	Total for period.		Annual average for period, value.
	Ounces, fine.	Value.	
1901	12,625,527	$260,992,900	.....
1902	14,354,680	296,737,600	.....
1903	15,852,620	327,702,200	.....
1904	16,804,372	347,377,200	.....
1905	18,396,451	380,288,700	.....
1906	19,471,080	402,503,000	.....
1907	19,977,260	412,966,600	.....
1908	21,422,244	442,476,900	.....
1909	21,965,111	454,059,100	.....
1910	22,022,180	455,239,100	.....
1911	22,348,313	461,939,700	.....
1912	22,549,335	466,136,100	.....
Total	714,747,822	14,775,110,000	.....

Mr. McCUMBER. I would simply call attention to the fact that from 1545 to 1560 the world produced only $90,492,000 worth of gold, whereas in 1907 the production had grown to $412,000,000 in a single year, and has since that time been above the $400,000,000 basis every year.

THE DEMOCRATIC POLICY MISLEADING.

Now, whether or not this increased gold supply be the one fundamental cause of the world's high prices, as is claimed, the proposition is at least a reasonable one and deserves thorough attention, for the subject is of the greatest importance. This gold-supply theory recognizes that the cause or causes of the high level of prices must be some world-wide factor. This theory was advanced long before 1912 as the scientific explanation of the high cost of living throughout the world, and the able men who have written most about it in the United States are both Republicans and Democrats. Nevertheless, the Democratic leaders in the campaign of 1912 and in the Democratic administration now in power persisted in misleading the people on this subject as long as they could possibly do so, and kept maintaining that the Republican protective tariff was the great cause of the high cost of living, and that the Democratic tariff which they proposed and subsequently enacted would be the remedy, and they kept up this farce until their Democratic tariff had been in effect for many months without any reduction in the cost of living being accomplished. Then came the end of this comedy and the open admission of the failure of the Democratic tariff to accomplish this or any other useful result; and this was the situation before the war was in prospect.

THE IMPORTANCE OF GREATER DOMESTIC PRODUCTION.

Mr. President, there is, in my judgment, much to commend the gold-supply theory of high prices. It is in line with sound reason and common knowledge. It is practically a statement that the production of gold has outrun the production of the other commodities. This being so, the obvious remedy for the situation is either to diminish the production of gold, which is apparently impracticable, or to increase the production of the other commodities, which is entirely practicable and is, in fact, actually going on. I have frequently called attention to the great increase in recent years throughout the world of farm products, which form so large a proportion of all the commodities traded in, and I have repeatedly referred to the vast undeveloped agricultural resources of the United States, which would be developed and yield a great additional output of foodstuffs if the American farmers could obtain a proper return for their labor and investment. Such return they could and would obtain if the American markets were given to the American farmers for a term of years, as of right they ought to be. The actual production of the great additional output of American farm products which is at our command is simply a matter of meeting the necessary labor cost under our American standard of living.

OUR UNDEVELOPED AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.

Our undeveloped resources in this country, for agriculture and other industries as well, are quite thoroughly known and have been often commented on. The United States Department of Agriculture, under Democratic as well as under Republican management, has called attention to the need of greater and better production from our own soil. The present Secretary of Agriculture, a Democrat, said in a recent annual report that according to his estimate less than 40 per cent of our total arable land is reasonably well cultivated, and that less than 12 per cent is yielding fairly full returns.

Mr. President, the present lack of proper agricultural development is by no means limited to the Western States. It is well known that in my own State, North Dakota, less than 30 per cent of the prairie soil has yet been cultivated, and that in Montana there is a vast area waiting for agricultural development. Not only does a similar situation prevail in most of the States of the West, but also in the older States of the East there is disclosed a want of the normal use and development of fertile lands. The commissioner of agriculture in the State of Maine said in a recent report:

> There are thousands of acres of land located near our cities and yielding only light crops that might be made to produce abundant and profitable harvests of fruits, vegetables, grains, and potatoes.

Prof. Liberty H. Bailey, former director of the New York State College of Agriculture, and a great authority on agricultural affairs, has said:

> Speaking broadly, we are now in the rough and crude stage of our agricultural development, but the situation will develop only as it pays and satisfies persons to live in the country. * * * New York is undeveloped agriculturally. The same is true of New England and Pennsylvania and the great regions southward.

THE NEW WEALTH THAT COMES FROM OUR AGRICULTURE.

Mr. President, as agriculture is our basic industry, every addition to its product is an entirely new creation of wealth which flows on throughout the country and increases the production from other industries. Notwithstanding this great truth, and notwithstanding the abundant evidences of our great resources calling for development, the Democratic Party insisted on applying the policy of free trade in farm products and thus freely opening our American markets to such products from everywhere, to the disadvantage of our own farmers and the discouragement of our own agricultural production. The Democratic tariff law enforcing this policy went into effect on October 4, 1913. It had therefore been in effect just about 10 months before the great war began. Our experience during these 10 months illustrates clearly the effect of this policy. Of course, as soon as the war began the situation as to our imports and exports was at once entirely changed as a result of war conditions, so that the statistics of our imports of farm products or other imports during and after August, 1914, do not show the effect of the tariff law of this country but merely the effect of the industrial and trade disturbances in Europe arising from the abnormal condition of war.

THE GREAT IMPORTATIONS UNDER THE DEMOCRATIC TARIFF.

It is important for us, Mr. President, to have a clear idea of the character and extent of the importations of foreign farm products from the enactment of the Democratic tariff to the outbreak of the war in order to understand the conditions imposed by the Democratic policy on our farmers. Under these conditions our fundamental industry of farming was suffering with growing intensity when the war began, and from them this industry will again suffer when the war is over and until this Democratic tariff is repealed, with additional burdens of disadvantage resulting from the war, and to which I shall briefly refer. We can readily obtain an idea of these conditions by comparing the importations of some representative farm products under the 10 months of the Democratic tariff before the war with the importations of these products during the corresponding 10 months one year prior to that time under the former Republican tariff.

CORN.

The Republican tariff maintained a duty of 15 cents per bushel on this great American product. The existing Democratic tariff wiped out this duty entirely and placed corn on the free list. From that time until the beginning of the war corn was brought into our country in enormous quantities from Argentina and other distant countries. During the 10 months from October, 1912, to July, 1913, inclusive, under the then existing Republican tariff, the importations of corn were only 286,000 bushels, valued at $162,000. During the corresponding 10 months one year later, under the present Democratic tariff, corn was imported to the vast total of 13,600,000 bushels, valued at $8,700,000. Not one cent of revenue was paid to our Government by these greatly increased imports, which were thus encouraged to take the place of American corn in our markets.

Mr. President, the rate at which these imports were increasing when the war broke out indicates that when peace comes again there will be scarcely any limit to the importations of foreign corn. This crop is produced in vast and increasing quantities in Argentina from the cheapest lands and by the cheapest labor. Almost all of the corn crop in that country is exported, and, of course, while the American market is freely open to it every encouragement is thus given to increase the acreage devoted to it in the great area there available, and also to increase the yield per acre. Before the war began new arrangements were on the point of being made for additional ships to carry grain from Argentina to this country. Moreover, great preparations were also being made at that time in Russia for sending to this country great quantities of grain, with especial assistance in this matter from the Russian Government. And there were evidences of growing developments in other distant parts of the world, as well as in nearer places, of plans for increased production of grain for shipment to the American market.

OATS.

Under the former Republican tariff there was a duty of 15 cents per bushel on oats. The Democratic tariff cut down this duty to only 6 cents per bushel, which was a reduction of 60 per cent. During the 10 months from October, 1912, to July, 1913, inclusive, under the Republican tariff there were imported only 80,000 bushels, valued at $38,000. I am giving these figures all in round numbers. But in the corresponding 10 months, 1 year later, from October, 1913, to July, 1914, inclusive, under the Democratic tariff the imports of oats amounted to the great quantity of 22,500,000 bushels, valued at nearly $8,000,000. When the war broke out northwestern Canada, with its great production of oats, was just beginning to take advantage of the opportunities given to them under our Democratic tariff in the American market. Of course, the war has interrupted the Canadian and other imports, but it is certain that as soon as the war is over the great increase in the imports of oats will again prevail unless our protective tariff shall have been restored in the meantime.

POTATOES.

On potatoes the Republican rate of duty was 25 cents per bushel. The Democratic tariff has cut down the rate to only 10 per cent ad valorem, with a provision that no duty at all is imposed on potatoes imported from countries which impose no duty on potatoes from the United States. In this respect the situation as to potatoes in the present tariff is the same as that of wheat, and with potatoes as with wheat we have not yet begun to feel the full effects of what is practically equivalent to free trade in these products, and did not experience the full force of the tariff change even before the war began. There have been, however, very considerable importations of potatoes under the Democratic tariff. During the 10 months of this tariff prior to the outbreak of the war not less than 3,630,000 bushels were imported, valued at $1,752,000, most of this quantity paying no duty. The extent of the increase in such imports can be judged by noting that in the corresponding 10 months 1 year before, under the Republican tariff, only 314,000 bushels were imported, valued at $283,000. This great increase in actual imports took place in spite of the fact that great quantities of intended imports were held back by the quarantine which the Agricultural Department found it necessary to enforce against foreign potato diseases. When the war is over and this quarantine has been lifted it will be found that there are many millions of bushels of foreign-grown potatoes ready to be dumped into the American markets.

EGGS.

Mr. President, under the former Republican tariff eggs were kept dutiable at 5 cents per dozen. The Democratic tariff placed eggs on the free list. During the 10 months from the enactment of this tariff to the outbreak of the war 6,000,000 dozens of eggs were brought into our country, the increase being five times the imports during the corresponding period one year before under the Republican tariff. Many thousands of dozens of these foreign eggs came from China, where farm laborers work for a wage equivalent to about 40 cents a week. The Chinese have the art of preserving eggs, and with these, as with other farm products, the modern refrigerating systems which have been installed in ships to a great extent make it easy to carry such products over vast distances. The opening of the Panama Canal encourages the bringing to our shores of eggs and other products from China, Japan, and other parts of Asia. In December last a ship reached New York from China, after passing through the Panama Canal, with a great cargo of frozen Chinese eggs in her refrigerators. Because of the unusual demand in Europe, incident to the war, this cargo was sent on there for consumption by the armies in the field. When the war is over such cargoes will remain for consumption in this country. In fact, notwithstanding the war, a cargo of 60 tons, or 90,000 dozen, Chinese eggs was landed at San Francisco about the middle of February, one of the largest shipments of this kind ever received at that port.

DAIRY PRODUCTS.

On dairy products, also, the Democratic tariff has cut down duties severely where it did not completely establish free trade. Butter, which was dutiable at 6 cents per pound under the Republican tariff, has been reduced to only 2½ cents per pound

under the Democratic tariff. This is a reduction of almost 60 per cent. The result is that our butter market has been thrown open to Canada, Argentina, Siberia, and other butter-producing countries. From October, 1912, to July, 1913, inclusive, under the Republican tariff, the imports of butter amounted to only 1,000,000 pounds, valued at about $272,000; but in the corresponding 10 months one year later, under the Democratic tariff, the imports amounted to the substantial total of 7,685,000 pounds, valued at $1,700,000. Then the war began and stopped importations to a great extent. The duty on cheese was reduced from 6 cents per pound to 20 per cent ad valorem, a reduction of about 40 per cent, and during the 10 months above mentioned the increase in the imports was no less than 12,500,000 pounds, and the prospect of further increase was interrupted only by the war.

Mr. President, cream was placed on the free list by the Democratic tariff, sacrificing the Republican duty of 5 cents per gallon. The importations before the war under this free trade increased by 482,000 gallons. Milk, both fresh and condensed, was also made absolutely free of duty by the Democratic Party. The imports increased enormously. From October, 1912, to July, 1913, under the Republican rates, the importations of fresh and condensed milk were valued at $134,000. During the corresponding 10 months under the Democratic tariff before the war such importations amounted to $1,264,000. New arrangements for the importation of great quantities of condensed milk scarcely had been under way when the war broke out, but already our American dairymen had been obliged to sell their milk at lower prices to our condensed-milk manufacturers because of this foreign competition. Moreover, fresh milk was being sent from Canada into certain parts of the United States in tank cars. When the war is over, such great importations of dairy products will be resumed in their former and in increasing force.

LIMITED ADVANTAGE TO OUR FARMERS FROM THE WAR.

Mr. President, this present war, as it surpasses every former one in the number of nations and the millions of men engaged, has brought a greater disturbance than ever before in the normal trade of the neutral nations. The demand in Europe for wheat and other foodstuffs has been altogether unprecedented. This situation, combined with the bottling up of the great exportable surplus of wheat in Russia, has brought such a demand for wheat from our continent as to raise the price to figures which must, of course, be very gratifying to American farmers. The vast surplus of wheat in Canada is being drawn almost entirely to Europe, and since the war began has not pressed upon the American market as formerly. The war has, in fact, given to the American farmers a temporary but none the less substantial command of the American market for farm products, and, in addition, an extraordinary market abroad.

But the American farmers can take no great satisfaction in these conditions, notwithstanding that they find some unexpected profit in them. They find that these unforeseen war conditions overcome to a great extent the damaging results to them of the Democratic tariff. This is satisfactory, of course, as far as it goes. But it is no satisfaction to reflect that such temporary and partial relief from an ill-advised tariff is merely an incidental result of the death and destruction inflicted in Europe and elsewhere by the contending armies and navies. Our American farmers can not do otherwise than regard the whole conflict with abhorrence and dismay whatever its results.

As a matter of fact, any advantage that may be accruing to our farmers, because of the war prices of foodstuffs, is likely to be greatly overestimated. A great deal of our wheat, corn, and other products was sold by the farmers before the war was in prospect and at prices depressed at the farm through the actual or expected importations of foreign supplies under the Democratic free-trade tariff. And since the war prices came it will be found that the greatest advantage therefrom has gone to the speculators and middlemen, as is usually the case.

Mr. President, it was only the other day that a large farmer from my State was visiting me, and stated that he was on the point of contracting all of his grain at 60 cents a bushel just prior to the outbreak of the war. When that war suddenly came upon the world he felt certain that it would be better for him to keep it, and he sold it but a short time ago for $1.30 a bushel, or more than double what he was willing to take for it just a few days prior to the outbreak of the war.

It is exceptionally difficult for farmers to accumulate such resources as to enable them to hold back their products and wait for improved market conditions, and the very character of their products makes it impossible to do this to any great extent, for the products of agriculture are in general more perishable than those of any other industry.

And while the prices of wheat and other grains have been high because of the abnormal demands of war, the prices of certain other important products have remained low because the war demand has not affected them enough to overcome the effects of the great industrial and commercial depression from which we have been suffering since the Democratic tariff was inflicted on the country. For example, the prices of hogs and of pork have been and remain so low as to bring discouragement to the producers of these necessary articles. This is apparently because of the falling off in our domestic consumption, which is one of the results of the widespread and persistent depression.

Mr. President, I was asking a gentleman who is thoroughly acquainted with the pork and hog market how he accounted for the fact that while beef during the war has increased in value, the hog product had gone down. His reply was somewhat new to me. He stated that the hog product is consumed almost wholly at home; that it is the laborer's meat in the United States; that owing to the depression and the consequent decrease in the consumption of pork by the laborers in the United States, and because of the fact that pork is not used in the armies to any great extent, as they desire beef and mutton and that kind of meat rather than pork, it had depressed rather than raised the price of pork.

GREATER PRODUCTION THE WORLD OVER CAUSED BY THE WAR.

The present war demands of Europe, however, are having a tremendous effect in stimulating a much greater production of wheat and other foodstuffs all over the world. The immediate needs of the warring nations and the prices now being paid are causing all the agricultural countries not engaged in the war to devote all possible energies and resources to the production of the greatest possible supplies of such products. In the United States our wheat crop of 1914 was an enormous one, the greatest in the history of the country. The same was true of the rye crop. The crops of corn, oats, and barley were greater than in any previous year except 1912. With these banner crops to be disposed of by our farmers, and with the great importations of foreign foodstuffs coming into our markets under the Democratic policy of free trade in farm products, the outlook for prices at the farms was not an encouraging one from the standpoint of the farmers prior to the outbreak of the war. But the war has entirely changed this situation, and the farmers who were able to hold their crops, or part of them, until the war began have reaped a substantial reward. And so powerful is the stimulating effect of the war on grain production that an exceptionally large crop of winter wheat has been planted, and its condition is so good that if nothing unforeseen happens, our harvest of winter wheat in 1915 will exceed that of last year, and an even greater planting of spring wheat is in prospect.

A similar increase in production is known to be developing in Canada, in South America, Australia, and other countries, and because of the great areas of available and cheaper land in these places the increase in grain production from these newer countries is bound to run to much larger quantities than the increase in the United States. It is true that in the cotton-growing States of our country there will be thousands of acres diverted from cotton to corn or wheat because of the low and unprofitable price to which cotton fell under war conditions while these same conditions were bringing high and very profitable prices for the grains. But a study of the increased production that already has been accomplished in the great wheat-producing countries of the world indicates that the foreign countries referred to have much greater undeveloped resources for such production than exists in the United States, although it has been demonstrated that in the United States the agricultural possibilities are such as to enable us to raise here all the food we shall need to supply eight times the present population, or 800,000,000 people.

Mr. President, the extent of the recent and continuing development of grain production in a number of the less advanced foreign countries is not clearly understood by many of our people. The period from 1900 to 1912 was one of great development in the United States in agriculture as well as in manufactures. During this period our wheat production increased 39 per cent. But the production of wheat in Russia increased in the same time 59 per cent. In Argentina it increased 63 per cent. In the wheat-raising Provinces of Canada west of the Great Lakes it increased 725 per cent. Canadian statisticians report that western Canada alone can raise enough wheat to feed the whole world to-day. From 1900 to 1912 the production of oats in the United States increased 75 per cent. But in Canada west of the Great Lakes such production increased 262 per cent, and in Argentina as much as 2,952 per cent; and in other foodstuffs there has been a similar increase in production.

THE BETTER UTILIZATION OF GREAT RESOURCES.

Mr. President, now what the war is accomplishing in practically all the great producing countries of the world is a sudden and extraordinary increase in their already great production of foodstuffs. It brings a greater acreage into use and promotes a greater yield per acre. In the great areas of these countries the war does not interrupt but incites production. It is true that Russia is involved in the war and that millions of her men have been called from the fields to the front. But very little of Russia's territory can be invaded, and her population is so great and the women and older men there so much accustomed to farm labor that it is very likely to be true, as reported, that her next crops will not be appreciably diminished by the war. Moreover, the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of vodka and other alcoholic liquors in Russia must have the effect of adding to the available food supply millions of bushels of grain which were formerly turned into alcohol.

Instead of the demoralization and waste which always attend the drinking of alcohol and which have greatly injured and impoverished the Russian peasants, there are now to be found the greater strength and efficiency and the increased savings and resources that attend the practice of strict sobriety. It is reported from Russia that the productive efficiency of the Russian peasants has increased 50 per cent since prohibition was put into effect. As to Australia, although a part of the British Empire, the productiveness of this great country is not affected by the war otherwise than to be aroused to greater results.

The impetus which is thus given by the war to the increased production of foodstuffs in the great countries outside of the areas of battle is bound to continue in force to a great extent after the war is over. In making new efforts it is the first step which costs. Thereafter it is comparatively easy to keep on. It is generally believed that the great conflict can not possibly last more than 12 months longer, and there are good reasons for expecting a much earlier termination. And when the longed-for end of the horror comes, when the last shot has been fired and the whole of the shocking calamity has passed into history, it will be found that from the loss and misery of Europe there remains a force driving on a greater agricultural production.

GREATER AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION TO COME FROM THE COUNTRIES NOW AT WAR.

Mr. President, when we consider the economic conditions that will prevail within the countries in Europe which have been involved in the struggle, we are bound to see another and a very interesting advance in the development of agriculture. When peace has come to the warring nations it will find almost all of them practically or entirely bankrupt. Whether or not there may be a fiscal bankruptcy of the national treasuries, which does not necessarily follow, there is the widespread collapse and ruin of private enterprises in all the fields of industry. In Germany, Austria-Hungary, Poland, Belgium, and a large part of France manufacturing and trading businesses have been swept away. The capital accumulations of many years have been lost. Over a great area factories, mills, and establishments of all sorts, with their valuable machinery and equipment, have been actually destroyed.

When peace has been restored the brave people who remain on earth amid all this suffering and loss will, of course, go to work with greater energy than before to repair their shattered fortunes and to build up profitable trade anew. They will have to begin all over again. Their Governments will help them in every way possible. They must begin at the beginning to produce wealth again. Where and how shall they begin? They will have to make their great effort in their building-up process through the one industry which has not been and can not be destroyed. This is the fundamental industry of agriculture. Buildings and manufacturing equipment have been destroyed, but no land has been destroyed. All the land remains, and is at once ready to be put to use, no less fertile than before.

Mr. President, there has been very little, if any, interruption of agricultural production within the borders of any of the warring nations. On the other hand, there is now going on a forced production of every possible increase. It is known that the Germans, under the pressure of the keenest necessity for more foodstuffs, are, with their characteristic thoroughness, about to apply the most energetic efforts, aided by the best skill and science, to every available plat of ground in their territory. And it is reported that in Austria-Hungary the Government has issued orders that every available bit of ground be sown with wheat, and that not a single plat of ground anywhere be left uncultivated. It is not only in wheat that the effects of such new efforts will be felt. Corn is being produced in Europe in steadily increasing quantities. All the grains will be produced more abundantly.

All the nations which have suffered so much from the war know very well that it is by working up a great agricultural production, with a great surplus for export wherever possible, that they will be able to obtain, after the conclusion of the war, through the sale of such surplus, the capital urgently needed for the rehabilitation of the other industries. Their agriculture, therefore, the basic industry and the original source of wealth, will be developed and driven to the utmost yield. From this source they must commence to build up again their credit balances with other nations, and the output of their manufacturing industries, and all the superstructure of trade and commerce which helps to advance their progress. For these reasons all the war-time efforts for greater agricultural production will be continued and intensified in time of peace. They will not be buyers of foodstuffs to the extent they formerly were. They will be sellers to a greater extent than ever before. Their economic necessities will drive them in this direction, and their own domestic consumption will be less than before through the loss in war of millions of lives and increased poverty throughout the land.

THE ONLY WAY OF RELIEF FOR AMERICAN FARMERS.

Under these conditions, confronting these economic effects of the war, what will be the position of the American farmers after the close of that war? They will have a greater production of farm products to dispose of, and all the other countries will be similarly situated. Surplus farm products from everywhere will be seeking a market, and such products will be sent to the United States in quantities greater than ever before. Under the Democratic policy of free trade in such products, as long as this policy continues, they will be entering our markets easily and freely. Our own farmers will have no advantage in our markets as against these foreign products and will have to stand by and see their own American products displaced or depreciated by the imported ones. They will have to see their own production discouraged thereby and further development of our American soil retarded.

The meager tariff on wheat and foodstuffs depending upon Canadian duties, which may be removed at any time, the product will enter the country far more freely, and we therefore probably will see Canada and other countries taking advantage of the provision in the Democratic tariff whereby wheat and potatoes will be admitted free of duty into our country from countries which impose no duty on like products from this country. With a great increased production of wheat in Canada and with lessened opportunities for export to Europe because of increased production of grains there and greater supplies going there from South America, our great neighbor on the north, whose extensive lands adjoin our market, will feel the need of every possible advantage in getting her wheat into their nearest market, the United States. Canada consumes only about one-quarter of the wheat she produces. She has, therefore, nothing whatever to lose by removing her duty on wheat from the United States. The imports to Canada from the United States would be inconsiderable, but Canadian wheat would obtain the great benefit of free entry into this country, with its higher priced lands and its far greater consumption of food products.

If the American farmers wish to have a reasonable advantage in the American market, so that they may maintain and advance their industry in the face of the conditions throughout the world, which I have referred to, they will find it necessary to demand the repeal of the Democratic tariff and a return to the protective policy of the Republican Party, under which they were rapidly traveling toward the goal of assured and lasting prosperity.

So, Mr. President, if in this Agricultural appropriation bill there is a real desire to benefit the American farmer, the very first thing to do, and the only thing to do, will be to reinstate the old protection which he had prior to October 4, 1913. He does not need that protection probably during the continuance of the present war, but as soon as it is over, unless that tariff law is repealed, we shall have the greatest agricultural depression in this country it has ever known since the early nineties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHILTON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, under the head of "Department of Agriculture," in the items for salaries. Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, on page 3, line 16, after the word "each," to strike out "one carriage driver, $600," and in line 20, after the words "in all," to strike out "$352,280" and insert "$351,440," so as to read:

Two lieutenants of the watch, at $960 each; 44 watchmen, at $720 each; 5 mechanics, at $1,200 each; 2 skilled laborers, at $960 each; 1 janitor, $900; 22 assistant messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $600 each; 21 laborers or messenger boys, at $480 each; 1 char-

woman, $540; 2 charwomen, at $480 each; 15 charwomen, at $240 each; for extra labor and emergency employments, $12,000; in all, $351,440.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 23, after the word "clerk," to insert "or photographer"; in line 25, after the word "clerks," to insert "or map tracers"; and on page 4, line 4, after the word "photographer," to insert "or clerk," so as to make the clause read:

Salaries, Office of Farm Management: Two clerks, class 3; 1 clerk, class 2; 6 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk or photographer, $1,020; 5 clerks, at $1,000 each; 6 clerks, at $900 each; 3 clerks, at $840 each; 4 clerks or map tracers, at $720 each; 1 messenger or laborer, $720; 1 messenger, messenger boy, or laborer, $660; 3 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $480 each; 1 messenger boy, $360; 1 messenger boy, $300; 4 charwomen, at $240 each; 1 photographer, $1,400; 1 photographer or clerk, $900; 1 map tracer, $720; in all, $36,080.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 21, after the word "Agriculture," to strike out "$623,360" and insert "$622,520," so as to read:

Total for Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, $622,520.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Weather Bureau," in the item of appropriation for "Salaries, Weather Bureau," on page 5, line 1, before the word "one," to strike out "and executive assistant, $3,000," and insert "$2,500," so as to read:

Salaries, Weather Bureau: One chief of bureau, $5,000; one assistant chief of bureau, $3,250; one chief clerk $2,500; one chief of division of stations and accounts, $2,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for "Salaries, Weather Bureau," on page 6, line 2, after the words "in all," to strike out "$333,400" and insert "$332,900," so as to read:

Thirty-seven messenger boys, at $360 each; one charwoman, $360; three charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $332,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the items for "General expenses, Weather Bureau," on page 6, line 20, after the word "subsistence," to strike out "care and purchase" and insert "and care," so as to read:

For subsistence and care of horses and vehicles.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 11, after the word "aerology," to strike out "$1,185,150" and insert "$1,201,150: *Provided*, That not to exceed $3,000 may be expended for the purchase or construction of an extension of the Tatoosh Island-Port Crescent telegraph line from Port Crescent to Port Angeles, Wash., about 20 miles," so as to make the clause read:

For necessary expenses outside of the city of Washington incident to collecting and disseminating meteorological, climatological, and marine information, and for investigations in meteorology, climatology, seismology, evaporation, and aerology, $1,201,150: *Provided*, That not to exceed $3,000 may be expended for the purchase or construction of an extension of the Tatoosh Island-Port Crescent telegraph line from Port Crescent to Port Angeles, Wash., about 20 miles, including not to exceed $599,660 for salaries, $122,170 for special observations and reports, and $279,000 for telegraphing and telephoning.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 19, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$1,333,150" and insert "$1,349,150," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, $1,349,150.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 20, after the word "Bureau," to strike out "$1,666,550" and insert "$1,682,500," so as to make the clause read:

Total for the Weather Bureau, $1,682,050.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Bureau of Animal Industry," in the item of appropriation for "Salaries, Bureau of Animal Industry," on page 9, line 11, after the word "each," to strike out "two messengers and custodians" and insert one messenger and custodian," and in line 12, after "$1,200," to strike out "each" and insert "one messenger and custodian, $1,000," so as to read:

Salaries, Bureau of Animal Industry: One chief of bureau, $5,000; 1 chief clerk, $2,500; 1 editor and compiler, $2,250; 6 clerks, class 4; 1 clerk, $1,680; 13 clerks, class 3; 2 clerks, at $1,500 each; 23 clerks, class 2; 2 clerks, at $1,380 each; 3 clerks, at $1,320 each; 1 clerk, $1,300; 1 clerk, $1,260; 42 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, $1,100; 1 clerk, $1,080; 50 clerks, at $1,000 each; 2 clerks, at $960 each; 65 clerks, at $900 each; 1 architect, $2,000; 1 architect, $900; 1 illustrator, $1,400; 1 laboratory helper, $1,200; 1 laboratory helper, $1,020; 2 laboratory helpers, at $840 each; 1 laboratory helper, $720; 1 laboratory helper, $600; 1 laboratory helper, $480; 1 instrument maker, $1,200; 1 carpenter, $1,100; 2 carpenters, at $1,000 each; 1 messenger and custodian, $1,200; 1 messenger and custodian, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 9, after the word "ticks," to strike out "$398,800" and insert "$498,800," so as to read:

For all necessary expenses for the eradication of southern cattle ticks, $498,800, of which sum $50,000 may be used for live-stock demonstration work, in cooperation with the States Relations Service, in areas freed of ticks, and of this amount no part shall be used in the purchase of animals for breeding purposes.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. I should like to have some explanation at some time of that item in the bill, and especially of that part of it which is to be diverted to a purpose for which this appropriation has not previously been used. I should like to know what the condition of the attempt to eradicate the cattle ticks has reached. Is progress being made? Every year I note that more money is being provided for that purpose. Now, it seems that an attempt is being made to use some part of the appropriation for another purpose.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WEEKS. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. This item reads:

For all necessary expenses for the eradication of southern cattle ticks, $498,800.

I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that the chairman of the committee is temporarily absent, and I wish the Senator would withhold his question until he comes in, if the matter may be passed over until that time.

Mr. WEEKS. I ask that the amendment may be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the item will be passed over for the present.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 13, line 21, after the word "products," to strike out "$85,940" and insert "$98,580," so as to make the clause read:

For all necessary expenses for scientific investigations in diseases of animals, including the maintenance and improvement of the bureau experiment station at Bethesda, Md., and the necessary alterations of buildings thereon, and the necessary expenses for investigations of tuberculin, serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, $98,580.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 2, after the word "dourine," to strike out "$235,000" and insert "$375,000," so as to read:

For all necessary expenses for the investigation, treatment, and eradication of hog cholera and dourine, $375,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 21, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$1,816,706" and insert "$2,069,346."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 4, after the words "Animal Industry," to strike out "$2,545,336" and insert "$2,797,976," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Animal Industry, $2,797,976.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Bureau of Plant Industry," in the item of appropriation for "Salaries, Bureau of Plant Industry," on page 15, line 20, before the word "clerks," to strike out "forty-eight" and insert "forty-seven," so as to read:

Salaries, Bureau of Plant Industry: One physiologist and pathologist, who shall be chief of bureau, $5,000; 1 chief clerk, $3,000; 1 executive assistant in seed distribution, $2,500; 1 officer in charge of publications, $2,250; 1 landscape gardener, $1,800; 1 officer in charge of records, $2,250; 1 superintendent of seed weighing and mailing, $2,000; 1 executive clerk, $2,250; 3 executive clerks, at $1,980 each; 1 assistant superintendent of seed warehouse, $1,400; 1 seed inspector, $1,000; 1 seed warehouseman, $1,400; 1 seed warehouseman, $1,020; 1 seed warehouseman, $1,000; one seed warehouseman, $840; 6 clerks, class 4; 12 clerks, class 3; 2 clerks, at $1,500 each; 21 clerks, class 2; 47 clerks.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for "Salaries, Bureau of Plant Industry," on page 16, line 3, after "$1,620," to strike out "one clerk or artist" and insert "two clerks or artists, at," so as to read:

Twenty-six messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $600 each; 1 artist, $1,620; 2 clerks or artists, at $1,200.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that, if that amendment providing for 2 clerks or artists at $1,200 should be agreed to, there should be inserted after the numerals "$1,200" the word "each."

Mr. SHAFROTH. That is right; the word "each" should be inserted, and I move that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary states to the Chair that that amendment has been corrected by the committee in the copy which is being used at the desk. The amendment will be again stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 16, in lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to strike out the words "one clerk or artist, $1,200," and in lieu thereof to insert "two clerks or artists, at $1,200 each."

Mr. SMOOT. In the copy of the bill which I have the word "each" does not appear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee has called the attention of the Secretary to that, and the amendment is correctly stated in the copy which the Secretary is using. The amendment will be agreed to as last stated in the absence of objection. The Chair hears none.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask if there is some other bill being used at the Secretary's desk than the one which is now on the desks of Senators?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Chair is informed that there were two places in which the amendments of the committee were not correctly printed in the copies of the bill which are on the desks of Senators, and those corrections will be stated. One has just been stated.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 17, line 22, after the word "fruits,' to strike out "$56,115" and insert "$58,225," so as to make the clause read:

For the control of diseases of orchard and other fruits, $58,225.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if the increase proposed by that amendment is made to cover an amount named in an amendment introduced by me, which I think was to be inserted at that point. The amendment was introduced at the instance of some one in the department. I offered the amendment to provide for the investigations of fruit rot, spotting, and apple mildew, $2,640, which covers that increase.

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONES. That is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 18, line 3, after the word "control," to strike out "$57,175" and insert "$67,950," so as to make the clause read:

For the investigation of diseases of forest and ornamental trees and shrubs, including a study of the nature and habits of the parasitic fungi causing the chestnut-tree bark disease, the white-pine blister rust, and other epidemic tree diseases, for the purpose of discovering new methods of control, $67,950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 6, after the word "plants," to strike out "$56,000" and insert "$51,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the control of diseases of cotton, potatoes, truck crops, forage crops, drug and related plants, $51,000.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on information received since the committee recommended this reduction, for the committee I wish to withdraw that amendment. The House figures ought to remain. I will say that the House increased the estimates of the department; the committee reduced it to the estimates, but upon information since received it is the judgment of myself and others that the former amount, the amount provided by the House, should remain in the bill. I therefore ask that the amendment be disagreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be disagreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 19, line 5, after the word "investigations," to strike out "$19,770" and insert "$22,270," so as to make the clause read:

For crop technological and fiber plant investigations, $22,270.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 22, after the word "diseases," to insert "and the testing and breeding of flax," so as to read:

For the investigation and improvement of cereals and methods of cereal production, and the study of cereal diseases, and for the investigation of the cultivation and breeding of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax diseases and the testing and breeding of flax, and for the investigation and improvement of broom corn and methods of broom-corn production.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same clause, on page 19, line 25, after the words "broom-corn production," to strike out "$139,505" and insert "$142,005."

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question at that point. I suggested an amendment covering that increase, and, as I understand, the amendment in the bill has been made to meet the requirements of the department in connection with some experimental work in the central part of the State of Washington near Waterville. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the increase at this place is due to a transfer from the following page. It was stricken out on another page and transferred to this place.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, perhaps the Senator did not understand my statement. I suggested an amendment to strike out "$139,505" and to insert "$142,005." Now, the committee has done that. I suggested that amendment for the purpose, as expressed in my amendment, of providing an increase of $2,500 for use in connection with the experiment station at Waterville, Wash. I did that because the department gave the people out there to understand that they would contribute about $2,500. Then it was found that a mistake had been made and that they had not really made an estimate for it. So I suggested this amendment in order to cover that situation, and I want to be sure whether the committee made the amendment in accordance with my suggestion or with some other understanding.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I can not give the Senator the information at this moment. I suggest that the amendment be passed over temporarily.

Mr. JONES. Very well; I will ask that it be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 20, line 8, after "$10,840," to strike out "*Provided*, That $5,000 of this amount may be used in testing and breeding flax, with a view to increasing the quality and oil content of flaxseed, including rotation experiments and demonstrations," so as to make the clause read:

For testing and breeding fibrous plants, including the testing of flax straw, in cooperation with the North Dakota Agricultural College, which may be used for paper making, $10,840.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 8, after the word "country," to strike out "$75,400" and insert "$70,400," so as to make the clause read:

For investigations in foreign seed and plant introduction, including the study, collection, purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries and from our possessions, and for experiments with reference to their introduction and cultivation in this country, $70,400.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator in charge of the bill why the reduction of $5,000 is made in that item?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. SMOOT. On page 22, beginning with line 3 down to and including line 9, there occurs this provision:

For investigations in foreign seed and plant introduction, including the study, collection, purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries and from our possessions, and for experiments with reference to their introduction and cultivation in this country, $75,400.

That amount has been reduced by the committee to $70,400.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in the bill as it passed the House there were several transfers from the lump-fund appropriations to the statutory roll, and a corresponding reduction was made in the lump fund. This reduction is made to cover the reduction that ought to follow, in the judgment of the committee, from those transfers; otherwise the transfers would have been made to the statutory roll without any resulting reduction in the lump fund.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think, if we are going to spend money "for investigations in foreign seed and plant introduction, including the study, collection, purchase, testing," and so forth, of rare plants, the amount appropriated ought to be sufficient to do the work well. I am rather inclined to the belief that, if we are going to be extravagant at all, it should be along this line, and I hardly understand how the reduction of $5,000 in this particular item would have any effect whatever upon the transfer to the statutory roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the committee adopted that rule. A number of transfers had been made in the bill as it passed the House from the lump-fund appropriations to the statutory roll, but, as a rule, there was

no corresponding reduction in any of the lump sums. We rather favored the transfer to the statutory roll, but were of the opinion that a corresponding reduction ought to be made in the lump fund.

I will say further to the Senator that, in connection with this particular appropriation, the department said that owing to conditions in connection with international trade there was not the same necessity for this appropriation as heretofore; that they would not need so much money, because it would be more difficult to procure seed and in all probability importations would be very largely reduced. The direct reason, however, is that certain clerks were transferred from the lump fund to the statutory rolls, and reductions were made to correspond to those changes.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PAGE. I think that no reduction of this kind was made in the committee, unless the Secretary of Agriculture, who was present, stated that in his judgment the reduction safely could be made. As the chairman of the committee has well said, in many cases the reduction was made because in some other part of the bill the matter had been taken care of. I do not think we ought to increase any of these amounts or change them without very good reason, because I think the committee has been very, very liberal in meeting all the requirements and suggestions of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 22, line 16, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$39,000" and insert "$100,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of new and rare seeds; for the investigation and improvement of grasses, alfalfa, clover, and other forage crops, including the investigation of the utilization of cacti and other dry-land plants; and to conduct investigations to determine the most effective methods of eradicating weeds, $119,920: *Provided,* That of this amount not to exceed $100,000 may be used for the purchase and distribution of drought-resistant field seeds throughout the Great Plains area and other dry-land sections of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to ask whether the appropriation for seed distribution is in this bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will state that the appropriation for the congressional seed distribution has been stricken out by the committee.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 23, line 1, after the words "general expenses," to strike out "$1,455,135" and insert "$1,472,845."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 1, to strike out:

Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For purchase, propagation, testing, and congressional distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants; all necessary office fixtures and supplies, fuel, transportation, paper, twine, gum, postal cards, gas, electric current, rent outside of the District of Columbia, official traveling expenses, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same; for repairs and the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $252,540. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated; and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supplying of printed packets and envelopes and the packeting, assembling, and mailing of the seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States. An equal proportion of five-sixths of all seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants shall, upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the department upon the receipt of their addressed franks, in packages of such weight as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General may jointly determine: *Provided, however,* That upon each envelope or wrapper containing packages of seeds the contents thereof shall be plainly indicated, and the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each Member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided, also,* That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-fourth parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery not later than the 10th day of January: *Provided, also,* That any portion of the allotments to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress remaining uncalled for on the 1st day of April shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress and who have not before during the same season been supplied by the department: *And provided, also,* That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, mulberry, and other rare and valuable trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I notice that the amendment just stated by the Secretary strikes out the provision for the distribution of seeds. Are we to understand that the Senate committee amended the bill to the extent of striking out the appropriation for the distribution of seeds?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, when the last agricultural appropriation bill was passed by the Senate, and when the bill prior to that was passed, the Senate after considerable discussion voted to eliminate the seed provision from the House bill. The House, as eveybody knows, insisted that it go back in conference; but the committee felt obliged to be governed by the sense of the Senate as heretofore expressed on two different occasions.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I move now that the Senate disagree to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Oklahoma to allow the amendment to go over for the present.

Mr. GORE. Very well.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, we can return to it after we pass through the bill.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the entire amendment, including the amendment striking out "$2,131,825" and inserting "$1,896,995," in line 16, on page 25, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection the entire amendment will be passed over as indicated by the Senator from Utah.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, under the head of "Forest Service" in the item of appropriation for "General expenses, Forest Service," on page 39, line 20, after "$400,000," to insert "of which sum not to exceed $3,000 may be expended in the erection of a headquarters building at the Grand Canyon National Monument," so as to make the clause read:

For the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, bridges, fire lanes, telephone lines, cabins, fences, and other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, and development of the national forests, $400,000, of which sum not to exceed $3,000 may be expended in the erection of a headquarters building at the Grand Canyon National Monument.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 9, to insert:

That hereafter all moneys received toward cooperative work in forest investigations or in the protection and improvement of national forests or in the survey, examination, and appraisal of lands and timber, the exchange of which shall have been or hereafter may be authorized by Congress for the purpose of eliminating private holdings in national forests or of consolidating lands of the United States therein, shall be covered into the Treasury and shall constitute a special fund, which is hereby appropriated and made available until expended, as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct, for the payment of the expenses of said work and of refunds to the contributors of amounts heretofore or hereafter paid in by them in excess of their share of the cost of said work: *Provided,* That annual report shall be made to Congress of all such moneys so received as contributions for such cooperative work. And hereafter in lieu of requiring purchasers of national forest timber to dispose of the brush and débris resulting from cutting operations the Secretary of Agriculture may require them to deposit in the Treasury such sum in each case as he may consider necessary to cover the cost to the United States of such work, and the moneys so deposited shall constitute a special fund, which is hereby appropriated and made available until expended, to enable the Secretary to pay such cost and to make refunds of any amounts deposited by such purchasers in excess of such cost.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have the Senator in charge of the bill explain the full intent and meaning of that amendment. In reading it so hurriedly I could hardly understand it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the present practice is, when timber is purchased in forest reserves, that the parties purchasing the timber are required to destroy or burn the brush and débris. They do that from time to time, and the danger of forest fire is great. This plan requires that the Secretary of Agriculture may require parties purchasing timber to make a deposit suffi-

cient, in the judgment of the Secretary, to cover the cost of removing or destroying or burning the débris, and if the deposit in any particular case should exceed the actual cost of the removal of the obstruction the excess is returned to the party making the deposit.

Mr. SMOOT. If every farmer who purchases timber from a forest reserve to secure the timber he may want for his use is required to make a deposit, I am afraid a great many of those farmers will be compelled to go without the timber. The cutting of the timber is generally done in the spring or summer, and I know farmers who have not the money to make the deposit; and it does seem to me that it is a hardship to be placed upon them that is not necessary.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. PAGE. This matter was very carefully discussed in the committee, and the Secretary of Agriculture was present. He did not intimate that this was a course that would be generally pursued, but in certain cases he said it was quite essential that the department should be given this power. If the Senator from Utah will read the matter carefully he will see that it says "the Secretary of Agriculture *may*." It does not say that he shall require this plan to be followed. It is simply a privilege given to him in case he thinks the interests of the Government demand that extra care shall be taken in regard to forest fires or things of that kind, in which case he may ask that the provisions of this amendment shall be applied.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Vermont that of course I have no doubt this subject was discussed in the committee, and perhaps the Secretary of Agriculture was present and gave his views upon that amendment; but that does not prevent me, at least, calling attention to the hardships that will come to many of the farmers who cut timber from Government lands.

Mr. PAGE. It is hardly to be expected that where farmers go in to cut just a little timber for their own use the Secretary will insist upon the application of this provision. This, as I understand, is to take care of some of the larger cuttings, where there is a good deal of débris left around which ought to be gathered up under the supervision of the officers of the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator has followed this question very closely, he will remember that the charge in the past has been that it is the small man who cuts timber on a forest reserve who causes the fires. I thought the arrangement that exists to-day was severe enough upon the farmer without imposing upon him the further necessity of depositing a sum of money with the Secretary of Agriculture before he can secure the timber.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to say to the Senator from Vermont that my understanding was that it was to be made general; that no one should be permitted to go into the forests and cut timber unless he had made a deposit, and in that way to prevent forest fires. Of course, I do not know that I have any objection to the amendment, but I think there is a great deal of force in the argument made by the Senator from Utah, that in many cases it would be a hardship to the small man who goes in there to cut his wood or perhaps secure material for posts or fences.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota is always very attentive to the proceedings at committee meetings, and I will trust his memory even further than my own.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not say that the statement of the Senator from Vermont is incorrect, but I gathered from what the Secretary said that it was to be a general provision, a provision to be generally applied——

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. GRONNA. And that no one would be permitted hereafter to enter the national forests and cut any timber unless a deposit was made sufficient to take care of this débris, burn it, and in that way prevent forest fires. I think the Senator from Utah is correct in the position he has taken.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this is not the first time this subject matter has been up for discussion. It has always been opposed in the past, and I certainly think it should be defeated at this time. The men who ought to receive a benefit from the forest timber are the farmers who live adjacent and near our forest reserves. The Lord knows it is hard enough for them now to hunt up a forester and secure a permit to go in and get a few fence poles, and now to compel those men to make a cash deposit, I say, Mr. President, in fifty cases out of a hundred it will be impossible for them to do it.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. I made no objection to this language going into the bill. I did make this observation, that there were members on the committee who knew more about the affairs in the western country, and especially about the national forests, and I thought if it was not a good provision they would object to it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator exactly what this deposit is intended to cover?

Mr. SMOOT. This deposit is intended to cover the expense that may be undergone by the forester or the assistants upon the forest reserve in cleaning up the cuttings that may come from the cutting of timber.

Mr. GALLINGER. Do not the regulations require that the débris shall be cleared up by the purchaser?

Mr. SMOOT. The present requirements are such as to compel them to do it, and now they are not satisfied with that, but they want to require that a deposit of money shall be made with the forester.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is it not the duty of the forester to see that the regulation or the law, whatever it is in that respect, is complied with?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and I want to say to the Senator that in the past it has been strictly complied with.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is no difficulty in Germany or France in having every twig cleared from the ground by any person who fells a tree, and I do not see why when we have Federal officers to control those matters it should not be their duty and they should not be held accountable if they neglect to see that the débris is cleared from the land.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. GORE. I will say that this provision is intended to relate to timber-sale contracts. Its purpose is to diminish fire risks. It is true that under the present system the purchasers of timber are required to remove or to burn the débris. That is inconvenient to those purchasers in many instances, as will be apparent to Senators. This proposition is to require them to make a deposit sufficient to cover the cost of burning or removing the débris, and the excess if any is to be returned to the purchaser. It is a matter of convenience to them and a matter of great security in preventing forest fires.

Further, to illuminate the subject I will request the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to read a paragraph from the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture. It will be seen that it is to be limited to timber sale contracts. If it should be applied to a farmer purchasing a few posts, as suggested by the Senator from Utah, I myself should certainly oppose it.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me read one part of the amendment, so that the Senator can see just what the provision covers:

> And hereafter in lieu of requiring purchasers of national forest timber to dispose of the brush and débris resulting from cutting operations the Secretary of Agriculture may require them to deposit in the Treasury such sum in each case as he may consider necessary to cover the cost to the United States of such work, and the money so deposited—

And so forth. That applies to all purchasers of national forest timber.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. GORE. Before the Senator from Nebraska proceeds, will he kindly allow the Senator from Florida to read what the Secretary of Agriculture says?

Mr. SMOOT. Very well; I yield to the Senator from Florida to read what the Secretary of Agriculture says.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will read what the Secretary said about it, and I think it will be very apparent. As the Senator from Oklahoma says, it refers not to a mere incidental tree or cordwood or firewood or something of that sort, as the case may be, but it has application to regular timber contracts. Here is what the Secretary of Agriculture says:

> The amendment provides for the receipt and disbursement of funds by the Government from purchasers of timber from the national forests

to defray the expenses connected with the burning of brush and débris resulting from their timber operations. All timber-sale contracts for national forest timber require that brush and débris shall be burned at the expense of the operator, the contract stipulating a maximum expenditure for which the operator is liable under the requirement. These expenses are now met directly by him. It has not always been practicable, however, for operators to burn brush and débris from timber-sale operations at the most opportune time on account of lack of men or the necessity of employing all men available to them on other major features of their operations. It is intended by the amendment to have the required sum now specified in national forest timber-sale contracts deposited by the operator in the United States Treasury, with which sum the Forest Service can directly defray the expense of brush and débris disposal on the timber-sale areas to which the deposit is applicable. The amendment, proposed for the more adequate and efficient protection and administration of the national forests, will insure the disposal of brush and débris at the proper time and in the proper manner within the maximum liability specified in the timber-sale contract.

I think that makes the point clear.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator and to the Senate again that where there are small purchasers of timber in the western forest reserve—and most of them are small purchasers—there is a requirement made of them to-day that all the débris and branches shall be disposed of, and I have not heard any complaint in the past that that has not been done. I have never heard a solitary small purchaser of timber asked that he be allowed to make a cash deposit in order that he may get what little timber from a forest reserve he may need.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was going to ask the Senator from Utah, if I understand this correctly, that the purchase is made of timber in a forest reserve, and the present regulations require that the purchaser, who ordinarily, I suppose, would be a poor man, shall clear up the land after the tree or trees have been removed. As I understand this amendment, the poor man is not allowed to do that work at his own expense, giving him employment, but it is put in the hands of officials of the Government to do it and to require a cash payment from the purchaser of the timber for that purpose. Am I correct?

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly what this amendment provides.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SMOOT. In just a moment. I can plainly see that if there was a large purchase of timber by a man running a great sawmill and cutting millions of feet of lumber, he could well say, "I will make a cash deposit, and I will allow the foresters here to destroy and burn up the débris and brush"; but where there is one of those there are a hundred small purchasers, and it is going to place a burden upon them which should not be placed upon them. It is hard enough now to get the timber off the forest reserves without placing more burdens on them than are placed to-day.

I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I wanted to suggest to the Senator from Utah that in a case of this kind the Government always exacts sufficient money for the purpose; that is, its estimate is large enough to cover the purpose for which it is required, and in many instances if not in most the amounts so required are greater than the actual cost. The difficulties which beset a man in trying to get a refund of that money are very great, and when you consider the delay and the expense it is far more than the amount of the surplus. As a general thing he is poor and is unable to stand the loss. This imposes a burden upon him that may become intolerable.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Colorado has well stated the point. I can imagine a case of this kind, Mr. President, a small timber purchaser cutting what little timber he does has created débris and brush; perhaps $20 will be required from him as a deposit. When it is destroyed it is found that the cost was $16, and I say now that it will be worth more than the $4 to get that amount out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I know that in my State this amendment would work very great hardship. The homesteaders in New Mexico, in undertaking to acquire homesteads, need fence posts, and they have to secure a contract with the forester for a certain number of posts. This amendment leaves it entirely in the hands of the forester to estimate what he assumes will be the cost of gathering the brush and burning it. This requirement can be made very harsh. Even if it is considered to be absolutely just it will still in fact be so harsh upon the homesteader that it will be impossible for him to comply with it. The homesteaders in our country have not the cash to make deposits for purposes of this kind. They have the muscle, the labor, and the desire to do the work themselves, and they will do it. If they are required to deposit $20 or $50 in cash or even $10 in cash at times it would really preclude them from availing themselves of the law under which they can purchase the fence posts at all.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I suggest to the Senator from Utah that it seems to me the best and most expeditious way to get at this matter is to move to amend the amendment by striking out of it all after the word "work" in line 25 on page 40.

Mr. SMOOT. The suggestion of the Senator from Colorado is a good one, but I think the best thing to do is to make a point of order against the whole amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not as familiar with the part of the amendment which precedes. I have not read it carefully.

Mr. STERLING and Mr. WALSH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota, as he rose first.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Utah to another provision of the amendment which does not relate to forest fires or protection therefrom or cooperation in the extinguishment of forest fires. It is that clause of the amendment relating to the survey examination and appraisal of lands and timber, the exchange of which shall have been or hereafter may be authorized by Congress for the purpose of eliminating private holdings in national forests or of consolidating lands of the United States therein.

The first part of the amendment relates to cooperation or cooperative work in forest investigation. My question is as to whether in the case of a survey examination and appraisal of lands and timber for the purpose of exchange the settler is required to contribute or the one who has a private holding in a forest reserve is obliged to contribute to such survey examination and appraisal.

Mr. SMOOT. I think under the present practice that is required, but I do believe that that ought to be covered in the Treasury direct. I think it is held as a special fund, but it is covered into the Treasury of the United States. I will ask the Senator from Oklahoma if I am right in that statement?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am not able to state, without examining a memorandum I have here, what the present practice is.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. Perhaps the Senator from Wyoming can tell us.

Mr. GORE. As I remember, this amendment was brought forward by the committee last year and perhaps went out. I think the department desires this particular amendment, because they have had some trouble with respect to bookkeeping. Some bank perhaps failed in which the money was deposited. I am not quite sure, however, without examining my memorandum.

Mr. SMOOT. If that is the case, I do not want to put this burden upon the small man on account of some money in a bank having been lost or the bank having failed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I think another proposition involved in this is perhaps the exchange of lands between the General Government and the State where State school land happens to fall within a reserve. I think there is no provision of law now authorizing an exchange so that the State can consolidate its holdings.

Mr. SMOOT. This has nothing to do with that law. This is a question of exchange where money is involved, and it shall be kept as a special fund in the Treasury.

Mr. GORE. After consulting the memoranda, I find there is no law now authorizing this to be done. I will ask the Senator from Florida to read an extract from the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well.

Mr. FLETCHER. In just a line this memoranda says:

There is no legislation at present permitting the receipt and disbursement of such funds by the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. I think, however, Mr. President, there has been a practice in the past of having cooperative work. I do not know how the funds have been handled, but I have always taken the position that the fund ought to be covered into the Treasury of the United States, and whenever a dollar is paid out from

the Treasury it ought to be upon a requisition of some head of a department.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. I merely wish to make this statement in connection with the question I asked the Senator from Utah, namely, that I suppose it is the policy of the Government to eliminate the private holdings from forest-reserve lands. If that is true, it does not seem to me to be right that the man who owns the private holding should be required to contribute anything toward the survey, examination, or appraisal of the land.

Mr. SMOOT. I fully agree with the Senator in that statement.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield the floor now to the Senator from Montana, but I want to say that at the end of the discussion I shall make the point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. I hope the Senator from Utah will not feel moved to make the point of order as to any portion of the amendment down to and including the paragraph which has been the subject of discussion, leaving in the earlier provision.

Mr. THOMAS. It was my suggestion to strike out the last sentence.

Mr. WALSH. That can be done; but I think the Senator from South Dakota, however, is in error concerning the significance of the first portion of this amendment. It deals with two subjects. They are entirely unrelated and ought not to have been thus combined. The one is contributions made by cooperative work for the purpose of preventing fire or putting out fire. As is well known, the private owners of timberlands, the States, and the National Government are all interested in the prevention of fires. They work together, and private owners make contributions which are to be utilized under the direction and supervision of the Forestry Service for the purpose of accomplishing the work that they all desire to have done.

Now, if that went into the General Treasury, it would be very difficult indeed to get it in shape so that it could be utilized. It seems to me quite proper that that should go into a special fund which the Secretary of Agriculture, who has charge of the Forestry Service, could utilize at any time he saw fit.

Next the amendment deals with another matter, which is not the elimination of private holding within the forest reserve at all. I will say for the benefit of the Senator from South Dakota——

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I think the Senator will agree with me that that seems to be the plain reading of the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. No.

Mr. STERLING. The amendment, in the first place, surely contemplates a fund to be derived from the survey, examination, and appraisal of lands, the exchange of which shall have been or hereafter may be authorized by Congress for the purpose of eliminating private holdings in national forests.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is right about that. I read it hurriedly.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH. "Or of consolidating lands of the United States therein." That, it seems to me, should go into the private fund as well, so that it could be utilized for that purpose.

Mr. GORE. This amendment is undoubtedly liable to a point of order, and I see no use in protracting the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SWANSON in the chair). The Chair rules that the point of order is sustained.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 22, to insert:

That hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to reimburse forest officers or other persons for horses, vehicles, or equipment lost, damaged, or destroyed while being used for necessary fire fighting, trail, or official business, such reimbursement to be made from any available funds in the appropriation to which the use or hire of such equipment is properly chargeable.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that is an entire change from the existing regulations of the department. There is no law, of course, covering that item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah make the point of order against the amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. It does seem to me that that is opening a door for claims against the Government of the United States that ought never to be opened. Congress has never hesitated to pass a bill relieving a forester, a supervisor, for the loss of a horse or of property of any kind.

Mr. WALSH. My understanding is that this is not the forestry officer at all, but it applies to a private individual whose horse is hired. The forester goes to a liveryman, and says, "There is a fire out here and I want a team to drive out to it." He drives the team and the horses are killed while he is gone. It does seem to me that a provision to cover such a case is proper.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me read the amendment to the Senator, and see if it does not include both classes. It reads:

That hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to reimburse forest officers or other persons for horses, vehicles, or equipment lost, damaged, or destroyed while being used for necessary fire fighting, trail, or official business, such reimbursement to be made from any available funds in the appropriation to which the use or hire of such equipment is properly chargeable.

That reads, "To reimburse forest officers or other persons for horses" hired. It does seem to me that wherever a forest officer hires a horse or a vehicle of any kind, or if it is his own horse used in the service, and it is lost, the claim ought to come to Congress and be paid just as such claims have been paid in the past. It seems to me that this would invite a forest officer who had a horse that he desired to get rid of to see that it was lost and make a claim on the Government for reimbursement. I repeat it is opening a door, Mr. President, that should not be opened. All claims against the Government of the United States, outside of those that are provided for for Army and Navy officers, come to Congress.

We passed to-day a claim to reimburse a postmaster for stamps lost; there was reported yesterday a claim of $1,500 for beer stamps that were lost in transportation. An untold number of claims have been presented, but here we are proposing to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to settle certain claims. I believe that is an unwise policy to inaugurate, and I shall make the point of order against the amendment unless the Senator from Oklahoma desires to say something upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah make the point of order?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Just a word, Mr. President. I will say that under the Agricultural appropriation bill passed March 4, 1913, the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to reimburse private parties for the loss of horses and vehicles where the loss occurred fighting forest fires. The law requires that certain employees on forest reserves shall furnish their own horses. It was the view of the Secretary of Agriculture that such parties losing horses ought to be reimbursed in the same manner and to the same extent as should private parties. I suppose it was a matter of dispatch in order to avoid the expense and delay of securing reimbursement by a more circuitous route, as indicated a few moments ago, might occur when they were trying to recover the excess deposited.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that the provision he speaks of refers only to the loss of horses in fighting forest fires.

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMOOT. But this goes to private parties, and it goes to officers not only in fighting of fires, but for losses on the trail; that is, in regular, everyday business or on official business of any kind; in fact, it covers every officer in the Forest Service. If any one of them loses a horse from any cause, the Secretary of Agriculture is allowed to reimburse him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Utah makes a point of order against the amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. I make the point of order against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GORE. The amendment is, no doubt, liable to the point of order; but I ask to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum from the Secretary of Agriculture, stating the reasons which actuated him in recommending the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

(12) Page 40, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

"That hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to reimburse forest officers or other persons for horses, vehicles, or equipment lost, damaged, or destroyed while being used for necessary fire fighting, trail, or official business, such reimbursement to be made from any available funds in the appropriation to which the use or hire of such equipment is properly chargeable."

NOTE.—This item was approved by the House Committee on Agriculture, with the restriction that reimbursement be made only for horses, vehicles, or equipment lost or damaged while being used in fire-fighting or other unforeseen emergencies, but was stricken out on a point of

order. It is deemed to be no more than fair that forest officers should receive the same protection as other owners of horses, vehicles, or equipment lost or damaged while being used on Government work, and therefore it is recommended that the amendment as above be included in the bill.

The act of March 4, 1913, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, provided for reimbursement to "owners of horses, vehicles, and other equipment lost, damaged, or destroyed while being used for necessary fire fighting, trail, or official business." It has been decided by the Comptroller of the Treasury that this act does not authorize reimbursement of forest officers for the loss of or damage to horses, vehicles, or other equipment which they are required to furnish in the performance of their official duties. During the past two years there have been several cases in which forest officers who were using their own horses and vehicles in fire fighting or other official business have suffered losses from unusual causes which could not be foreseen or from which they could not escape, and inability to secure reimbursement has caused them to suffer great hardship.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 42, after line 4, to insert:

That hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture, under regulations to be prescribed by him, is hereby authorized to permit the Navy Department to take from the national forests such earth, stone, and timber for the use of the Navy as may be compatible with the administration of the national forests for the purposes for which they are established, and also in the same manner to permit the taking of earth, stone, and timber from the national forests for the construction of Government railways and other Government works in Alaska: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit with his annual estimates a report of the quantity and value of earth, stone, and timber furnished as herein provided.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee what the income for the Forest Service was for the year just ended, if he has the figures at his disposal?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have not the figures immediately available, but I will say that it was something in the neighborhood of $3,000,000. I will furnish the figures to the Senator later.

Mr. THOMAS. A little bit more than half of the amount it cost the Government to look after and administer these reserves?

Mr. GORE. Something more than half. I do not remember the exact amount.

Mr. THOMAS. My impression is that when the proposed leasing system is in full operation the difference between operation and income will be much more startling than that.

Mr. GORE. I think the Forestry Service ought to be made self-sustaining, if possible.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 42, after line 17, to insert:

That hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture may, upon such terms as he may deem proper, for periods not exceeding 30 years, permit responsible persons or associations to use and occupy suitable spaces or portions of ground in the national forests for the construction of summer homes, hotels, stores, or other structures needed for recreation or public convenience, not exceeding 10 acres to any one person or association, but this shall not be construed to interfere with the right to enter homesteads upon agricultural lands in national forests as now provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I do not feel that the remark made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] a few moments ago ought to be allowed to pass without a word at least. My recollection is that when the great extension in the forestry system took place some 10 or 12 years ago it was promised that long before this time not only would the forests be self-sustaining, but that they would be a source of very considerable revenue to the National Government. That promise apparently has not been realized, for quite obviously the receipts do not now nearly cover the expenditures necessary, and the timber is being consumed without any real substantial benefit, so far as that is concerned.

At the same time, Mr. President, what policy shall we pursue with respect to the matter? Shall we allow the great forests that cover the mountain slopes of the Western States to remain absolutely unprotected from the ravages of fire and depredations of all kinds? Obviously the Senator from Colorado does not mean to say that. He does not desire that no appropriation shall be made for the care and preservation of the forests.

Mr. President, the State of Montana is the owner of very extensive tracts of timberland. It had large grants from the National Government at the time it was admitted into the Union; and every time that it was found possible to select timberlands under that grant, exercising the same degree of prudence and influenced by the same selfish motives that would actuate a private owner under the same circumstances, the State went on and selected valuable timberlands. It has not stood idly by and allowed those lands, which it thus owns and which are of immense value to it, to become the prey of forest fires which, regrettable as it may be, sweep over the country and destroy millions of values every year. They are annually making an appropriation to protect those forests in exactly the same way, as was indicated awhile ago, private owners are banding themselves together in timber associations, having exactly the same purpose in mind.

All this simply means, Mr. President, that we are not going to abandon the policy of exercising a fostering care over the national forests; and those of us who have suffered from the administration of the law by a lot of incompetent and inefficient representatives can not, as it seems to me, advance our cause by criticisms that would imply the necessity of absolutely wiping out the entire system. If we are hoping to secure any relief whatever from the conditions that have been found oppressive in every State in which these national forests exist, we must start in by standing upon the proposition that protection must be accorded to the forests from depredations of one kind or another, from the ravages of insects, and from destruction by fire and the elements generally.

Mr. President, I am unable to agree with my esteemed friend from the State of Colorado—and I am always pleased to work with him and usually find myself in accord with him—that the so-called leasing system bears any kind of relation, except the most remote relation, to the forestry reserve system.

Furthermore, Mr. President, so far as the leasing system is concerned, now that I am speaking about this matter I will refer to it briefly. It has not been seriously proposed—and I desire to have that distinctly understood—that it shall be applied to the general body of our agricultural land or to our mineral lands, except such minerals as primarily become the source of power, such as coal, oil, and gas, and likewise those minerals, nonmetallic in character, that occur in great bodies located by the Government itself through the operations of the Geological Survey, such as potash, phosphates, asphaltum, and other nonmetallic minerals of that character.

Mr. President, while speaking of this matter, I want to invite the attention of the Senate, because this is a most opportune time to do so, to a feature of the bill which has thus impliedly had the criticism of the distinguished Senator from the State of Colorado. I refer to that provision of the so-called leasing bill for the disposition of lands containing deposits of phosphates. We import large quantities of potash, which is a deposit of much the same character as phosphate—we import enormous quantities of potash, for instance, from Germany. That supply is now shut off. It becomes the source of nitrogen and potassium and is used in many different ways, but I want to speak particularly about phosphates.

There are great deposits of phosphates, the source of one of the most valuable fertilizers known to agricultural science, in the States of Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, and Montana. The State of Florida exports annually, when the foreign market is open to her, $9,000,000 worth of that product. Great areas of land containing these valuable deposits have been withdrawn from entry, so that to-day there is absolutely no law whatever under which any of those great deposits may be utilized. The people who desire to utilize them, the people who are willing to put their money into them, instead of taking an absolute conveyance of these lands from the Government, are perfectly satisfied with the bill which has been introduced here for the utilization of those phosphate properties. Let me tell you about that.

Those deposits are insoluble. They are made soluble and valuable for fertilizing purposes by the application of sulphuric acid. The fertilizers thus obtained are extensively used, and it is appropriate to discuss the matter in connection with the agricultural appropriation bill. They are now being shipped to Japan across the Pacific Ocean. They are used in California; they are used in intensive farming of all kinds; and now extensive experiments are being conducted in all of the Northwestern States for the utilization of that fertilizer upon the wheat fields of the Northwest, to increase the product of grains in that great region. Those deposits, as I have said, are made soluble by the application of sulphuric acid. That is all that is needed.

In the State of Utah there is a great copper smelter; in the State of Montana are two great copper smelters, which are annually belching into the atmosphere tons and tons and tons of sulphuric acid, to the destruction of vegetation all around. There is no use for it now at all. All you have to do is to save that sulphuric acid and apply it to these phosphate deposits, and you then will have a product that easily can produce $25,000,000 of value a year, and that would easily increase the productive capacity of the lands all over the Northwest from 25 to 40 or 50 per cent.

It affects, Mr. President, only the States of Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, and Utah. The people there want the law; at least, the people of my State, for whom I speak, want this valuable product utilized. We have an opportunity to build up a great industry there, but there is not any law by which the deposits can be made available.

The so-called leasing bill, which has received the strictures of the distinguished Senator from Colorado, provides that anyone who desires to do so may take a lease of 2,560 acres of land containing phosphate deposits, upon such terms as he and the Secretary of the Interior may agree. That is all there is to it. I do not see any reason why that bill should not pass without an objection from the floor here. Bear in mind that this great gas, Mr. President, is not only escaping uselessly into the atmosphere day after day and year after year, but it is actually destroying vegetation in the rich valley of the Deerlodge in my State.

Why, Mr. President, they are now installing at the great smelter works in the city of Anaconda, under the direction of the Bureau of Mines, a plant for the extraction of sulphuric acid from the fumes that escape from the smokestacks. There is practically no purpose to which to apply it. All of it could be utilized, or the most of it could be utilized, in the preparation of this valuable product. Here we go, day after day. The water-power bill is exactly the same. They are values of the very highest character. Speaking about conservation, I am talking conservation to you. Here is a great value that is escaping from you day by day. The water-power bill is in the same situation. Here we are; a million dollars a day is being spent for coal in this country for the production of power that could be just as easily produced by the water which runs idly and unused along in the channels of our rivers.

Mr. President, the other day a gentleman called me out into the Marble Room who represents capital to the extent of $10,000,000 willing to go into the development of a power plant just across the line from the State of Idaho in the State of Washington—the Senator from Idaho will know the place perfectly well—for the production there of nitrogenous products, also for fertilizing purposes, and for use in many of the arts. Ten million dollars is ready to go into that enterprise there, and yet the water-power bill can not pass here because of some academic objections that some gentlemen have to some features of it.

I trust that some day or other we will be able to consider these questions as practical questions of legislation that confront us. I have very great regard and esteem for the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], who does not want this leasing bill passed. He does not want to permit us to dispose of the phosphate lands in the State of Montana as we would like to dispose of them. I would be quite willing to agree to sell them to anybody who might want to buy them, but we can not get a law of that kind passed, and we can get the other; but such opposition as this is made to it. I think that if we would take these things as practical questions of legislation for the purpose of seeing what we can do without violating fundamental principles, we could solve some of these questions a little more rapidly; and I still entertain the hope that at some time before the termination of this session we shall be able to get through either the power bill or the bill to give us an opportunity to utilize our phosphate deposits, at least.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. If I had supposed that my criticisms of the probable economic results of a leasing system would have aroused my good friend from Montana to such a vigorous protest, I would not have made them; but in view of his defense of the forestry reserves and his advocacy of a leasing law, which carried with it a condemnation of my position, I must beg the indulgence of the Senate for a very few moments.

I am opposed to the present forest reserve system because I believe it to be wasteful, extravagant, and carried to such an extreme that no justification can be made of it. I assure my friend that I am quite as anxious to preserve the forests as he can be. I believe, and always have believed, that they can be best preserved by the people of the respective States wherein they are situated; and I could not but think, as the Senator was eloquently advocating the so-called leasing bill, that if his great State of Montana had control, as it should have control, and ownership of the great phosphate beds and other mineral deposits in that State, it would be very easy for its people to develop them as a part of its own resources and increase its wealth and its population.

When I consider that the forest reserves of the United States consist for the greater part of territory upon which there are no forests, upon which there never were any forests, and upon which there never can be any forests, great tracts of land which were reserved in order to enable those who owned a great part of them to relinquish and exchange them for some of the most valuable lands in the world; and when I further consider that an enormous number of so-called inspectors, field agents, employees, rangers, and other forces under the pay of the Government of the United States are maintained at public expense for the purpose of looking after forest reservations where there are no forests, I think he will agree with me that a much better system could be devised.

It is true that in these forest reservations agricultural land may be homesteaded; but it is equally true that, owing to the many inspections and examinations that are made between a location and its entry, and the many difficulties of obtaining a patent between the date of location and the time when it is issued, with which he is quite as familiar as I am, the situation is almost as bad as though the reservations were absolute.

I want to see the West developed. I want to see it developed as the East and the Mississippi Valley country were developed. I want to see it developed by that sturdy American citizenship which, dependent upon its own resources, wants to avail itself of the largess of the Government, and, by acquiring freeholds upon the public domain, add them to the taxable wealth of the country, establish homes, raise families, and increase populations to the end not only that the western Commonwealths may prosper and wax exceeding strong but that they may contribute of their wealth to the common purposes and growth of the Nation.

I believe—and that is my fundamental objection to the leasing system—that it is un-American. We can not be a great people if our people are a tenantry, and it makes no difference whether the landlord be an individual, a corporation, or the Government of the United States. It is fundamentally wrong.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield; yes.

Mr. WALSH. I apprehend the Senator would not imagine that any of us would dispute the proposition that the great bulk of the people of the country ought not to be tenantry; but the Senator will bear in mind that these are not agricultural lands that a man is going to cultivate, and that nobody proposes that the leasing system shall be applied to such lands. Now, why should the Senator make that suggestion when it comes to a matter of phosphate lands?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think that if in 1872 our mining laws had been framed upon the theory of the pending leasing measure the great State of Montana would be far less populous than it is at present, and therefore far less prosperous; and I can conceive of no reason why I, a citizen of the United States, can go upon the public land and locate a lead mine, a gold mine, a silver mine, and at the same time should be obliged to lease other forms of metalliferous or mineral deposits from the United States. If one is wrong, the other is also reprehensible.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to tell the Senator why; and the Senator knows likewise that it is not proposed to apply the principle to metallic mines or veins that a man must go out and labor for years to find, bringing to his aid the very highest kind of prospecting skill.

Mr. THOMAS. Why does the Senator say it is not proposed to do that? I want to tell him that if he starts upon this leasing policy, that will be the next step.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, well, of course——

Mr. THOMAS. And, as suggested by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], it is even proposed now. In fact, the Senator himself is the author of a measure which, as originally framed, was designed, if I remember correctly, to reserve from the locators of this country all of the public mineral lands which were supposed to contain radium.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is entirely mistaken. I never introduced a bill of that sort.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not say the Senator introduced the bill, but my recollection is that that was the theory upon which the Senator sought to frame it.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is in error.

Mr. THOMAS. I am very glad to be corrected.

Mr. WALSH. The idea never entered my head. It never entered the mind of anybody who ever talked with me upon the subject. I am opposed to it as resolutely and as determinedly as the Senator himself can be. So far as the development of the State of Montana is concerned, it was developed through its metallic mines of gold, silver, copper, lead, and zinc; and

nobody proposes to touch even a line of the law as it is now written to substitute anything in the nature of a leasing system.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I cheerfully confess my error. My memory was evidently at fault with reference to the Senator; but I know that the Interior Department proposed to do it and that a number of conferences were held, some of which I attended, with the purpose of reserving these lands.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH. If that is the case, Mr. President, they very skillfully concealed their purpose from me, and I felt that I was in their confidence.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course I can not speak for the Senator. I know what occurred at the conferences which I attended, and I remember very well that my colleague [Mr. SHAFROTH] and I took advantage of the opportunity offered and brought the State commissioner of mines and others to Washington in order to protest against that policy, which, I am glad to say, was abandoned by the department.

I now yield to my colleague.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator from Colorado that the conservation congress, from which nearly all these bills were originally started, which was held in Kansas City, absolutely indorsed the withdrawal of all mineral lands.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, Mr. President, there is no more question but that this policy, when once entered upon, will be extended to all forms of mineral wealth than that I am now speaking upon the subject to the Senate. But, as I said, I am not going to take the time at present to go extensively into this matter. I have perhaps already trespassed upon the patience of the Senate, and certainly upon that of my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, who has this bill in charge. I merely wish to say before taking my seat, however, that the prediction which I made a few moments ago and which I now repeat, that the leasing system, if entered upon, will be productive of great loss to the Government, is based upon the experiences which the country has encountered in the administration of the Forestry Service.

The leasing bills and the water-power bill, if they become laws, will result as usual in the multiplication of civil-service employees. No landlord, especially upon the scale which the Government of the United States proposes to inaugurate, can carry this system into effect without constant and careful supervision. It means a lot of additional field officers, inspectors, agents, and supervisors, constantly increasing in number, taking not only the profits which the Government expects to realize, but a large amount of revenues which are raised by taxation besides. It will satisfy some people, perhaps, so far as its financial aspect is concerned, but in my judgment it is foredoomed to failure; and I dare say that away down in his heart, if the Senator from Montana could have his own judgment carried into effect, he would not only oppose with all his heart and with all his great ability the institution of such a system, but he would insist upon the acquisition of title to these properties by citizens of the United States as they have been acquired heretofore.

Before I take my seat let me say that the policy which the Government has entered upon, and which it proposes to continue, is in some respects similar to the policy of Great Britain in the eighteenth century which finally culminated in the American Revolution. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Montana to the fact that our Declaration of Independence assigns that as one of the causes of the rebellion of the American Colonies:

> The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States. To prove this let facts be submitted to a candid world.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the laws for naturalization of foreigners, refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.

Now, the Government of the United States, so far as its administration of the public lands of the country is concerned, at least those of them that are left, is duplicating the conduct of the King of Great Britain in his administration of the land conditions of the Colonies. We went at that time, and partly in consequence of it, to the extreme of opposition. Nothing of the kind is here contemplated, but this leasing system as a policy of the United States, while it may and probably will become law, will never do so with my vote unless I change my mind very radically upon the subject, which is not at all probable.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. SHAFROTH. I want just about five minutes, and that is all, because my name has been mentioned.

The Senator from Montana has referred to me and referred to the bills which are now pending before Congress, and incidentally he referred to the fact that the potassium claims that he is so anxious to have leased by the Government are situated in the States of Montana and Utah and Wyoming and Idaho, and that it seemed, from his standpoint at least, that these lands ought to be developed. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Montana to the fact that the Senators from Utah, the Senators from Wyoming, and the Senators from Idaho are just as anxious for the development of their States as is the Senator from Montana, and yet every Senator from those States is opposed to these leasing bills.

Is it possible that we are obstructing anything by reason of that when three out of four States mentioned are absolutely opposed to this leasing system?

Mr. President, I opened a paper called the Oregonian the other day. There was an account in the Oregonian of February 5, 1915, of a proceeding that took place in the State senate of that State. Some man had the hardihood to get up there in Oregon and propose an indorsement of the Ferris bill, which is the very bill which the Senator from Montana is now advocating. I will only read the headlines, because they are very clear and plain as to what the senate of Oregon felt with relation to that matter. I read:

> Senate on record against Ferris Act.
> Oregon's water-power policy declared.
> All but one for resolution.
> Even Democrats vote against administration bill.
> Eloquent appeals made.
> Approval entails meeting of 50 delegates from 10 Western States at Portland to wage fight for home control.

Mr. President, that article shows that one man who rose and wanted to approve the Ferris Act was immediately met by such a storm that when the vote came the whole senate unanimously, except that one man, voted against it; and not only that, but they put through resolutions condemning the Ferris Act. So if the Senator thinks that the western people are in favor of this leasing proposition, he is sadly mistaken.

I want to say to him that every political convention in our State for years has been against any leasing system, and specifically have they mentioned the rights of the State with respect to the waters of the State. I want to say to him that there were nine governors of nine Western States who met in the city of Salt Lake in 1913 and declared against the leasing system and in favor of the entry system. I will state that in April, 1914, the governors of nine Western States, irrespective of political party, appeared in the city of Denver and held a conference there, and they unanimously decided in favor of an entry system and against a leasing system.

I want to know whether the Senate of the United States wants to force a leasing system upon the people of the West in view of such a unanimous condemnation by the people of the West. If you do, I must say it will be a sad condition indeed. I believe it will begin a war that it will take 50 years, perhaps, to remove, and which, in my judgment, will eventually end in the repeal of such laws.

Mr. President, the Senator from Montana does not seem to recognize what is in these leasing bills. He does not seem to recognize that there is a question of the sovereignty of the State in the matter. If there is one principle that is recognized as proper and as inherent in a State itself, it is the right of that State to tax every foot of property within the borders of the State. Yet these bills which are presented here cover subjects that can not be the subject of State taxation. If you are going to deprive the State of the right of taxation upon the property within the limits of that State, Mr. President, you can absolutely deny the right of the State to raise any revenue; you can annihilate the State. When you once surrender an inherent principle of sovereignty that is supposed to exist both under the State constitution and under the Constitution of the United States, you are invading the rights of the State to an extent which I do not believe any people or any Members of the Senate will agree to if they fully understand the situation.

Mr. President, I do not care to detain the Senate any further. I have made extended remarks on this question, and I do not care to proceed further at this time. I ask that the article to which I referred from the Portland Oregonian may be appended to my remarks.

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

SENATE ON RECORD AGAINST FERRIS ACT—OREGON'S WATER-POWER POLICY DECLARED—ALL BUT ONE FOR RESOLUTION—EVEN DEMOCRATS VOTE AGAINST ADMINISTRATION BILL—ELOQUENT APPEALS MADE—APPROVAL ENTAILS MEETING OF 50 DELEGATES FROM 10 WESTERN STATES AT PORTLAND TO WAGE FIGHT FOR HOME CONTROL.

[By Ronald G. Callvert.]

STATE CAPITOL, *Salem, Oreg., February 4.*

So far as the senate can accomplish that end, the State of Oregon is committed to the main elements of a definite water-power development policy antagonistic to the Ferris bill now before Congress. If there is anywhere near the unanimity in the house that was exhibited in the senate, Oregon will soon not only have declared this policy, but invited 10 other States of the West to share with it in the effort to preserve for Oregon what is Oregon's, and for the West that which belongs to the West.

Although the Ferris bill is recognized as an administration measure, or at least as one having the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, both Democratic members of the Oregon Senate supported to-day's antagonistic resolution.

Senator Strayer did no more than to vote "aye." Senator Garland spoke in his semihumorous, half-sarcastic way, but finally declared his purpose to support the bill. Later in the debate he outlined briefly and seriously his purposes. They were, he said, to place Oregon's interests above party interests whenever there was conflict.

KELLAHER SOLID MINORITY.

The support given the Ferris bill and the opposition to the resolution defining Oregon's water-power policy and calling a conference of Western States came from the habitual minority of the senate. This minority rallied its entire forces, consisting of one Daniel Kellaher, and voted solidly one vote against the resolution. Everybody else voted for it.

The resolution that has been adopted by the senate has heretofore not only been outlined but published in full in the Oregonian. Briefly, it asserts the State's title to the water within the banks of nonnavigable streams and its title to the waters of navigable streams subject to the paramount rights of commerce; declares the Government's interest in water power because of its ownership of the adjacent lands to be merely incidental; urges the Government to turn over to the water-power sites such unappropriated public lands as are needed for water-power development under terms that will guard against monopoly and speculation; and invites 10 other States to join in electing five delegates, each to attend a conference to be held in Portland next summer or fall to define more definitely the legislation that will be acceptable to the West.

ACTION WHOLLY LEGISLATIVE.

Had it not been for one feature of the resolution it would have received a unanimous vote. At least Minority Leader Kellaher declared that his entire faction would vote for it if selection of delegates were given over to the governor instead of to the legislature. Minority Leader Kellaher was emphatically resentful of what he took to be a slap at Gov. Withycombe.

The explanation given of this feature of the bill, as given by Senators Day and Thompson, was that the issue was wholly a legislative one and should be handled throughout by the legislatures. Senator Thompson pointed out that governors often were susceptible to pleas for appointment as delegates, with the result that reclamation representatives and others who had some interest in the proceedings had obtained seats in conferences previously called to attain worthy ends. As a result, the declarations or resolutions of such conferences had not been looked upon as authoritative.

KELLAHER'S MEMORIAL DOWNED.

The formal procedure consisted of defeating the original Kellaher memorial praying Congress to pass the Ferris bill as it had been adopted by the House. The substitute resolution was thereupon taken up under suspension of the rules and adopted.

Perhaps the leading address on the resolution was delivered by Senator Thompson, who called Senator Farrell to the chair that he might speak from the floor. Senator Thompson warmly defended the resolution as not in any way discrediting Secretary Franklin K. Lane. Senator Thompson asserted his belief in Secretary Lane's friendship for the West, but declared him hampered by the influence and power of a combined East. He thought Secretary Lane would be the happiest man in the world if the Western States would unite to make plain the fact that they wanted no more Pinchotism.

MONOPOLY HERE IMPOSSIBLE.

Senator Thompson also pointed out that under the provisions of the Oregon water code and those of the Oregon public-utilities law, monopoly of Oregon water power was impossible; there was no need for Congress to withdraw water-power sites. Senator Butler characterized the Ferris bill as the most deadly blow ever struck at Oregon, and eloquently insisted that the State hold and maintain its water rights. The resolution asked only for a square deal in the eyes of Senator Moser, who referred to the resolution as urging a policy opposite from that of giving money paid for Oregon's good land to the development of reclamation projects in other States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to assure all Senators that if the leasing bill now on the calendar, or any other leasing bill, is proposed as an amendment to the Agricultural bill, I shall feel it my duty to interpose the point of order. This has been a most illuminating discussion, and I entreat Senators now to allow us to proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bill.

The reading of the bill was continued. The next amendment was, under the head of "Bureau of Chemistry," on page 43, line 12, after "$2,500," to strike out "one food and drug inspector" and insert "two food and drug inspectors, at"; in line 13, after "$2,250," to insert "each"; and in line 17, before the word "food," to strike out "four" and insert "two," so as to read:

Salaries, Bureau of Chemistry: One chemist, who shall be chief of bureau, $5,000; 1 chief clerk, $2,500; 3 executive clerks, at $2,000 each; 8 clerks, class 4; 11 clerks, class 3; 1 clerk, $1,440; 12 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, $1,300; 20 clerks, class 1; 13 clerks, at $1,020 each; 13 clerks, at $1,000 each; 1 clerk, $960; 25 clerks, at $900 each; 1 clerk, $840; one food and drug inspector, $2,500; two food and drug inspectors, at $2,250 each; 13 food and drug inspectors, at $2,000 each; 13 food and drug inspectors, at $1,800 each; 1 food and drug inspector, $1,620; 11 food and drug inspectors, at $1,600 each; 2 food and drug inspectors, at $1,400 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for "salaries, Bureau of Chemistry," on page 44, line 8, after the words "in all," to strike out "$291,540" and insert "$290,990."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 6, after the word "industry," to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$49,400," so as to make the clause read:

For investigating the preparation for market, handling, grading, packing, freezing, drying, storing, transportation, and preservation of poultry and eggs, and for experimental shipments of poultry and eggs within the United States, in cooperation with the Office of Markets and Rural Organization and the Bureau of Animal Industry, $49,400;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 19, to insert:

For investigating and testing the chemical and physical properties of leather and tanning materials, and for the study of tanning processes and the utilization of tannery by-products, $8,000;

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if I remember correctly this same item was presented to the Committee on Appropriations at the time they had under consideration the sundry civil bill. I have just sent for a copy of the bill as it was printed for the use of the subcommittee to find out whether I am correct or not, but I feel positive that I am. The Committee on Appropriations had a hearing on this matter, the subcommittee as well as the full committee, and it was decided not to include in that bill this item for investigating and testing the chemical and physical properties of leather and tanning materials, and for the study of tanning processes, and the utilization of tannery by-products. I ask the Senator having the bill in charge what immediate necessity there is for this appropriation and why it was put in the Agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will say that this work has been conducted for some time by the department. The appropriation has been carried in a different item. This is merely to transfer it. I have here a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture concerning this item if the Senator would care to hear it read.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like the Senator to have the letter read, because I do believe the time will come when we must have some kind of a system established in relation to our appropriation bills. If a department goes to one committee and fails to have an item adopted it should not go to another committee and have it adopted in an appropriation bill under the charge of that particular committee. If the Senator will have the letter read I shall be very glad.

Mr. GORE. I ask the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to read it.

Mr. FLETCHER. This is what the Secretary of Agriculture has to say on the subject:

This item was stricken out on the floor of the House on a point of order. While it is new language, the project is not a new one, and the amount involved, $8,000, is merely a transfer from the appropriation for agricultural investigations, page 42, lines 10 to 12, inclusive, which has been reduced accordingly, and under which the work has heretofore been done. The reason given by Representative PAGE, who made the point of order, was that this work should be done in the Bureau of Standards. Last year the work of testing contract supplies was transferred to the Bureau of Standards. It was understood at that time, however, that the Bureau of Chemistry should continue the constructive work of developing the methods of making leather on a small scale on the farm. Mr. Page undoubtedly had reference to the testing of contract supplies made of leather goods. The work of the Bureau of Chemistry relates to agricultural industry in that it is developing methods by which the farmer can make small quantities of leather and includes also the utilization of products from the farm in tanning. No testing of contract supplies is contemplated under this item, and accordingly there will be no actual conflict between the work of the two bureaus. In the event the committee decides not to adopt the recommendation, it is urgently recommended that the sum involved, $8,000, be restored to the item for agricultural investigations, page 42, lines 10 to 12, inclusive.

It would seem that it does not add anything to the appropriation carried in the bill, but it provides simply another feature for investigating these tanning products, which it seems to me would prove to be quite a good deal of benefit perhaps to farmers and the people who have the products out of which tanning may be made. I know in my own State one source of that supply is what is known as scrub palmetto, which is said to make very excellent tanning material. I merely mention that, I do not know that it has any connection here, at least I do not know that the department proposes to investigate it down there at all. These various products it seems to me might be available if some investigations of this kind were made for the purpose of developing that industry.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Bureau of Standards desires an appropriation for this same purpose, and after listening to

all they had to say, the Committee on Appropriations of the House refused to appropriate the amount for this specific purpose. They came before the Cmmittee on Appropriations of the Senate, and after listening to all that was said in relation to the needs for it, the committee decided that this item should not be put in the bill. Now we find it in the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I would much prefer to have the bill read as it was before. If you want to transfer this item to the item suggested by the Department of Agriculture, let us do so, if it is necessary; but let us not in this bill undertake to enumerate everything that is to be accomplished under the lump-sum appropriation referred to by the Secretary of Agriculture. Whenever it is started, Mr. President, and it becomes an item of itself I notice that it never gets out of the appropriation bill. That is why this item is taken out of the lump sum and put into a particular item by itself.

Mr. President, this year it will be $8,000. Next year the item will be reported and increased perhaps to $10,000, and the next year to $15,000, and the next year to $20,000. I only say this because that is the usual policy followed. That has been the result in the past when items of this kind are mentioned in a paragraph by themselves for some particular purpose.

I will ask the Senator having the bill in charge if he is not satisfied to return to page 42 and increase the lump sum there $8,000 and allow this item to go out.

Mr. GORE. I may say that the Secretary suggested that it would be better to state explicitly the purpose for which the appropriation was made. I think there are some good arguments in favor of that course; but, on the other hand, I appreciate the force of the suggestion on the part of the Senator from Utah that when one of these investigations starts it never stops. There seems to be no subject investigated where any department is ever able to find out everything, and they go on forever. I have no serious objection to the transfer, and I will agree to it to facilitate the passage of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. The designation is wrong in the letter as applied to the bill as it is before us, but wherever the lump sum is stated in the bill, let it be increased $8,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. The letter, I think, refers to the bill as it came from the House.

Mr. SMOOT. I noticed that in looking at the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. It can be inserted at the proper place where it belongs.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent that the insertion may be made at the proper place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be disagreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. And then added to the lump sum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerks in making up the totals will be instructed to add $8,000 to the lump sum at the proper place.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 1, after the words "general expenses," to strike out "$139,680" and insert "$149,080."

Mr. SMOOT. Of course the total will be changed now, taking $8,000 out of the amount.

Mr. GORE. I should like at this place to ask unanimous consent to have the total changed to conform to the amendment made.

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

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 19, after the word "Chemistry," to strike out "$1,066,381" and insert "$1,075,231," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Chemistry, $1,075,231.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Bureau of Entomology," on page 50, line 9, before the word "charwomen," to strike out "two" and insert "three," and in the same line, after the words "in all," to strike out "$69,050" and insert "$69,530," so as to make the clause read:

Salaries, Bureau of Entomology: One entomologist, who shall be chief of bureau, $4,500; 1 chief clerk and executive assistant, $2,250; 1 financial clerk, $1,800; 3 clerks, class 4; 3 clerks, class 3; 9 clerks, class 2; 7 clerks, class 1; 7 clerks, at $1,000 each; 2 clerks, at $900 each; 2 entomological draftsmen, at $1,400 each; 1 entomological draftsman, $1,080; 4 foremen, at $1,080 each; 2 entomological preparators, at $840 each; 1 entomological preparator, $720; 6 entomological preparators, at $600 each; 1 messenger, $840; 2 messengers or laborers, at $720 each; 4 messenger boys, at $360 each; 1 mechanic, $840; 1 laborer, $540; 3 charwomen, at $480 each; 1 charwoman, $240; in all, $69,530.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 13, after the word "Entomology," to strike out "$829,420" and insert "$829,900," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Entomology, $829,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 6, to insert:

For the improvement of the game preserve in Sullys Hill National Park, in the State of North Dakota, including the construction of all fences, sheds, buildings, corrals, roads, and other structures which may be necessary, in addition to the amount heretofore appropriated, $10,000, the same to be available until expended.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota if this same item which was appropriated a year ago was retained in the bill, or was it lost in conference?

Mr. WARREN. I do not see the Senator from North Dakota present, but I will state that it was lost in conference except a small amount.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 16, after the word "wolves," to insert "coyotes," and in line 19, after the word "marten," to strike out "$110,000" and insert "$300,000," so as to read:

For investigating the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including experiments and demonstrations in destroying wolves, coyotes, prairie dogs, and other animals injurious to agriculture and animal husbandry, and for investigations and experiments in connection with rearing of fur-bearing animals, including mink and marten, $300,000.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I feel obliged to object to that item.

Mr. GORE. I will ask to have the item passed over, if that course is agreeable to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is agreeable to me.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator wish to occupy any time on it?

Mr. THOMPSON. A few moments.

Mr. WARREN. I will ask the chairman if it is his wish that it shall go over. Of course, it might as well be settled now as at any time, perhaps. I make no objection if the chairman wishes to have it go over.

Mr. GORE. I fear that the debate might run on and oblige us to stop the consideration of unobjected amendments, and I would not like to have that situation arise at this juncture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to having the amendment passed over?

Mr. GORE. I should like to insert a comma after the word "animals."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. We are not agreeing to the appropriation of $300,000?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; simply the insertion of a comma. The Senator from Oklahoma, the Chair understands, requests that the amendment be passed over.

Mr. GORE. Yes; for fear that the discussion may develop the want of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and the amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 17, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$236,820" and insert "$436,820."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 18, after the words "Biological Survey," to strike out "$271,290" and insert "$471,290," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Biological Survey, $471,290.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Division of Publications," in the item of appropriation for salaries, Division of Publications, on page 57, line 2, after the word "each," to insert "one chief folder, $1,200," and in line 10, before the word "four," to strike out "two laborers, at $600 each," so as to read:

Four skilled laborers, at $780 each; 1 chief folder, $1,200; 16 skilled laborers, at $720 each; 1 folder, $1,000; 2 folders, at $900 each; 2 skilled laborers, at $1,100 each; 1 skilled laborer, $1,000; 2 messengers, at $840 each; 2 messengers, at $720 each; 3 messengers or messenger boys, at $600 each; 2 messengers or messenger boys, at $480 each; 2 messengers or messenger boys, at $420 each; 2 messengers or messenger boys, at $360 each; 1 laborer, $840; 4 charwomen, at $480 each; 3 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $174,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Library, Department of Agriculture," on page 59, line 26, after the word

"expenses," to strike out "$17,500," and insert "$16,300," so as to read:

General expenses, library: For books of reference, technical and scientific books, papers and periodicals, and for expenses incurred in completing imperfect series; for the employment of additional assistants in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for official traveling expenses, and for library fixtures, library cards, supplies, and for all other necessary expenses, $16,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 4, after the word "Library," to strike out "$47,220," and insert "$46,020"; so as to make the clause read:

Total for library, $46,020.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Miscellaneous expenses," on page 60, line 21, after "$115,000," to insert "of which sum $5,000 shall be immediately available," so as to make the clause read:

Miscellaneous expenses, Department of Agriculture: For stationery, blank books, twine, paper, gum, dry goods, soap, brushes, brooms, mats, oils, paints, glass, lumber, hardware, ice, fuel, water and gas pipes, heating apparatus, furniture, carpets, and matting; for lights, freight, express charges, advertising, telegraphing, telephoning, postage, washing towels, and necessary repairs and improvements to buildings, grounds, and heating apparatus; for the purchase, subsistence, and care of horses and the purchase and repair of harness and vehicles, for official purposes only; for the payment of duties on imported articles, and the Department of Agriculture's proportionate share of the expense of the dispatch agent in New York; for official traveling expenses; and for other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for, and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the department, $115,000, of which sum $5,000 shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma, in charge of the bill, why the large amount of rent for buildings for the Department of Agriculture forms an item in this bill? A few years ago the Agricultural Department was confined to the old building. We then gave $1,000,000 to erect a new building. At that time they said that the new building would house everything that they had, and that they could dispose of the old building—could tear it down, because it was not very pretty and was in the Mall. Now they have both buildings; and I see here is a charge of $125,000 per year for rent. Will the Senator from Oklahoma tell me what it is for, and why it should be?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that this amount is the amount estimated by the department. I think they are just preparing to occupy one or two new buildings. Of course it is due to the expansion of the service in the Agricultural Department. I can not give any of the details in regard to the amount of space used.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What branches of the department are renting?

Mr. GORE. I think quite nearly all of them are. We made an effort at the last session, when the last appropriation bill was passed, to provide long-term leases, so as to reduce the rents, but it failed to meet the approval of the Senate and went out.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I want to say this: The departments in this city are coming to us all the time to erect new buildings of a very fine character, architecturally ornate and impressive, but I do not find that they reduce their rental charges one particle when we construct such buildings.

The Department of Justice wants a building just now; the Department of State wants a building; the Department of Agriculture, before I left the other House, wanted this building. We gave them a million dollars; they have had the building quite a long while; and, as well as I can gather, they have not reduced their rental charges from what they were when they had only the old building.

I introduced a resolution of inquiry quite early in my term in the Senate—and I shall renew it at the beginning of the next session—to have the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds make an inquiry to discover how many of the departments are renting property in the District of Columbia, why they are renting it, who made the contracts; that is, what particular blood-and-flesh man, representing a department, actually negotiated the lease—not what departments made them, not what division or bureau made them, but what particular person made them—and why it is that the Government rentals are so high in this District, and whether or not those renting precisely the same sort of property to private individuals get less rent than when such property is rented to the Government. I understand that several divisions of the Agricultural Department are in rented buildings.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I can now furnish a detailed statement of the rent roll for the current year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

Mr. GORE. The appropriations for the fiscal year is a lump-sum appropriation. I send it to the desk, and ask to have the Secretary read it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will yield to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFIFCER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

RENT OF BUILDINGS, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

For rent of buildings and parts of buildings in the District of Columbia for use of the various bureaus, divisions, and offices of the Department of Agriculture, namely:
For Bureau of Animal Industry, $2,220;
For Bureau of Plant Industry, $26,420;
For Forest Service, $25,075;
For Bureau of Chemistry, $17,320;
For Bureau of Soils, $306;
For Divison of Publications, $5,000;
For Office of Solicitor, $2,160;
For Office of Experiment Stations, $5,000;
For Office of Public Roads, $3,500;
For additional rent in cases of emergency for any bureau, division, or office of the department, $21,328;
In all, $108,329.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this is a singular illustration of just what I was talking about. Not only is the Department of Agriculture renting buildings all over the District of Columbia, but all the various divisions of the Department of Agriculture are partially renting. They could not even put the Division of Animal Industry all in the public agricultural buildings which the Government owns; they could not even put all of the Plant Industry Division there; they could not even put all of the Forest Service there—in fact, I believe all of the Forest Service is outside of it; they could not put all of the Bureau of Chemistry there; they could not even put all of the Bureau of Soils there; they could not even house the Division of Publications there. They have got also to rent a special office for the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture. They could not even put all of the Experiment Station Office there; they could not even put all of the rooms for the Office of Public Roads there.

You would think that, if the department wanted to rent outside, they would rent some building for some special division instead of renting a part of 10 buildings for parts of 10 divisions.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator state the amount of rental that the office of solicitor calls for?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The rental for the office of solicitor is $2,160.

Mr. GALLINGER. It strikes me that that is an illustration of the fact that they are paying excessive rentals. The idea that a single office of a single individual should require $2,160 rental a year is preposterous.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think my colleagues here on both sides of the Chamber will bear me out in the claim I make that I am one of the least muckraking of all men in my disposition or in my temperament, but I am tired of this. I do not know how true it may be; I do not know whether or not it is true, but a friend of mine in the city of Washington, who did not want her name mentioned in connection with the matter, one day asked me, "Do you know what the Government is paying for this little property here?" I said, "No; I do not." She told me, and she said, "Right next door to it"—it was about where Gude's florist establishment was at that time, I believe—"private individuals are renting room almost just like it for one-fourth the amount of money." I do not know whether she was correctly informed or not, and I could not use her name, because what she was stating to me was upon information and not based on personal knowledge. In my private opinion there is a great deal of graft in this, and, as I suspect and fear, some "rake-off" to somebody representing the Government as actual negotiating agent. I do not mean in regard to these particular items; I do not know about them, but in my private opinion a great deal of this renting business is utterly useless. It reminds me of a man with five rooms to his house building four more rooms, and then finding after he is through that he has not any more room than he had before he built the four additional rooms. That frequently happens with a bad manager—when the woman of the household does not know how to manage things.

We have these two great wings there of the Agricultural Department Building, to be connected some of these days in the remote future by an ornamental passageway over the street, and perhaps with offices above the passageway; and we were assured, when the Agricultural Committee reported the appropriation to erect the building favorably to the House—and I was then the senior Democratic member of the Agricultural Committee in the House and Mr. Wadsworth, of New York, was chairman of that committee—we were assured at that time that not only would the new building accommodate the Department of Agriculture, but that it would enable us to remove from the Mall the old building, which is an eyesore, and which is not, architecturally speaking, a part of the general plan of the Mall at all, but is a disfigurement. Now, it turns out that here are ten different divisions of the Department of Agriculture renting all over this town.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to suggest to the Senator that there is now about to be torn down a splendid building adjoining the Capitol Grounds, called the Maltby Building——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was just going to come to that.

Mr. SHAFROTH (continuing). Belonging to the Government; and also a row of houses are to be torn down that could accommodate pretty nearly any department of the Government. It is of no use to tear them down; they are part of a park scheme; but they do not fit in with the park scheme.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was going to come to that after a bit.

Now, I hope that when the next session of Congress begins other Senators will aid me in probing this matter to the bottom. I do not refer especially to the Department of Agriculture; I have no reason to suspect anything particularly in connection with that department or with any other department; I have no information on which to base a charge of any sort; but it smells bad, it looks bad, it feels bad; and it seems to me that there is graft and perhaps "rake-off" in it somewhere along the line. I have been noticing for years that no matter what we build it seems to be to somebody's interest to see to it that the landlords of Washington rent the usual amount of property to the United States Government, and at very stiff prices, as this one item mentioned by the Senator from New Hampshire shows.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] said some time ago, Congress—I do not know just when; I do not remember now, but it was while I was in the House—passed a bill to condemn parts of 12 squares in the neighborhood of the Capitol. The part west of New Jersey Avenue they seem not to have condemned thus far. There was a provision in the bill, I think, to the effect that not over $500,000 should be expended in any one year in condemnation proceedings. They seem, therefore, thus far not to have condemned west of New Jersey Avenue, because I noticed lights shining in all the houses there to-night, showing occupancy. West of that avenue is the Maltby Building, upon the corner, and all those other buildings which now belong, or which will belong when condemned under the law, to the United States Government. Why can we not stop the condemnation right at New Jersey Avenue?

When the matter came up in the House it was then my function to object to unanimous consent for things, being minority floor leader. It was brought to me, and I said, "I am perfectly willing to have a vista between the new Union Railway Station and the Capitol. When visitors and tourists come to Washington I should like them from the station to see the Senate Office Building, the Capitol, and all that; but all you need in the world, instead of 12 squares, is the property between the Senate Office Building and the Union Station and the square just west of that;" and I thought it was arranged in that way. Somebody came to me and said, "The matter has been fixed the way you want it," and I did not know until I came to the Senate of the United States that these 12 squares had been condemned and put under an everlasting commission, which may never expire until the sun itself ceases to give light to the earth.

Why can we not in some way stop that, and why can not the Agricultural Department locate its force on that side of New Jersey Avenue, in the Maltby and the other buildings, if we do proceed with the condemnation and if the Government does buy that square? Why should we tear down the Maltby Building? Why should we tear down all these other buildings, when not only the Department of Agriculture but every other department is renting outside buildings somewhere?

Senators need not fool themselves. Instead of housing the State, War, and Navy Departments in one great building, if we were to construct a new building for the State Department, we would find it still renting. If you construct a great building for the Department of Justice, you will find it still renting. Somehow or other—I do not know why, but somehow or other—you can not unclasp the tentacles of the landlord interests here off of the Federal Government.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. I want to say to the Senator from Mississippi that there was not an appropriation of a half million dollars this year. A large appropriation was made two years ago to cover the entire balance of condemnation amounts. The law provided, if I remember correctly, that connected with this improvement there should be an avenue starting at the Peace Monument and ending on the axis in the center of the Union Station.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator mentioned that; that is one thing which I forgot. If there is anything in the world that ought not to be done, that is the thing. Do you know, if they run that avenue from the Union Station down to the Peace Monument, what it is going to do? It is going cut off a corner of the historic old Capitol Park Grounds close to the little grotto. It will cut off a corner there, and why? Just because somebody wants to draw a straight line, when it will be just as easy to skip it, and to leave the trees that were planted there in Jefferson's administration with the beautiful idea that there should be in the Capitol Grounds a representative of every sort of tree that was native to America that would grow in the grounds. There is the old spring, that was there before the Capitol was built, in that little grotto. How close the avenue will come to that I do not know.

Mr. WARREN. Not near it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But it will cut off the corner just to the north of it or to the northwest of it. That is my information.

Mr. WARREN. It will take a trifle off the grounds to the northwest, I will say to the Senator, but not to the north.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is what I meant. It will take off that corner; and there is no reason why it should, and there is no reason under the sun why the Capitol Grounds, which are already so large that it takes the police force of an average city, in numbers at any rate, to take care of them, should be extended except for the purpose of opening a vista between the Union Station and the Capitol itself.

Mr. WARREN. Well, Mr. President, I did not rise to take issue at all with the Senator with regard to what has been done. We have followed the law. We appropriated $500,000 each year for several years, and then appropriated for the remainder a lump sum, to acquire all the land which I understood it was intended to acquire.

Now, as to the Maltby Building, I think I was a Member of the Senate when it was purchased. It was purchased at a small figure, because at the time there was a rumor that it could not be rented for an apartment house because it was considered unsafe. However, we took the chances on that. Later on it was, if not officially condemned, at least condemned in the minds of a great many people, and I recall a great many fervid speeches made by Senators upon the other side of the Chamber—the Democratic side—in favor of constructing the great, extravagant, but elegant and satisfactory, building which we are now occupying as the Senate Office Building, because the Maltby Building was unsafe, and it was said that we had no right to keep Senators in an unsafe building. I myself occupied committee rooms on the third or fourth floor of the Maltby Building for several years and without fear, but some Senators seemed worried.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, unfortunately I too remember all that.

Mr. WARREN. Well, I thought that ought to go into the RECORD with the statement of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and we will put a little bit more into the RECORD. About that time the House constructed the House Office Building at a cost, I believe, of $3,800,000—I have forgotten the exact amount now.

They could have given each Member of Congress at that time, and his successors in perpetuity, a $10,000 home in Washington for the same amount. After they got the Office Building built it never did any particular good, but the chief effect of it was that it took twice as long to get a quorum into the House as it had taken previously to that time. Then the Senate said to itself: "Well, if the House is going to 'swell' like that, we want to swell a little, too; so we will spend $2,500,000," I believe it was, "to furnish offices for 96 men." You proceeded to do it; and in order to get popular approval—misled, perhaps, by experts; I do not know; men generally are—men did stand upon this floor and say that the Maltby Building was "unsafe"; it was "apt to fall down" overnight, as the Germans say. Why, from what they said, a man who went down there and dic-

tated a letter ought to have gotten extra life insurance. And with all that this Senate got an excuse to build the Senate Office Building, costing two million and a half dollars, for offices for 96 men.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think it cost nearer $4,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Was it $4,000,000?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I think the original appropriation was two and a half million dollars.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Like most original appropriations, then, it grew by what it fed upon, to wit, itself.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if the site did not cost two or three or four times as much as the estimate that was furnished upon which those figures were based when we made the appropriation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. However that may be, if they had confined the cost to the original estimate it would have been a very expensive piece of luxury for 96 men; but the excuse was that those Senators who had no offices in the Capitol and were in the Maltby Building were daily threatened with life extinction; and you built the Senate Office Building, and now we have so many offices that some Senators have five offices. I believe one committee has seven rooms for offices. The excuse, at any rate, was that the Maltby Building was about to fall down; and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], who has been down there recently and inspected it, informs me that even now there is not a crack in it that he can discover from the basement to the roof. Is that correct?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state that I went all around the building, and I could not find a crack in the rear walls which would show whether or not there was a settling of the foundation, and nothing in the nature of a crack, except under sills or something of that sort, of minor importance, that is found on every building.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. If any Senator desires to offer an amendment to abolish the House and Senate Office Buildings, I will accept it. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, under the head of "States Relations Service," at the top of page 66, to insert:

> That hereafter there be prepared by the Department of Agriculture an annual report on the work and expenditures of the agricultural experiment stations established under the act of Congress of March 2, 1887 (24 Stat. L., 440), on the work and expenditures of the Department of Agriculture in connection therewith, and on the cooperative agricultural extension work and expenditures of the Department of Agriculture and of agricultural colleges under the act of May 8, 1914, entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture"; and that there be printed annually 8,000 copies of said report, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 copies for the use of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I make the point of order against that amendment beginning in line 16, after the word "Agriculture," as follows—

> and that there be printed annually 8,000 copies of said report, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 copies for the use of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, that would conflict with the present law, the printing law, and it is clearly subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether this is a new item of appropriation or contrary to any existing law?

Mr. SMOOT. It went out in the House on a point of order. I do not want to make a point of order against the whole amendment, but I do make the point of order against the latter part.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator desires to divide this amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the part of the amendment on page 66 to line 16 will be agreed to. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Utah what good this report will be if it is not printed?

Mr. SMOOT. It will be then in just exactly the same position as any other report. Under the printing law a certain number of copies of it will be printed; but this provision will not only interfere with our Rule XXIX, paragraph 2, but it will also interfere with the laws providing for the printing of public documents and reports. Therefore I make the point of order against the latter part of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that this is not general legislation. Does the Senator from Utah make the point of order that it is general legislation?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I make the point of order that it is changing existing law.

Mr. GALLINGER. That point will not hold on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that under Rule XVI general legislation is not in order on an appropriation bill; but this is not general legislation, as the Chair understands. It is confined simply to the publication of one document.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, Mr. President; but the present law provides that a certain number of all of these documents shall be printed. Let me call attention also to Rule XXIX of the standing rules of the Senate, paragraph 2:

> Motions to print additional numbers shall also be referred to the Committee on Printing; and when the committee shall report favorably the report shall be accompanied by an estimate of the probable cost thereof; and when the cost of printing such additional numbers shall exceed the sum of $500 the concurrence of the House of Representatives shall be necessary for an order to print the same.

Under the provisions of this law this could amount to more than $500. Under the standing rules of this body if it did, it would have to receive the sanction of the House of Representatives, and therefore would have to be referred to that body. This same point was raised and sustained in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. I think possibly the Senator from Utah is under an erroneous impression in regard to this act. The act of April 27, 1904, provides for the publication of the reports of the Office of Agricultural Experiment Stations. The Agricultural bill last year authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to report a plan for the reorganization of the department. The House bill adopted the plan of reorganization proposed by the department under that reorganization. Under the plan of reorganization the name of the Office of Experiment Stations has been changed to the Office of State Relations; and there is a question as to whether or not this publication, already provided for by the act of April 27, 1904, could be done under the changed name of the office. It is to meet that situation that this amendment is proposed. It is not to provide for a new printing, as I understand, but to continue printing heretofore authorized and, I think, perhaps required by law.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course it is not only changing the law providing that a certain number of copies shall be printed, as all other reports are provided for, but this provision states that "there shall be printed annually 8,000 copies of said report." I want to say to the Senator that there is no report of which that number of copies are allowed to be printed under the present printing law. This changes that law, and it is also in violation of paragraph 2 of Rule XXIX.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to have read the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture in relation to this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, let me make a suggestion. It seems to me that these reports ought to be printed, and we ought to authorize them. It is not a question of the Senate merely doing it by an amendment of this kind. Of course this goes into the law, and Congress certainly has the right to authorize the printing of these reports. The law as it exists authorizes printing them as reports from experiment stations. Here we are considering the question of the States Relations Service reports, and it seems to me there ought to be some authority to print those reports. If the Senator makes the point of order against this item, there is no authority left to print these reports at all.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator certainly misunderstood me if he thinks that is the case, or else I did not explain myself clearly. The present law provides that a certain number of copies of the report of the department shall be printed; but the department is not satisfied with the regular number, but wants now 8,000 copies of it.

Mr. FLETCHER. In addition to the regular number? I think the Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. SMOOT. No; it does not say in addition to the regular number, nor do I think that it is in addition to the regular number, but it is 8,000 copies to take the place of the regular number.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to submit just one observation. The Senator from Utah says this item went out on a point of order in the House of Representatives. The Senator occupying the chair [Mr. SWANSON in the chair] knows that the rule in the House is very different from the rule in this body, and that a change of law is subject to a point of order in the House of Representatives. It is not in this body at all. I will further submit the suggestion that whatever the law may be regarding the printing of reports the Senate surely must have the power to provide for printing a larger number if it sees fit to do so.

I do not know whether this is wise or not; but to say that the Senate can not in its discretion and its wisdom provide for printing a larger number than is provided for in the case of ordinary documents strikes me as being rather remarkable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is satisfied——

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, just a word.

Mr. GORE. I send to the desk the letter of the Secretary, which I should like to have read.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. I think the Senator from Utah should forego making the point of order on this amendment. This is a provision to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to print a report to show to the Senate and to the House of Representatives how successful the department has been in teaching the farmer how to farm.

I think the Senate will remember that when this law was passed about a year ago I called their attention to the fact that what the farmer needed more than anything else was a market. While I made no particular objection to an appropriation of money to assist the farmer or to teach the farmer how to farm, I insisted that there was a greater demand to help him to be able to distribute his products. We of the North do not happen to suffer this year, because we have produced an abundance of products that the world needs. You people of the South have produced so much cotton that you are unable to sell it. Consequently the price has declined, and the farmers of the South are suffering from it.

No business man, no matter whether he is engaged in manufacturing or in any other business, is going to produce so much or to throw so much of his product on the market that it will depress prices; but it is different with the farmer. I am simply taking the time of the Senate for just a moment to call attention to what I said when this law was enacted a year or two ago. The appropriation has not benefited the American farmer. It has not benefited the people of the South. It has not benefited the people of the North. I might just as well take the time of the Senate now to call attention to the fact that what we are in need of more than anything else is a system of marketing, or a system of distribution.

With the permission of the Senate, I wish to read a short article published in one of my home papers, the Walhalla Mountaineer. It is an article written by Peter Radford. Mr. Radford is the lecturer of the Farmers' National Union.

MARKETING WORLD'S GREATEST PROBLEM—WE ARE LONG ON PRODUCTION, SHORT ON DISTRIBUTION.

[By Peter Radford, lecturer National Farmers' Union.]

The economic distribution of farm products is to-day the world's greatest problem, and the war, while it has brought its hardships, has clearly emphasized the importance of distribution as a factor in American agriculture and promises to give the farmers the cooperation of the Government and the business men the solution of their marketing problem.

This result will, in a measure, compensate us for our war losses, for the business interests and Government have been in the main assisting almost exclusively on the production side of agriculture. While the Department of Agriculture has been dumping tons of literature on the farmer telling him how to produce, the farmer has been dumping tons of products in the Nation's garbage can for want of a market.

While that does not apply to the farmers this year, it did apply last year, and it will apply again just as soon as peace is established in Europe.

THE WORLD WILL NEVER STARVE.

At no time since Adam and Eve were driven from the Garden of Eden have the inhabitants of this world suffered from lack of production, but some people have gone hungry from the day of creation to this good hour for the lack of proper distribution. Slight variations in production have forced a change in diet, and one locality has felt the pinch of want while another surfeited, but the world as a whole has ever been a land of plenty.

We now have less than one-tenth of the tillable land of the earth's surface under cultivation, and we not only have this surplus area to draw on, but it is safe to estimate that in case of dire necessity one-half the earth's population could at the present time knock their living out of the trees of the forest, gather it from wild vines, and draw it from streams. No one should become alarmed; the world will never starve.

The consumer has always feared that the producer would not supply him, and his fright has found expression on the statute books of our States and nations, and the farmer has been urged to produce recklessly and without reference to a market and regardless of the demands of the consumer.

BACK TO THE SOIL.

The city people have been urging each other to move back to the farm, but very few of them have moved. We welcome our city cousins back to the soil; and this earth's surface contains 16,092,160,000 idle acres of tillable land where they can make a living by tickling the earth with a forked stick; but we do not need them, so far as increasing production is concerned; we now have all the producers we can use. The city man has very erroneous ideas of agricultural conditions. The commonly accepted theory that we are short on production is all wrong. Our annual increase in production far exceeds that of our increase in population.

THE WORLD AS A FARM.

Taking the world as one big farm, we find 2,000,000,000 acres of land in cultivation. Of this amount there is approximately 750,000,000 acres on the western and 1,260,000,000 acres on the eastern hemisphere in cultivation. This estimate of course does not include grazing lands, forests, etc., where large quantities of meat are produced.

The world's annual crop approximates 15,000,0000,000 bushels of cereals, 13,000,000,000 pounds of fiber, and 65,000,000 tons of meat.

The average annual world crop for the past five years, compared with the previous five years, is as follows:

Past half decade.

Crops:		
Corn	bushels	3,934,174,000
Wheat	do	3,522,769,000
Oats	do	4,120,017,000
Cotton	bales	19,863,800

Previous half decade.

Crops:		
Corn	bushels	3,403,655,000
Wheat	do	3,257,526,000
Oats	do	3,508,315,000
Cotton	bales	17,541,200

The world shows an average increase in cereal production of 13 per cent during the past decade, compared with the previous five years, while the world's population shows an increase of only 3 per cent.

The gain in production far exceeds that of our increase in population, and it is safe to estimate that the farmer can easily increase production 25 per cent if a remunerative market can be found for the products. In textile fibers the world shows an increase during the past half decade in production of 15 per cent, against a population increase of 3 per cent.

The people of this Nation should address themselves to the subject of improved facilities for distribution.

During the reading of the article,

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator need not do that. I will be through in a minute, and the Senator can not take me off my feet.

Mr. JAMES. I did not mean to take the Senator off his feet. I merely intended to make a point of order that the point of order is not debatable; and, if it was, the Senator was not debating it. If he is going to get through soon, I will not insist upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order can not be debated under the rules of the Senate if it is insisted on.

Mr. JAMES. I will not insist upon the point of order.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understood that my colleague asked the Senator from Utah to withhold his point of order, in order that he might make his statement, and I understood that was assented to.

Mr. GRONNA. I did make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not understand the Senator from Utah to withhold his point of order.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from North Dakota will be through in a very few minutes.

Mr. JAMES. I say that I will not make the point of order as the Senator will be through in a moment. It is all right.

Mr. GRONNA. I am much obliged to the Senator from Kentucky.

After the reading of the article,

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to say I do not think that this provision is subject to the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is prepared to rule upon it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, will the Chair indulge me a moment before ruling?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I know how anxious the Chair is to rule, but I will guarantee not to take any time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hear the Senator from Connecticut. The Senator from Kentucky has made a point of order that it is not debatable.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I admit that it is not debatable, and I do not claim any right to proceed unless the Chair will say it is willing to hear discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is willing to hear the Senator from Connecticut, but the Chair has a definite conclusion on the subject.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have no doubt the Chair has made up his mind irrevocably.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to withdraw the point of order and let it go into conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Being somewhat of a mind reader, I had an intuition myself, but I renew the point of order, and I make it on the whole paragraph; not the point of order on which the Chair has ruled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first part of the amendment has already been agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Then I can not do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can not do that. Only the latter part has not been agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The point of order which the Senator from Utah made has been ruled upon by the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But the Chair had agreed to hear me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is willing to hear the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I simply want to say that clause 3 of Rule XVI provides that—

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I would not ask to be heard if I did not think this an important matter, because the Chair's ruling is liable to be cited as a precedent.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for a question.

Mr. GORE. I should like to have the letter of the Secretary read before the Senator proceeds.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am perfectly willing to have the letter read if the Chair will recognize me afterwards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize the Senator on the point of order. The letter will be read.

Mr. GORE. I think this discussion ought to proceed in the light of the letter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

This provision was eliminated on the floor of the House on a point of order. The act of April 27, 1904 (33 Stat., 590), authorizes the printing of the report of the Director of the Office of Experiment Stations on the work and expenditures of that office and of the agricultural experiment stations. This is a permanent provision of law. In the bill the Office of Experiment Stations is converted into the States Relations Service. In view of this change it is doubtful whether the latter will be authorized to prepare the report in question. The language suggested makes no change in the substance of the act of 1904 except that it requires that the report incorporate an account of the activities and disbursements under the Lever Extension Act. The alterations in phraseology, in all respects except as just noted, are merely adaptations of existing law to the new proposed form of organization of the office formerly called the Office of Experiment Stations. The Lever Extension Act directs the Secretary of Agriculture to report to Congress annually the receipts, expenditures, and results of the cooperative agricultural extension work conducted in the various States thereunder.

It should be noted that the general printing bill which has passed the House and is now pending in the Senate contains a provision authorizing the printing of the report required by the act of 1904. We have requested the chairman of the Senate Committee on Printing to substitute the language suggested above for that included in the printing bill. In view of the uncertainty, however, as to when that bill will become a law, it is desirable that the department should have authority to continue the preparation of the report and to include therein the activities and disbursements under the Lever Extension Act.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have no objection whatever to giving the department authority to continue the work or to make a proper report about its successes, but my point is as to the rule of the Senate, whether the legislation providing for this very commendable purpose can be put upon a general appropriation bill.

Mr. President, this bill proceeds to appropriate the sums named therein for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916. It is simply an appropriation bill appropriating money and defining the purposes for which it shall be used. This proposes to place on it as an amendment, on page 66, language in part as follows, "that hereafter," which contemplates the making of a law for all time, not for the fiscal year to which the bill applies itself, but "hereafter" there shall be "prepared by the Department of Agriculture an annual report," and it goes on specifying it, and the latter part of the amendment, after it was subdivided, provides "that there be printed annually" every year. This is simply an appropriation bill for this year.

Mr. President, if the language, on page 66, from line 1 to line 20, inclusive, is not general legislation, I do not know general legislation when I see it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. I do not know whether the Senator heard the statement which I previously made. The act of April 27, 1904, required this report to be prepared by the director of the experiment stations. The name of that office has been changed to the office of State relations, and that is the occasion for this amendment. It is that the report can be made in the name and by the authority of the new office under the name it now bears. I understand it is no alteration in the law of 1904, which designated the office as the Office of Experiment Stations.

Mr. FLETCHER. It does not increase the number now provided by law. It is the same number.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I have not based my point of order upon the fact that this changes existing law or is an increase in the number of employees or attempts to do anything different from the existing law. That is not a point of order in the Senate, as I understand it, but it would be a point of order under the House rules. My point of order is that this is general legislation on an appropriation bill; and it is not only general legislation, but it provides what shall be done each year annually after all the provisions of this bill have been complied with and the appropriation is expended. It is a clear case of legislation. If it is not legislation it is nothing. It is certainly general legislation. The fact that it pertains to this particular department does not make it less general legislation. The appropriation bill itself is legislation. It is not general legislation; it is a law appropriating money, and in that sense it is legislation. As I understand it, the intent of the Senate rule is that upon these legislative bills, designed simply to carry appropriations of money, there shall not be legislation of this character.

That is all I have to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the part that has been agreed to is general legislation. The latter part of the amendment is a provision to print a specific report. It does not contemplate changing any general printing law and it is an item that is recommended by a standing committee of the Senate. The Chair is of opinion that it is in order under the rules of the Senate, and overrules the point of order.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The fact that it was reported by a committee does not make it less liable to the objection that it is general legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of opinion that it is not general legislation. The Chair is of opinion also that it is a specific item reported, and it is in order under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not wish to do anything to impede the progress of this bill; far less to suggest any question about a quorum. If I appeal from the decision of the Chair and that appeal can lie, to be acted upon when there is a quorum here some time, I am perfectly willing that should be done, but I do not want to lose my right of appeal simply out of my desire to have progress made upon the bill.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon the appeal. Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. JAMES. The appeal could be submitted without a yea and nay vote.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I would have to ask for the yeas and nays. I do not do this in any captious spirit, and I do not want to break up the meeting. I understand that certain provisions of the bill have gone over until to-morrow anyway.

Mr. GORE. I will state that no item has gone over until to-morrow. One or two have been passed over. I ask the Senator if he would object to the passing over this for the present.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I did not understand the last request.

Mr. GORE. I ask the Senator if he would object to the passing over of this amendment for the present.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Except we could not have the yeas and nays, I assume, without disclosing the lack of a quorum. Otherwise, I would have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator demand the yeas and nays?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should have to do so. I do not make that demand now, unless it is necessary to protect myself.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the Senator if he would not be willing to let it go over like several other propositions in the bill and let us go on with the bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have said I would desire to do that, but I was informed that it was objectionable.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not believe anybody would object to letting it go over the same as the other amendments went over.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is what the Senator from Oklahoma asked, that the Senator from Connecticut allow it to go over.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I would be delighted to have that course adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the matter going over? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, perhaps I can call attention now to a matter that I wanted to refer to on page 63, which was passed over. The reading was so rapid that it was passed before I knew it. However, I will wait until the bill is through, and then I will refer back to page 63.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering," on page 69, after line 12, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the existence of artesian water and other underground water supplies suitable for irrigation in the arid and semiarid regions by boring wells, $100,000.

Mr. NORRIS. I move to amend the committee amendment by inserting after the word "Agriculture," in line 13 the words "in conjunction with the Geological Survey," so that it will read:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in conjunction with the Geological Survey, to investigate—

And so forth.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I simply want to call attention to the fact that in the sundry civil appropriation bill there is a provision which reads as follows:

For gauging streams and determining the water supply of the United States, the investigation of underground currents and artesian wells, and the preparation of reports upon the best methods of utilizing the water resources, $150,000.

In other words, Mr. President, the sundry civil appropriation bill already contains an appropriation of $150,000 for this purpose along with some other purposes, and it is not limited to underground currents, but it also includes the gauging of streams and determining the water supply of the United States. While that includes some other matters, it includes the same purposes contained in the clause now under consideration.

So we find that this legislation is establishing in two separate departments the investigation of underground currents and artesian wells. The Agriculture Department is not equipped for such an investigation. The provisions in the sundry civil bill leaves this investigation to the Geological Survey, which is equipped for investigations of this sort and is now conducting such investigations.

It is true the Senator from Nebraska claims that the Geological Survey is not doing work in the arid regions, but in the sundry civil bill as it now stands, having passed really both Houses and will certainly become a law, there is an appropriation of $150,000 embracing this very purpose. So we have two departments of the Government, one equipped for this work and the other not equipped for it, both carrying on these investigations. It is a plain duplication of the work.

I think it is most unfortunate legislation. I can not conceive of any good to come from legislation of the kind. It seems to me if the $150,000 was not sufficient for this purpose, the amount ought to have been increased in the sundry civil appropriation bill and the proper department of the Government—the Geological Survey—required to expend the money in the arid region, if not expending it as it ought to do, proportionately in that region. I simply call attention to it. I think it is very bad legislation. It is practically a duplication of work and intrusting work to a department not equipped for executing it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator from Virginia, I move that the provision now under consideration in the Agricultural appropriation bill be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Colorado that this is an amendment proposed by the committee. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the question is——

Mr. THOMAS. If I can make a point of order against it I will do that.

Mr. NORRIS. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by me to the committee amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not want to make a point of order that will take the Senator off his feet.

Mr. NORRIS. In the first place, I do not believe it is subject to a point of order, but I want to be heard upon the proposition. Will the Senator from Virginia tell me the page upon which that particular item in the sundry civil bill was contained?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It was on page 101, I will say to the Senator. I will send the bill over to him, if he has not a copy of it before him.

Mr. NORRIS. What the Senator from Virginia has said is true. There may be an unfortunate condition here, and I have a great deal of sympathy with the desire of the Senator from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to have these various appropriations made in such way that they will not be conflicting. However, I think I shall be able to show that the conflict is more apparent than real. I would have no objection, as I said to the Senator from Virginia, who very kindly called my attention to this matter, it having been called to his attention by a letter from the Geological Survey, if the matter could have been put in the sundry civil bill in such a way that it would insure the investigation provided for in the pending bill. I do not believe, if the amendment I have offered be adopted, that there will be any conflict or any duplication or any lack of harmony in the work. Let me now read this item in the sundry civil bill to which the Senator from Virginia has called our attention. It reads as follows:

For gauging streams and determining the water supply of the United States, the investigation of underground currents and artesian wells, and the preparation of reports upon the best methods of utilizing the water resources, $150,000.

Mr. President, that is an item that has been in the sundry civil bill, I think, for a great many years. The amount appropriated is not the same, I think, but is increased a little this year. The Geological Survey have always complained that the amount appropriated in the item was not sufficient to do the work. They have never yet expended one penny, and do not intend to expend one penny, of that appropriation for the purposes named in this amendment in the Agricultural bill.

Mr. President, useful as it is, and important as it is, the particular item that we are invited to examine by the Senator from Virginia in practical effect has nothing whatever to do with irrigation or the development of irrigation in the arid or semiarid West. They are gauging streams; they will use some of that money perhaps in gauging the Potomac River; they can bore artesian wells in Virginia or in New York or in Maine; they can investigate the underground currents in Ohio or in Indiana or in California.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. In just a moment. The particular thing that I want, however, to accomplish in the provision in the Agricultural bill is to go into the arid and semiarid West and develop irrigation by the boring of artesian wells.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I want to suggest to the Senator from Nebraska in reference to this item in the sundry civil bill, that I do not know how the Geological Survey now interprets the language of that appropriation, but I know a few years ago they held that they did not have authority under the language to bore artesian wells. I do not know whether they now hold that under that language they have a right to actually bore wells. If they do, then something might be accomplished under it, but a few years ago they did hold that the language did not authorize them to bore wells. Their investigation was then a sort of theoretical investigation. As the Senator from Nebraska has stated, there never has been a well bored.

Mr. NORRIS. And there never will be under that item.

Mr. JONES. And there never will be one bored under that appropriation.

Mr. NORRIS. Not one; but, Mr. President, they used most of this money for gauging streams. I am not belittling the work they do under this appropriation. It is important for various purposes that we should know the flow of all the streams of the United States.

I am going to read the language as it would read if my amendment were adopted:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in conjunction with the Geological Survey, to investigate the existence of artesian water and other underground water supplies suitable for irrigation in the arid and semiarid regions by boring wells, $100,000.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PITTMAN. Would the Senator from Nebraska accept an amendment, inserting the words "to explore for and investigate"?

Mr. NORRIS. I would not have any objection to that language.

Mr. PITTMAN. I only suggest that out of precaution, because, as has been stated, as the language has heretofore been interpreted by the department, they held they had no authority to explore.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; the Senator from Nevada is mistaken. This language has never heretofore been used in the bill.

Mr. PITTMAN. I refer to the sundry civil bill.

Mr. NORRIS. We can not now amend that bill.

Mr. PITTMAN. No; but I was suggesting that we insert in this bill the words "explore for and investigate."

Mr. NORRIS. The language of this amendment reads "by boring wells." I do not know, but I should think that would be sufficient, although I would not have any objection to the language which the Senator suggests.

Mr. PITTMAN. All right. It was only a suggestion.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, this appropriation is for a specific purpose. If you increase the appropriation in the sundry civil bill by adding another hundred thousand dollars to it, unless you also add language which would compel its use for the specific purpose, there would not be a cent used for this purpose.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator will permit me for just a moment, I want to call attention to and to read an extract from a letter received by me from the Director of the Geological Survey, in which, so far from claiming that he did not have a right to use the money for the purpose which the Senator's amendment provides that it shall be used, he says that he has the right and that he has for years been using it for that purpose in the West. I will read exactly what he says.

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. He says:

I do wish to bring to your attention the fact that, in my opinion, such an appropriation could be better made available by a service already organized for this special line of investigation, and which, in fact, as far as its appropriations have permitted, has been carrying on such work for many years in the West.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, now, Mr. President——

Mr. JONES. They have never yet sunk a well.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to say to the Senator from Virginia that, as near as I know, without being present and having personal knowledge of it, I do know that in all the years they have been working under the item noted they have never yet bored a single well.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I should be glad to have the entire letter printed in the RECORD. I did not read it all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
Washington, February 20, 1915.

Hon. THOMAS S. MARTIN,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations.

MY DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: In connection with the Agriculture appropriation bill as reported to the Senate I note the committee amendment, page 69, line 13:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the existence of artesian water and other underground water supplies suitable for irrigation in the arid and semiarid regions by boring wells, $100,000."

This is in large part a duplication of the authority granted the Geological Survey for a number of years and repeated in the language contained in the sundry civil bill as reported to the Senate, page 101, line 12:

"For gauging streams and determining the water supply of the United States, the investigation of underground currents and artesian wells, and the preparation of reports upon the best methods of utilizing the water resources, $150,000."

The Geological Survey, however, is without adequate appropriations to carry on as much of this work as I realize is needed. The estimates this year provided for an increase of $50,000 in this appropriation, and, as you may remember, last year an amendment increasing this item was offered to the sundry civil bill and carried in the Senate, but was objected to by the House conferees.

Realizing, as I do, the need of increasing the utilization of the ground water in the arid and semiarid regions, I would not care to object to any appropriation made therefor, but I do wish to bring to your attention the fact that, in my opinion, such an appropriation could be better made available by a service already organized for this special line of investigation, and which, in fact, as far as its appropriations have permitted, has been carrying on such work for many years in the West. In this connection you may be interested to refer to the discussion of the matter in the Senate last year by Senator NORRIS and others in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 7, 1914. (Pages 11702–11704, bound RECORD.)

Yours, very cordially, GEO. OTIS SMITH,
Director.

Mr. NORRIS. This appropriation has been used and for the purposes named, and that is, as specified in the law here, for gauging streams and determining the water supply of the United States. They do that mostly by gauging streams. As I have said, I do not belittle the work of the Geological Survey, but I know that several years ago, on my personal request made of the officials, they refused to expend any of that money for this particular purpose. The reasons they gave were that they were using it for the purpose of gauging streams and that they did not have enough money to do the work. They were trying to cover the whole of the United States. They pointed out the importance of the work, which I readily conceded. I believe in the last appropriation bill they only had a hundred thousand dollars for that purpose—if I am wrong, the Senator from Virginia can correct me—and that they have asked and have received an additional appropriation in the bill of this year for that purpose.

Mr. President, I do not want any duplication; I only want to bring about the possibility of making some of the arid and semiarid regions of the West useful for agricultural purposes. No one is asking the Government to bore for him an artesian well, or any other kind of a well, but there are communities and vast stretches of country in the West and semiarid West that can not at the present time be irrigated from any known supply. It is expensive to put down an artesian well. The people living in those sections of the country are always poor. It is a new country, and no man there can afford to bore a well and run the risk of losing all the money he should put into it; but if he knew that he could get artesian water in a sufficient amount to irrigate his farm he would have no trouble in getting money to bore his own well.

The object of this particular item is for the Government, after making the proper investigation through the Geological Survey, to go into a community where, as a result of the study of the Geological Survey, they have reason to believe that artesian water can be had, and put down a well. When it is established that there is artesian water in sufficient quantities to irrigate, evey man in the community will bore his own well at his own expense and will irrigate his own land. Thus we should make valuable and useful large areas of land that are now a desolate waste.

I remember not long ago receiving a resolution through the mails from a meeting of cattlemen and farmers living in the semiarid West. To that meeting delegates had been sent from a large area of surrounding country, comprising four or five different counties, to discuss methods by which they might get together and put down test wells in different portions of that locality with a view of getting water to irrigate their lands.

Here is an instance, it seems to me, where the Government could utilize its money by making an experiment for the public good. It strikes me that there is not an appropriation in this bill, Mr. President, that can more properly be spent to bring about good results than the appropriation contained in this amendment which is designed to try to get water for irrigation purposes in communities that are now arid or semiarid.

To show you, Mr. President, that such a provision is not out of place in the Agricultural appropriation bill, let me read the item that immediately precedes this in the bill. It is as follows:

For investigating and reporting upon the utilization of water in farm irrigation, including the best methods to apply in practice; the different kinds of power and appliances, and the development of equipment for farm irrigation; the flow of water in ditches, pipes, and other conduits; the duty, apportionment, and measurement of irrigation water; the customs, regulations, and laws affecting irrigation; for the purchase and installation of equipment for experimental purposes; for the giving of expert advice and assistance; for the preparation and illustration of reports and bulletins on irrigation; for the employment of assistants and labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for rent outside of the District of Columbia; and for supplies and all necessary expenses, $106,400.

Then follows the amendment under discussion. It seems to me it is absolutely appropriate, although I know that what the Senator from Virginia has said is true, that the Geological Survey is the branch of the Government service, above all others, which is equipped for this kind of work; and therefore I have offered an amendment to the amendment. It occurred to me when the Senator from Virginia was kind enough to call it to my attention before we reached it, knowing that I was interested in the subject, that there ought to be some amendment of the kind I have suggested.

I ought to pause here to refer to the letter from which the Senator from Virginia has read as coming from the Geological Survey. That service wants to do the work, and, I believe, in this case properly so. I think it is proper for them to be considered, although it seems to me the Secretary of Agriculture should have supervision over it, because it comes peculiarly within his province and under his duties. Yet we ought not to forget that this very objection is called to our attention by another bureau, illustrating very well that the bureaus and departments of the Government, located side by side in Washington, are jealous of each other. One looks over the agricultural bill and says, "Here is something that we ought to have," and writes a letter to a Senator, calling attention to the fact that they ought to have that money to expend—in this case, I think, with some reason—but it is at least proper for the Senate to consider, if they have any idea that they ought to give much weight to the letter of the Geological Survey, that it is an attempt of that bureau to get more money which they think might be expended through some other bureau. I believe they

are the best equipped, and it seems to me the Secretary of Agriculture, although in a different department of the Government, can, if this amendment is adopted in the amended form in which I have suggested, make use of the scientific knowledge and the great experience of the scientists in the Geological Survey to utilize their experts and use a portion of this money with which to do it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I want to call the Senator's attention to the estimate, which has been submitted for the item, of $150,000, in the sundry civil appropriation bill, taken from the Book of Estimates.

Mr. NORRIS. I will be glad to have the Senator read it.

Mr. JONES. On page 799 of the Book of Estimates I find the estimates for gauging streams, determining water supply, and here they are. Every one of them is an estimate for an officer and his salary, and nothing at all is estimated for machinery or for the operation of machinery or for the hiring of help to sink a well or anything of the kind:

1 hydraulic engineer	$4,000
1 hydraulic engineer	3,600
4 hydraulic engineers, at $2,700 each	10,800
3 hydraulic engineers, at $2,400 each	7,200
1 assistant engineer	2,160
3 assistant engineers, at $1,980 per annum each	5,940
7 assistant engineers, at $1,800 per annum each	12,600
9 assistant engineers, at $1,620 per annum each	14,580
11 junior engineers, at $1,380 per annum each	15,180
13 junior engineers, at $1,200 per annum each	15,600
9 junior engineers, at $1,080 per annum each	9,720
1 chemist	2,400
1 junior chemist	1,200
1 assistant geologist	1,980
1 assistant geologist	1,380
1 geologic aid	1,200
1 geologic aid, at $100 per month	1,200
1 senior clerk	1,800
1 junior clerk	1,380
1 junior clerk	1,320
2 junior clerks, at $1,200 per annum each	2,400
1 junior clerk	1,140
1 clerk	1,620
4 underclerks, at $1,080 per annum each	4,320
2 underclerks, at $1,020 per annum each	2,040
5 underclerks, at $960 per annum each	4,800
1 underclerk	900
1 underclerk	840
2 underclerks, at $720 per annum each	1,440
1 messenger boy	360

He might sink some artesian wells.

One hydraulic engineer	$2,700
One junior engineer	1,440
One junior engineer	1,200
One assistant classifier	1,320
One junior clerk	1,320
Two underclerks, at $1,080 per annum each	2,160
One messenger	720
One accountant	1,800
One purchasing clerk	1,680
One clerk	1,680
One junior clerk	1,320
One underclerk	1,020
One underclerk	720
One messenger	720
Two messenger boys, at $360 per annum each	720
Two charwomen, at 82½ cents per day (300 days each)	495

Mr. NORRIS. I expect it is the charwomen.

Mr. JONES. I expect so.

Mr. NORRIS. Because they would have some shovels, very likely.

Mr. JONES. The total estimate is $156,115. Now, here is what they want this money for. I do not see where they will get any artesian wells put down there with people like that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. How many underclerks are there altogether?

Mr. JONES. I do not know.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems to me it well illustrates that between that item in the sundry civil bill and this one there can be no real controversy. They are not duplications, although, as I said at the beginning, if the other bill had contained a provision that would compel the use of this money I would just as soon have it there as here, and I would a little rather, because I know it would suit the Senator from Virginia better to have it that way, and it would be more logical.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken. I have not the least desire in the matter. I simply brought it to the attention of the Senate in the interests of good legislation. It is a matter of no consequence to me which department uses it. I simply wanted to get before the Senate the condition that existed.

Mr. NORRIS. That is all I want to do. It seems to me that I have done that in the best way I can, and it seems to me I have shown that if we are going to do this work, if we want it done, we must adopt this amendment; that under the sundry civil bill we will get nothing. We might have managed it if we had it before us now; but it has passed the House, and the Senate has voted on it, and it is now in conference, and it is too late to amend it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I agree with the Senator from Virginia that it would have been better to have put this amendment in the sundry civil bill. I think last year we put an amendment of that character in that bill, but it went out in conference. Now, unless we have this provision as presented here in the Agricultural bill we will have nothing for demonstrating the supply of artesian water, because the appropriation under the sundry civil bill is not used for that purpose. It never has been used for that purpose in the way of sinking wells, and it never will be used for that purpose until we appropriate a sum of money for that specific purpose.

I have read the estimates here, which show what this money is for. They investigate the matter of artesian water supply from a scientific standpoint. I remember, Mr. President, that I stated, when the sundry civil bill was up before, that several years ago in North Yakima, where I live, they made an investigation under the sundry civil bill to see whether or not artesian water could be secured. They reported that it could not be secured. By and by some man who had a little more money than some of his neighbors and had some land that he wanted irrigated, and who from his practical observation thought there might be artesian water there, went and sank a well, and at a depth of about a thousand feet he struck artesian water. He got enough artesian water out of that well to irrigate 160 acres of land, and to-day there are 20 or 30 artesian wells in that section, all of them being used for the irrigation of land. The scientific investigators said that there was not any such thing as artesian water there. The actual demonstration, by sinking a well, showed that there was and is artesian water there.

That is the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. We want to actually demonstrate and determine whether or not there is artesian water in a certain section. You can not do it under the appropriation in the sundry civil bill unless you make a specific appropriation for that purpose and put it in the hands of these men. We have plenty of men in the Geological Survey to do this work if we would just give them the money for that purpose and authorize them to hire the necessary ordinary labor to go to work and get the spades and machinery and sink the wells, but we have not provided for that in the sundry civil bill, and unless you adopt this provision you will not have anything of that kind done.

The Senator from Nebraska well pointed out the importance of it, and the illustration that I have just used in reference to my own home locality illustrates the importance of it and what can be accomplished. As he has said, if the Government sinks one artesian well in a certain locality, and artesian water is found, that is all the Government has to do. The people owning the lands around there will then sink the other wells. They will reclaim their lands, irrigate them, and develop them. That is what we would like to do. That is what would be done under the amendment the Senator from Nebraska has offered, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If these artesian wells are as expensive as the Senator from Nebraska intimates, if you have to go down a thousand feet in order to make a test, as the Senator from Washington says, even if the $150,000 in the sundry civil bill could be used, together with the sum attempted to be appropriated in this bill, it would be none too much to make a respectable beginning, considering the amount of territory to be covered; because if this policy of the Government is to be adopted, it must be pretty generally adopted, and the amendment proposes to cover the arid and semiarid regions of the West, which, I think, is a fairly extensive territory. So if this sum here, $100,000, should be adopted as a beginning, even if the sum referred to by the Senator from Virginia could be used also for the same purpose, I do not think it would be an excessive appropriation, and I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. I want to add just a word of testimony in corroboration of what has been said by the Senator from Ne-

braska, as well as by the Senator from Washington, in regard to the great need there is for an appropriation of this kind for the purpose of sinking artesian wells and demonstrating whether or not an artesian-well supply can be obtained for irrigation purposes and for other domestic uses.

West of the Missouri River, in the State of South Dakota, is a part, at least, of the Great Plains country, a vast semiarid region. That region has been settled largely since 1905 or 1906 under various acts of Congress opening the Indian reservations. It has been settled by homesteaders, who bought their lands of the Government at an average price of about $4 per acre, there being thus something of a Government guaranty that the lands were cultivable lands and could be relied on for the production of crops. In addition to the Government's course in opening these lands and having them appraised at these prices, there were, of course, the advertisements of the railroad companies and the advertisements of the land and real estate people inducing the settlers to go to that section, where now for four successive years they have had crop failures, partial or total, due to want of sufficient rainfall.

The country east of the Missouri River contains within it what is known as the James River Valley, running north and south through central South Dakota. It is one of the famous artesian-well sections of the world. I think, perhaps, it is the most famous, more famous than that region in Artois, France, from which the name "artesian" comes; and the wells first sunk there, many of which were 4½-inch wells or over, had a pressure of 125 to 160 pounds per square inch. The water came with such force that we needed no other or further fire protection in the towns where those wells were put down than the artesian wells themselves. Now, it is supposed that the source of that water—it was then, and I think it is yet the theory—is the Rocky Mountain region beyond, and that it came from the rains and the melting snows percolating down through the strata until it found its place from 850 to 1,200 feet beneath the surface there in the James River Valley, and then, when the well was sunk, the waters gushed forth with that tremendous force. If the Rocky Mountains are the source, the fact that they lie on beyond these semiarid regions in the western part of the State suggests this as one of the great fields in the country for exploration on the part of the Government for the purpose of demonstrating whether water may be found there which can be brought to the surface in quantities sufficient for irrigation purposes.

Mr. President, in view of what the Government has done to induce the settlement of that country, it can do no less than to afford every opportunity within its proper power to help those who are there in the development of the resources of that country, so that they will be enabled to make and maintain their homes in that region. It has been shown here, I think, by what has been cited from the estimates heretofore made, that there will be no duplication of the work provided for in the sundry civil bill and in the present bill, because heretofore they have been doing none of the work covered by the provision in this bill. There is this great field in western South Dakota, and I have not known of the Agricultural Department or of the Geological Survey attempting any work in exploring for artesian wells in all that region, inviting as the field seems to be.

I think this amendment should prevail.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PITTMAN. I will take up none of the time of the Senate. I simply desire to say that I hope the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska will be adopted. There is no question among western men—that is, men in the arid States—of the importance of legislation of this character. We only regret that the appropriation is not much larger than it is.

The statement of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] is true. It is a mere pittance. It will only start the work, and if it were not for fear of embarrassing this bill I would offer an amendment to increase the amount. It would only be a start. I trust that the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 70, line 16, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$497,700" and insert "$610,505."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 17, after the word "Engineering," to strike out "$573,660" and insert "$686,465," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering, $686,465.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Before the good-roads section of the agricultural bill is passed I wish to correct an intimation that was thrown out yesterday by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW]. He criticized some experimental roads which had been made in Maryland by this branch of the Agricultural Department. I wish to state that the work he referred to was done at a time when I was in close observation of it, some years ago, under a Republican administration. It was entirely well done and properly done; but the Bureau of Roads had a certain fund for experimentation purposes, and several very difficult pieces of construction had been attempted by our State roads commission. One section of a road that had cost $14,000 had disappeared in less than a year under heavy traffic and unusual subbase conditions. That and another section of road were opened for experimental purposes. The Agricultural Department people offered to experiment on these roads in Maryland if the local authorities would double their money; and so, by the action of the county authorities and local subscription, the Government money was doubled as available for these experiments, and expended there in that way. Although part of the road was a great deal more expensive than was necessary for local purposes, yet for experimental purposes it seemed proper to make it in the way that the department concluded to construct it.

The whole transaction was very much to the interest of the experimental purpose of the Agricultural Department and was incidentally beneficial to a very worthy portion of the neighborhood of the Capital City.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to state to the Senator from Maryland that whatever experience his State may have had in experimental road building, Maryland deserves the admiration of everybody for the system of roads she has built in recent years. In my opinion, there is no State that has done any better work than Maryland in that direction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will resume the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, under the head of "Office of Markets and Rural Organization," on page 71, after line 19, to insert:

Experiments in dairying and live-stock production in semiarid and irrigated districts of the western United States: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct investigations and experiments in problems connected with the establishment of dairying and meat-production enterprises on the semiarid and irrigated lands of the western United States, including the purchase of live stock, the erection of barns and other necessary buildings, and the employment of necessary persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $87,500.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask precisely what the significance of the term "western United States" is? I see it says "semiarid and irrigated lands of the western United States." That is a new term.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, in answer to that I will say that there is where the semiarid regions for the most part are found—in western United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. I presume the term is correct. It struck me as being a new term, however—"western United States."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Before this item is agreed to I should like to ask the Senator to what extent this appropriation is to be used for the purchase of live stock, and where that live stock is to be located when purchased, and what we are to do with it?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. I am not able to answer the question from the terms of the amendment; but my understanding is that very little or none will be apportioned to that purpose. The object is to conduct experiments, I suppose, using largely the stock furnished by the settler. The general theory was that it would be greatly to the advantage of the settlers on the irrigated lands if they could convert their hay and other materials into stock and dairy products and market them in that form, and no effort

is being made at present to carry on experiments or demonstrations of that sort. The Government is conducting demonstrations in various parts of the country upon an extensive scale, and appropriating a great deal of money for that purpose, and it was deemed but fair to these settlers, who perhaps more than any other single class need this particular service. It seems to me to be a highly important provision.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not complaining about the object of the amendment. Out of this appropriation of $87,500 the department is to pay for "the employment of necessary persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere." Does the Senator know how much of this would be spent for the payment of clerks here in Washington and how much would be paid for employees and persons engaged in this work in other parts of the United States, and also if the purchase of live stock is to be for the purpose of experimenting with them upon the products that are raised in the arid and semiarid parts of our country?

Mr. GORE. I suppose the experimental and demonstration work will be largely of the same character as the work that is conducted in other parts of the country, extending to the irrigation regions. I will have read a letter from the department upon this subject. It discloses the various purposes for which the appropriation is made.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before the letter is read I want to say that this bill is growing on some of us and becoming more interesting than some novels I have read. We are now going to make an appropriation for the arid and semiarid regions of the United States, and spend the people's money for the purpose of experimenting in live stock. After we have taken care of the arid and semiarid regions we turn to page 79 and then go to sugar cane and cotton districts of the United States and make experiments and demonstrations there in reference to live stock.

I wish that the Senators who framed this bill would not forget that there is a little rocky "neck of the woods" in this country called New England, and on our mountain slopes, and the foothills of our beautiful mountains there is a vast deal of grazing land that might be occupied for experimental demonstrations in the raising of live stock, and we would like to have the Government go into the business there.

While I am not going to oppose these appropriations, notwithstanding they look to me as being rather absurd, yet I will bespeak for New England, for New Hampshire as an illustration, in the preparation of the next appropriation bill a little thought on the part of the committee. If the members of the committee will accompany me to that part of the country, I should like to point out to them the splendid opportunities which are there for raising cattle and horses, if you please, and other live stock at the expense of a paternal Government, which seems to be taking care of the West and the South to the exclusion or the neglect of the northern section of the country.

In one of these amendments we have the western United States. Now, let us go to the northern United States and see if we can not do a little missionary work there in this direction.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will simply say, in response to what the Senator has observed, that if New Hampshire or New England failed to receive anything to which they are entitled it was a mere oversight on the part of the very distinguished and active Senator, and I will join the Senator in rectifying the wrong. I ask that the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, to which I referred, be printed in the RECORD.

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

This item was submitted in our estimates, but was not approved by the House committee. The work proposed under this item will be directed toward securing results of an extremely practical nature, particularly in regard to the establishment of animal industries in our dry-land regions of the West. I regard it as extremely important in view of the diminishing meat supply of the country.

The field stations of the department in the semiarid and irrigated districts of the United States have in the past been devoted almost entirely to the production of crops. Methods have been established on these stations that make it possible now to produce forage crops in these districts with a considerable degree of success, but such crops are not marketable for the reason that in most cases there are no near-by cities and there is no demand for them in the immediate neighborhood in which they are produced. The profitable utilization of these crops on the farm, therefore, is essential to successful farming in these regions. For the purpose of establishing proper methods of feeding, along with the natural grazing that is afforded, it is the desire of the department to place live stock at several of the field stations in the semiarid and irrigated districts of the United States and thereby make the production of field crops profitable and at the same time increase the production of live stock. If this work is provided for, attention will be given both to dairying and meat production, and this will make these field stations serve as guides to the farmers in these regions not only in crop production but also in the profitable utilization of these crops for the production of live stock.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 3, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$352,650" and insert "$440,150."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 18, after the word "Organization," to strike out "$484,050" and insert "$571,550," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Office of Markets and Rural Organization, $571,550.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 4, after the word "work," to strike out "$19,702,712" and insert "$20,143,617," so as to make the clause read:

Total, Department of Agriculture, for routine and ordinary work, $20,143,617.

Mr. LANE. I should like to ask the Senator having the bill in charge as to this item. It states that it is the total expenditure for the Department of Agriculture. It does not state that in words, but it is a total for the Department of Agriculture, "for routine and ordinary work, $20,143,617." Then, over here there is an item for general expenses, $440,000, in addition to this $20,143,000. So there are more items of the kind scattered along in that way.

Mr. GORE. If I understood the Senator's question, I will say there is an item of that character under each bureau and division. The general expenses of each division are provided for in the appropriation relating to that division.

Mr. LANE. But there are "general expenses, $440,150."

Mr. GORE. The total on page 73 is for the "Office of Markets and Rural Organization."

Mr. LANE. The item before that was "For general administrative expenses in connection with the lines of investigation, experiments, and demonstration conducted in the Office of Markets and Rural Organization, $23,250." Then this other item is "For general expenses, $440,150"; and then there is another item on the same page, "Total for Office of Markets and Rural Organization, $571,550"; then over here is this item, "For routine and ordinary work, $20,000,000." It is rather confusing, I submit.

Mr. GORE. Perhaps it could be arranged differently and with more wisdom; but the item to which the Senator has referred is for general expenses, another is for incidental expenses, and $20,000,000 is the aggregate for all the bureaus.

Mr. LANE. What are general expenses considered to be? What is the nature of those expenses?

Mr. GORE. The bill contains an enumeration of them.

Mr. LANE. You have an estimate for them?

Mr. GORE. They are estimated for.

Mr. LANE. All right.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the head of "Miscellaneous," on page 75, after line 10, to insert:

That hereafter when any State shall provide for terminal inspection of plants and plant products, and shall establish and maintain, at the sole expense of the State, such inspection at one or more places therein, the proper officials of said State may submit to the Secretary of Agriculture a list of plants and plant products and the plant pests transmitted thereby, that in the opinion of said officials should be subject to terminal inspection in order to prevent the introduction or dissemination in said State of pests injurious to agriculture. Upon his approval of said list, in whole or in part, the Secretary of Agriculture shall transmit the same to the Postmaster General, and thereafter all packages containing any plants or plant products named in said approved lists shall, upon payment of postage therefor, be forwarded by the postmaster at the destination of said package to the proper State official at the nearest place where inspection is maintained. If the plant or plant products are found upon inspection to be free from injurious pests, or if infected shall be disinfected by said official, they shall upon payment of postage therefor be returned to the postmaster at the place of inspection to be forwarded to the person to whom they are addressed; but if found to be infected with injurious pests and incapable of satisfactory disinfection the State inspector shall so notify the postmaster at the place of inspection, who shall promptly notify the sender of said plants or plant products that they will be returned to him upon his request and at his expense, or in default of such request that they will be turned over to the State authorities for destruction.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 76, after line 13, to insert:

On and after the passage and approval of this act it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation to deposit in the United States mails any package containing any plant or plant product addressed to any place within a State maintaining inspection thereof, as herein defined, without plainly marking the package so that its contents may be readily ascertained by an inspection of the outside thereof. Whoever shall fail to so mark said packages shall be punished by a fine of not more than $100.

The Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out the purposes hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 77, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out an agreement heretofore made by and between him and the State of Washington, through its proper officers, looking to the exchange of lands and indemnity rights with said State, $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be available until expended when the said State shall

have made available a like amount to be used for carrying out the aforesaid agreement: *Provided*, That such exchanges shall be made on the basis of approximately equal area and value.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the item of appropriation for a domestic potato quarantine, on page 77, line 20, after the word "Columbia," to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$125,000, $25,000 of said sum to be immediately available," so as to make the clause read:

Domestic potato quarantine: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with those States in the inspection of Irish potatoes where a quarantine has been or hereafter shall be established by the Secretary of Agriculture, prohibiting the movement of such potatoes from any State into any other State, District, or Territory of the United States except under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and for the enforcement of such rules and regulations, and for the employment of persons and means necessary in the city of Washington and elsewhere, including rent outside of the District of Columbia, $125,000, $25,000 of said sum to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 3, on page 78.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, we have already passed it, but it seems to me that it ought not to be passed unnoticed. There is an item upon page 77 of $125,000 for New England.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think they must raise potatoes in other sections of the country.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; but they raise potatoes that do not have to be quarantined like in New England.

Mr. GALLINGER. They may have to be quarantined next year perhaps.

Mr. NORRIS. This is for New England. I hope the Senator will not move to strike it out.

Mr. GALLINGER. Not at all. I am going to move to add another amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 78, after line 3, to insert:

International Dry Farming Congress, Denver, Colo.: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and make an exhibit at the next annual meeting of the International Dry Farming Congress, to be held at Denver, Colo., during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, illustrative of the investigations, products, and processes relating to farming in the subhumid, arid, and semiarid regions of the United States, including labor and all expenses in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $20,000.

Mr. SMOOT. The item on page 78, "International Dry Farming Congress, Denver, Colo.," provides $20,000 "to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and make an exhibit at the next annual meeting of the International Dry Farming Congress to be held at Denver, Colo."

Mr. President, three years ago, I believe, was the first time an appropriation was made for assisting in the holding a congress at any place in the United States. That was the irrigation congress, which was held at Salt Lake City, being 25 years after the first irrigation congress was ever held in the United States. At that time there was appropriated $10,000. I think since that there was appropriated $20,000 for the dry farming congress held at some place in Oklahoma. Last year, as I remember, $25,000 was appropriated to hold it at some place in Kansas.

But it seems to me, Mr. President, that $10,000 is ample if we are going to make the appropriations for holding these congresses. I ask the Senator from Colorado if the people of Denver are not willing to assist the same as the people of Salt Lake City assisted in entertaining the delegates to the congress held there, and allow this appropriation to be cut to $10,000, the same amount which was provided for the great irrigation congress which was held at Salt Lake City?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, the first appropriation that was made for a matter of this kind was to a contribution toward the exhibit which was made in Alberta, Canada, and that was $10,000. But there has been no appropriation for less than $20,000 for any place where this congress has been held in the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. That is, the Dry Farming Congress?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I mean the Dry Farming Congress. The congress to which the Senator refers is the Irrigation Congress, and that congress has gone out of existence by reason of its being consolidated with the Trans-Mississippi Congress. I want to state in relation to this Dry Farming Congress that it is of great importance. We held one once at Colorado Springs, Colo., and we did not ask for any contribution whatever from the National Government. So, if you take the two together, the average has been only $10,000, the same amount that Salt Lake City got for her Irrigation Congress.

But, Mr. President, this is one of the most instructive things to people who are endeavoring to reclaim the portion of the country known as the great semiarid region that can be devised. You may talk about instruction and reading, but the exhibits that were presented in my State when it was held at Colorado Springs consisted of enormous exhibits brought from all over the United States to show just what could be done on the arid lands and what character of plants could be raised there. It was a matter for which people would go and stay there. There were instructors at each of the departments, and the knowledge which was distributed at that time was of great value to the people. I was at the time governor of Colorado, and I spent a whole day at the exhibits, and I must say that it was a great advantage to me, and, I have no doubt, of great advantage to farmers.

This is not a congress of one day. It continues about two weeks, and persons can go there and can get more knowledge in one or two weeks than they can get from the Agriculture Department or from anything that is promulgated by simple literature. It is pretty nearly a school of instructions, and when we get those arid lands raising crops of some kind you will find that they will add great wealth and great population to the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. I agree, Mr. President, with what the Senator said as to the beneficial results from holding this congress; but when I contemplate the fact that we have in the United States dozens of so-called international congresses—the Irrigation Congress, the Trans-Mississippi Congress, the Dry-Farming Congress, and I could enumerate others—I can not differentiate this from any of the great congresses that are held annually in this country.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Colorado agree to pass over this amendment for the present?

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing——

Mr. STONE. Before it is passed over I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Utah. This is an international congress?

Mr. SMOOT. It becomes an international congress in this way, that the invitation is extended to some representatives of foreign countries to attend.

Mr. STONE. Who extends the invitation?

Mr. SMOOT. The name of the congress itself is the International Dry-Farming Congress. Congress does not do it, the President of the United States does not do it, but I think the congress itself does it.

Mr. STONE. I want to say——

Mr. SHAFROTH. If the Senator will allow me, every one of the bills, I understand, that have been passed authorized the President of the United States to invite the nations to send delegates, with the express statement, though, that no part of the appropriation shall be used for the payment of the expenses of delegates.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator is wrong in that statement. As I remember it: First, the Irrigation Congress was simply designated an irrigation congress. Then when the question came up of an appropriation after it had been in existence 25 years and it was to be held at Salt Lake City, where the first one was held, the members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House said that the appropriation should not be made for a congress, because of the fact that there were so many of them in the United States, and one would have as much claim on the Government as another. Then it was decided at that time to make it an International Irrigation Congress. The name was changed and the congress itself invited the representatives of foreign countries, and we had representatives from foreign countries to attend that congress. Since then the Dry Farming Congress has been established, and I understand that congress took the name of the International Dry Farming Congress.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state that in the congresses I have attended there have always been representatives of foreign Governments. I remember one from Australia was there, a man who made a speech in relation to the dry sections of Australia, and also from Alberta a large delegation came to that congress. I think over 100 came there.

Mr. WARREN. There was a representative from Brazil also.

Mr. SMOOT. But the President of the United States did not invite them.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I beg to say that I did not mean by my inquiry to provoke this sort of a discussion. I simply wanted to ask a question and get a direct answer, which would have taken but a moment. I have no wish to interfere, even if I could, with this bill or with this item. I wanted to say that a great many joint resolutions are introduced in one House or the other for so-called international congresses for almost every imaginable object. Large numbers of them have been referred

to the Committee on Foreign Relations during the last several years; and I suppose most of them go to that committee because of the international character of the enterprises.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has adopted a rule which they adhere to with very rare exceptions, and the exceptions must have some special merit behind them. The rule is to turn down these joint resolutions for inviting foreigners in the name of the Government of the United States. We did for a while pass them, inserting, however, a proviso that the Government of the United States should never at any time in anywise be held responsible for the expenses of such congresses; but more recently it has been thought by the committee that it was hardly a dignified thing to do, to issue an invitation by the President of the United States, and at the same time say, "We do not intend to pay your expenses." I am thoroughly convinced, in my own mind, as are all the other members of the committee to which I refer, that the expenses of these congresses, so called, multiplying, as they are, ought not to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I say. I will say to the Senator, then, that if he is willing to allow this to go over to-night, I am perfectly willing to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to this item going over? The Chair hears none, and the item goes over.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, we have now been in continuous session for more than 12 hours. I want to inquire of the chairman of the committee how much longer he desires to continue the consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. I will state to the Senator from North Dakota, and I intended to state to the Senate, that it is my purpose to ask the Senate to remain only a few moments longer. I therefore suggest that we consider only unobjected amendments.

Mr. GRONNA. Very well.

Mr. GORE. Any amendment to which there is objection we may pass over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will be resumed.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, at the top of page 79, to insert:

Experiments and demonstrations in live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the authorities of the States concerned, or with individuals, to make such investigations and demonstrations as may be necessary in connection with the development of live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States, including the erection of barns and other necessary buildings, and the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $60,000; and of the funds heretofore appropriated for the development of live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States during the fiscal year 1915, not to exceed $7,500 is hereby made available for the erection of barns and other necessary buildings.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I send to the desk an amendment to be read. I can not well offer it now, as committee amendments are first being considered. I ask, however, that the amendment be read and lie on the table, giving notice that I shall offer it at the proper time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert the following:

Experiments and demonstrations in live-stock production in the New England States: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the authorities of the States concerned, or with individuals, to make such investigations and demonstrations as may be necessary in connection with the development of live-stock production in the New England States, including the erection of barns and other necessary buildings, and the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $60,000; and of the funds hereby appropriated for the development of live-stock production in the New England States, not to exceed $7,500 is hereby made available for the erection of barns and other necessary buildings.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. This appropriation, I think, of $60,000 was in last year's appropriation bill, was it not?

Mr. RANSDELL. It was.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am asking the Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. GORE. It was in last year's appropriation bill.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to ask, now, whether or not it is intended to be a continuing appropriation, year after year, of $60,000 for this purpose?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will state that my fear is that it will be; but the department suggests that the amount already expended would in large measure be wasted unless there was another appropriation with which to continue the work. I will also state that the State of Louisiana is cooperating and is furnishing something more than 500 acres of land to assist the Government in the conduct of the experiment. I ask that the amendment be passed over for the present.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to say just one word on the amendment before it is passed over. I want the Senator having the bill in charge to pause a moment while I read the first two lines of it:

Experiments and demonstrations in live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States, * * * $60,000.

I have been engaged more or less in live-stock production, and I never thought there was a different method of producing live stock in the cotton-growing States from that employed upon the prairies. I have thought the same method whereby we produce a steer or a mule in North Dakota would be the method adopted for the production of a like kind of animal in Louisiana.

I can understand, Mr. President, why, after you have so legislated that you have destroyed the sugar-cane industry in Louisiana, you might well expend a little money in making an investigation there to ascertain what can be raised on the land in place of that product. The individual farmer perhaps will not be able to go into the business himself and make experiments to see what he can do; he can not afford it; he has not the money, any more than upon the western plains we can experiment to ascertain what kind of trees or shrubs, and so forth, can best be grown. Most farmers would be bankrupt before they could ascertain that, but the Government can do it, and the Government ought to do something for those people there, from whom they have taken away the means of livelihood; but, Mr. President, upon the face of it, it does seem to me that it is merely spilling $60,000 down there, because we all know that there is no difference in the method of producing live stock in one section of the country from that of producing it in another.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Does the Senator from North Dakota think that Congress ought to discriminate in favor of the cane-sugar growers as against the beet-sugar growers in this matter?

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, no. I think, however, they have taken care of the beet-sugar growers, not in teaching them how to raise live stock, but at least in experimenting to see what else they can raise. I have no objection to the expenditure of money in investigating what the soil will produce; but for many millions of years, so long as there have been human beings upon the face of the earth, they have had a pretty fair idea of how live stock is produced, and we do not need any new lessons as to how to take care of sheep or of lambs, or how to take care of horses, cattle, mules, and so forth. It does seem to me, however, that if there is any good honest reason for the expenditure of $60,000 we ought to state the particular thing for which we want to expend it.

Mr. PENROSE. That amendment had better go over until to-morrow.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, there may be several reasons actuating this appropriation; possibly the Senator from North Dakota, with his penetrating mind, has divined one or two of them; but I might say, in order to be perfectly ingenuous with the Senator, that the real motive actuating the department and the committee in proposing this appropriation was the hope that the precedent would justify and lead to a similar appropriation for New England.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma ask that the amendment go over?

Mr. GORE. I am not making the request, but some other Senators desire that it shall go over.

Mr. PENROSE. Let that paragraph go over until to-morrow.

Mr. NORRIS. I think we ought to have a quorum to listen to this debate.

Mr. RANSDELL. What is the request?

Mr. PENROSE. I think this paragraph had better go over. It opens a wide vista, and we can meet the question with fresh minds in the morning.

Mr. RANSDELL. I have no objection to its going over.

Mr. GORE. Let it go over.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 79, after line 23, to insert:

Hereafter the President of the United States is authorized to designate such areas on any lands purchased by the United States under the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L., p. 961), entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States or with the United States for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the ac-

quisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable streams," and acts supplementary thereto and amendatory thereof as should, in his opinion, be set aside for the protection of game animals, birds, or fish; and thereafter whoever shall hunt, catch, trap, willfully disturb, or kill any kind of game animal, game or nongame bird, or fish, or take the eggs of any such bird on any lands so set aside, or in or on the waters thereof, except under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time prescribe, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both: *Provided*, That this provision shall be effective only in those States the legislatures of which have consented or which hereafter shall consent to the making by the Congress of the United States or under its authority of such rules and regulations as, in the opinion of the Federal Government, may be needful in respect to said animals, birds, and fish on said lands and in or on the waters thereof.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, to save the time of the Senate, I want to ask the Senator to allow that amendment to go over, because I think a point of order ought to be made against it; but I do not want to make it until I look further into the provisions of the amendment. I will assure the Senator that I will not discuss it at all to-morrow; but, if I conclude to do so, will simply make the point of order.

Mr. GORE. I am perfectly willing that the amendment shall be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator for information what the Agricultural Department has to do with naval stores?

Mr. NORRIS. To spend money in connection with them.

Mr. LANE. The provision at the top of page 81 reads:

For investigating the grading, weighing, and handling of naval stores, and preparation of definite type samples thereof, including the employment of necessary persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $5,000.

Is that an item to provide salaries?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the naval stores industry is a very important one in the States of Florida, Alabama, and Georgia, and the provision was inserted in the bill a year ago, I think, on the motion of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH.]

Mr. LANE. What are naval stores?

Mr. FLETCHER. They are yellow-pine products, spirits of turpentine, and rosin, and they exist wherever yellow pine grows in this country.

Mr. LANE. What are naval stores used for?

Mr. FLETCHER. Spirits of turpentine are use for medicinal purposes, they are used in pharmacy, in paints, and in similar articles. Naval stores are forest products.

Mr. LANE. In former times naval stores used to be tar and pitch.

Mr. FLETCHER. Naval stores now mean turpentine and rosin.

Mr. LANE. They are not used in the Army or the Navy as they formerly were?

Mr. FLETCHER. No.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I remember when this item was put in the appropriation bill. The purpose, as stated then, was to provide for the preparation of definite type samples of naval stores.

Mr. GORE. For their standardization.

Mr. SMOOT. For their standardization. I thought that was perfectly proper and right, and I thought we ought to provide for that in the bill of last year.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. OLIVER. My point of order is that the item we are discussing is not a committee amendment, and that discussion is not in order at the present time.

Mr. GORE. If discussion is to ensue, I will ask that the item go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, we can return to it, of course.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Oklahoma how long it is expected we are to continue to-night? I think it is about time we finished the day's work and took a recess, or we will be faced with a proposition to adjourn.

Mr. FLETCHER. This matter ought not to be under discussion at all; it is not an amendment reported by the Senate committee.

Mr. NORRIS. It is under discussion, however, and time is being taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The item will be passed over.

Mr. GORE. I think we will conclude in a few moments, I will say to the Senator.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 81, line 6, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$55,000" and insert "$40,000"; in line 7, after the word "appropriations," to strike out "now available or"; in line 11, before the word "work," to insert "field"; in the same line, after the word "Agriculture," to insert "outside the District of Columbia"; and in line 15, after the word "service," to insert "outside the District of Columbia," so as to make the clause read:

That not to exceed $40,000 of the lump-sum appropriation herein made for the Department of Agriculture shall be available for the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles and motor boats necessary in the conduct of the field work of the Department of Agriculture outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not to exceed $5,000 of this amount shall be expended for the purchase of such vehicles and boats, and that such vehicles and boats shall be used only for official service outside the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall on the first day of each regular session of Congress make a report to Congress showing the amount expended under the provisions of this paragraph during the preceding fiscal year.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of why the words "outside the District of Columbia" are used in lines 15 and 16. The proviso reads:

Provided, That not to exceed $5,000 of this amount shall be expended for the purchase of such vehicles and boats, and that such vehicles and boats shall be used only for official service outside the District of Columbia.

Does that mean that in the District of Columbia pleasure yachts and joy rides are to be permitted?

Mr. GORE. No, sir; it leave officers within the District of Columbia subject to the provisions contained in the legislative appropriation bill of last year. A year ago we inserted the words "field service," so as not to interfere with the necessary service in the field, on the theory that officers within the District of Columbia would fall under the provisions of the legislative bill. In the hearings before the House committee the chief of one bureau stated that they had interpreted "field service" to include the District of Columbia. It was the purpose of the committee and the purpose of the Senate a year ago to limit the use of such vehicles to field service, so that machines could not be operated in the District of Columbia; but in view of that interpretation of the act of a year ago, these words were inserted so as to make it specific beyond any and all reasonable doubt, or any other sort of doubt, that they could not use this money within the District of Columbia for the purchase and operation of machines.

Mr. PENROSE. Then, as I understand, the item of $5,000 does not apply to the District of Columbia?

Mr. GORE. No, sir.

Mr. PENROSE. Well, it does not seem to me that the paragraph is drawn with a very great amount of clearness; but, if that is the explanation, I will make no objection.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, perhaps I can make it a little clearer. The large amount is for maintenance, and so forth, and the $5,000 is for the purchase of vehicles; but they are only for use outside of the District of Columbia. The language is a little awkward, I will admit.

Mr. PENROSE. It is certainly awkwardly expressed, and not calculated to convey any other than the impression that within the District of Columbia vehicles may be used for purposes other than for official business.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will suggest that if the Senator will consider this in connection with the provision in the legislative bill of last year, he will see clearly the point which the committee had in mind, which is also the point he seems to have in mind, judging from his suggestion.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I do not think that in a great supply bill like this the accounting officers of the Government and the legislators called upon to pass the bill ought to be referred to an appropriation bill of the preceding year to secure an explanation of a provision. However, in view of the explanation of the chairman of the committee and of the senior minority member of the committee, I shall not press the matter any further, except to state that, in my opinion, the paragraph is awkwardly and obscurely drawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 81, after line 20, to strike out:

In case of an emergency arising out of an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious disease of animals, which in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture threatens the live-stock industry of the country, he may expend during the fiscal year, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500,000, or so much thereof as he determines to be necessary, in the arrest and eradication of any such disease.

And insert:

In case of an emergency arising out of an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious disease of animals, which in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture threatens the live-stock industry of the country, he may expend in the city of Washington and elsewhere, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500,000, or so much thereof as he determines to be necessary, in the arrest and eradication of any such disease, including the purchase and destruction, in cooperation with the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease, and said sum shall be immediately available for the purposes specified.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I thoroughly approve that appropriation, if it is an appropriation. I notice, however, that it is not in the usual form of an appropriation, but it is peculiarly worded. It says that the Secretary of Agriculture may expend two and a half million dollars or such portion of it as he determines to be necessary in the event of this outbreak, and "said sum shall be immediately available for the purposes specified." I simply want to inquire if that beyond any question makes an appropriation which the Secretary of Agriculture—I will wait until the chairman of the committee is at liberty.

Mr. NORRIS. If there is going to be any waiting, I ask the Senator to yield to me?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I notice the chairman of the committee, versatile as he is, can not attend to two Senators at the same time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut requests the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The inquiry in brief is this——

Mr. GORE. I understood the inquiry, and I think probably there is some force in it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator has great powers of perception. I had not concluded my inquiry.

Mr. GORE. I understood the Senator to inquire whether or not this provision contained appropriating language; that is, was not written in the ordinary language of appropriations, and he doubted whether or not——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Now, I wish to inquire of the Senator whether he is sure that there has been provided here a method by which the Secretary of Agriculture can draw upon the Treasury and get this money in case he needs it?

Mr. GORE. I imagined that was what the Senator desired to know. I will suggest in answer, however, that the amendment was drawn by the department. That does not argue in favor of its infallibility, and I think possibly it ought to be changed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Presumptively it is right. All I desire to do is to call the Senator's attention to it, so that he can consider it in conference.

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if he noticed the language on lines 11 and 12, where it says "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated"?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. Of course it is asking the department to do it, and it does not read in the usual way, but I think that covers it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. My impression was that the suggestion I made is overtechnical. I agree to it; but it is a very important appropriation, and I know how technical the auditors for the Treasury Department are.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will say that I appreciate the suggestion, and I think it ought to be acted on, and I will keep it in mind in conference, if a change is not made before it gets to conference.

I desire to submit, in lieu of the committee amendment, an amendment suggested by the department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the committee amendment it is proposed to insert the following:

In case of an emergency arising out of the existence of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious disease of animals, which, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, threatens the live-stock industry of the country, he may expend in the city of Washington and elsewhere, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500,000, or so much thereof as he determines to be necessary, in the arrest and eradication of any such disease, including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction, in cooperation with the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease, and said sum shall be immediately available for the purposes specified.

Mr. GORE. I will suggest that the amendment which I have offered is intended to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make the payments for cattle heretofore slaughtered. The value of those which have been slaughtered exceeds the emergency appropriation made sometime ago, and there was some doubt as to whether or not such payments could be made under the language of the appropriation. This is intended to remove any uncertainty.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator state what percentage of loss is met by the National Government?

Mr. GORE. One-half.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is it one-half?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I suggest that the entire amendment go over until to-morrow. Possibly the chairman may frame such a provision as would be certain to carry an appropriation and incorporate the provision that he has just offered in it.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not ask that it go over until I can offer an amendment tending to perfect it on behalf of the committee.

Mr. JONES. I shall be very glad to withhold the request until the Senator offers a committee amendment to perfect it.

Mr. WARREN. I offer two amendments to the same section, both of which have been submitted to the chairman of the committee and both of which have the approval of the department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 82, line 17, after the word "disease," it is proposed to insert:

Wherever found, and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I suggest——

Mr. WARREN. There is also another amendment, which the Secretary has not yet read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the second amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

The SECRETARY. At the end of line 18, it is proposed to substitute a semicolon for the period and to add the following:

Provided, That no payment for any such diseased or exposed animal or contaminated or exposed materials shall be made if any of the quarantine regulations of the Department of Agriculture shall have been so violated at the yards or pen where such animal is seized or materials found as to cause the disease against which the quarantine is established.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington requests that this amendment be passed over and that it be printed. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES. And these suggested amendments.

Mr. GORE. I have no objection.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest that it be likewise printed as it has been proposed to be amended, so that we may see it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, these amendments will be printed. The Chair hears no objection to this amendment being passed over. The Secretary will resume the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 82, after line 18, to insert:

The unexpended balance on June 30, 1914, remaining to the credit of the appropriation authorized in the Agricultural appropriation act approved March 4, 1913, for the expenses of a commission to investigate and report to Congress on European cooperative land-mortgage banks and rural-credit unions, is hereby appropriated and made available for the fiscal years 1915 and 1916, including expenses incurred since the end of the fiscal year 1914, for the purposes set forth in said act, to be paid out on the audit and order of the chairman of said commission; and such audit and order shall be conclusive and binding upon all departments as to the correctness of the accounts of such commission under this appropriation and under the appropriation made for the fiscal year 1914.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I wish to ask what the unexpended amount of this appropriation is?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the amount actually unexpended and on hand is about $1,500. It was appropriated originally to carry out that work, and it was supposed at the time that it would remain available during the life of the commission. Now a technical point has been raised that it expired with the fiscal year, and this is intended simply to continue the appropriation during the lifetime of the commission.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What does the language mean in line 2, page 83, "including expenses incurred since the end of the fiscal year"?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is intended to meet the situation in which the commission finds itself under a technical ruling of the comptroller, that the appropriation covered only the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914. It continues the appropriation during the life of the commission, as the original act, according

to our construction, meant. The most of the fund was expended prior to that time, I will say to the Senator, because, you will remember, this commission went to Europe and spent three months there.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What I mean to suggest is that I think the words "including expenses" are rather blind, because if the Senator will look at the way this language is framed he will see that it provides that the unexpended balance "is hereby appropriated and made available for the fiscal years 1915 and 1916, including expenses incurred since the end of the fiscal year 1914." What does that mean—that a balance is made available, including some expenses?

Mr. FLETCHER. There are no extra expenses. It is simply to include the items from 1914 on down to date and to the end of 1916; that is all. It is no additional appropriation, no additional item.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It seems to me to be blind, but I am satisfied with it if the Senator is.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think it is all right. It is all right, I think, according to the direction of the comptroller.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I think this matter ought to go over. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I hope——

Mr. JONES. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Washington withhold that motion?

Mr. JONES. No; I will not. It is now nearly 11 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the floor, and does not yield it.

Mr. JONES. The Chair recognized me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. JONES. No; I did not ask the Senator to yield at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the floor. He had not surrendered the floor.

Mr. JONES. But the Presiding Officer recognized me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asked the Senator from Florida if he would yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. No.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does the Senator insist that this matter shall not be acted on now?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Everybody else is willing to agree to it.

Mr. JONES. When the Senator gets through I will take my action.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate take a recess——

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, before the motion to take a recess is agreed to I simply wish to ask the consent of the Senate, or I will ask it to-morrow morning before this bill is taken up again, immediately on the assembling of the Senate, to have a short executive session.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Florida if he will not yield to me to offer some reports from the Finance Committee.

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I ask who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina has the floor.

Mr. JONES. That is all right.

PETITIONS.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of Borner Grange, No. 7, Patrons of Husbandry, of Lander, Wyo., praying for the adoption of a system of rural credits, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SAULSBURY presented petitions of sundry citizens of Delaware, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. BRYAN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 21491) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

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

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 21328) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and I submit a report (No. 1028) thereon.

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

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21201) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, to report it with amendments and submit a report (No. 1024) thereon.

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 19061. An act for the relief of homestead entrymen under the reclamation projects of the United States (Rept. No. 1026); and

H. R. 19116. An act to grant certain lands to the city of Grand Junction, Colo., for the protection of its water supply (Rept. No. 1025).

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 4110) authorizing the cutting of timber for mining purposes by corporations organized in one State and conducting mining operation in another, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1027) thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21218) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1030) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21089) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1029) thereon.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1062) granting a patent to Joseph Robicheau, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1031) thereon.

Mr. SIMMONS, from the Committee on Finance, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 5909. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1880 (Rept. No. 1033);

H. R. 2909. An act to extend the privileges of the seventh section of immediate-transportation act to Bay City, Mich. (Rept. No. 1034); and

H. R. 9591. An act to permit the manufacture of denatured alcohol by mixing domestic and wood alcohol while in process of distillation (Rept. No. 1032).

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 7727) granting a pension to Mattie S. M. Hope (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 7728) granting an increase of pension to Edelbert Roundy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 7729) to authorize the reinstatement of George Hill Carruth as a cadet in the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILLMAN:

A bill (S. 7730) to provide for the appointment of a district judge, district attorney, and marshal for the western district of South Carolina, and for other purposes (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. NEWLANDS submitted an amendment authorizing the District Court of the United States for the District of Alaska, third division, to direct its clerk to refund to the Copper River & Northwestern Railway Co. an amount turned over to him as a license tax of $100 per mile on each mile of road operated in Alaska, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general

deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 21546), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RECESS.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. I move that the Senate take a recess until half past 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest to the Senator that he make it 11 o'clock.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, it was understood, or, at least, a number of Senators on this side of the Chamber understood, that the session to-night would last only until about 10 o'clock. We have been here an hour longer, and I appeal to the Senator to make it 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

Mr. SIMMONS. I will change the motion to 11 o'clock.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina moves that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m., Wednesday, February 24, 1915) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, February 25, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m..

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *February 24, 1915.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

We bless Thee, Infinite Spirit, our heavenly Father, for the industry, patience, courage, integrity, and self-control which obtains in the Members of this great legislative body—for the courtesy displayed when feelings are tense on questions of moment before them. Let Thy blessing be upon them in the closing hours of this historic Congress, that they may finish their work and leave behind them a record worthy of emulation. And Thine be the praise, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 20347. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill H. R. 19909, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. GALLINGER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 20347) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Army appropriation bill, H. R. 20347, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20347) making appropriations for the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

Mr. GARDNER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. GARDNER. The Speaker asked if there was objection, and I rose to reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. All right.

Mr. GARDNER. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he is in possession of a letter which was written by the Secretary of War or by Gen. Scriven pointing out the necessity of this increase in the aviation appropriation?

Mr. HAY. I am.

Mr. GARDNER. And is the chairman inclined to think that there is some merit in the letter?

Mr. HAY. For what purpose does the gentleman ask that question?

Mr. GARDNER. Because the gentleman, when this was put to a vote in the House, did not mention the existence of that letter—that he had it at the time.

Mr. HAY. I do not recall now whether I had it then or not. I do not know whether it was my business to mention it, even if I did have it.

Mr. GARDNER. When I raised the question as to the gentleman making a mistake in his $300,000 figures, I was supplied immediately afterward with a copy of this letter.

Mr. HAY. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that what was asked for by the War Department was $400,000.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. HAY. And the Committee on Military Affairs cut it down to $300,000, and the Senate committee has raised it to $400,000.

Mr. GARDNER. I understand.

Mr. HAY. And when we get into conference we will do the best we can about it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. HAY, Mr. DENT, and Mr. KAHN.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Washington rise?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I desire to ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a statement from the Forest Service regarding the proposed reduction in the size of the Olympic national monument.

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

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, if there are no appropriation bills demanding consideration, I ask that the Speaker lay before the House the bill (H. R. 17869) providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of the State of Georgia, with Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 17869) providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of the State of Georgia.

Mr. CULLOP rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. CULLOP. I rise for the purpose of moving a nonconcurrence in the Senate amendments.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I make a preferential motion. I desire to move to concur in all three Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] makes a preferential motion to concur in all three of the Senate amendments.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of that motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SPEAKER. The gentleman undoubtedly has the right to it.

Mr. WEBB. I have the floor, Mr. Speaker, have I not?

The SPEAKER. Yes; but everybody has the right to inject that remark into the proceedings.

Mr. WEBB. Certainly. I wanted to see if we could have some agreement as to the time for the discussion of this motion, because I realize the importance of time at this juncture, and I am willing to do my part toward expediting the disposition of the public business. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman any time he desires, so far as my hour is concerned.

Mr. CRISP. I realize at this stage of the session that the House can not take much time on this bill, and I would like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. MANN. We have plenty of time this morning, for all that I can see.

The SPEAKER. What suggestion has anybody to make about this bill?

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the motion to concur and nonconcur be limited to two hours, one half the time to be controlled by myself and the other half to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman from Minnesota opposed to this bill?

Mr. CULLOP rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] be allowed to control the time instead of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] asks unanimous consent that the debate on the motion to concur in these amendments shall be limited to two hours, one hour to be controlled by himself and the other by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. Now, for what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. CULLOP. The purpose was to have a division of the time, to be controlled as it is already decided to be controlled, one-half by the friends of the amendment and one-half by those who are opposed to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, when this bill passed the House it provided for an additional judge in the southern district of Georgia. The business of the courts there was falling behind. The late Attorney General, Mr. Wickersham, had an agent of the Department of Justice investigate the status of the docket in the district, and he reported that he thought Judge Speer, the judge of that district, should have additional help, because only 62 per cent of the cases filed were being tried yearly, and the business of the court was gradually falling behind, and the Attorney General had Judge Grubbs, from Alabama, detailed to help catch up with the docket.

This bill was introduced in the House by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. WEBB], and not by any of the Georgia Members. The Judiciary Committee reported it favorably, the report being a unanimous one. The House will recall that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was sent to Georgia to investigate the conduct of the judge of the southern district, Judge Emory Speer. When the committee returned they were of the opinion that the district needed relief, and this bill was the outcome of their report, being introduced, as I said, not by a Georgia Member but by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. WEBB, who had just returned from an investigation of the conditions in the judicial district. If the Members of the House will notice the report, they will see that former Attorney General—now Justice—McReynolds on August 4, 1914, wrote the chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. WEBB] to this effect:

> Permit me to reply to your letter of this date, inclosing House bill 17869, providing for an additional judge for Georgia, etc.
>
> Under existing circumstances it seems to me essential that there should be another judge in the southern district of Georgia. The conditions there are lamentable, and I know of no other way in which they can be speedily remedied. I hope the bill will be promptly enacted into law.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman had reference to the House bill, had he not?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. What has the gentleman to say with reference to the amendment put on by the Senate to make two permanent judges there?

Mr. CRISP. I will come to that in a moment. I was trying to acquaint the House with the conditions that obtained which caused the House in its wisdom to pass the bill providing an extra judge in the district. This bill came up in the House, and the House in its wisdom saw fit to pass the bill as reported to the House, providing that the additional judge should be temporary—or, rather, that when Judge Speer either retired or passed away there should be no successor appointed to him and there should thereafter be only one permanent judge in the district.

Judge Speer is a very able man. In the vigor of his youth he was able to keep up with the work. He is well advanced in years and for a considerable time has suffered with hay fever, which necessitates his absence from the district a good many months in each year in a high altitude. Now, the House passed this bill, but adopted what is known as the Cullop amendment, which provides that the President shall make public the indorsements filed in support of the person appointed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WEBB. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia three minutes more.

Mr. CRISP. Personally I have no objection to the amendment, though I doubt whether it is constitutional. I realize that in saying that I may bring ridicule upon myself for mentioning the Constitution in this body. [Applause.] But, Mr. Speaker, at this late day in the session I fear that if the House insists upon that amendment it may jeopardize the bill. For that reason I have moved that the House concur in the Senate amendment to eliminate from the bill the Cullop amendment.

The southern district of Georgia covers the entire southern half of the State and has a population of 1,340,000 people. It has two large ports in it. Judge Speer lives in Macon, which is over 200 miles from either Savannah or Brunswick. Savannah is the largest port for the export of naval supplies in the world. It is the second largest port for the exportation of cotton in the world. Brunswick has a large commerce, and there is a considerable maritime practice in this district. There are 76 counties in the southern district of Georgia. In my opinion, the Senate believed that the best interests of the Government would be served by dividing this very large district into two districts. Therefore the Senate adopted an amendment providing that there should be two judges, or that the new judge should be permanent, which will mean, if the bill becomes a law, that later the southern district will be divided and there will be two districts. According to the RECORD, page 4215, of the proceedings of the present session of Congress, Senators BURTON and ROOT favored the passage of this bill with this amendment making this judge permanent, and it was stated on the floor of the Senate that it had the unanimous support of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the best interests of the Government and the people of Georgia will be best subserved by this judge being made permanent, and therefore I have moved to concur in the amendment so providing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. WEBB. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia two minutes more.

Mr. CRISP. I thank the gentleman, and I will stop at the end of that time.

The third amendment simply strikes out the provision allowing the senior circuit judge to designate which district judge shall hold the court. That amendment is unnecessary, because section 23 of the Judicial Code, passed March 3, 1911, regulates this matter. If this bill becomes a law, the general law will provide that until the district is divided the senior circuit judge shall designate the judge to hold the court, so that this provision of the bill as it passed the House is unnecessary. The Senate amendment is a wise one, and I hope it will be concurred in. [Applause.]

Mr. WEBB. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. EDWARDS]. If he does not desire to use the time, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to use five minutes of his time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair remind me when I have used 10 minutes? I do not think there is any need at all of this additional judge. When we passed the bill it was stated that the judge there, Judge Speer, was in ill health and was not attending to the business of the court so as to keep it up to date. The other day somebody down there sent me a clipping from the Savannah News, containing a statement made by Judge Speer in discharging the Federal grand jury recently. This clipping is dated February 17, 1915. In this statement to the grand jury Judge Speer, among other things, said:

> You will be very glad to learn that the business of the district is in a most satisfactory condition.

This follows a statement of the number of cases pending in the court, the number of new cases which had been brought, and the number of cases which had been disposed of, with an analysis of the cases which were pending. For instance, take the criminal cases, one important class of suits in that court. Of these there were 179 pending on the 28th of last December. Of that number 57 had been instituted during the months of November and December of last year. In 28 cases no arrests had been made. This left only 94 criminal cases in the entire district over two months old. Of the 176 civil cases pending, 13 were pending on reference before masters; 5 for settlement; in 1 the defendant was dead and no party made; 27 had been filed recently and were not ready for trial or final action; 4 were ancillary to proceedings pending in other districts; 2 awaited the decision of the circuit court of appeals; and 1 awaited the mandate. The judge goes through the different classes of cases pending in his court and shows that the busi-

ness is up to date, probably better in that district than almost any other district in the United States. So you see there is no congestion of business there.

I also received a clipping from the Albany Herald of the date of February 5 last, which has this heading to it:

United States court had a busy session. Practically nothing remaining on the docket after adjournment on January 25.

It has this statement:

The United States court transacted a great deal of business at the recent January term in Albany, and a recapitulation of the docket is highly interesting. It shows that not a single case which could be disposed of was left unattended to, and the docket is in excellent shape.

Then follows a statement in detail of the several cases, bankruptcy cases, naturalization cases, criminal business, and so forth, and the article winds up with the statement, "No cases or matters were left undisposed of that could be tried."

These statements, which can not be successfully contradicted as to the details, show that there is no need of an additional judge in Georgia at this time. More business has been disposed of in that district during the last few months by far than in the average of districts in the United States, and fewer cases undisposed of are pending by far than in the average districts in the United States.

I appreciate the desire of gentlemen in the House to create additional judgships, to be filled by their friends or by a friend, but, after all, that is hardly a sufficient reason for providing an additional judge. If we are ever to exercise any economy, we ought to exercise it in regard to matters of this sort.

Doubtless many people would like to be appointed to a judgeship for life, and if this bill passes some one person will receive the appointment. But if the bill passes it will be for the benefit of that person and not for the benefit of the public business; the public business of the district does not require an additional judge.

It is true that that is not the question now pending in the House, but gentlemen on the other side who have spoken have urged that the House recede from its position in reference to the publicity, and so forth, because of the need of a judge. The judgeship can wait; the House has repeatedly declared its position on these questions, and the House is entitled to maintain its position, instead of yielding weakly to the Senate. When the bill was before the House it was urged that the bill ought to pass because it was such a trifling matter; it did not involve the appointment of a permanent judge. Now, gentlemen say that they want a permanent judge. If the proposition before the House when the bill passed had been the appointment of a permanent judge, I do not believe that the House would have passed the bill.

There are in the United States, as shown by the report of the Attorney General, at least 40 or 50 districts that need a judge much more than this district. The House, instead of constantly creating additional judgeships, ought, in my opinion, to restrict the jurisdiction of the Federal court, so that so many cases will not be taken from the State courts to the Federal courts. [Applause.] We will never accomplish that purpose if we constantly increase the number of the Federal judges. There is no reason why every corporation having a lawsuit involving over $5,000 should be permitted to take it to the Federal court. The people, the individuals and the corporations, on matters which do not involve great national or constitutional questions ought to be willing and ought to be compelled to submit their differences to the local State courts. [Applause.] I think the only way to accomplish that is to stand out against increasing the number of the Federal judges. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of saving time I wish to say that we will have but one more speech on this side, and if the gentleman from Illinois will use the remainder of his time it may be that we will cut the two hours short.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, since this bill was projected into the House this morning I have taken occasion to examine the reports of the Attorney General for the year 1913 and the last one available, that of 1914. These reports give a detailed account of the business pending in the northern district of Georgia as well as all other districts of the United States. I have compared the condition of business pending in the northern district of Georgia where it is proposed to have two permanent judges under the bill now presented for consideration with those existing in districts in Indiana, the eastern district of Washington, and the district I am most familiar with in my own State, the eastern district of Wisconsin.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. This bill provides for an additional judge in the southern district of Georgia and not the northern district.

Mr. STAFFORD. The tables that I examined were for the southern district of Georgia. It was a mere inadvertence my saying northern district.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman the total number of cases tried last year in Indiana and the total number in Georgia?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have. In the case of Indiana other than those suits to which the United States was a party, and that is the main factor in the consideration of the bill before us, there was commenced during the fiscal year 120 suits. There was terminated during the year 134, leaving as unfinished at the close of business June 14, 145. The district of Indiana is represented by only one district judge.

Let us compare the conditions of business in this southern district of Georgia, where they ask in the motion made by the gentleman from Georgia to constitute permanently two judges. I claim there is not much basis for an argument made in favor of the emergency judge coming to the relief of Judge Speer, according to the statement made by the Attorney General in his reports.

I have here the statistics for the southern district of Georgia. Number of cases commenced during the fiscal year, 79; number terminated, 68; pending at the close of business June 30, 130. More cases were pending for disposal in the district of Indiana than in the southern district of Georgia.

Mr. COX. How many in the whole State of Georgia?

Mr. STAFFORD. That, of course, takes in another district. I have the northern district here, and I will give the gentleman the figures; but that is beside the question before us, because we are only providing an additional judge in the southern district. In the northern district the number of cases commenced during the fiscal year was 94; number terminated, 81; number pending at the close of business June 30, 153. There is more warrant for an additional judge in the case of the northern district than there is in the southern district.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. What is the comparison in new business between Georgia and Nebraska, which has two judges?

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course Nebraska is a Western State. I have not examined that. I think that you will find in the case of Nebraska that they would not have near so much business, because it is an agricultural State.

Mr. MURDOCK. They have two judges there.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; and one office was created, no doubt, in years gone by to give some place to a favorite of a Member of another body, just as the proposal is here to give some additional place to some favorite, so that he may hold a life job. I can give that in Nebraska, if the gentleman wishes, but I hardly think that is a parallel case, because Georgia may be likened more to Indiana, where there is not only agriculture but also manufactures, the same as in Wisconsin. I will take the case of Nebraska.

Mr. MURDOCK. Just the new cases.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois to yield me five minutes more.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is but one district in Nebraska, according to the report.

Mr. MURDOCK. There are two judges.

Mr. STAFFORD. If there are two judges, it is not disclosed by this report. Number of cases commenced during the fiscal year, 273; number terminated, a very good record, 326; number pending at the close of business, 317. I could go on and cite figures from the other districts which I have examined, but I think I have shown in the figures given of the condition of business in parallel district courts that there is no reason for a permanent additional judge in the southern district of Georgia, as this bill contemplates in the Senate amendment. As the bill passed the House it was provided that upon the death or resignation of the present incumbent of that court that position should not be filled. That practice has only been followed in a few cases where the conditions have been presented of an aged judge, one who had reached the age of retirement but who refused to retire because he wished to die in office, clogging of the business of the court. I remember in my service of 10 years three or four bills have been introduced to cover those emergencies. Many of us waived the question as to whether

there was real need for an additional judge for temporary purposes because of the unpopularity of Judge Speer and voted in favor of it, so as to remove all doubt.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] makes a strong plea on the ground that Judge Speer is a hay-fever sufferer. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be one of those unfortunates myself, but during the past two summers I have remained at my work here in Washington. Two years ago I was a member of the lobby-investigating committee, and while at home was summoned here for that work. I remained here during all of that summer and suffered the torments of the damned. Nevertheless I worked, and again I remained here all of last summer during the hay-fever season, from the middle of August until the latter part of October. That is only a temporary condition which occurs when judges usually take their vacations. There is no good argument to be made for the passage of this as a temporary relief measure, because the condition of the calendar does not show that the business is being congested there and that justice is in any way being impaired by delay.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Have not the statutes of the United States been recently amended so as to authorize the transfer of a judge from another district anywhere in the United States for the purpose of relieving congestion?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, some time ago we passed here a relief measure authorizing the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court to assign circuit judges for relief in New York only, but the civil code, as I recall, authorizes the Chief Justice to assign district judges to other districts, but the gentleman will realize that the district judges are not inclined to leave their own districts and take up additional work in other districts. They are willing to go to New York because of the experience gained by a brief service there of two or three months, but they do not care to be assigned to a little district in the South or in the West. They decline to serve, and it is necessary to have the full cooperation of the judge before he is assigned. That would not be a relief, if there was really any emergency presented here for consideration.

I say to the House on this presentation that I can see no reason for having an emergency judge to come to the relief of this district and the relief of Judge Speer, and certainly no good reason can be advanced in favor of having two judges for the southern district of Georgia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

GENERAL DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 21546) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1915 and for prior years, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report (No. 1440), referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves all points of order on the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, some gentlemen have just inquired respecting the appropriation bills, and I desire to say that this is the last of the general appropriation bills. [Applause.]

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP].

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] to concur in the Senate amendments will be voted down. The first Senate amendment was to strike out an amendment adopted by the House by a very decisive vote of more than 100 majority. It was to make public by the President all indorsements of the applicants. The second amendment of the Senate is to abolish the temporary provision in reference to this judge and therefore to make it permanent. Now, surely it will not be contended here that this kind of practice in legislation ought to be indulged in even to give some of our friends an office——

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULLOP. Certainly.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman support the bill if the judgeship is left temporary or as an emergency matter and the permanency of it stricken from the bill?

Mr. CULLOP. No; I will not support it then. I do not believe in a duplication of these judgeships. Even if the duplication were made to give my very best friend a job, I would not vote for it then. I do not believe in looting the Public Treasury in that way. I am opposed to that manner of dealing out the patronage. I believe in a higher standard in dispensing the patronage. There is a proper way to get at this. If the present incumbent is not satisfactory, prefer charges and have him removed. Dispose of him in the proper way and not by this proposed questionable method. Our platform indorsed the publicity of these matters, and we ought to carry out the pledges of our party, because the people indorsed that platform at the polls and expect us to obey their instructions. The Senate has refused to comply with it in respect to this particular proposition, and that responsibility is with it to satisfy the people for its breach of duty. Shall that be the policy of this House, especially when that policy is to repudiate a plank in our platform? I hope not. We should be true to the trust reposed and not falter in our duty. Now, from the showing of the gentleman from Illinois, there is no need for this judgeship. The business of that district is up as nearly as any of the courts of this country. In fact, it is in a much better condition than many of the districts in different parts of the country. It is in a better condition than nearly every other district in the United States, and it therefore clearly appears litigants are not suffering from this cause.

Now, because a judge is disagreeable to some litigant or to some of the people in that district, or because he does not retire and give some other man a good job, I do not think that is any excuse for us here in this instance to trample upon what is right and just. There are not as many cases in that district as there are in the district of Indiana. There is not as large a population in the State of Georgia, with its two districts, as there is in the State of Indiana, comprising one district. With more than 3,000,000 of population, with many large business interests of various kinds important in character, one judge in Indiana does the business, and is not occupied nearly all the time each year. In the State of Nebraska, with one judge, that judge is doing as much business, according to the report of the Attorney General, as is done in both districts in Georgia.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULLOP. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the gentleman will find there are two judges in Nebraska.

Mr. CULLOP. I am taking the Attorney General's report as read here a moment ago, which says there is only one. There are two judges—a circuit and a district judge—but the circuit judge no longer holds court as a trial judge in the hearing of cases.

Mr. KINKAID. I desire to say to the gentleman there are two district judges in Nebraska.

Mr. CULLOP. Two district judges, with a population that is nearly as large as the State of Georgia, and with more cases in the court than there are in both districts in Georgia, as the report shows, and those two judges are keeping up the business in the State of Nebraska, but one judge in Indiana is doing the business of that State and keeping up with the docket, and frequently holds court in other States. Now, what is the situation here? It is the policy in litigation that all litigation possible should be tried in the State courts and not in the Federal court; but if we are to duplicate the judgeships to reward political friends or to escape the wrath of a tyrannical judge to appease some one who imagines he has a grievance, then we will reverse the settled policy so long in existence and establish a new one which will be subject to great abuse and reflect on the judiciary of the entire country and one that will provoke intense criticism throughout the country. If we establish this policy, we will regret it, and the country will suffer because of it. I dare say one could not go in a district but what he would find somebody who has a grievance against the presiding judge, whether it is real or imaginary is immaterial. That is another consideration. But there will be found no judge who sits on the bench and administers the laws but what he will trample upon the toes and offend some one in the administration of the same. Appoint these duplicate judges, establish this policy, and we will break down that better policy in litigation; that is, to discourage litigation in the Federal courts and let the State courts settle the litigation.

This proposed policy, this breaking down of a well-settled tradition, will encourage it, because there will be an attempt to make more business in the Federal court and try cases there that ought to be tried in the State courts, bring litigants from long distances, and impose hardships both as to the consumption of time and as to the cost of litigation. The adoption of the policy here proposed will menace the administration of justice and have a bad effect on the public. Now, I am going, when the time comes, to ask for a separate vote on these amend-

ments. The first amendment proposes that the President of the United States, before he makes the appointment of these judges, shall make public the names of the indorsements of the applicant. [Applause.] This is the reason that this fight is on. The Senate is hostile to this amendment. I do not know whether the applicants are or not, but I should think that any man who would apply for the high office of a judgeship would not be afraid or ashamed to have his indorsers made public before the appointment. If he is, he is unworthy to hold that important office and should not be considered in making the appointment. I am sure no President of this country would refuse to comply with such a law. This is the question involved in this bill. I stood for this amendment under a Republican Executive; I stand just as strongly for it under a Democratic Executive. [Applause.] I see no reason why I should be for it when a Republican was President and against it when a Democrat is President. If it is good in one case, it is good in the other. I take it that the constitutionality of this amendment will not longer be controverted. It has been assailed on this ground, but in vain. That question has been determined here in this House on more occasions than one, and on each occasion that assault has been refuted from every standpoint. The principles of the Constitution apply. The principles embodied in that great document may be old, but they easily apply to new doctrines as the occasions arise and sustain them, and it does in this instance, to the delight of its friends and to the chagrin of its enemies. Things now are conceded constitutional which five years ago were denounced as unconstitutional; but they now accept the application of old principles to new doctrines, and this amendment means another step in advance in this respect, one for the public good and the advancement of essential protection to the courts of the country and the welfare of the people. It will prevent vicious and unfounded attacks on the judiciary of the country and uphold the dignity of the courts.

It means this, that if we stand by this amendment we will soon get another amendment to the Constitution that will be hailed with delight in this country. That amendment will be that judges shall be elected for specified terms by a vote of the people in the districts over which they are to preside. Can any man give a reason why the people are competent to select a President, to select State judges, and other public officers, but when you come to the selection of a Federal judge they are not competent to make a selection for that office? The sooner we get this amendment, gentlemen, anybody in this House can see the sooner we will be relieved from such vicious legislation as is proposed here now, and the sooner we will secure the adoption of an amendment to the Federal Constitution requiring that all Federal judges be elected for specified terms, and then the people can select their judges and Congress will not be troubled with such embarrassing legislation as is now proposed. The adoption of the amendment which I have proposed will hasten the authority to elect judges and other Federal officers, which will produce a better era in this Republic and elevate its standards among the people. I hope the day will soon come when the people will elect their officials, and the life tenure will be abolished. A better condition will then prevail, and better administration of public affairs result.

I can not imagine a more vicious thing than to legislate a man out of office by indirection, as they are proposing to do in this bill. It is not to relieve a congested docket; that is not its real purpose, but the real object of this measure means to legislate a Federal judge out of office and put somebody else in his place. Behind this is concealed the real object and another purpose is made to appear, but it will not deceive us. The proposition is vicious within itself. It is revolutionary. If the judge is guilty of such misconduct that he is unfitted to hold his court, charges ought to be preferred against him, and have them investigated, and if sustained remove him as the law prescribes. But it is revolutionary procedure when Congress proposes to establish a new office, a duplicate office, and put the present judge out of office by indirection. We should hesitate before we adopt such a method and consider the consequences of such a course. That is just what this kind of legislation means. It is not only revolutionary legislation, but it is indefensible from any standpoint. Unmasked, it is an attempt to appropriate spoils before the time has come. It is a new way of reaching the pie counter. Now, for one I do not justify the plan, and I do not believe anybody else would openly defend it. It will not be commended by many, I am sure. It is not the way to obtain a judgeship in this country.

If such measures of legislation are resorted to for the purpose of removing the judiciary in this country it will lower the dignity of every Federal court in the United States and menace the judges in the discharge of their duties. Men who hold the judgeships will stand trembling with fear as to the next step Congress will take to legislate them out of office and deprive them of their positions. The spoilsman will camp on their trails all the time. As I have said, the whole plan is revolutionary in its purpose; it is hostile to the spirit of our institutions and the good administration of justice. It is lowering the dignity of every Federal court in this country, and we ought to vote the measure down. We ought to stop such proceedings and put a veto now on this plan of removing Federal judges. For that is what it means, and it means nothing else. Such legislation ought to be voted down, because it is casting a gloom over the pure administration of justice in this country. If Judge Speer is abusing the functions of his high office, complain to the right tribunal, make the charges, have him investigated and removed, but do not adopt this revolutionary plan to put him or any other judge out of office. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this measure should become a law, and if the President will consider the purpose which animates its enactment, the real object behind it—spoils, purely spoils—the effect it probably will have on the judiciary of the country, watch the scramble for the appointment under it, in my judgment he will hesitate in giving it his approval; and if he refuses to approve it he will do a great work for the upholding of the dignity of the courts of this country and reprove this method of appropriating spoils, which can not, in my judgment, be from any standpoint justified.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, on December 9 when this bill was before the House I gave expression to my views, and tried to put before the House the reasons why we need this judge. My remarks can be found on page 66 of the RECORD of December 9, 1914. To the mind of any man who has investigated this matter, there can be no doubt but that we need this relief and need it very badly.

I was somewhat amused when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] read from the Savannah Press a statement made by Judge Speer. I am not at all surprised, because it shows the extent to which this judge will go to grip every inch of power that he can. He gave out a statement which he knows is absolutely against this bill, and, in my opinion, it was so aimed, and there can be little doubt about it. To show the need for another judge, I want to read from the report—pages 2 and 3—of the committee:

The subcommittee examined witnesses whose evidence tended to support the charges made against Judge Speer, as follows:

1. That he had violated section 67 of the Judicial Code in allowing his son-in-law, Mr. A. H. Hayward, to be appointed and employed in offices and duties in his court;
2. That he had violated the bankruptcy act in allowing compensation in excess of the provisions of that act to a trustee who was his personal friend;
3. That he had violated the laws as to drawing jurors;
4. That he had violated the mandate of the Supreme Court of the United States;
5. That he had been guilty of the oppressive and corrupt use of his official position in deciding cases unjustly in favor of his son-in-law;
6. That he was guilty of unlawful and corrupt conduct in proceedings in cases wherein his son-in-law had a contingent fee;
7. That he was guilty of corrupt and unwarranted abuse of his official authority in using court officers who were paid by the Government as private servants without rendering any service to the Government.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. Not just now, if my colleague will pardon me. The report further says:

8. That he was guilty of oppressive and corrupt conduct in allowing the dissipation of assets of bankruptcy estates in the employment of unnecessary officials and the payment of excessive fees;
9. That he was guilty of oppressive and corrupt abuse in granting orders appointing receivers for property without notice to the owners and without cause, resulting in great costs to the parties;
10. That he was guilty of oppressive and corrupt abuse of authority in refusing to allow the dismissal of litigation for the purpose of permitting relatives and favorites to profit by the receipts of large fees;
11. That he was guilty of improper, if not a corrupt, abuse of authority in taking, or causing to be taken, money from the court funds for his private use;
12. That he was guilty of oppressive conduct in entertaining matters beyond his jurisdiction, fixing fines, and the like;
13. That he was guilty of unlawful and oppressive conduct in denying the mandate of the Circuit Court of Appeals;
14. That he was guilty of oppressive conduct in allowing money to remain on deposit without interest in banks in which relatives or friends were interested;
15. That he was guilty of allowing excessive fees to receivers for improper purposes and also corrupt conduct in raising the amount of fees allowed to others in order that his son-in-law might profit thereby;
16. That he was guilty of attempted bribery of officials appointed to act as custodians;
17. That he was guilty of oppressive conduct in unlawfully seizing and selling property;
18. That he was guilty of the excessive use of drugs; and
19. That he was guilty of general unlawful and oppressive conduct for his own private ends.

On page 165, the conclusion of that subcommittee is as follows:

The subcommittee regrets its inability to either recommend a complete acquittal of Judge Speer of all culpability so far as these charges are concerned, on the one hand, or an impeachment on the other. And yet it is persuaded that the competent legal evidence at hand is not sufficient to procure a conviction at the hands of the Senate. But it does feel that the record presents a series of legal oppressions and shows an abuse of judicial discretion which, though falling short of impeachable offenses, demand condemnation and criticism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. EDWARDS. Then I will yield to my colleague [Mr. TRIBBLE] for a question.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Granting that all you have read there is true, this House passed a bill to create a temporary judge to be associated with Judge Speer. Now, how does your position prove that two permanent judges will be needed in the southern district of Georgia when Judge Speer is retired at 72 years of age, or goes off the bench?

Mr. EDWARDS. My answer to my colleague is this: Georgia, with a population of 2,609,000, has only two judges. Florida, with a population of 700,000, has two judges. Alabama, with a population of 450,000 less than Georgia, has two judges. In the southern district of Georgia there are 76 counties. There are five divisions. The courts are held at Albany, Augusta, Valdosta, Macon, and Savannah. The southern district of Georgia has a population of 1,354,000.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. EDWARDS. I have only two minutes, and I would like to offer further reasons in support of this bill. I yield to my friend.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Does not the record show that the northern district of Georgia is seventh in volume of business in the United States, and does not the record show that Judge Newman is up with his business in that district? And does not the record show that there is only one-half of the business in the southern district that there is in the northern district?

Mr. EDWARDS. Judge Newman is an exceptionally good judge. I have looked into this matter, and I agree with the report of the committee that three permanent judges are necessary for Georgia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] to make a statement.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I find after conferring with the members of the Judiciary Committee that they feel they can not support the amendment providing that this judge shall be a permanent judge. And knowing that the district needs relief, and believing the surest way to get that relief is to defer to the views of the members of the Judiciary Committee, I give notice that I am going to change my motion by moving to concur in the first and third Senate amendments and ask the House to nonconcur in the amendment making the judge permanent. [Applause.]

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the argument based upon the quotation from the articles of impeachment is wholly aside from the issue that is presented by these amendments. A bill was reported favorably from the Committee on the Judiciary recognizing, perhaps owing to the discontent and difficulty that pervaded that district and the dissatisfaction among members of the bar in some quarters, that the appointment of a judge temporarily would relieve the situation to a certain extent. The amendments that are returned from the Senate wholly destroy the original purpose of the bill, and for that reason I am opposed to the amendments.

As to the first one, I am in principle opposed to it. I would concur in striking that out of the bill, from my personal viewpoint, as being unnecessary and not a wise provision.

Now, with regard to the other two——

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the gentleman think we have the power to instruct the President as to what he should do in the matter of appointing judges under the Constitution?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I do not think we ought to ask for the production and printing of anything that is sent to the President to inform him in the exercise of his executive function.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. I simply wanted to ask the gentleman whether he did not think it would be an invasion of the power of the Executive for Congress to attempt to do that, and whether the President could not regard it as being absolutely an interference with his powers under the fundamental law to do a thing of that sort.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Well, I do not know as to that; it is a request that might be granted, and the President might furnish the information. Yet, I think it is an intrusion upon the Executive by the legislative branch; and inasmuch as I am opposed to the encroachment by the Executive upon the legislative branch of the Government, so I am opposed to the encroachment by the legislative branch upon the Executive.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman has put it in the way in which I wanted to ask it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. We have to-day too much interference on the part of one branch of the Government with the functions of another, and I would like to have an opportunity at some time to voice a protest against it as a wrong that will produce evils the consequences of which it is impossible at this time to measure.

But, speaking of the bill, I do not object to the first amendment being concurred in. As to the second amendment, we ought not to concur in it, because it revolutionizes the legislation of the House completely and destroys the purpose of this bill. The statistics quoted here show clearly that there is no need of an additional permanent law judge in that district, and this temporary appointment, which would expire upon the death of the judge now holding the senior commission, was the only thing recommended by our committee.

As to third paragraph, which has been excluded by the Senate amendment, I have some doubt as to the wisdom of leaving that out of the bill. I think there ought to be a direction that the senior judge should arrange the order of business and the assignment of cases for trial in the district between the several district judges. There is no good reason for striking that paragraph from this bill, and I would like to have the gentleman who offered that motion to amend it so that it would apply only to the first Senate amendment and let the other two stand.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, there will be a separate vote taken on all of them, and the reason why I gave notice that I would make the motion to concur in the third amendment was that I thought the general Judiciary Code did regulate it exactly, and therefore the amendment was not needed. That is, the general law covers it, and it would not be necessary to incorporate it in this bill.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. That is true, but, so far as this particular district is concerned, I felt that to have this formally expressed in this bill would be helpful, and not hurtful.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I have tried in my association with my colleagues here to be frank about everything, and I want to be absolutely frank with the House in this instance. Although the appointment of this additional judge affects the State of Georgia, the people in the State of Georgia do not need an additional permanent judge. It is an absolutely useless charge on the Treasury of the United States. They ought not to have it. The judge of the northern district of Georgia, the Hon. William H. Newman, is now in his seventy-first year, and the volume of business in the northern district of Georgia as compared with the volume of business in the other districts of the United States ranks about fifth. The business in the northern district of Georgia is very satisfactory at this time as compared with the condition of the dockets in the southern district of Georgia.

Now, I have not one unkind word to say about Judge Speer; but I do say this: That the health of Judge Speer has been in such a condition for about four and one-half or five years that it is absolutely impossible for the judge to have kept up his docket in the southern district of Georgia. I understand that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has read a statement here from the judge as to the condition of the business. There is one condition that exists that I think I ought to mention. Judge Speer has been sick. He has been impatient, probably, and he has not run the court to the satisfaction of the bar, and I do not believe that he will be able to do it in the future. I believe he honestly thinks he will be able to do it, but I do not think he will.

Now, we need this temporary judge, and we need him badly, and we ought to have him. What I say about the temporary judgeship is predicated upon what the members of the bar in the southern district of Georgia tell me. Now, then, after Judge Speer's death we would have three judges in the State of Georgia. Two of them would be assigned to the southern district of Georgia; two of them would be assigned to the district in which we need help the least. Now, if we are to have an additional judge he ought to be in the northern district of Georgia, where the volume of business is done. But I hope the House will see fit to give this temporary judgeship to the people of the State of Georgia, because I believe they need it. I believe that Judge Speer, if it had not been for the fact that he has been under certain charges and is now anxious to exonerate himself, would admit that his physical condition is such that he can not competently attend to all the business of the southern district of Georgia.

Now, that is a frank statement about it. I do not care anything about the publicity of the indorsements of those folks. I know who the applicants are and who their indorsers are. Everybody in Georgia knows that. It is public. But if they want to put that in I do not care anything about it.

If they want to know who is indorsing these different candidates, I think they ought to know it. I know whom I indorsed. I did it openly. I went up to the White House at noonday and told the President who my candidate was, and I hope the President will appoint him in the event that we get this temporary judge. I have no doubt everybody in this House will be very glad indeed to see him appointed, because everybody in the House knows him. But to make this a permanent judgeship would be a waste of money, and it ought not to be done. I say with an equal amount of positiveness, on the other hand, that we ought to have this temporary relief, and I hope that gentlemen of the House will give it to us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SAUNDERS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I will consume five minutes. It may possibly be that the State of Georgia needs this temporary judge. I do not know anything about that; but I asked the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], while reading from the report of the Attorney General, to give some comparison between the volume of work done in the State of Georgia and the volume of work done in the State of Indiana. As I retain in my memory the figures that he gave of the total number of cases tried and disposed of in the entire State of Georgia last year and in the State of Indiana, I think the total number of cases tried and disposed of in Georgia was 30 or 40, or possibly 50, in excess of the number tried in the State of Indiana. Now, Indiana has only one district judge. While according to the figures the State of Georgia has probably a few more cases to try, surely when the magnitude of the business is taken into consideration the State of Georgia does not have much, if any, more litigation than the State of Indiana.

Judge Anderson, of my State, in the last two years has tried some of the most notable cases that have been tried in the United States. He has tried cases that took more than three months of hard work to dispose of. I refer to one, known throughout the United States as the dynamite case, which took upward of three months to dispose of. Yet not only has Judge Anderson kept his docket in the State of Indiana up to date, but he actually spends day after day in trying cases in the city of Chicago as a special judge. How does he do it? He does not begin his court at 1 o'clock in the day and adjourn at 4. Every morning when the clock ticks 9 o'clock, promptly the case is called, and, if necessary to expedite business, he requires the attorneys and parties litigant to remain there until 6 o'clock in the evening. Sometimes that is not altogether satisfactory to the attorneys or to the litigants, but Judge Anderson sees to it that the business never crowds his court, but on the other hand sees to it that his court crowds the business.

As I said a moment ago, it may possibly be that the State of Georgia deserves, for the time being, this temporary judge. I do not know about that. But as to its needing another United States district judge, basing my judgment upon the evidence presented here this morning and on the report of the committee, in my opinion there is no earthly use at all of another permanent judge.

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

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. I want to suggest to the gentleman that the comparison made as to the volume of business tried in the State of Georgia during the last year is not, I think, exactly fair to the State, because Judge Speer tried absolutely no cases of any character during the year 1914, and the volume of business that has accrued in the southern district of Georgia, if it had been disposed of normally, would have increased the number of cases in the State very materially.

Mr. COX. That may be. The State of Indiana has a population of approximately 2,700,000. The State of Georgia has a population of about 2,600,000, and I repeat again that while, according to the report of the Attorney General, the total number of cases tried and disposed of in the State of Georgia was somewhat in excess of the number in Indiana, yet when you take into consideration the tremendous magnitude of the cases tried and the length of time it took to dispose of them, if the judge in the State of Georgia could conduct his court as Judge Anderson conducts his court, there would never be any demand from any source for an extra judge, not even for a temporary judge. If this proposition goes through, I agree heartily with my friend from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] that if the gentleman whom he has recommended, or whom I suppose he has recommended, is appointed to the bench there the business of the court will, I am sure, be transacted promptly and in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] that he will withdraw his motion to concur in the second amendment and move to nonconcur, I shall have little to say.

When this bill passed the House originally I was very much impressed by the statement of the gentlemen from Georgia who favored the bill, as to the necessity of it to fill a temporary need. But when the gentlemen from Georgia, my good friend Judge CRISP and Mr. EDWARDS, this morning attempted to get the House to concur in the amendment of the Senate making this a permanent judgeship, and when they stated to the House that they believed that a permanent judge was necessary, and that they only withdrew that motion because they were satisfied it could not pass this House, highly as I respect those gentlemen, when they still think that a permanent judge is necessary, in view of the facts that they have presented, my confidence in their judgment as to the necessity of a temporary judge has been very greatly lessened. I am inclined to think that perhaps we could go on for a year or more with this one judge, and that the situation would take care of itself. But the motion is to be made to nonconcur, so I need not discuss this further.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the gentleman yield for a short interruption?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. In my remarks on December 9 last, found on page 66 of the RECORD, I stated that I then thought we did need a permanent third judge. I have taken that position all along. I now think we ought to have three districts and three judges in Georgia. I took that position then.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman, I hold in my hand the bill as it was originally introduced in the House. Presumably the bill originally introduced was in accord with the wishes and judgment of the gentlemen from Georgia. That bill, as originally introduced and referred to the committee, made the judge a temporary judge only.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. CRISP. Speaking for myself, I never saw this bill, and I do not think any members of the Georgia delegation saw the bill until after it was introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. WEBB, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LENROOT. I accept the statement of the gentleman from Georgia. I will say this, that if it had not been for the second section of the bill making the judge a temporary judge, this bill never would have reached the Senate.

I want to say a word with reference to what is known as the Cullop amendment. The gentleman from Georgia this morning stated that to speak of a constitutional question subjected a man to ridicule in this House, and that is true. Ever since our Democratic friends have been in control here it has been practically useless to discuss any constitutional question. Time and again you have passed bills through this House, and they have gone from this House to the Senate when every lawyer in the House knew that there were provisions in the bill in plain violation of the Constitution. So the gentleman from Georgia was correct in saying that it really subjected one to ridicule to discuss constitutional questions in the Sixty-third Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt the same statement can be made——

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will not the gentleman make some exception to that statement?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; I will. There are a few exceptions, like the gentleman from Georgia himself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SAUNDERS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin three minutes more.

Mr. LENROOT. We have come to a pass, Mr. Speaker, in this House where if a Member undertakes to quote from the Democratic platform of 1912 it subjects him to ridicule also, because there is scarcely a provision in that platform our Democratic friends have not violated. But upon the subject of the Cullop amendment, I will take the risk of subjecting myself to ridicule by undertaking to read from the Democratic platform of 1912 upon this identical proposition.

The print of this platform which I have here is so fine that I can not read it, but I will put the text in the RECORD. The substance of it is that we commend the Democratic House of Representatives for extending the doctrine of publicity to recommendations made to the President in making appointments. That was your position then when there was a Republican President in the White House, and when you thought you would be making some political capital by taking such a position. Now that you have a Democratic President in the White House what has become of that platform declaration upon this proposition? Do you refuse to abide by it because you dare not take the position that you are willing to have your Democratic President make public the recommendations that have been made to him for the appointment? Were you playing politics four years ago? By your action now you admit that you were. Are you playing politics now by moving to concur in this amendment without attempting to secure a conference upon it to see if the Senate will yield? It is an admission upon your part that there was absolutely no good faith in this promise that you made to the people of America in your platform in 1912.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I will read the provision in the Democratic platform which the gentleman from Wisconsin, owing to the fine print, did not read. This plank in the platform was adopted at the Baltimore convention just after the House had inserted in a bill creating an additional district judge a provision providing for publicity of indorsements. I hope the gentlemen on the other side of the House will feel that I am doing this in friendship, because it is pure friendship that causes me to occasionally remind the Democratic Members of that which they have tried to forget—the Democratic platform. [Laughter.]

I will commend a considerable portion of the Democratic side for voting in favor of this plank in the platform upon a number of occasions when it has been up before. The plank is this:

> We commend the Democratic House of Representatives for extending the doctrine of publicity to recommendations, verbal and written, upon which presidential appointments are made.

What is the pending question before the House? The House inserted a provision in this bill that the President shall make public all indorsements made in behalf of the person appointed as such district judge. That followed the recommendation, or the commendation, of the Baltimore platform. That provision was inserted as an amendment to the bill on a roll call, and those gentlemen on the Democratic side who voted one way when the amendment was up and who vote another way to-day will have their names inserted as a special exhibit hereafter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in Bryan's Commoner. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. No; I can not yield. Gentlemen on that side of the House who voted for the proposition were held up by Mr. Bryan, now Secretary and then Secretary of State, as following the right course, and gentlemen who voted against it were pilloried by him. Those who change their votes will not only be pilloried by Mr. Bryan, but they will be pilloried by the Republicans every time we have a chance.

The proposition now is to strike this out of the bill, and we will have a roll call upon it. I hope this side of the House, under the circumstances, will vote against striking the provision out of the bill, and I hope the other side of the House, those who voted to put it in the bill, will have consistency enough to keep it in the bill. You have violated every other plank of your platform, you have gone back on the one-term provision, on the Panama Canal, on the deposit of public moneys in national banks, on almost every other plank in the platform, and I beseech you as your friend [laughter on the Republican side] to stick to one plank in the platform upon which you have already voted. You can not excuse yourselves for voting against this proposition now by saying that you voted for it once before and straddle both sides of the fence. [Laughter on the Republican side.] You have got to walk up to the rack and take your medicine. If you are in favor of any plank in your platform, you have got to vote against the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] to strike this out of the bill. I hope you will be manly enough to be consistent for once. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from Illinois used his entire time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 1 minute left, and the gentleman from North Carolina has 32 minutes left.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, it can not be charged that I as an individual member of the Judiciary Committee have ever been in favor of creating useless judgeships. At numerous times during the last 12 years I have opposed the creation of district judgeships. In some instances I have favored them, notably in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and in Maryland. I opposed the creation of a new circuit judgeship in my own circuit. I have never yet advocated the creation of one to give somebody a job, and I never expect to.

When the resolution passed the House to investigate the conduct of Judge Speer a subcommittee composed of Mr. VOLSTEAD, Mr. FITZHENRY, and myself went to Georgia to investigate those charges, and we reported. Having been in the district two weeks we understood thoroughly the condition of affairs. We knew before we went that Mr. Wickersham, the Attorney General of the United States in 1912, had induced other judges to try to clear up the docket, which was then woefully congested. The docket has been congested for four years. After the resolution to investigate Judge Speer was adopted, of course, he tried no more cases. His health was bad, and we had certificates from doctors to the effect that he was almost in extremis, and we continued the hearing for three or four months on account of his condition. For 15 months, I believe it is, not a single case in the entire southern district of Georgia, composed of 76 counties, with more than 1,000,000 population, was tried by this judge. When we recommended that no further proceedings should be taken in the House in reference to his impeachment, the Committee on the Judiciary realized—and that is not the Democratic members alone, but Mr. VOLSTEAD, the ranking Republican member, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], and all Republican and Democratic members—that there was a congestion of business in the southern district of Georgia that ought to be cleared up in the interest of the public and litigants and not in behalf of any particular individual. So deplorable had that condition become that three additional district judges had been sent into this district in an effort to clear it up, but it could not be done. Mr. McReynolds, the former Attorney General of the United States, just last fall wrote to this House a letter in which he declared that conditions in the southern district of Georgia were lamentable—about as strong a term as he could use. We know that there is a demand and an important demand for additional help for this now old and sickly judge in the southern district of Georgia. He can not do a mans' work as he once did. He has been a brilliant man in his day, but he is nearly 68 years of age and has been a sufferer from a chronic disease for many years.

The Committee on the Judiciary recommended this temporary judgeship unanimously. The House passed the bill, and that is as far as the Committee on the Judiciary ask you to go. We have never asked you to make a permanent judge there. I told the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] that I, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, could not afford to ask that the House make the judgeship permanent, because we think, we hope at least, that with a strong judge put in to help clear up this docket, that when Judge Speer's time for retirement comes, one able-bodied judge can keep up the work, and that is all we ask you to do. Therefore we ask you to disagree to Senate amendment No. 2 and to agree to Senate amendment No. 3, which strikes out the provision with reference to the distribution of work. Section 23 of the Judicial Code provides for that in the same language, and it is immaterial whether this stays in the bill or goes out of it.

On amendment No. 1 I ask the House to concur. I think we have come to a time where we may just as well discuss this Cullop-Mann amendment frankly and freely as lawyers. I voted for the Cullop amendment before I had investigated the

constitutional side of it, but I swore to support the Constitution of the United States, and every Member does the same thing when he is sworn in here. Mr. Speaker, this is not the Cullop amendment that is on this bill. This is the Mann amendment. Mr. CULLOP, of Indiana, originally offered this amendment, but when this bill was up for consideration last December I believe the gentleman from Illinois adopted it and offered it—offered it and then voted against it, a rather peculiar situation for a distinguished man to occupy, but he did it, and his avowed purpose is to put the Democrats "in a hole." I do not think we ought to legislate in that way. I think we ought to be frank among ourselves, and especially when it involves a constitutional question. My friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] voted against the amendment because in my judgment he thinks it is unconstitutional, and is not willing to undertake to limit the power of the President of the United States under the Constitution by any such proposition. For a little while I want to dscuss this point, and I ask unanimous consent to have the privilege of extending my remarks in the RECORD upon this point of the Mann-Cullop amendment if I do not have time to finish it. The Constitution, Article II, section 2, provides:

SEC. 2. The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States; he may require the opinion, in writing, of the principal officer in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices, and he shall have power to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.

He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

The Constitution has vested in the President of the United States the power to make these appointments, and that is, therefore, a constitutional prerogative, a constitutional power. Congress can not make these appointments. If Congress can not make them, Congress has not the power to tell the President how they shall be made. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, has been designated by Congress under the Constitution as the power to make these appointments. The Constitution makes it plain that this House has no power to appoint to such an office as contemplated in this bill. The moment Congress puts it in the power of the President to make this appointment, then he makes it under the Constitution. Can you delegate power under the Constitution to the President and take it away at the same time? This power is vested in the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by special enactment may be vested in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments. It follows that the House has no power to prescribe the conditions under which it shall be exercised. If the House has power to prescribe the conditions contained in this amendment, then why can they not stretch this power to still other conditions until this constitutional provision has been entirely wiped out?

It is not a question of whether we think such a law would be beneficial, for if it is an encroachment upon the President's prerogative as fixed by the Constitution, then it is our sworn duty to uphold the Constitution until it is changed in the manner provided therein.

The Secretary of War under President Jackson quotes the President as holding that—

Upon the preservation of the Constitution, as well in its partition of duties as in its limitations upon their exercise, depends the stability of this Government which the people have established.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Would not the mere fact that the President had to make public the indorsements sent to him regarding the appointment of a candidate for office take away some of his constitutional privileges?

Mr. WEBB. Would it take them away?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WEBB. Of course it would.

Mr. MADDEN. In what way? It does not take the power of appointment away.

Mr. WEBB. The power of appointment includes the right to pass upon the recommendations and indorsements of applicants.

Mr. MADDEN. Not necessarily.

Mr. WEBB. They are part of the same transaction.

Mr. MADDEN. Not necessarily.

Mr. WEBB. I will deal with that in a moment if the gentleman will allow me to come to it.

But the advocates of this amendment will contend that the simple provision requiring "the President to make public all indorsements made in behalf of the person appointed as such district judge" does not in any way interfere with his right of appointment. A proviso, such as is used in this amendment, is defined to be "a limitation or exception to a grant made or authority conferred, the effect of which is to declare that the one shall not operate or the other be exercised unless in the case provided." It always implies a condition, unless subsequent words change it to a covenant. This amendment when examined, apart from any constitutional provision, would mean that the President is only authorized to make this appointment, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, on condition that he make public all indorsements; otherwise he is not authorized.

The act contemplates that the exercise of the power shall be dependent upon the compliance with the terms of the proviso, and yet the language used makes it impossible to comply until after the appointment is made, and fixes no limit of time. Would the appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate be nullified by the subsequent failure of the President?

In 1860 the House passed an appropriation bill which contained various items, among which was the appropriation—

For the completion of the Washington Aqueduct, $500,000, to be expended according to the plans and estimates of Capt. Meigs and under his superintendence: *Provided*, That the office of engineer of the Potomac Waterworks is hereby abolished and its duties shall hereafter be discharged by the chief engineer of the Washington Aqueduct.

President Buchanan in his message to the House of Representatives on June 25 expressed approval of the appropriation "for the wise and beneficial object," but made it clear to the House that he did not acknowledge their right to interfere with the right of the President to be "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States." After placing a strained construction upon the objectionable clause in order to relieve it of its constitutional objection, and after pointing out the disastrous effects it would have if given its literal meaning, he says:

Under these circumstances I have deemed it but fair to inform Congress that while I do not consider the bill unconstitutional, this is only because, in my opinion, Congress did not intend by the language which they have employed to interfere with my absolute authority to order Capt. Meigs to any other service I might deem expedient. My perfect right still remains, notwithstanding the clause, to send him away from Washington to any part of the Union to superintend the erection of a fortification or on any other appropriate duty.

In concluding his message President Buchanan adds the following:

It is not improbable that another question of grave importance may arise out of this clause. Is the appropriation conditional and will it fail provided I do not deem it proper that it shall be expended under the superintendence of Capt. Meigs? This is a question which shall receive serious consideration, because upon its decision may depend whether the completion of the waterworks shall be arrested for another season.

The rights of the House to demand information from the Executive are briefly but accurately stated in the resolution embodied in the report from the Committee on Indian Affairs made to the House by Mr. James Cooper, of Pennsylvania, upon the message of President Tyler, in which he had declined to furnish to the House information as to the affairs of the Cherokee Indians, and as to frauds upon them. The first resolution, which was adopted by a vote of 140 to 8, reads as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives has the right to demand from the Executive such information as may be in his possession relating to subjects of the deliberations of the House and within the sphere of its legitimate powers.

This is all the House should ever claim. This same report goes on to discuss the matter and attempts to make it plain to the President that they recognize his rights, as follows:

This, it will be remarked, does not include any assertion of right on the part of the House to demand from the Executive the information in his possession relating to negotiations with foreign Governments or appointments to office. By the Constitution the power of making treaties is vested in the President and Senate. The House has no participation in the treaty-making power, nor in that of appointment to office—

And so forth.

President Washington, in a message to the House of Representatives of the 30th of March, 1796, declined to comply with a request contained in a resolution of that body to lay before them—

a copy of the instructions to the ministers of the United States who negotiated the treaty with the King of Great Britain, together with the correspondence and other documents relating to the said treaty, excepting such of the said papers as any existing negotiations may render improper to be disclosed.

While this resolution seeks to review the exercise of the power by the President of making treaties, as contained in this same paragraph of the Constitution, what is said by the Presi-

dent is equally applicable in the case now under discussion. The President closed his message to the House with the following:

As, therefore, it is perfectly clear to my understanding that the assent of the House of Representatives is not necessary to the validity of a treaty, as the treaty with Great Britain exhibits in itself all the objects requiring legislative provision, and on these the papers called for can throw no light; and as it is essential to the due administration of the Government that the boundaries fixed by the Constitution between the different departments should be preserved, a just regard to the Constitution and to the duties of my office, under all the circumstances of the case, forbid a compliance with your request.

The fact that this amendment requires the information to be given to the public and not to this House but weakens the contention. The House can have no more power to demand information for the public than for its own use. It will not be contended by the friends of this amendment that it is intended to procure information for the House bearing upon pending legislation. Its real object is to supervise and review the acts of the Chief Executive.

In 1886 the Senate called for the documents and papers filed in the Department of Justice in relation to the management and conduct of the office of district attorney of the United States of the southern district of Alabama, and having exclusive reference to the suspension by the President of George M. Duskin, the late incumbent. Answering this request of the Senate, Mr. Cleveland, in a message on March 1, 1886, among other things, said:

While, therefore, I am constrained to deny the right of the Senate to the papers and documents described, so far as the right to the same is based upon the claim that they are in any view of the subject official, I am also led unequivocally to dispute the right of the Senate, by the aid of any documents whatever, or in any way save through the judicial process of trial on impeachment, to review or reverse the acts of the Executive in the suspension, during the recess of the Senate, of Federal officials.

The requests and demands which by the score have for nearly three months been presented to the different departments of the Government, whatever may be their form, have but one complexion. They assume the right of the Senate to sit in judgment upon the exercise of my exclusive discretion and executive function, for which I am solely responsible to the people from whom I have so lately received the sacred trust of office. My oath to support and defend the Constitution, my duty to the people who have chosen me to execute the powers of their great office and not to relinquish them, and my duty to the Chief Magistracy, which I must preserve unimpaired in all its dignity and vigor, compel me to refuse compliance with the demand.

That was passed by the House of Representatives and had been the construction placed on this matter since the days of John Tyler.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Does not the gentleman believe that the provision, if incorporated into the law, will allow this condition to arise—a corporation or a trust that might be opposed to the appointment of some man who is named as a possible appointee for the position might, through its officers, send on recommendations to the President of the United States urging the appointment of this man without the knowledge or request of any friend of the man. Is there not danger in that?

Mr. WEBB. The gentleman is exactly right. If the greatest lawyer, a good man, were about to be appointed to office and a trust, some unpopular organization in the United States, were opposed to that good man, the way to defeat him would be to write to the President and tell him that they wanted to see this man made judge, and the President would be either embarrassed or the judge himself would be embarrassed after the appointment.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the gentleman think that would afford a reason for repudiating that plank of the platform?

Mr. WEBB. Oh, well, that has been thrashed out so much that I do not care to take the time in discussing it. I know there is some platform declaration commending this kind of legislation, but platforms are not binding on a man's conscience when he comes to construe the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman is now referring to a constitutional question.

Mr. WEBB. I think it is a credit to any man who voted one way and, after studying the question, because he was convinced that he ought not to do it under the Constitution, for him to change his vote rather than stick to his old opinion.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. I will.

Mr. LENROOT. The inquiry of the gentleman from California, in which the gentleman from North Carolina concurred, was not directed to the constitutional question at all, but to the matter of policy.

Mr. WEBB. I know it was not.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. I do.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand the gentleman's contention is the Democratic platform commended the House of Representatives for inserting an unconstitutional provision?

Mr. WEBB. The gentleman knows how platforms are made.

Mr. MANN. I know; but I am talking about this contention.

Mr. WEBB. They commended that as a matter of policy; they had not discussed or studied the constitutional side of it.

Mr. MANN. That was molasses to catch flies.

Mr. WEBB. They voted upon that question without having to put their hands upon a Bible and swear to support the Constitution and they recommended that as a policy. When we come to vote here we come with the knowledge that we put our hands upon the Bible, swearing to support the Constitution, the greatest instrument, which is our chart and compass, and, as it has been called, the greatest instrument that ever came from the mind of man.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Is it not a fact the same argument was made when the original Cullop amendment was adopted by the House that the gentleman is making, that the very same question was brought out which the gentleman from California has suggested?

Mr. WEBB. I did not hear it, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. I do.

Mr. CULLOP. In the passage of the civil office tenure act did not both branches of Congress, by an overwhelming majority, write this very provision into the law of the land and did it not remain there for many, many years?

Mr. WEBB. They never provided it for the appointment of Federal judges, and never have and never will and never ought to, as long as the Constitution remains unchanged on this point.

Mr. CULLOP. Did not it apply to every appointment and every removal that the President made?

Mr. WEBB. No; and as my friend from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] suggests, that was passed when the Constitution was silent under the clash of arms in the United States.

Mr. CULLOP. But did it not go on for more than 30 years after the war closed?

Mr. WEBB. I do not yield any further to my friend.

Mr. CULLOP. And the Executive was changed.

Mr. WEBB. I say again, whatever may have been legislation with regard to minor officers which the Constitution provides for, Congress has never passed any such amendment as this with reference to the appointment of Federal judges, never will, and never should. I take it as almost a reflection upon the President of the United States to put in such a provision. It is an admission that you do not trust him; and if you do not do so, you had better abolish your form of Government. You can not tie strings around everything you would expect him to do, because there are some people just about as good as those who want to hold the strings.

Mr. GORDON. How does it interfere with the President's right to appoint wholly regardless of any recommendations that might be made?

Mr. WEBB. Not at all.

Mr. GORDON. Then how does it interfere with the constitutional power to appoint?

Mr. WEBB. I fear he will not sign the bill. We put it up to him as a condition on which he shall make the appointment.

Mr. GORDON. But you just said it did not interfere with the right to appoint in any way?

Mr. WEBB. Of course; it does not. The President, I fear, will not sign the bill, if you put this proposition up to him, if he thinks it is unconstitutional. If he should sign the bill with this proviso in it, he might feel bound to make the recommendations public.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman said that this gave evidence of distrust of the President. Did the gentleman from North Carolina have it in his mind that he would not trust the President when he voted for this amendment?

Mr. WEBB. I did not. It came up here one day several years ago like a flash of lightning out of a clear sky. I have not studied the question, and I had no idea of reflecting on anybody.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am citing in this speech numbers of cases similar to this where the House attempted to violate these constitutional provisions and the President has declined to accede to the request of the House. He has as strict a prerogative within his constitutional sphere as you gentlemen have in yours. You must not trespass upon his, and he will not trespass upon yours. The three cardinal principles on which this Government

rests are those which separate the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government. The House attempted this sort of thing in Gen. Grant's time.

In 1876 President Grant declined to answer an inquiry of the House as to whether or not he had performed any Executive acts at a distance from the seat of government in the following language:

I have never hesitated and shall not hesitate to communicate to Congress, and to either branch thereof, all the information which the Constitution makes it the duty of the President to give or which my judgment may suggest to me or a request from either House may indicate to me will be useful in the discharge of the appropriate duties confided to them. I fail, however, to find in the Constitution of the United States the authority given to the House of Representatives (one branch of the Congress in which is vested the legislative power of the Government) to require of the Executive, an independent branch of the Government, coordinate with the Senate and House of Representatives, an account of his discharge of his appropriate and purely executive offices, acts, and duties, either as to when, where, or how performed.

What the House of Representatives may require as a right in its demand upon the Executive for information is limited to what is necessary for the proper discharge of its powers of legislation or impeachment. The inquiry in the resolution of the House as to where Executive acts have within the last seven years been performed and at what distance from any particular spot, or for how long a period at any one time, etc., does not necessarily belong to the province of legislation. It does not profess to be asked for that object.

By a message dated September 30, 1890, President Benjamin Harrison returned to the House of Representatives, without his approval, the joint resolution declaring the retirement of Capt. Charles B. Shivers, of the United States Army, legal and valid, and that he is entitled as such officer to his pay. The President says:

It is undoubtedly competent for Congress by an act or joint resolution to authorize the President, by and with the advice of the Senate, to appoint Capt. Shivers to be a captain in the Army of the United States and to place him upon the retired list. It is also perfectly competent, by suitable legislation, for Congress to give to this officer the pay of this grade during the interval of time when he was improperly carried upon the Army lists. But the joint resolution, which I herewith return, does not attempt to deal with the case in that way. It undertakes to declare that the retirement of Capt. Shivers was legal and valid, and that he always has been and is entitled to his pay as such officer. I do not think this is a competent method of giving the relief intended.

The message states the facts to be that Capt. Shivers was summarily dismissed from the Army by order of the President on July 15, 1863. On August 11, 1863, an order was issued revoking this order of dismissal and restoring Capt. Shivers to duty as an officer of the Army. On December 30, 1864, Capt. Shivers, by proper order, was placed on the retired list of the Army. The Supreme Court (114 U. S., 619) had decided that the President had the authority to so separate an officer from the service, and that having been thus separated he could not be restored except by nomination to the Senate and confirmation thereby. The Attorney General therefore gave an opinion that Capt. Shivers was not an officer on the retired list of the Army.

This message was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and was not acted on further.

While not questioning the right of the House to decline to appropriate for a diplomatic office, President Grant protested against its assumption that it might give directions as to that service. On August 15, 1876, President Grant sent the following message to the House:

In announcing as I do that I have attached my signature of official approval to the act making appropriations for the Consular and Diplomatic Service of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes, it is my duty to call attention to a provision in the act directing that notice be sent to certain of the diplomatic and consular officers of the Government "to close their offices."

In the literal sense of this direction it would be an invasion of the constitutional prerogatives and duty of the Executive.

* * * * * * *

In calling attention to the passage which I have indicated I assume that the intention of the provision is only to exercise the constitutional prerogative of Congress over the expenditures of the Government and to fix a time at which the compensation of certain diplomatic and consular officers shall cease, and not to invade the constitutional rights of the Executive, which I should be compelled to resist, and my present object is not to discuss or dispute the wisdom of failing to appropriate for several officers, but to guard against the construction that might possibly be placed on the language used as implying a right in the legislative branch to direct the closing or discontinuing of any of the diplomatic or consular offices of the Government.

The message was debated at some length, and in the course of the discussion reference was made to the precedent in the case of Mr. Harvey, whom President Johnson appointed minister to Portugal. The Congress declined for a time to appropriate for his salary, but later did so. The message was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, no action on the part of the House being contemplated.

The question suggests itself, For what purpose is it desired that these indorsements should be made public? Whatever the House might think of the indorsements it would, when published, be helpless to change the appointment. If an unfit man was named as judge, it would have the right to prefer charges against him and impeach him. These charges would have to be based upon misconduct in office and not upon objectional indorsements. The public would not have this power, but could only criticize. There is no law to prevent any person from indorsing another for office. There would be no way to ascertain what weight the President gave to any particular indorsement. He might act upon personal information gained in the course of many casual conversations which would be difficult, if not impossible, to concisely state. It would be manifestly unfair to the President to have him judged in the public forum upon the formal indorsements. Let him be judged by results. If he makes a wise appointment, the public will know it and applaud; if unwise, they will not be slow to condemn. He is already accountable to the people who elect him and should be given a fair trial.

The future of this Government depends largely upon our vigilance in observing the limits of power set for the several departments of the Government.

If this amendment were not unconstitutional, still this House would have no right to assume that it possesses superior wisdom and virtue, and therefore could justify its right to demand superior power to review the acts of the Executive.

A just regard for the wisdom, virtue, and constitutional power of the Executive will insure a divided responsibility which, in the opinion of the framers of the Constitution, would guarantee better government.

As said by President Washington, regarding the right of the House of Representatives to demand papers respecting a negotiation with a foreign power, "to admit such right would be to establish a dangerous precedent." While the information sought by this amendment may not within itself have far-reaching effect, and by many may be regarded as a safeguard rather than a pitfall, yet, as stated by President Jackson, "precedents established for good purposes are easily perverted to bad ones."

The logical and far-reaching effects which should naturally be expected as a result of discarding the bounds of power set by the Constitution and starting on this policy of encroachment are forcibly pointed out in the speech of Mr. Buck delivered in opposition to the resolution, already referred to, calling upon President Washington for documents and correspondence in regard to a treaty with Great Britain. He said, in part:

I am opposed to the resolution now under consideration, not from an apprehension that the papers referred to will not bear the public scrutiny or from a belief that there would be the least reluctance on the part of the Executive to deliver them on account of any such apprehensions of his; but I am opposed to the resolution in point of principle, because I conceive those papers can be of no use to us, unless to gratify feelings of resentment or of vain curiosity. As I would never sacrifice principle to these motives and thereby fix a precedent pernicious in its consequences, I hope for the indulgence of the House while I offer my sentiments upon the subject. * * *

But if we are to take upon ourselves the right of judging whether it was expedient to make the treaty or not, whether it is as good a one as might have been obtained or not, and if we are to assume the power of judging upon the merits as well as the constitutionality of it, then those papers may be necessary; and if we possess the power of thus judging, then we may equally possess the right to call for those papers. But from whence do we derive this right and power? Have the people, when coolly deliberating upon and forming the Constitution, which is the expression of their dispassionate will, in that Constitution given us this right? No; not a syllable in the Constitution that ever intimates the idea. Do we possess the right merely because we are the representatives of the people? No; that can not be, for we are their representatives only for particular purposes, and the Constitution has prescribed to us our bounds, and assigned to us the limits of our powers as well as to the Executive. Are we to derive this right from popular opposition to the treaty, and from thence say that it is the will of the Nation that we should exercise this right of inquiry? Is, then, popular clamor, which originates in discontent, fostered in violence and passion, and stimulated by the intrigues of interested and ambitious individuals, to be taken as the dispassionate will of the Nation? If so, how are we to designate *and mark out* the numbers of the discontented? Are we to learn it from inflammatory newspaper publications, teeming with invectives against Government and its measures, and not carrying even the appearance of reason with them? These can furnish no data by which to determine whether it is one-tenth or even one-thousandth part of the Nation that are dissatisfied. * * * If so, where shall we stop? If we, by an assumption of power, may invade the prerogatives of the people vested in the President as their representative in making treaties, and may rifle the sacred deposit of their confidential correspondence with foreign nations, and judge upon the merits of a treaty, then may we reverse the judgment of the President and Senate and annul the treaty. Who is then to make the next? Is it supposable that the President will again attempt it, when the principle is fixed that he and the Senate are not the ultimate judges of its merits? No; to me this is absurd. We must, then, take the whole business to ourselves, and become the negotiators as well as the ratifiers of a treaty; and if we may do this, upon the same principle whenever there shall be a popular clamor raised against the persons appointed to the judiciary department we may interpose, call on the President for the reasons of his making the appointment, declare it injudicious, withhold appropriations for the salaries, and engross all the judiciary powers to ourselves. Upon the same principle we may ultimately determine upon our own adjournments, declare our sittings perpetual, constitute ourselves the judges and executioners of the law, and become the accusers, judges, and

executioners of our fellow citizens. This would be forming an aristocracy with a witness; and where then would be the boasted rights of America, for which she fought and bled?

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope we may have a vote on this Cullop amendment from a conscientious constitutional standpoint, as an interpretation of the Constitution as to our divided powers of Government, the distinction between the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. We have no right or authority to encroach upon the power of the President when he comes to make these appointments, any more than he would have the right to send for your manuscript or recommendations when you made a certain speech on the floor of the House. You are independent in your sphere, as the Executive is independent in his sphere.

Mr. GORDON. What is your view generally—and I submit this question because you are chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and your judgment is entitled to great consideration—of what are the rights of the public as to going to any of the departments of the Government and obtaining information concerning applicants for office?

Mr. WEBB. There is a good deal to be said in favor of that sort of a suggestion and a good deal against it. A bad but powerful man may be an applicant for office, and you and I may want to write to the President and tell him why this man should not be appointed, and tell him confidentially the reasons why we think he is a bad man. You would not want your letter made public. But the fact that correspondence is more or less sacred and guarded by these officers is one reason why men confide in them and tell them the truth.

Mr. NORTON. The question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] brings to my mind the question of whether you believed or thought that the public should be entitled to examine the records in the different departments? Now, I should like to ask this: Do you think that Members of Congress should have the right to examine the records in the different departments? I know personally that that privilege is not granted to at least Republican Members.

Mr. WEBB. It would take quite a while to answer my friend's question according to my view, and it is aside from the merits of this question, and I hope he will not take my time to discuss that. It is not now before the House.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman permit a short question?

Mr. WEBB. Yes, sir.

Mr. CULLOP. I wish to say that if this amendment were adopted it would prevent men from fooling candidates for office. They could not indorse all of them without it being made public, and it would eliminate a lot of hypocrisy.

Mr. WEBB. I am not going to agree to violate the Constitution of the United States in order to prevent the making of political hypocrites.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the three amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] did that two hours ago.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I want to modify my motion and, with the permission of the House, to move to concur in the first and third amendments and nonconcur in amendment No. 2.

Mr. MANN. It is six of one and half a dozen of the other.

The SPEAKER. Both the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] ask that these amendments be voted on separately.

Mr. CULLOP. Now, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. CULLOP. I was going to ask that we have a vote by a roll call, but I will not make that request now.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 9, of the House print, after the word "therein," strike out the colon and the proviso, as follows: *"Provided, however,* That the President shall make public all indorsements made in behalf of the person appointed as such district judge."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Under the form of this amendment, those who wish to vote for this amendment will vote "no." Is that correct? Those who wish to retain this provision in the bill will vote "no"?

The SPEAKER. Those who wish to retain the Cullop amendment will vote "no." Those who want to vote against it will vote "aye."

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is there any way by which a vote can be had against the Cullop amendment and then a vote also had against the bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand what the gentleman said.

Mr. SHERLEY. There are a number of us who are not in favor of the Cullop amendment and at the same time are not in favor of the bill. We would like to have a chance to express both views, if possible.

The SPEAKER. There is no way that the Chair knows of doing that at this time. Those who are in favor of the Cullop amendment will vote "no." Those that are opposed to it will vote "aye."

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRISP. There has been no demand for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows that. He was not putting the question by yeas and nays.

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CULLOP rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. CULLOP. I would like to have the Speaker state the question on which the vote is to be taken. The Speaker just now stated that question erroneously. He said those in favor of the Cullop amendment would vote "aye." Those opposed will vote "no." It is just the reverse.

The SPEAKER. Well, the Chair has correctly stated it. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 99, nays 202, answered "present" 4, not voting 119, as follows:

[Roll No. 87.]

YEAS—99.

Adamson	Doremus	Jacoway	Rainey
Aiken	Dupré	Kent	Rayburn
Alexander	Edwards	Kirkpatrick	Saunders
Allen	Fergusson	Kitchin	Sherley
Bailey	Finley	Lazaro	Slayden
Bartlett	FitzHenry	Lee, Ga.	Smith, Idaho
Beakes	Floyd, Ark.	Lesher	Sparkman
Beall, Tex.	French	Lever	Switzer
Bell, Ga.	Gard	Levy	Taggart
Blackmon	Garner	Linthicum	Talcott, N. Y.
Booher	Garrett, Tenn.	Lloyd	Ten Eyck
Borland	Gittins	Logue	Townsend
Broussard	Goldfogle	Metz	Tuttle
Brown, N. Y.	Graham, Pa.	Montague	Underhill
Bulkley	Griest	Morrison	Underwood
Burnett	Gudger	Murray	Vinson
Butler	Harrison	Padgett	Vollmer
Caraway	Hay	Page, N. C.	Weaver
Carlin	Hayes	Park	Webb
Carter	Holland	Parker, N. J.	Whaley
Claypool	Howard	Patten, N. Y.	Whitacre
Coady	Howell	Platt	White
Connolly, Iowa	Hughes, Ga.	Plumley	Williams
Crisp	Humphreys, Miss.	Pou	Witherspoon
Dies	Igoe	Price	

NAYS—202.

Abercrombie	Decker	Gray	Konop
Adair	Deitrick	Green, Iowa	Kreider
Ainey	Dent	Greene, Mass.	La Follette
Anderson	Dershem	Greene, Vt.	Langley
Anthony	Dickinson	Gregg	Lenroot
Aswell	Difenderfer	Guernsey	Lieb
Austin	Dillon	Hamilton, Mich.	Lindbergh
Avis	Dixon	Hamlin	Lonergan
Baltz	Donohoe	Hardy	McGillicuddy
Barkley	Donovan	Harris	McKellar
Barton	Doolittle	Haugen	McKenzie
Borchers	Doughton	Hawley	McLaughlin
Britten	Drukker	Hayden	MacDonald
Brockson	Eagan	Heflin	Madden
Brown, W. Va.	Eagle	Helgesen	Maguire, Nebr.
Browne, Wis.	Edmonds	Helm	Mann
Browning	Esch	Helvering	Mapes
Bryan	Evans	Henry	Miller
Buchanan, Ill.	Falconer	Hinds	Mitchell
Buchanan, Tex.	Farr	Hinebaugh	Mondell
Burke, S. Dak.	Ferris	Hughes, W. Va.	Moore
Burke, Wis.	Fess	Hulings	Morgan, Okla.
Calder	Fitzgerald	Humphrey, Wash.	Moss, Ind.
Callaway	Fordney	Johnson, Ky.	Moss, W. Va.
Campbell	Foster	Johnson, Utah	Mott
Candler, Miss.	Fowler	Johnson, Wash.	Murdock
Chandler, N. Y.	Frear	Kahn	Neeley, Kans.
Cline	Gardner	Keating	Neely, W. Va.
Connelly, Kans.	Garrett, Tex.	Kelley, Mich.	Nelson
Cooper	Gillett	Kelly, Pa.	Nolan, J. I.
Cox	Gilmore	Kennedy, Iowa	Norton
Cullop	Godwin, N. C.	Kennedy, R. I.	Oldfield
Curry	Goeke	Kettner	Paige, Mass.
Danforth	Gordon	Kiess, Pa.	Parker, N. Y.
Davenport	Goulden	Kinkaid	Patton, Pa.
Davis	Graham, Ill.	Knowland, J. R.	Peters

Phelan	Russell	Stephens, Nebr.	Towner
Plumley	Scott	Stephens, Tex.	Tribble
Porter	Seldomridge	Stevens, Minn.	Vaughan
Powers	Sherwood	Stone	Volstead
Quin	Sims	Stringer	Wallin
Raker	Slemp	Sutherland	Walters
Rauch	Smith, J. M. C.	Tavenner	Watkins
Reed	Smith, Saml. W.	Taylor, Ala.	Watson
Reilly, Conn.	Smith, Minn.	Taylor, Ark.	Wingo
Reilly, Wis.	Smith, Tex.	Taylor, Colo.	Winslow
Roberts, Mass.	Stafford	Temple	Woods
Rogers	Stedman	Thacher	Young, N. Dak.
Rouse	Steenerson	Thomas	Young, Tex.
Rubey	Stephens, Cal.	Thompson, Okla.	
Rucker	Stephens, Miss.	Thomson, Ill.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Flood, Va.	Gill	Key, Ohio	Moon

NOT VOTING—119.

Ashbrook	Dooling	Kennedy, Conn.	Ragsdale
Baker	Driscoll	Kindel	Riordan
Barchfeld	Dunn	Korbly	Roberts, Nev.
Barnhart	Elder	Lafferty	Rothermel
Bartholdt	Estopinal	Langham	Rupley
Bathrick	Fairchild	Lee, Pa.	Sabath
Bell, Cal.	Faison	L'Engle	Scully
Bowdle	Fields	Lewis, Md.	Sells
Brodbeck	Francis	Lewis, Pa.	Shackleford
Bruckner	Gallagher	Lindquist	Shreve
Brumbaugh	Gallivan	Lobeck	Sinnott
Burgess	George	Loft	Sisson
Burke, Pa.	Gerry	McAndrews	Sloan
Byrnes, S. C.	Glass	McClellan	Small
Byrns, Tenn.	Good	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Md.
Cantor	Goodwin, Ark.	Mahan	Smith, N. Y.
Cantrill	Gorman	Maher	Stanley
Carew	Griffin	Manahan	Stevens, N. H.
Carr	Hamill	Martin	Stout
Cary	Hamilton, N. Y.	Morgan, La.	Sumners
Casey	Hart	Morin	Talbott, Md.
Church	Hensley	Mulkey	Taylor, N. Y.
Clancy	Hill	O'Brien	Treadway
Clark, Fla.	Hobson	Oglesby	Vare
Collier	Houston	O'Hair	Walker
Conry	Hoxworth	O'Shaunessy	Walsh
Copley	Hull	Palmer	Wilson, Fla.
Cramton	Johnson, S. C.	Peterson	Wilson, N. Y.
Crosser	Jones	Post	Woodruff
Dale	Keister	Prouty	

So the motion to concur in Senate amendment No. 1 was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For this day:

Mr. SISSON with Mr. GOOD.

Until further notice:

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee with Mr. TREADWAY.

Mr. BURGESS with Mr. LINDQUIST.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. WALKER with Mr. VARE.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SMALL with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. DALE with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. ASHBROOK with Mr. BELL of California.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina with Mr. CRAMTON.

Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. LANGHAM.

Mr. COLLIER with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. CARY.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. MANAHAN.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. HULL with Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. MCANDREWS with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. SHREVE.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. SINNOTT.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. SLOAN.

Mr. BRODBECK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening?

Mr. BRODBECK. No; I was not. I was on the way.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. GILL. I do not think I can bring myself within the rule. I did not get into the Hall until after my name was called.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, under his statement, does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. GILL. Then I will vote present.

The SPEAKER. The motion to concur is rejected, which is equivalent to disagreeing to the amendment. The Clerk will report the third amendment.

The Clerk reported Senate amendment No. 3.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, this is the third amendment.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. What becomes of the second amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put that later. They did not want to concur in that, but did want to concur in this one.

Mr. MANN. I know; but what "they" want does not determine the order in which amendments shall be voted upon.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the second Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all of section 2, which reads as follows:

"SEC. 2. That whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of the district judge for the southern district of the State of Georgia senior in commission such vacancy shall not be filled, and thereafter there shall be but one district judge in said district."

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in this amendment.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The motion to concur is rejected, which is equivalent to a disagreement. The Clerk will report the third amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all of section 3, which reads as follows:

"SEC. 3. That the senior circuit judge of the circuit in which the southern district of Georgia lies shall make all necessary orders for the division of business and the assignment of cases for trial in said district between the several district judges therein."

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in this amendment.

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

On a division (demanded by Mr. CRISP), there were—ayes 35, noes 101.

The SPEAKER. The House refuses to concur in the third amendment, which is equivalent to a disagreement.

Mr. WEBB. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House request a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the House request a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, before the conferees are appointed I send the following motion to the Clerk's desk. I believe this is the proper time to instruct the conferees.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CULLOP moves that the House conferees be instructed not to concur in Senate amendment No. 1, which is to strike out, on page 1, line 9, after the word "therein," the words "*Provided, however,* That the President shall make public all indorsements made in behalf of the person appointed as such district judge."

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WEBB. I want to know if this is debatable.

Mr. CULLOP. I move the previous question.

Mr. WEBB. The gentleman can hardly take me off my feet to make that motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina has already claimed the floor.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I hope the House will pass no such resolution as that. The conferees will understand their duty and will obey the mandate of this House. It would be an unusual proceeding to instruct the conferees in this fashion and thus foreclose any conference whatever, because the Senate would never meet the House conferees if that resolution should be adopted, as well as an affront to the Senate.

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

Mr. WEBB. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman recall the fact that this House, in this Congress, has already passed a similar instruction on another bill, and that the Senate conferees readily met the House conferees when the House conferees were instructed in the identical language of the instruction now offered?

Mr. WEBB. On what bill was that?

Mr. CULLOP. On the Pennsylvania judgeship.

Mr. MANN. On the Philadelphia judgeship.

Mr. WEBB. The House finally yielded on that anyway and struck out the Cullop amendment; and I understand that the Senate conferees never met ours officially after the resolution was adopted.

Mr. MANN. That is another proposition.

Mr. WEBB. That was after it had been voted on several times.

Mr. MANN. But there was no objection on the part of the Senate to appointing conferees, although the House conferees were instructed in this identical way.

It will relieve the gentleman of much embarrassment, because I do not think the Speaker would be warranted in appointing three conferees who had voted against the practical instruction of the House. The gentleman from North Carolina and the next gentleman on that side of the House on the Judiciary Committee do not represent the sentiment of the House under the vote just taken, and I should think that the gentleman would welcome the instruction.

Mr. WEBB. I suppose the gentleman from Illinois knows, although it does not represent our sentiment, that we will represent the sentiment of the House in conference, and he need not worry about that. I have no personal interest in this bill; it is my desire to carry out the mandate of the House. I have done my duty as chairman of the committee, and that is all I expect to do. I will carry out the mandate of the House, and the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Indiana need not worry about that.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from North Carolina yielded the floor?

Mr. WEBB. No; I have not, but I am about to yield the floor. I do not think these instructions ought to be adopted. The conferees will carry out the mandate of the House, and I think it would be a reflection on the House conferees to adopt such instructions.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard in reply for just a moment, and I assure all that the motion means no reflection on the conferees. They ought to desire the instructions. I would be the last to cast such a reflection. Only a few moments ago the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for whom I have the highest regard, stated he was opposed to what is known as the Cullop amendment from conscientious conviction, and hence the adoption of this motion will enable him to support the amendment in conference because of the instruction given the conferees by this House, and thereby save him from embarrassment. I take it that he will be one of the House conferees because of his position. The adoption of this instruction would relieve him of all difficulty in the discharge of his duty as a conferee. There can be no objection to it, and in this Congress on a similar bill to this we passed a resolution by more than a hundred majority instructing the conferees on this same question, and it was considered no reflection upon them. The Senate did meet the House conferees and had a conference a number of times. Consequently the passage of this resolution can not be considered a reflection upon the conferees. It is not a reflection upon anybody. It is simply to show the Senate and the conferees of the Senate that the House means what it says upon this proposition, and that it has a right to be understood upon it.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULLOP. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. Had not the House and Senate conferees had several conferences upon the matter in relation to the Pennsylvania bill the gentleman speaks of and reported a disagreement before the House adopted instructions to the conferees?

Mr. CULLOP. It had not at the time we disagreed to the Senate amendment, and the RECORD shows that we then instructed the conferees at the same time, just as we are proposing to do it now. The gentleman from Georgia, an experienced parliamentarian, knows we could not have done it at any other time.

Mr. WEBB. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULLOP. Yes.

Mr. WEBB. Did not the House later reverse itself, notwithstanding its instructions, by knocking out the Cullop amendment?

Mr. CULLOP. Some time afterwards, and only after the gentleman from Pennsylvania importuned some of the Members to change their votes, as a personal accommodation doubtless to him; under his importunities they did change their votes.

Mr. WEBB. My suggestion is that these instructions are useless, because if any effort be made to have it adopted you will have a vote on it in the House.

Mr. CULLOP. It is not, in my judgment, useless at this time. The fact is that the conferees, if appointed as is generally done, are not in favor of this amendment, and there should be instructions from the House. To instruct will do no harm, but, on the contrary, be of benefit in disposing of the question. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves the previous question on his resolution to instruct the conferees.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the resolution.

The question was being taken when Mr. CULLOP demanded the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 168, nays 125, answered "present" 3, not voting 127, as follows:

[Roll No. 88.]

YEAS—168.

Abercrombie	Falconer	Kelly, Pa.	Raker
Ainey	Farr	Kennedy, Iowa	Rauch
Anderson	Fess	Kennedy, R. I.	Reilly, Wis.
Anthony	Fitzgerald	Kettner	Rogers
Ashbrook	Fordney	Kiess, Pa.	Rubey
Aswell	Foster	Kinkaid	Scott
Austin	Fowler	Knowland, J. R.	Sherwood
Avis	Francis	Konop	Siemp
Barkley	Frear	Kreider	Smith, Idaho
Barton	Gardner	La Follette	Smith, J. M. C.
Borchers	Garrett, Tex.	Langley	Smith, Saml. W.
Britten	Gillett	Lenroot	Smith, Minn.
Brown, W. Va.	Gilmore	Lindbergh	Smith, Tex.
Browne, Wis.	Godwin, N. C.	Lonergan	Stafford
Browning	Goeke	McKellar	Steenerson
Buchanan, Ill.	Gordon	McKenzie	Stephens, Cal.
Buchanan, Tex.	Graham, Ill.	McLaughlin	Stephens, Miss.
Burke, S. Dak.	Gray	MacDonald	Stephens, Nebr.
Burke, Wis.	Greene, Mass.	Madden	Stevens, Minn.
Callaway	Gregg.	Maguire, Nebr.	Stone
Candler, Miss.	Guernsey	Manahan	Stout
Chandler, N. Y.	Hamilton, Mich.	Mann	Stringer
Church	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mapes	Sutherland
Cline	Hamlin	Martin	Tavenner
Connelly, Kans.	Hardy	Miller	Taylor, Ark.
Cooper	Haugen	Mitchell	Taylor, Colo.
Cox	Hawley	Mondell	Temple
Cramton	Heflin	Moore	Thompson, Okla.
Cullop	Helgesen	Moss, Ind.	Thomson, Ill.
Davenport	Helm	Moss, W. Va.	Towner
Davis	Henry	Mott	Tribble
Decker	Hinds	Murdock	Volstead
Deitrick	Hinebaugh	Neeley, Kans.	Wallin
Dickinson	Hobson	Nolan, J. I.	Walters
Difenderfer	Hughes, W. Va.	Norton	Watson
Dillon	Hulings	Paige, Mass.	Whitacre
Dixon	Humphrey, Wash.	Parker, N. Y.	Wingo
Doolittle	Johnson, Ky.	Peters	Winslow
Drukker	Johnson, Utah	Platt	Witherspoon
Eagle	Johnson, Wash.	Plumley	Woods
Edmonds	Kahn	Powers	Young, N. Dak.
Esch	Kelley, Mich.	Quin	Young, Tex.

NAYS—125.

Adair	Dershem	Hughes, Ga.	Roberts, Mass.
Adamson	Donohoe	Igoe	Rothermel
Aiken	Doremus	Jacoway	Rouse
Alexander	Doughton	Kent	Rucker
Allen	Dupré	Key, Ohio	Russell
Bailey	Eagan	Kirkpatrick	Saunders
Baltz	Edwards	Kitchin	Sherley
Bartlett	Evans	Lazaro	Slayden
Beakes	Fergusson	Lee, Ga.	Small
Beall, Tex.	Ferris	Lee, Pa.	Sparkman
Bell, Ga.	Fields	Lesher	Stedman
Blackmon	Finley	Lever	Stephens, Tex.
Booher	FitzHenry	Levy	Switzer
Borland	Flood, Va.	Lieb	Taggart
Bowdle	Floyd, Ark.	Logue	Talcott, N. Y.
Brockson	French	Metz	Taylor, Ala.
Brodbeck	Garner	Montague	Ten Eyck
Broussard	Garrett, Tenn.	Morgan, Okla.	Thacher
Brown, N. Y.	Gittins	Morrison	Thomas
Bulkley	Goldfogle	Murray	Townsend
Burnett	Goulden	Nelson	Underhill
Butler	Graham, Pa.	Oldfield	Underwood
Byrnes, S. C.	Gudger	Padgett	Vinson
Caraway	Harris	Page, N. C.	Vollmer
Carlin	Harrison	Palmer	Watkins
Carter	Hay	Park	Weaver
Claypool	Hayes	Parker, N. J.	Whaley
Coady	Helvering	Patten, N. Y.	White
Connolly, Iowa	Hill	Pou	Williams
Crisp	Holland	Price	
Curry	Howard	Rainey	
Dent	Howell	Rayburn	

ANSWERED "PRESENT" 3.

Dies	Sloan	Webb

NOT VOTING—127.

Baker	Byrns, Tenn.	Collier	Estopinal
Barchfeld	Calder	Conry	Fairchild
Barnhart	Campbell	Copley	Faison
Bartholdt	Cantor	Crosser	Gallagher
Bathrick	Cantrill	Dale	Gallivan
Bell, Cal.	Carew	Danforth	Gard
Bruckner	Carr	Donovan	George
Brumbaugh	Cary	Dooling	Gerry
Bryan	Casey	Driscoll	Gill
Burgess	Clancy	Dunn	Glass
Burke, Pa.	Clark, Fla.	Elder	Good

Goodwin, Ark.	Lafferty	O'Brien	Shreve
Gorman	Langham	Oglesby	Sims
Green, Iowa	L'Engle	O'Hair	Sinnott
Greene, Vt.	Lewis, Md.	O'Shaunessy	Sisson
Griest	Lewis, Pa.	Patton, Pa.	Smith, Md.
Griffin	Lindquist	Peterson	Smith, N. Y.
Hamill	Linthicum	Phelan	Stanley
Hart	Lloyd	Porter	Stevens, N. H.
Hayden	Lobeck	Post	Sumners
Hensley	Loft	Prouty	Talbott, Md.
Houston	McAndrews	Ragsdale	Taylor, N. Y.
Hoxworth	McClellan	Reed	Treadway
Hull	McGillicuddy	Reilly, Conn.	Tuttle
Humphreys, Miss.	McGuire, Okla.	Riordan	Vare
Johnson, S. C.	Mahan	Roberts, Nev.	Vaughan
Jones	Maher	Rupley	Walker
Keating	Moon	Sabath	Walsh
Keister	Morgan, La.	Scully	Wilson, Fla.
Kennedy, Conn.	Morin	Seldomridge	Wilson, N. Y.
Kindel	Mulkey	Sells	Woodruff
Korbly	Neely, W. Va.	Shackleford	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. BELL of California.

Mr. SIMS with Mr. SLOAN.

Mr. BARNHART with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. COLLIER with Mr. GREEN of Iowa.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi with Mr. GREENE of Vermont.

Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. CARY.

Mr. LLOYD with Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LOBECK with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY with Mr. DANFORTH.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, in view of the instruction of the House, I ask that the Speaker appoint as conferees Messrs. MCGILLICUDDY, THOMAS, and VOLSTEAD, all three of whom voted for the Cullop amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the following conferees, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. VOLSTEAD.

THE AMERICAN FLAG.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of printing in the RECORD a speech made on Sunday by my colleague, Mr. MARTIN, on the subject of the American flag.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by his colleague, Mr. MARTIN, on the American flag. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WAR-RISK INSURANCE BUREAU.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania on what subject?

Mr. MOORE. On the subject of the War-Risk Insurance Bureau.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to object to the gentleman's request, but I would not like to have the House get into a political discussion at this time.

Mr. MOORE. It is not a political controversy. I have some accurate information which the House ought to have, and I think I can state it in five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] for waiving his right to object, because what I have to say is timely and I think the House ought to be fully informed. A few mornings ago we were informed in the dispatches from Berlin, Germany, that the steamship *Evelyn*, flying the American flag, had gone down, sunk by a mine. This morning we are informed by similar dispatches from the same city that the steamship *Carib*, flying the American flag, went down in very much the same fashion. It ought to be known to the people of this country that both of these vessels were foreign built, each being constructed at Glasgow, Scotland. It ought to be known, too, that each of these vessels was wrecked upon the American coast, one 14 years after construction and the other 16 years after construction, and that in each instance they were able to obtain the right to use the American flag because they had been repaired on this side of the water. The *Evelyn* was constructed in Glasgow in 1883. She was wrecked on the American coast in 1897. The *Carib* was built in Glasgow in 1882, and she was wrecked on the American coast in 1898. Each was able to obtain the right to sail under the American flag because each had been repaired in this country.

Yesterday I said about all I care to say on the legislation that has been passed with respect to foreign vessels wrecked on the American coast. I wish now to say that by virtue of the war-risk law passed by this Congress and signed by the President September 2, 1914, it was possible for exporters who desired to send cotton abroad to obtain the use of these two ships, both of which had been wrecked and thus obtained the invaluable privilege of the American flag, to go into the war zone on dangerous errands. I call attention to the very significant fact that neither of the vessels was of very great value except for the privilege of using the American flag. I call attention to the further fact that even with the American flag they could not obtain from private companies insurance sufficient to indemnify the cargoes they were to carry into what might be called contraband or belligerent territory. It was not until the Government of the United States stepped in and passed the war-risk law and guaranteed the hulls and the cargoes that these vessels were able to sail into those dangerous and hazardous zones.

The direct result of the act of September 2, 1914, therefore, has been that these two old foreign-built ships, wrecked upon the American coast and using the American flag, were insured by the people of the United States under the law, so that the loss upon the hulls will not be borne by the owners and the loss upon the cargoes will not be borne by the consignors or the consignees. Whatever loss there is, up to the value of the insurance, will be paid by the people of the United States.

The *Evelyn* was insured to the extent of $100,000 upon her hull and her cargo was insured to the extent of $301,000, a total of $401,000, guaranteed by the people of the United States upon cotton going to the war zone. For that insurance the United States received a premium of $13,030, about 3 per cent. That is to say, we staked $401,000 of the people's money against $13,030, which we received in the form of a premium.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I can not yield now.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Just for a question.

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. ALEXANDER. How much has the Government received in the way of premiums for war-risk insurance up to this time?

Mr. MOORE. I will give the figures in a moment. The *Carib* was insured on her hull for $22,253——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes additional.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may have five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not like to object——

Mr. MOORE. I shall not digress from a statement of the facts, if the gentleman from Alabama will permit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. MOORE. The *Carib* was insured on her hull for $22,253, on her cargo for $235,850. The total amount of the people's money thus at risk on the *Carib* and her cargo was $258,103. The premium paid was $7,965.62. That is to say, for $7,965.62 received on the *Carib* we staked $258,103 of the people's money.

Now, before I reply to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] I desire to say that the total premiums on those two ships was $20,995, or approximately $21,000, as against a loss of $659,103, approximately $660,000. That is to say, we stand to lose $660,000 of the people's money for $21,000 in premiums.

As to the question of the gentleman from Missouri, I will answer directly. My information from the War Risk Bureau this morning is that the total amount of premiums received on all business thus far done is $1,502,302—more than a million and a half of dollars in round figures—and to be fair with the bureau and with the gentleman from Missouri, a very large proportion of that is protected, because a number of insured cargoes have arrived at their destination. But a million and a half dollars of money derived in premiums insuring owners against loss on cargoes and hulls of these old vessels, wrecked or otherwise, is only one side of the story. The risk we took to secure those premiums of $1,500,000 was $55,000,000, and that is what we stood to lose on that million and a half for which the gentleman claims credit.

Mr. BARTLETT. Can the gentleman give the figures as to what amount in premiums have been earned?

Mr. MOORE. A million and a half earned in premiums.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield, if to anyone?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARTLETT. Up to date we have earned in premiums $640,848, and this is the first loss.

Mr. MOORE. Up to date we have lost $659,000, and we stood to lose $55,000,000——

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh, yes.

Mr. MOORE. Yesterday my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] made an eloquent appeal for somebody to stop this hazardous business into which we are plunged headlong. As a matter of fact, there is no telling what the volume of the risk will be. We stood to lose $55,000,000, less what has been marked off on cargoes that have gone through. I understand policies have already expired to the amount of $25,000,000, but we still stand to lose $30,000,000, and on two ships we have actually lost $659,000. The surety business is all right when the premiums are coming in, but we are just beginning to hear of the losses, and they seldom grow less.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I can not; I have not the time.

Mr. BORLAND. I wanted to ask the gentleman to put in another fact——

Mr. MOORE. Yesterday the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] rose and said that somebody ought to stop this business; that somebody ought to stop these vessels carrying contraband and conditional contraband into the war zone, inviting complications. Yes; somebody ought to rise and say to the speculators who want to take these chances with ships and lives in the danger zones that the risk belongs to them and not to the people of the United States.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I can not. If anyone shall seek to apply the remedy for those losses and those perils, perhaps it may be found in the war-risk law. You provided in that law that the President shall have discretion to stop this business. He can exercise that discretion if he will. He can check this tremendous hazard against which the peace and the money of the people of this country is being staked. Section 9 of the war-risk bill provides:

> That the President is authorized whenever, in his judgment, the necessity for further war insurance by the United States shall have ceased to exist, to suspend the operations of this act in so far as it authorizes insurance by the United States against loss or damage by risks of war—

And so forth.

I will insert the rest of it in the RECORD. The time has come for the President to act if he cares to do so. Two vessels have already gone down——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. [Applause.]

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, in extension, I am hopeful the resolutions I offered yesterday to acquire detailed information from the Secretary of the Treasury as to the business of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance may be passed in order that we may know the nature of the cargoes that have been insured and the volume of risk which the country has assumed. The figures I have just presented show that our total risk up to date was $55,000,000, reduced, as claimed by the bureau, to $30,000,000 because a number of vessels with cargoes insured have successfully run the gantlet. That the losses in the bureau are only beginning with the destruction of the *Evelyn* and the *Carib* is patent to those who have any knowledge of the surety business. It is more than probable that we shall hear of war-risk claims for many years after the President has seen fit to discontinue the bureau or after it has died by limitation. We are told that all of the maritime nations have established war-risk bureaus. Many of them are actively engaged in the conflict, and none of them are so happily situated to avoid trouble as is the United States. This morning's papers contain a dispatch from Liverpool indicating that the war-risk losses of the British company are "very slight." They may be slight considering the necessity that has surrounded a country engaged in war. Even at that, the six months' losses of the British War Risk Association appear to mount up in American money to $26,000,000. I append a dispatch bearing upon this subject:

> BRITISH SHIPPING LOSSES SMALL, DECLARES ISMAY—CARGOES DESTROYED ONLY SEVEN-TENTHS OF 1 PER CENT OF TOTAL VALUE.
>
> LIVERPOOL, *February 23.*
>
> J. Bruce Ismay, presiding to-day at a meeting of the Liverpool and London War Risks Association, said that the shipping entered in this association was valued at £80,000,000 ($400,000,000); that the vessels identified with the association which had been lost during six months of the war were valued at only £850,000 and the cargoes at £4,500,000. The cargo losses represented only 14 shillings per cent (seven-tenths of 1 per cent) of the total value of the cargoes at risk.
>
> This, he said, constituted a magnificent tribute to the efficacy of the protection afforded by the British Navy, and showed that the submarine peril had been greatly exaggerated.

While I am privileged to do so, Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly as to the remarks made by my colleague from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] yesterday and my Mississippi colleague [Mr. HARRISON] this afternoon. These gentlemen refer to the necessity of getting cotton abroad, and the gentleman from Missouri is curious to know exactly what kind of a speech the gentleman would make "if all the cotton of the United States was still held in storage in this country and had no foreign outlet at all." I am sorry the gentleman from Missouri has not listened to what I have previously said upon this side of the cotton question. I have contended that there was a market for cotton in the United States under a protective tariff, but that that market has been very seriously affected in this country because of low-tariff conditions. The intense desire of our Democratic friends to send their cotton abroad rather than to sell it at home is partly responsible for the bank balances in Missouri to which the gentleman refers, as it is also responsible for the failure of industrial establishments in the eastern part of the country to buy up as much raw cotton as they would like to use. The gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Mississippi should take up the report of the Director of the Census for the month of January to better understand this situation. In January, 1914, when there was no European war and no special complaint about the price of cotton, our cotton exports amounted to 1,052,272 bales. In January, 1915, when the war was on and complaints were heard about the price of cotton, our cotton exports were 1,372,175 bales, or more than 300,000 bales more in war times than in times of peace. It does not appear, therefore, that either the foreigner who uses raw cotton or the planter who sells it had any special cause to complain about the quantity bought or sold in January, 1915. Let us concede that much of this cotton would not have been exported if the Government had not gone into the war-risk insurance business, but while this business has worked well for raw cotton and for foreign manufacturers, who are shipping back tremendous quantities of fabrics into the United States, I do not want my friends to overlook the fact that the same report of the Director of the Census shows that there were 500,000 less cotton spindles active in the United States in January, 1915, than there were in January, 1914. In other words, the increase in cotton exports was at the expense of American industries, and accounts in a large degree for the unemployment that now prevails in the United States. Witness the customhouse statement from New York this morning that German exports to the United States, meaning exports of goods that compete with United States manufactures, have been substantially as great in January, 1915, as they were in January, 1914. If our friends upon the other side can see no danger in purchasing antiquated foreign-built vessels, giving them an American register, insuring them with the people's money, and sending them to war zones, they should at least recognize the injustice done the industries of the United States by the persistence with which our foreign trade in cotton is encouraged to break down the textile industries of the United States.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] asks leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the same question. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Georgia judgeship bill.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 20347) entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916," disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. FLETCHER, and Mr. DU PONT as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PRACTICE OF PHARMACY AND SALE OF POISON IN CHINA.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 6631) to regu-

late the practice of pharmacy and sale of poison in the consular districts of the United States in China.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 6631) to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poison in the consular districts of the United States in China.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the bill ought to be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the 1st day of January, 1915, it shall be unlawful in the consular districts of the United States in China for any person whose permanent allegiance is due to the United States not licensed as a pharmacist within the meaning of this act to conduct or manage any pharmacy, drug, or chemical store, apothecary shop, or other place of business for the retailing, compounding, or dispensing of any drugs, chemicals, or poisons, or for the compounding of physicians' prescriptions, or to keep exposed for sale at retail, any drugs, chemicals, or poisons, except as hereinafter provided, or, except as hereinafter provided, for any person whose permanent allegiance is due to the United States not licensed as a pharmacist within the meaning of this act to compound, dispense, or sell at retail any drug, chemical, poison, or pharmaceutical preparation upon the prescription of a physician, or otherwise, or to compound physicians' prescriptions, except as an aid to and under the proper supervision of a pharmacist licensed under this act. And it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation owing permanent allegiance to the United States owning partly or wholly or managing a pharmacy, drug store, or other place of business to cause or permit any person other than a licensed pharmacist to compound, dispense, or sell at retail any drug, medicine, or poison except as an aid to and under the proper supervision of a licensed pharmacist: *Provided*, That where it is necessary for a person, firm, or corporation whose permanent allegiance is due to the United States and owning partly or wholly or managing a pharmacy, drug store, or other place of business to employ Chinese subjects to compound, dispense, or sell at retail any drug, medicine, or poison, such person, firm, corporation, owner, part owner, or manager of a pharmacy, drug store, or other place of business may employ such Chinese subjects when their character, ability, and age of 21 years or over have been certified to by at least two recognized and reputable practitioners of medicine, or two pharmacists licensed under this act whose permanent allegiance is due to the United States: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to interfere with any recognized and reputable practitioner of medicine, dentistry, or veterinary surgery in the compounding of his own prescriptions or to prevent him from supplying to his patients such medicines as he may deem proper, except as hereinafter provided; nor with the exclusively wholesale business of any person, firm, or corporation whose permanent allegiance is due to the United States dealing and licensed as pharmacists, or having in their employ at least one person who is so licensed, except as hereinafter provided; nor with the sale by persons, firms, or corporations whose permanent allegiance is due to the United States other than pharmacists of poisonous substances sold exclusively for use in the arts, or as insecticides, when such substances are sold in unbroken packages bearing labels having plainly printed upon them the name of the contents, the word "poison," when practicable the name of at least one suitable antidote, and the name and address of the vender.

SEC. 2. That every person whose permanent allegiance is due to the United States now practicing as a pharmacist or desiring to practice as a pharmacist in the consular districts in China shall file with the consul an application, duly verified under oath, setting forth the name and age of the applicant, the place or places at which he pursued and the time spent in the study of pharmacy, the experience which the applicant has had in compounding physicians' prescriptions under the direction of a licensed pharmacist, and the name and location of the school or college of pharmacy, if any, of which he is a graduate, and shall submit evidence sufficient to show to the satisfaction of said consul that he is of good moral character and not addicted to the use of alcoholic liquors or narcotic drugs so as to render him unfit to practice pharmacy: *Provided*, That applicants shall be not less than 21 years of age and shall have had at least four years' experience in the practice of pharmacy or shall have served three years under the instruction of a regularly licensed pharmacist, and any applicant who has been graduated from a school or college of pharmacy recognized by the proper board of his State, Territory, District of Columbia, or other possession of the United States as in good standing shall be entitled to practice upon presentation of his diploma.

SEC. 3. That if the applicant for license as a pharmacist has complied with the requirements of the preceding section, the consul shall issue to him a license which shall entitle him to practice pharmacy in the consular districts of the United States in China, subject to the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. That the license of any person whose permanent allegiance is due to the United States to practice pharmacy in the consular districts of the United States in China may be revoked by the consul if such person be found to have obtained such license by fraud, or be addicted to the use of any narcotic or stimulant, or to be suffering from physical or mental disease, in such manner and to such extent as to render it expedient that in the interests of the public his license be canceled; or to be of an immoral character; or if such person be convicted in any court of competent jurisdiction of any offense involving moral turpitude. It shall be the duty of the consul to investigate any case in which it is discovered by him or made to appear to his satisfaction that any license issued under the provisions of this act is revocable and shall, after full hearing, if in his judgment the facts warrant it, revoke such license.

SEC. 5. That every license to practice pharmacy shall be conspicuously displayed by the person to whom the same has been issued in the pharmacy, drug store, or place of business, if any, of which the said person is the owner or part owner or manager.

SEC. 6. That it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation whose permanent allegiance is due to the United States, either personally or by servant or agent or as the servant or agent of any other person or of any firm or corporation, to sell, furnish, or give away any cocaine, salts of cocaine, or preparation containing cocaine or salts of cocaine, or morphine or preparation containing morphine or salts of morphine, or any opium or preparation containing opium, or any chloral hydrate or preparation containing chloral hydrate, except upon the original written order or prescription of a recognized and reputable practitioner of medicine, dentistry, or veterinary medicine, which order or prescription shall be dated and shall contain the name of the person for whom prescribed, or, if ordered by a practitioner of veterinary medicine, shall state the kind of animal for which ordered and shall be signed by the person giving the order or prescription. Such order or prescription shall be, for a period of three years, retained on file by the person, firm, or corporation who compounds or dispenses the article ordered or prescribed, and it shall not be compounded or dispensed after the first time except upon the written order of the original prescriber: *Provided*, That the above provisions shall not apply to preparations containing not more than 2 grains of opium, or not more than one-quarter grain of morphine, or not more than one-quarter grain of cocaine, or not more than 2 grains of chloral hydrate in the fluid ounce, or, if a solid preparation, in 1 avoirdupois ounce. The above provisions shall not apply to preparations sold in good faith for diarrhea and cholera, each bottle or package of which is accompanied by specific directions for use and caution against habitual use, nor to liniments or ointments sold in good faith as such when plainly labeled "for external use only," nor to powder of ipecac and opium, commonly known as Dover's powder, when sold in quantities not exceeding 20 grains: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not be construed to permit the selling, furnishing, giving away, or prescribing for the use of any habitual users of the same any cocaine, salts of cocaine, or preparation containing cocaine or salts of cocaine, or morphine or salts of morphine, or preparations containing morphine or salts of morphine, or any opium or preparation containing opium, or any chloral hydrate or preparation containing chloral hydrate. But this proviso shall not be construed to prevent any recognized or reputable practitioner of medicine whose permanent allegiance is due to the United States from furnishing in good faith for the use of any habitual user of narcotic drugs who is under his professional care such substances as he may deem necessary for their treatment, when such prescriptions are not given or substances furnished for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section. But the provisions of this section shall not apply to sales at wholesale between jobbers, manufacturers, and retail druggists, hospitals, and scientific or public institutions.

SEC. 7. That it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation whose permanent allegiance is due to the United States to sell or deliver to any other person any of the following-described substances or any poisonous compound, combination, or preparation thereof, to wit: The compounds of and salts of antimony, arsenic, barium, chromium, copper, gold, lead, mercury, silver, and zinc, the caustic hydrates of sodium and potassium, solution or water of ammonia, methyl alcohol, paregoric, the concentrated mineral acids, oxalic and hydrocyanic acids and their salts, yellow phosphorus, Paris green, carbolic acid, the essential oils of almonds, pennyroyal, tansy, rue, and savin; croton oil, creosote, chloroform, cantharides, or aconite, belladonna, bitter almonds, colchicum, cotton root, cocculus indicus, conium, cannabis indica, digatalis, ergot, hyoscyamus, ignatia, lobelia, nux vomica, physostigma, phytolacca, strophanthus, stramonium, veratrum viride, or any of the poisonous alkaloids or alkaloidal salts derived from the foregoing, or any other poisonous alkaloids or their salts, or any other virulent poison, except in the manner following, and, moreover, if the applicant be less than 18 years of age, except upon the written order of a person known or believed to be an adult.

It shall first be learned, by due inquiry, that the person to whom delivery is about to be made is aware of the poisonous character of the substance and that it is desired for a lawful purpose, and the box, bottle, or other package shall be plainly labeled with the name of the substance, the word "Poison," the name of at least one suitable antidote, when practicable, and the name and address of the person, firm, or corporation dispensing the substance. And before delivery be made of any of the foregoing substances, excepting solution or water of ammonia and sulphate of copper, there shall be recorded in a book kept for that purpose the name of the article, the quantity delivered, the purpose for which it is to be used, the date of delivery, the name and address of the person for whom it is procured, and the name of the individual personally dispensing the same; and said book shall be preserved by the owner thereof for at least three years after the date of the last entry therein. The foregoing provisions shall not apply to articles dispensed upon the order of persons believed by the dispenser to be recognized and reputable practitioners of medicine, dentistry, or veterinary surgery: *Provided*, That when a physician writes upon his prescription a request that it be marked or labeled "Poison" the pharmacist shall, in the case of liquids, place the same in a colored glass, roughened bottle, of the kind commonly known in trade as a "poison bottle," and, in the case of dry substances, he shall place a poison label upon the container. The record of sale and delivery above mentioned shall not be required of manufacturers and wholesalers who shall sell any of the foregoing substances at wholesale to licensed pharmacists, but the box, bottle, or other package containing such substance, when sold at wholesale, shall be properly labeled with the name of the substance, the word "Poison," and the name and address of the manufacturer or wholesaler: *Provided further*, That it shall not be necessary, in sales either at wholesale or at retail, to place a poison label upon, nor to record the delivery of, the sulphide of antimony, or the oxide or carbonate of zinc, or of colors ground in oil and intended for use as paints, or calomel; nor in the case of preparations containing any of the substances named in this section, when a single box, bottle, or other package, or when the bulk of one-half fluid ounce or the weight of one-half avoirdupois ounce does not contain more than an adult medicinal dose of such substance; nor, in the case of liniments or ointments sold in good faith as such, when plainly labeled "For external use only"; nor, in the case of preparations put up and sold in the form of pills, tablets, or lozenges, containing any of the substances enumerated in this section and intended for internal use, when the dose recommended does not contain more than one-fourth of an adult medicinal dose of such substance.

For the purpose of this and of every other section of this act no box, bottle, or other package shall be regarded as having been labeled "Poison" unless the word "Poison" appears conspicuously thereon, printed in plain, uncondensed gothic letters in red ink.

SEC. 8. That no person, firm, or corporation whose permanent allegiance is due to the United States seeking to procure in the consular districts of the United States in China any substance the sale of which is regulated by the provisions of this act shall make any fraudulent representations so as to evade or defeat the restrictions herein imposed.

SEC. 9. That every person, firm, or corporation whose permanent allegiance is due to the United States owning, partly owning, or managing a drug store or pharmacy shall keep in his place of business a suitable book or file, in which shall be preserved for a period of not less

than three years the original of every prescription compounded or dispensed at such store or pharmacy, or a copy of such prescription, except when the preservation of the original is required by section 6 of this act. Upon request the owner, part owner, or manager of such store shall furnish to the prescribing physician, or to the person for whom such prescription was compounded or dispensed, a true and correct copy thereof. Any prescription required by section 6 of this act, and any prescription for, or register of sales of, substances mentioned in section 6 of this act shall at all times be open to inspection by duly authorized consular officers in the consular districts of the United States in China. No person, firm, or corporation whose permanent allegiance is due to the United States shall, in a consular district, compound or dispense any drug or drugs or deliver the same to any other person without marking on the container thereof the name of the drug or drugs contained therein and directions for using the same.

SEC. 10. That it shall be unlawful for any person whose permanent allegiance is due to the United States, not legally licensed as a pharmacist, to take, use, or exhibit the title of pharmacist, or licensed or registered pharmacist, or the title of druggist or apothecary, or any other title or description of like import.

SEC. 11. That any person, firm, or corporation, whose permanent allegiance is due to the United States, violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 and not more than $100 or by imprisonment for not less than 1 month and not more than 60 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court, and if the offense be continuing in its character each week or part of a week during which it continues shall constitute a separate and distinct offense. And it shall be the duty of the consular and judicial officers of the United States in China to enforce the provisions of this act.

SEC. 12. That the word "Consul" as used in this act shall mean the consular officer in charge of the district concerned.

SEC. 13. That nothing in this act shall be construed as modifying or revoking any of the provisions of the act of Congress of February 23, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the execution of the provisions of article 2 of the treaty concluded between the United States of America and the Emperor of China on the 17th day of November, 1880, and proclaimed by the President of the United States the 5th day of October, 1881."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume that this is the first instance where our Government has sought to legislate extraterritorially over the affairs of American citizens doing business when domiciled in a foreign country. If I am mistaken in that, I ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to correct me.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The Senate passed a bill very similar to this one in 1910, but it failed in the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. My question is whether this is not the first instance where our Government has attempted to legislate extraterritorially over our citizens doing business in a foreign country?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes; it is the first one that I recall.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to inquire further whether the other Governments who were parties to the convention convened to suppress the opium trade in China passed similar bills applicable to their subjects doing business in China?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. This whole matter was entered into upon the initiative of this Government, and the purpose of the other Governments is to follow the course of this Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. There has been a convention called at the instance of this Government to which the leading European nations were invited, in which a common course was agreed upon for the suppression of the opium trade in China.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Exactly.

Mr. STAFFORD. And I am inquiring whether these other foreign Governments have taken any action in the fulfillment of that convention?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I undertook to answer the gentleman's question by saying that this Government was supposed to act first. This whole proceeding was upon the initiative of this Government. The first opium commission, composed of representatives of this Government and Austria, China, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Persia, Portugal, Russia, and Siam, was formed upon the initiative of this Government and it made recommendations as to the kind of law that should be enacted by the different nations for the control of their nationals in the free ports of China. That measure passed the Senate in 1910 and failed in the House. Then there was an international conference at The Hague of these same nations in reference to this matter, and it was there agreed that the Chinese Government was to formulate a law that would be satisfactory to them and submit it to these Governments. That law was gotten up by China and by this country, and is based largely upon the antidrug law of the District of Columbia, with certain changes which they thought were proper to make. And this Government is to enact it first, and then the other Governments are to follow.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice that this is a penal statute.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Oh, yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The very opening sentence provides for it to take effect on and after January 1, 1915. I direct inquiry to the gentleman whether that should not be changed in view of the fact that unquestionably American pharmacists doing business in these Chinese ports over which there are treaty obligations between China and the United States may not have conformed to the provisions of this bill?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I think it ought to be changed to the 1st of January, 1916.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform us whether there are any other countries that have adopted a like bill to this under consideration?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I think not, up to this time. I think they will follow very rapidly after we have adopted it.

Mr. STAFFORD. We passed here a year ago last June the so-called Harrison Act, regulating the sale of habit-forming drugs. It has recently gone into effect, or will go into effect on March 1. I wish to inquire of the gentleman whether the provisions of the Harrison Act are virtually embodied in the bill under consideration?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I am not sufficiently familiar with the Harrison Act to answer that question with any degree of accuracy. My understanding has been, I will say to the gentleman, that this bill is framed upon the District of Columbia law on this subject.

Mr. STAFFORD. The report shows it was framed with that as a model, and by a certain Mr. Hamilton Wright. Can the gentleman inform us who Mr. Hamilton Wright is?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. He is the gentleman who has had charge of the international aspect of the opium work on behalf of this Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then it is understood the gentleman intends to offer an amendment substituting "16" for "15"?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I will.

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

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KAHN. I understand the Government of China has already taken steps to suppress the opium traffic?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes. In 1906 it took very vigorous steps to suppress it, and was thwarted by the Americans, whom they could not control because they did not have jurisdiction over them.

Mr. KAHN. I would like to insert in the RECORD statements uttered by the great Chinese statesman, Li Hung Chang, on the opium traffic, and I ask, Mr. Speaker, that I have unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on that matter.

The SPEAKER. On what?

Mr. KAHN. To insert in the RECORD some statements of Li Hung Chang on the opium traffic.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert some statements of Li Hung Chang on the opium traffic. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAHN. The statement is as follows:

In the autumn of 1906 the Chinese Government determined to bring to an end the practice of opium smoking in China. In support of China's effort the United States immediately proposed to Austria-Hungary, China, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Persia, Portugal, Russia, and Siam that an international commission should be assembled to study and recommend means by which the Indo-Chinese opium traffic and the collateral traffic to the Philippine Islands and other eastern territories might be brought to an end. That commission assembled at Shanghai in February, 1909, and in the course of its deliberations on the opium problem it was demonstrated that in the three preceding years the Chinese Empire had been flooded with so-called opium remedies largely manufactured by foreigners resident in the treaty ports of China, and that these so-called antiopium remedies were composed largely of opium and morphine. It therefore appeared that China's heroic effort to suppress the habit of opium smoking would be frustrated because the habit of swallowing opium was about to take the place of the habit of opium smoking.

The International Opium Commission promptly recognied this fact when demonstrated by the Chinese commissioners, and a means to prevent the replacement of the old habit of opium smoking by opium swallowing and the responsibility of foreigners in the treaty ports of China for the new habit had to be thought out.

After a thorough discussion between the American and Chinese commissioners it was decided that the commission as a whole should recommend to their Governments that they apply their national pharmacy laws to their subjects in the consular districts, settlements, and concessions in China, the object being to prevent foreigners in China manufacturing wholesale and placing on the market so-called antiopium remedies which contain nothing but opium and morphine. Therefore the commission as a whole adopted the following resolution, which was introduced by the American delegation:

RESOLUTION 9—INTERNATIONAL OPIUM COMMISSION.

"*Be it resolved*, That the International Opium Commission recommends that each delegation move its Government to apply its pharmacy

laws to its subjects in the consular districts, concessions, and settlements in China."

As the American commissioners, after consultation with the Chinese commissioners, were responsible for this resolution, it was incumbent upon the American Government to be the first to apply any national pharmacy act on the statute books to its subjects resident in its consular districts in China. The only national pharmacy act on the statute books is Public, No. 148, an act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

This act was therefore taken as a model of the act which the Chinese Government expected that the American Government would apply to Americans resident in China under those treaty stipulations which are briefed in another memorandum. The modifications of Public, No. 148, which accompanies this memorandum, was passed by the Senate on June 25, 1910, but failed of action in the House, and the matter has rested until the present moment.

Following upon the unanimous action of the International Opium Commission in condemning the evils associated with the opium traffic, this Government proposed to the other interested Governments that an international conference, composed of delegates with full powers, should meet at The Hague to give the force of law and international agreement to the resolutions of the International Opium Commission. That conference assembled at The Hague on the 1st of last December and, after signing a convention, adjourned on the 23d of the following January. Amongst the most important articles signed by the delegates on behalf of their Governments were those which confirmed to China the abolition of the Indo-Chinese opium traffic. (See Ch. 4, International Opium Convention, p. 34, S. Doc. No. 733, 62d Cong., 2d sess.)

Article 16 of chapter 4 of the International Opium Convention is the pertinent one, so far as the proposed legislation is concerned. That article is as follows:

ARTICLE 16, INTERNATIONAL OPIUM CONVENTION.

"The Chinese Government shall promulgate pharmacy laws for its subjects, regulating the sale and distribution of morphine, cocaine, and their respective salts, and of the substances indicated in article 14 of the present convention, and shall communicate these laws to the Governments having treaties with China through the intermediary of their diplomatic representatives at Peking. The contracting powers having treaties with China shall examine these laws, and, if they find them acceptable, shall take the necessary measures to the end that they be applied to their nationals residing in China."

Thus it will be seen that the powers having treaty relations with China, amongst them the United States, have entered into a solemn pledge with the Chinese Government to apply such pharmacy laws to their nationals residing in China as will regulate the sale and distribution of opium, morphine, and cocaine, the object being to prevent the nationals of the treaty powers flooding China with remedies containing opium which are more baneful in their effects than the evils of opium smoking, which the Chinese are successfully suppressing.

This pledge on the part of the United States can be redeemed by the passage and approval of the accompanying bill.

In regard to the proposed bill, it can be stated that as a pharmacy act it is as satisfactory as Public No. 148, on which it is modeled, which has been in force in the District of Columbia for several years, and which has proved to be as efficient and workable as the pharmacy acts of any of the States of the Union.

As to the law features of the proposed bill as they affect Americans in China, it may be said to be without fault. It represents the combined efforts of Mr. Hamilton Wright, who has been in charge of the international aspects of the opium work on behalf of the American Government, of the members of the Far Eastern Division, and of the solicitors of the Department of State. Since its drafting it has been submitted to Judge Thayer, of the United States court in China, and to several of the American consuls general in that country. They have all commended it from the point of view of principle, and regard it as practicable and well within treaty and statutory law under which Americans reside in China.

It should be borne in mind that the Chinese Government has by resolution in the International Opium Commission and by treaty stipulation in the International Opium Convention requested this Government to pass this act, and that all Chinese conversant with the question will welcome the present act, if passed and approved, as a model act on which a Chinese national pharmacy act may be based.

The bases for American jurisdiction over Americans resident in China are founded—

1. On the right of citizens of the United States to frequent the open ports of China.

2. On the right of the American Government to superintend and regulate the concerns of citizens of the United States doing business at the open ports of China, together with the right of the United States to appoint consuls or other officers at the same ports.

3. The judicial authority of the United States over citizens who reside at the open ports of China.

First. By article 3 of the treaty of Wang Hea between United States and China, 1844, citizens of the United States were permitted to frequent the five ports of Quangchow, Amoy, Fuchow, Ningpo, and Shanghai, and to reside with their families and trade there; to proceed at pleasure with their vessels and merchandise to and from any foreign port and either of the said five ports, and from either of said five ports to any other of them. (See p. 474, Treaties Between China and Foreign States, vol. 1.)

The provisions of article 3 of the treaty of Wang Hea were reaffirmed and broadened by article 14 of the treaty of Tientsin between the United States and China, 1858, and there was added to the five ports mentioned in article 3 of the treaty of 1844 Swatow, Canton, and Taiwan in the island of Formosa. (See p. 315, ibid.)

Second. By article 4 of the treaty of Wang Hea it is provided that for the superintendence and regulation of the concerns of citizens of the United States doing business in the five ports mentioned in article 3 of that treaty the Government of the United States may appoint consuls or other officers at the time, who shall be duly recognized as such by the officers of the Chinese Government. (See p. 474, ibid.)

Article 10 of the treaty of Tientsin of 1858 reaffirms this right of the United States to appoint consuls at all of the open ports of China.

Third. By article 21 of the treaty of Wang Hea, 1844, the judicial authority of the United States over its citizens who are in residence at the open ports of China was reaffirmed, it being provided by article 21 that citizens of the United States who may commit any crime in China shall be subject to be tried and punished only by the consul or other public functionary of the United States authorized according to the laws of the United States, while subjects of China who may be guilty of any criminal act toward citizens of the United States were to be arrested and punished by the Chinese authorities and according to the laws of China. (See p. 481, ibid.) The provision of this article was amplified by article 25 of the same treaty, which provides that all questions in regard to rights, whether of property or person, arising between citizens of the United States and China shall be subject to the jurisdiction of and regulated by the authorities of their own Government, and all controversies occurring in China between citizens of the United States and the subjects of any other Government shall be regulated by the treaties existing between the United States and such Governments, respectively, without interference on the part of China. (See p. 483, ibid.)

Article 11 of the treaty of Tientsin, 1858, reaffirmed and amplified article 21 of the treaty of Wang hea. (See p. 513, ibid.)

Since these treaties were negotiated the Congress has passed several acts relating to the rights of American citizens in China, and to consular and to judicial jurisdiction over them. The earliest act of Congress which applies was that of August 11, 1848. (9 Stat. L., 276.)

In reporting the bill the Senate Judiciary Committee stated that the measure was considered necessary to the execution of the treaty of 1844 with China. The next legislation was that of June 22, 1860. (12 Stat. L., 72.) It was occasioned partly by the newly made treaty with China, commonly known as the Tientsin treaty of 1858. It extensively amplified and improved the earliest legislation, and, together with the act of July 1, 1870 (16 Stat. L., 183), relating to appeals in certain cases, formed the basis of the law as embodied in the Revised Statutes, sections 4083, 4130. (See p. 787, R. S. U. S., 2d ed., 1878.)

It is repeatedly declared in these statutes that they are intended to carry into effect the treaties which have granted extraterritorial jurisdiction to the United States in China, as well as other oriental countries. The jurisdiction as provided for in China is described with some fullness. The second leading feature of these statutes is that they set forth what law is to be applied in consular courts. (Secs. 4086, 4117–4120, 4126.) The jurisdiction in both criminal and civil matters is to be exercised and enforced in conformity with the laws of the United States, which are by these statutes, and so far as necessary and suitable under the treaties, extended over all citizens of the United States in China, and over all others who may have the right of American protection. If the laws of the United States, the statutes continue, are not adapted to the object of the treaties, or are deficient in the provisions necessary to furnish suitable remedies, the common law and the law of equity and admiralty shall extend in like manner over citizens and other protected persons in those countries. And if neither the common law nor the law of equity or admiralty nor the statutes of the United States furnish appropriate and sufficient remedies, the American minister in China shall issue regulations which shall supply such defects and deficiencies and shall have the force of law. (See pp. 41–42, "American Consular Jurisdiction in the Orient," Hinckley.)

These statutes have been somewhat modified, so far as China is concerned, by the act of June 30, 1906, creating a United States Court for China. That act impliedly removes all jurisdiction and the power of making regulations from the minister to China. It confers this jurisdiction and power upon the judge of the United States Court for China. A copy of the act of June 30, 1906, is attached.

The proposed act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and sale of poisons in the consular districts of the United States in China does not in any way transcend the consular and judicial authority of the United States in China, as provided for in the above-mentioned treaties and statutes. It should be stated in regard to section 13 of the proposed act which protects the act of Congress of February 23, 1887, providing for the execution of the provisions of article 2 of the American-Chinese treaty of 1880, that this is necessary to prevent American citizens in the general act of practicing pharmacy from engaging in the opium trade in Chinese waters, as agreed to by the United States and China by article 2 of the treaty of 1880.

It may be stated as a general proposition that the Chinese Government has always welcomed the worthy exercise of the judicial functions of the United States which are reserved to this Government under the extraterritoriality provisions of our treaties, and the exercise of such power has always made for better relations between the two countries. The accompanying proposed pharmacy act, which is to apply to Americans resident in China, will serve as a sure indication of the solicitude of this Government to do its bounden duty toward China.

The Government of the United States "can, equally with any of the former or present Governments of Europe, make treaties providing for the exercise of judicial authority in other countries by its officers appointed to reside therein." (In re Ross, 1891, 140 U. S., 453, 463. See Moore, vol. 5, p. 161, third paragraph.)

The State Department favors this bill, as is shown by this letter from Secretary Bryan:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 15, 1914.

Hon. HENRY D. FLOOD,
Chairman Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives.

SIR: There is now pending before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs the bill (S. 6631) to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poison in China by Americans residing in the consular districts of the United States in that country. The Department of State is greatly interested in the passage of this bill.

The International Opium Commission which met at Shanghai in 1909 recommended that each Government represented at the meeting should enact certain proposed legislation upon this subject. The International Opium Conference at The Hague subsequently adopted a convention, to which the United States is signatory, pledging the signatory powers to the enactment, among other laws, of just such *legislation as is* proposed in the bill mentioned.

Unless this bill or one of similar import be enacted into law, it will be impossible for the American consuls in China to regulate the purchase, sale, and distribution in China of opium, morphine, and other poisonous drugs by Americans or other persons owing allegiance to the United States in that country.

The Department of State trusts, therefore, that your committee will favorably report this bill, and that it will be passed at an early date.

The report upon the bill by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations gives further information as to the character and need of the legislation asked.

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

W. J. BRYAN.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask that I may have unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an editorial from this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing therein an editorial from to-day's Washington Post. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the editorial?

Mr. MONDELL. The caption of the editorial is "Presidential dictation."

Mr. BORLAND. I think I shall have to object.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] both object.

Mr. POWERS rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. POWERS. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an article prepared by Marcus Borchardt, L. L. M., on the need of a United States official gazette. It is a well-prepared article and gives a great deal of valuable information.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, can not the object of the gentleman be obtained by printing it as a document?

Mr. ADAIR. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] objects.

PRACTICE OF PHARMACY AND SALE OF POISON IN CHINA.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood the gentleman from Virginia was going to offer an amendment to change the date from 1915 to 1916.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes. I move to amend the bill, Mr. Speaker, line 4, page 1, by striking out the word "fifteen" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "sixteen."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 1, line 4, by striking out the word "fifteen" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "sixteen."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill as amended.

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

CALENDAR FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, probably on Monday next the consideration of conference reports will interfere with the calling of the Unanimous Consent Calendar, and in order that there may be another opportunity to pass bills that may be passed by unanimous consent I ask that we now proceed to the consideration of the Unanimous Consent Calendar of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the House now proceed to the consideration of bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to object, but in view of what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] said about next Monday, I would like to remind him of the fact that to-morrow is one of the last six days of the session and suspensions and bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar are both in order every day from now on, although probably we will not get at them very often.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

RESERVATION OF SCHOOL LANDS IN ALASKA.

The first business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 20851) to reserve lands to the Territory of Alaska for educational uses, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest, although I suppose it is an unnecessary suggestion to make, that if the bill is to be read and consent is to be granted it would better be done on the Senate bill than on the House bill.

Mr. LENROOT. That is my intention.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been on the calendar for a long time. I believe the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] has a companion bill.

Mr. LENROOT. This is an Alaskan bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, if unanimous consent is to be given, as I understand it is, I will ask unanimous consent to discharge the House Committee on the Public Lands from the consideration of the Senate bill 7515, it being a bill identical in form and verbiage which passed the Senate and was inadvertently referred to the House committee.

Mr. MANN. We want to be sure now that somebody has compared the two bills and has seen to it that the Senate bill is the same as the House bill.

Mr. FERRIS. I am so informed by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. MANN. It can be read, and the fact can easily be ascertained by comparison.

Mr. FERRIS. I have made no comparison of the bills myself. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the House Committee on the Public Lands be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 7515, and ask that the Senate engrossed bill be read so that we can compare it with the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UNDERWOOD). The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] asks unanimous consent that in place of House bill 20851, Senate bill 7515 be read for the purpose later of asking unanimous consent for its consideration. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

An act (S. 7515) to reserve lands to the Territory of Alaska for educational uses, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That when the public lands of the Territory of Alaska are surveyed, under direction of the Government of the United States, sections Nos. 16 and 36 in each township in said Territory shall be, and the same are hereby, reserved from sale or settlement for the support of common schools in the Territory of Alaska; and section 33 in each township in the Tanana Valley between parallels 64 and 65 north latitude and between the one hundred and forty-fifth and the one hundred and fifty-second degrees of west longitude (meridian of Greenwich) shall be, and the same is hereby, reserved from sale or settlement for the support of a Territorial agricultural college and school of mines when established by the Legislature of Alaska upon the tract granted in section 2 of this act: *Provided*, That where settlement with a view to homestead entry has been made upon any part of the sections reserved hereby before the survey thereof in the field, or where the same may have been sold or otherwise appropriated by or under the authority of any act of Congress, or are wanting or fractional in quantity, other lands may be designated and reserved in lieu thereof in the manner provided by the act of Congress of February 28, 1891 (26 Stats., p. 791): *Provided further*, That the Territory may, by general law, provide for leasing said land in area not to exceed one section to any one person, association, or corporation for not longer than 10 years at any one time: *And provided further*, That if any of said sections, or any part thereof, shall be of known mineral character at the date of acceptance of survey thereof, the reservation herein made shall not be effective or applicable, but the entire proceeds or income derived by the United States from such sections 16 and 36 and such section 33 in each township in the Tanana Valley area hereinbefore described, and the minerals therein, together with the entire proceeds or income derived from said reserved lands, are hereby appropriated and set apart as separate and permanent funds in the Territorial treasury, to be invested, and the income from which shall be expended only for the exclusive use and benefit of the public schools of Alaska or of the agricultural college and school of mines, respectively, in such manner as the Legislature of Alaska may by law direct.

SEC. 2. That section No. 6, in township No. 1 south of the Fairbanks base line and range No. 1 west of the Fairbanks meridian; section No. 31, in township No. 1 north of the Fairbanks base line and range No. 1 west of the Fairbanks meridian; section No. 1, in township No. 1 south of the Fairbanks base line and range No. 2 west of the Fairbanks meridian; and section No. 36, in township No. 1 north of the Fairbanks base line and range No. 2 west of the Fairbanks meridian, be, and the same are hereby, granted to the Territory of Alaska, but with the express condition that they shall be forever reserved and dedicated to use as a site for an agricultural college and school of mines: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be held to interfere with or destroy any legal claim of any person or corporation to any part of said lands under the homestead or other law for the disposal of the public lands acquired prior to the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That so much of the said land as is now used by the Government of the United States as an agricultural experiment station may continue to be used for such purpose until abandoned for that use by an order of the President of the United States or by act of Congress.

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

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I think the question is whether the Committee on the Public Lands be discharged and present consideration had of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair understood it, the request for unanimous consent was that the Committee on

the Public Lands be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 7515, and that it be read for the purpose of asking unanimous consent for the passage of the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Was the unanimous consent given?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The consent to discharge the committee and to have the bill read at the Clerk's desk was given, but the unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill has not been given. Is there objection?

Mr. NORTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is this bill drawn for the purpose of locating the site of the agricultural college in Alaska?

Mr. LENROOT. It is not, except that if the Territory of Alaska shall use this as a site, it makes a grant of these four sections for that purpose. If they do not use the four sections for an agricultural college, the four sections revert to the Government.

Mr. NORTON. Well, in case the Legislative Assembly of Alaska should determine to locate the agricultural college elsewhere, would the Territory then receive the grant of land, being sections 33 in the townships enumerated?

Mr. LENROOT. It would only affect the four sections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there be no objection, it will be so ordered. The Clerk will read the bill under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk began the reading of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the bill has just been read. It is not customary to read it again unless somebody asks for it.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. LENROOT. Before the gentleman makes that motion I wish to correct a statement that I made in response to a question of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON]. I stated to him that if the agricultural school was not located on this tract it would not affect the grant. I find that it does.

Mr. NORTON. That is what I thought, and I certainly should object to the consideration of the bill if that is intended to be the law.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I hope the gentleman will not do that. There is nothing that we need up there more than this.

Mr. MADDEN. It is too late to object now, as consent for the consideration of the bill has been granted.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, I know, but where a mistake has been made no gentleman is going to take advantage of it.

Mr. LENROOT. Was that statement made before consent was given?

Mr. MANN. Yes; and the gentleman had reserved the right to object.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say that the provision which locates this agricultural college at a certain place near Fairbanks, irrespective of the desire of the people of Alaska as may be expressed by their legislative assembly, and provides that unless it is located on these four sections the grant of land will not go to the State Agricultural College of Alaska, is not, in my opinion, a fair provision and savors altogether too much of special congressional legislation for the benefit of a particular city or locality in Alaska to meet my approval.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. It seems to me that, after all, that is not very material. It has never been customary to give any of this land to an agricultural college under such conditions, and if the Territory of Alaska or the territorial legislature conclude that they want to locate the college somewhere else it will practically be a matter of form for Congress to do the same thing for that location that it has done for this.

Mr. NORTON. Why should not Congress at this time reserve or grant this land for a State agricultural college in Alaska, and leave it to the people of Alaska and to the legislative assembly of Alaska to determine its proper location, as has been done in other States?

Mr. MANN. One reason is that we want, if we can, to get rid of an expensive proposition that we have up there. I do not know whether we will succeed in it or not. I do not know whether the committee contemplated that. We have an experiment station on this land, have we not?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. MANN. While the raising of agricultural products there is undoubtedly profitable, yet this station is very costly, and they do not raise enough to pay the expenses of it, and never will.

Mr. NORTON. How much land is included in this grant?

Mr. MANN. Quite a large amount—one section in every township in a territory probably more than 75 or 100 miles square.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is 66½ miles one way and about 200 the other.

Mr. MANN. Equivalent to at least 100 miles square.

Mr. NORTON. How many acres are included in the grant?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is not a grant, but a mere reservation. Congress may set it aside at any time.

Mr. NORTON. It is to be reserved for the use of this agricultural college.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Only the four sections at the United States experiment station at Fairbanks were granted. These sections are granted to the Territory because of all spots in the Territory that is the place where the agricultural college ought to be. The Government has chosen that spot as the proper place for an agricultural experiment station, and through this bill we have chosen that location for an agricultural college.

Mr. MANN. An agricultural college anywhere else in Alaska, and I am not sure but one at this place, would be a joke—either an agricultural college or a school of mining. But if it is to be located up there at all, at present, it ought to be located at the experiment station.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is really the smallest part of this bill. The really valuable part of the bill is that it reserves the school lands for the Territory of Alaska which have never been reserved heretofore. Every other Territory at the time it was organized had sections 16 and 36 in each township reserved for the support of common schools. We have nothing of that kind in Alaska. We have no public lands, no school lands, no school fund, no school law, no school system. We have 10,000 children of school age and substantially no schools for them. Our legislature meets the 1st of March, and if we can get this bill passed the legislature can begin to pass legislation for the support of our common schools. This bill has been approved by Secretaries Lane and Houston before the committees of the Senate and House. It has been before the committees for a year. It has been most carefully considered. It is one of the most urgent necessities in the development of Alaska, and I certainly hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. NORTON. There is no one in this House who is more in favor of setting aside public land for school purposes than I am, but I do not believe it is a proper function at all for this Congress to say where in Alaska this agricultural college shall be located.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It does not say that.

Mr. NORTON. I think that is a function that properly belongs to the people of Alaska and to their legislative assembly.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The bill does not say that.

Mr. NORTON. It practically says that. No land is granted or reserved for a State agricultural college, unless the college is located on the four sections near Fairbanks.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The bill makes a grant of four sections at this particular place, because the Government and everybody else agree that that is the best place for the location of that particular kind of an institution.

Mr. NORTON. If the gentleman will permit me to read for a moment, the bill says, beginning on page 1, line 3:

> That when the public lands in the Territory of Alaska are surveyed under direction of the Government of the United States sections Nos. 16 and 36 in each township in said Territory shall be, and the same are hereby, reserved from sale or settlement for the support of common schools in the Territory of Alaska.

That is very good, and I heartily approve that portion of the bill.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. It continues—

> And section 33 in each township in the Tanana Valley.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Notice, that is in the Tanana Valley.

Mr. NORTON. Between parallels 64 and 65 north latitude——

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is 66½ miles.

Mr. NORTON. And between the one hundred and forty-fifth and the one hundred and fifty-second degrees of west longitude.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is about 200 miles.

Mr. NORTON. How many acres does that include?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That would take in 1 section out of each 36.

Mr. NORTON. I know that; but how many acres would that be?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I judge about 80 sections.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Eighty sections would be a little over 50,000 acres.

Mr. LENROOT. It comprises, I think, about 180,000 acres.

Mr. NORTON. I think it would be even more than that. However, the language of the bill continues:

And the same is hereby reserved from sale or settlement for the support of a Territorial agricultural college and school of mines when established by the Legislature of Alaska—

Now, it does not stop there, but it continues as follows:

upon the tract granted in section 2 of this act.

Mr. LENROOT. May I suggest to the gentleman that the gentleman seems to be laboring under the idea that here is a grant of land. All that it does in the world is to preserve from disposition this tract of land. The grant is a subject for the future, and there is no doubt that if the Territory of Alaska chooses to establish this agricultural college at some other point, that when it comes time to make a grant of school lands it will require further legislation and Congress will not refuse to make the grant because the college is not established on this tract.

Mr. NORTON. The language is, "reserved from sale or settlement for the support of a Territorial agricultural college and school of mines." It may be conceded that it does not make an express grant of this land. The grant will be made and completed when the Territory is admitted as a State?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. This is preliminary to the complete grant of all title?

Mr. LENROOT. The only thing this does is to prevent its being disposed of. As far as any declaration as to the purpose it is absolutely immaterial, except in future legislation Congress will make the grant in general accord with the purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. I want to direct the attention of gentlemen to the phraseology in section 2, where there is an express grant.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; there is an express grant of four sections.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alaska is it the intention of the legislature to establish an agricultural college?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I hope to have it done in March, when the legislature meets.

Mr. FALCONER. Is it the intention to have other educational institutions located in the same place in Alaska, or do you expect to have an agricultural college in one place and a college of arts and sciences in another?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. This is for an agricultural college and a school of mines only. This is in the agricultural region of the interior.

Mr. FALCONER. I want to say that, as a matter of economics, it is a question as to whether it is an advantage to any State or Territory to have a university located in one part of the Territory and an agricultural college in another. It is true that in Washington, as well as in other States, it is reported to have cost the taxpayers a great amount of money having educational institutions located in different parts of the State, and I think that will be true in Alaska. If this is the proper time, as far as Alaska is concerned, with a population of 35,000 white people, to establish an agricultural college and a university and a school of mines in one place, all right; but I should object at any time if I were a citizen of the Territory of Alaska, or as a Congressman here, having to do with the welfare of Alaska, in having two educational institutions in that Territory located in different parts of the Territory at this particular stage of development—just now when the Government is on the eve of great development in the fertile valleys of the Territory.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. This only provides for an agricultural college and a school of mines. Formerly it provided for a university, but the Secretary objected to the use of the word "university" and it is stricken out at his request.

Mr. FALCONER. Does the gentleman feel that it is necessary at this time to establish an agricultural college in Alaska?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; I do, or I would not be urging it.

Mr. NORTON. Would the gentleman accept an amendment to strike out the words "upon the tract granted in section 2 of this act"?

Mr. LENROOT. I would have no objection except on account of the peculiar situation of the bill at this time with reference to the other end of the Capitol; but I think the gentleman must see that this is immaterial, inasmuch as this only reserves the land, and it is within the complete control of Congress.

Mr. NORTON. It reserves it if this school is located in this identical place.

Mr. LENROOT. The reservation is made whether the school is located in that place or not. The declaration is that the purpose of the reservation shall be for the support or assistance of this school if located there, but the reservation is complete whether the school is located there or not located at all.

Mr. NORTON. I question the gentleman's interpretation.

Mr. STEENERSON. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the statement that this bill does not contain a grant is somewhat questionable, because the original grant of sections 16 and 36 was in these words, substantially: "There is hereby reserved for common schools in the different States sections 13 and 36."

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri calls for the regular order.

Mr. NORTON. I object.

Mr. LENROOT. I would agree to accept that amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota objects, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

LEASING OF OIL AND GAS LANDS WITHDRAWN FROM ENTRY.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill S. 5434, "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant permits to the occupants of certain unpatented lands on which oil or gas has been discovered, and authorizing the extraction of oil or gas therefrom."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN and Mr. MADDEN objected.

Mr. FALCONER. Do gentlemen understand that the Legislature of the State of Washington, and I presume other legislatures, have memorialized Congress asking for this legislation?

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know what the bill is?

Mr. FALCONER. I do.

Mr. MADDEN. It legislates three or four lawsuits out of court.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen from Illinois [Mr. MANN and Mr. MADDEN] object.

RESERVATION OF SCHOOL LANDS IN ALASKA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before taking up the next bill the Chair desires to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Committee on Public Lands was discharged from further consideration of Senate bill 7515, and that bill is now on the Speaker's table. The Senate bill was read for the purpose of unanimous consent. Objection was made to the consideration of the bill, and the bill is now before the House in some way.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain on the Speaker's table. The Committee on Public Lands has reported identically this bill, and it is on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Then the Chair would suppose it would be proper to refer it to the calendar.

Mr. MANN. No; just have it lie on the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the bill S. 7515 may remain on the Speaker's table. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I object. I think it ought to go back to its place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The point is that the bill is in an anomalous position. It was taken from the committee, and it is resting here without any place to go.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order discharging the committee from further consideration of the bill be vacated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

EL PASO & ROCK ISLAND RAILWAY CO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 2278) granting the El Paso & Rock Island Railway Co. a right of way for its pipe lines and reservoir upon the Lincoln National Forest for the carrying and storage of water for railroad purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TREATMENT OF LEPROSY.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 20040) to provide for the care and treat-

ment of persons afflicted with leprosy and to prevent the spread of leprosy in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] prepared any amendments to the bill?

Mr. ADAMSON. I have not. I have been waiting for suggestions from the gentleman from Illinois. If the gentleman will permit the bill to proceed, I am perfectly willing to strike out the words "or sites," in line 5, and at such other places in the bill where it is necessary, so as to provide for only one site. I would prefer, of course, to have others.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I think the authorization of one is enough at this time. I have no objection to doing that.

Mr. ADAMSON. Very well; I shall offer that amendment when the time comes.

Mr. MANN. There are several other amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire what is the idea of granting ad libitum authority to the Surgeon General to grant allowances to those surgeons assigned to duty at this leprosery?

Mr. ADAMSON. I presume it is on account of the extra hazardous and disagreeable work.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why should there be unlimited discretion granted to the Surgeon General to grant any allowances to those surgeons?

Mr. MANN. That is the law now. That does not change the law. It provides for one-half of the pay and allowances extra that are granted by the Surgeon General, and while theoretically they are allowed to fix it, practically it is beyond their control.

Mr. STAFFORD. As far as one-half increased pay is concerned, I do not believe there is any serious objection to that, because it is a very dangerous and hazardous employment.

Mr. ADAMSON. Where are the particular words to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. MANN. This relates to allowances to the man who goes there. This is not one-half of the allowance.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I am directing attention particularly to the phrase in line 13, page 3.

Mr. MANN. I should suppose if they got a permanent surgeon at a leprosy hospital that they would probably have to make him more allowances than the regular allowance.

Mr. ADAMSON. If the gentleman from Illinois will permit, I think that contemplates legal allowances, and the language proceeds to say "with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury." So it is not arbitrary with the Surgeon General.

Mr. MANN. On first reading of the bill I supposed that it meant one-half pay and allowances, but on reading the bill again I concluded it meant to give him extra one-half the pay of his grade; and, then, there should be a comma there; and then the language goes on, "and such allowances as may be provided by the Surgeon General." In other words, it was not to be one-half of the ordinary allowances, but they were to be permitted to make extra allowances for him.

Mr. ADAMSON. I presume it must be the legal allowance.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under this phraseology the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, could grant any allowance he saw fit.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. If you do not think it contemplates a lawful allowance we can say so.

Mr. MANN. That is a lawful allowance. They probably would have to make him an extra allowance. If they wanted me to go to a leprosery they would have to make me an extra allowance, although there are some people I know whom I would be very glad to locate there and pay them a considerable extra allowance.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are a great many on the other side who would like to have that distinction fall on many gentlemen on this side.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; not many, only a few.

Mr. ADAMSON. I hope the gentleman does not intend to be personal to anybody. I desire to say in answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin that I am not partisan enough to wish that bad luck on any gentleman on that side.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not publicly, but maybe privately.

Mr. ADAMSON. No, sir; not privately.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to select and obtain, by purchase or otherwise, a site or sites suitable for the establishment of a home or homes for the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy, to be administered by the United States Public Health Service; and the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury any abandoned military, naval, or other reservation suitable for the purpose, or as much thereof as may be necessary, with all buildings and improvements thereon, to be used for the purpose of said home or homes.

SEC. 2. That there shall be received into said home or homes, under regulations prepared by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, any person afflicted with leprosy who presents himself or herself for care, detention, and treatment, or who may be apprehended under authority of the United States quarantine acts, or any person afflicted with leprosy duly consigned to said home or any of said homes by the proper health authorities of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is authorized, upon request of said authorities, to send for any person afflicted with leprosy within their respective jurisdictions, and to convey said person to any such home for detention and treatment, and when the transportation of any such person is undertaken for the protection of the public health the expense of such removal shall be paid from funds set aside for the maintenance of said home or homes.

SEC. 3. That regulations shall be prepared by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, for the government and administration of said home or homes and for the apprehension, detention, treatment, and release of all persons who are inmates thereof.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to cause the erection upon such site or sites of suitable and necessary buildings for the purposes of this act at a cost not to exceed the sum herein appropriated for such purpose.

SEC. 5. That when any commissioned or other officer of the Public Health Service is detailed for duty at the home or homes herein provided for he shall receive, in addition to the pay and allowances of his grade, one-half the pay of said grade and such allowances as may be provided by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 6. That for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby appropriated, from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $250,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary, for the preparation of said home or homes, including the erection of necessary buildings, the maintenance of the patients, pay and maintenance of necessary officers and employees, until June 30, 1916.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out, in line 5, page 1, the words "or sites" and to strike out, in line 6, the words "or homes" and to strike out, in lines 3 and 4, page 2, the words "or homes."

Mr. ADAMSON. That is all right; I am willing to that.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, in line 5, strike out the words "or sites"; in line 6, strike out the words "or homes"; on page 2, in lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "or homes."

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out, in line 10, page 1, the word "is" and insert the words "are respectively." It is a grammatical error.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, in line 10, strike out the word "is" and insert the words "are respectively."

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, if that is done we will have to change the connecting word "or" at the beginning of line 10. As it is it is disjunctive; if you are going to make it conjunctive you will have to put the word "and" in the place of "or."

Mr. MANN. I do not think so, but if the gentleman prefers the present grammatical construction, I have no objection.

Mr. ADAMSON. It says "and the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to transfer." That is good as it is.

Mr. MANN. All right; I withdraw my amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. MANN. This bill was read?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent for the following amendments: Page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "or homes"; page 2, line 12, strike out the words "or any of said homes"; page 3, line 6, strike out the words "or sites."

Mr. STAFFORD. And strike out, in lines 21 and 22, the words "or homes."

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And also the word "any," in line 17, page 2. Should not that be stricken out?

Mr. MANN. Do not let the Clerk get it all mixed up.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, lines 21 and 22, strike out the words "or homes"; page 3, line 11, strike out the words "or homes."

Mr. ADAMSON. That is all right.

Mr. STAFFORD. In line 17, should not the word "any" be stricken out? It says, "to any such home." There is only one home. The word "any" presupposes more than one.

Mr. ADAMSON. That is all right. All of these changes are mere verbal changes.

Mr. MANN. And strike out the word "any," in line 17, page 2.

Mr. ADAMSON. These are all proper verbal changes to conform with the amendment already agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the House agree to the amendments which have been indicated by him.

Mr. MANN. The Clerk had better report them, to see that he gets them correctly.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "or homes"; page 2, line 12, strike out the words "or any of said homes"; line 17, strike out the word "any"; in lines 21 and 22, strike out the words "or homes"; page 3, line 6, strike out the words "or sites"; line 11, strike out the words "or homes."

Mr. MANN. And in line 20 strike out the words "or homes."

Mr. STAFFORD. And line 1, page 3, to strike out the words "or homes."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 1, page 3, strike out the words "or homes"; line 20, strike out the words "or homes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. This section 6—of course I do not know whether this bill is likely to pass, but I do not think you can do anything under section 6. There is a limitation on the appropriation of $250,000 until June 30, 1916. They can not finish a building by that time.

Mr. STAFFORD. They may be able to contract to make the money available two years after that date.

Mr. MANN. There will be no maintenance during the next year.

Mr. ADAMSON. I presume, though, it means that we spend that much in progress up to that time.

Mr. MANN. I think there ought to be a limit of cost. I move to strike out all of the section of the bill after the word "buildings," in line 21, page 23.

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

Mr. ADAMSON. The idea of the gentleman from Illinois is that it will not be ready for occupancy?

Mr. MANN. It will not be, I think; but if it is, a deficiency appropriation will cover it.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all of the bill after the word "buildings," in line 21.

Mr. ADAMSON. There is this to say about that: I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that if the department should succeed in acquiring a site it is possible it will be ready for occupation and operation at once.

Mr. MANN. All right; I will withdraw the amendment, if I may. If you want to take the chances on it, all right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMSON. The amendment we have made confining it to one would make it easier to secure one than it would be to secure two or more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were 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. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SITE FOR PUBLIC BUILDING, HARTFORD, CONN.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 18310) to acquire a site for a public building at Hartford, Conn.

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

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT BATH, ME.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 1702) increasing the limit of cost fixed by act of Congress approved June 25, 1910, for enlargement, extension, etc., of Federal building at Bath, Me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to know what particular work was authorized in the original authorization and was eliminated that necessitates the expenditure of $10,000 additional?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will say, Mr. Speaker, the department says it is the approaches and a number of other betterments of that sort, and, I think, a better fireproof construction, that they had to leave out, and they need this much money to complete them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not think it is of sufficient importance to pass under the existing condition of the Treasury, and I shall have to object.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask that the bill be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 1702 be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

VALIDATING CERTAIN HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 21122) to validate certain homestead entries.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill was under consideration on the last unanimous-consent day, and the question arose as to wherein these entrymen did not have the privilege of paying the appraised value in obtaining the lands on which they entered under a misapprehension caused by the public-land officials.

Mr. FERRIS. That is right. I stated at that time, if the gentleman will recall, in the colloquy between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and myself, that I was personally on the ground and saw notices that were published at that time. I did not have them with me then, but since that time I have communicated with the United States commissioner who takes the proof down there and who is still commissioner and has been commissioner for 12 or 13 years. He sends me a copy of the note that was published in the paper inviting the people to come on the land, and I have also here a letter from the department that tells the local land office to give publicity to this opening. I shall be glad to read the letter of the department to the gentleman. It is under the date of March 3, 1911. The letter is from the Assistant Commissioner of the General Land Office to the register and receiver of the General Land Office, and it reads:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, March 3, 1911.

Restoration near Wichita National Forest, Okla.

Restoration of public lands to settlement and entry. Notation ordered.

REGISTER AND RECEIVER, *Guthrie, Okla.*

GENTLEMEN: The vacant unappropriated public lands in the following-described areas, which were temporarily withdrawn for forestry purposes on January 29, 1906, and adjoin the Wichita National Forest, Okla., if not otherwise withdrawn or reserved, will be restored to the public domain on May 16, 1911, and become subject to settlement on and after that date, but not to entry, filing, or selection until on and after June 15, 1911, under the usual restrictions, at your office.

In T. 5 N., R. 14 W., NE. ¼ sec. 30, secs. 31 and 32.

In T. 5 N., R. 15 W., sec. 32 and E. ½ sec. 36, Indian meridian.

You will make the proper notations of this restoration to settlement and entry upon your records, post the copy hereof in a conspicuous place in your office, and give as much publicity to the restoration as possible as a matter of news.

This restoration is made upon the recommendation of the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, dated February 14, 1911.

A diagram showing the areas to be restored is hereto attached.

Very respectfully,

S. V. PROUDFIT,
Assistant Commissioner.

Approved March 3, 1911.

FRANK PIERCE,
First Assistant Secretary.

And the diagram shows the land to be restored. Now, let me read the notice to the gentleman that was published in the paper after that letter went out there. It is as follows:

OPENING NEW LANDS SOON.

The vacant unappropriated public lands in the following-described areas, if not otherwise withdrawn or reserved, will be restored to the public domain on May 16, 1911, and become subject to settlement on and after that date, but not to entry and filing or selection until on and after June 15, 1911, under the usual restrictions at the United States land office, Lawton, Okla.

(Then follows description of lands.)

This restoration is made upon the recommendation of the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, dated February 14, 1911. It includes 21,830 acres. The usual restrictions requiring payment of $1.25 per acre when final proof is made will be in force.

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, *County of Comanche, ss:*

Charles C. Black, being first duly sworn upon his oath according to law, deposes and says that he is the editor of the Lawton News, formerly the Lawton News-Republican, and as such has charge of the records and files of said publication; that he finds in the issue of the daily of the Lawton News-Republican of March 10, 1911, a notice of which the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy.

CHARLES C. BLACK.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 17th day of February.

H. R. BLANDING,
United States Commissioner, Lawton, Okla.

Mr. STAFFORD. On the former occasion I did not question that there had been a publication and that these people were led to believe that these lands were open to entry, but at that time I could not see wherein any of these persons had entered under the provisions of the act approved June 30, 1913.

Mr. FERRIS. They entered way prior to that.

Mr. STAFFORD. They entered under the act of March 3, 1911.

Mr. FERRIS. No; they did not. If they had entered, no doubt the gentleman would be entirely correct. The act that the gentleman refers to was an amendment placed upon the Indian appropriation bill, and the General Land Office and the local land office people did not pursue the provisions of that act, but instead of that they went ahead and provided for the opening of the land. No doubt it was an oversight. No doubt they did not see the amendment in the appropriation bill. They have now paid $1.25 an acre for it. They did exhaust their homestead right. Forty-two of them have entered and complied with the homestead law. Now we ask that they be permitted to do the thing they started out to do, and the thing which they had a right to do.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why do they ask to be relieved of the provisions of the act of 1913?

Mr. FERRIS. Because the later act provides that they shall pay the highest price for this land, under rules and regulations such as the department prescribes. After a man is permitted to homestead, and after he has filed on the land and exhausted his right and proved it and sold his land, it is preposterous for the Government to come along and say, "I will take it away from you and sell it to somebody else, or else make you pay full value for it."

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, as I understand, the only people to whom this bill applies are those who took advantage under the erroneous publication?

Mr. FERRIS. Precisely.

Mr. STAFFORD. And no one who entered by reason of the act of June 30, 1913, is affected?

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, no. They did not enter under the act of June 30, 1913. They bought. They did not make homestead entries at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. It says here in the bill, "All homestead entries erroneously allowed for unused and unreserved lands authorized to be sold under section 6 of the act of March 3, 1911, and under the provisions of the act approved June 30, 1913."

Mr. FERRIS. But the point is that the lands that were sold were not entered at all. They put them up and sold them to the highest bidder. Some very valuable lands were sold in that way. But some of these entrymen have proved up and made leases on the land and moved away. It is a clear case of a mistake made by the Land Office, and they ask that it be corrected.

Mr. STAFFORD. Only 44 of them——

Mr. FERRIS. Fifty-six of them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Twelve of them are not affected by these patents?

Mr. FERRIS. They say, "Unless you get relief from Congress you can not hold these lands."

Mr. STAFFORD. That applies only to the 12?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] asks unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. 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 all homestead entries heretofore erroneously allowed for the unused, unallotted, and unreserved lands of the United States in the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian Reservations, which lands were authorized to be sold under section 16 of the act approved March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. L., p. 1069), and under the provisions of the act approved June 30, 1913 (38 Stat. L., p. 92), are hereby ratified and confirmed.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 1, insert the following: "*Provided*, That in addition to the land-office fees prescribed by statute for such entries the entryman shall pay $1.25 per acre for the land entered at the time of submitting final or commutation proof."

Mr. MANN. There is a duplication there, Mr. Speaker, of the word "proof." One of them should be stricken out.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the duplication of the word "proof" be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] asks unanimous consent that the duplication of the word "proof" be stricken out. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

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. FERRIS, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. LOUIS RIVER BETWEEN MINNESOTA AND WISCONSIN.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 5325) authorizing the county of St. Louis to construct a bridge across St. Louis River between Minnesota and Wisconsin.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LENROOT. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] objects, and the bill is stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next one.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. LOUIS RIVER, MINN. AND WIS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15727) authorizing the county of St. Louis to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between Minnesota and Wisconsin.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Reserving the right to object, if the gentleman would like to have this go over——

Mr. MILLER. What would be the object in letting it go over? The gentleman has just objected to the consideration of a Senate bill on the same subject.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman is the author of this House bill.

Mr. MILLER. Oh, well, we are not going to quibble about the thing. If the gentleman wants to pass his bill, let us pass it, and I will pass mine. That is fair.

Mr. LENROOT. I told the gentleman that if he desired to have it passed without prejudice I am willing. Otherwise——

Mr. MILLER. What is the use of passing it without prejudice, when in all probability this is the last time that the Unanimous Consent Calendar will be called during this Congress? I do not think we ought to take up the time of the House——

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects. The bill will be stricken from the calendar.

INTERSTATE TRANSFER RAILWAY CO. BRIDGE ACROSS ST. LOUIS RIVER.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 17762) to amend an act approved February 20, 1908, entitled "An act to authorize the Interstate Transfer Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been read once. Reserving the right to object, is it the purpose of the gentleman from Wisconsin to pass this bill, may I inquire?

Mr. LENROOT. If the gentleman does not object, I expect it will be passed.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman saw fit to object to a perfectly meritorious, absolutely proper bill in which neither he nor his district is interested in the remotest degree, but in which the whole people of the State of Minnesota are interested, because it is a Minnesota project, a good-roads project, a farmers' market project——

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, unless I can have an opportunity to reply to the very inaccurate statements that are being made by the gentleman from Minnesota——

Mr. FOSTER. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MILLER. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. FOSTER. Regular order!

Mr. LENROOT. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. FOSTER. These two gentlemen have had their day in court——

Mr. MILLER. No; we have not. I have been a very patient and silent sufferer under a long-continued persecution, and the long suffering is going to end.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER. Reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. But the regular order is called for.

Mr. MILLER. Then I object.

Mr. FOSTER. I withdraw the demand for the regular order.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not call for the regular order, but I shall have to unless I can have an opportunity to reply to the gentleman from Minnesota——

Mr. FOSTER. I withdraw the demand for the regular order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida objects. The bill will be stricken from the calendar.

TEMPE, ARIZ.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 11253) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the town of Tempe, Ariz., a tract of land containing road-making material.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill how much land there is, what the price of it is going to be, and what the value of the land is?

Mr. HAYDEN. The bill describes a tract containing 40 acres of rough land, to be sold to the town of Tempe for $1.25 an acre.

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the gentleman let me explain the situation? If he will hear my explanation, I am sure that he will not object.

The SPEAKER. But he has already objected.

Mr. MADDEN. I am willing to withhold the objection to allow the gentleman to make a statement.

Mr. HAYDEN. I will say for the information of the gentleman from Illinois that this tract of land adjoins the north boundary of the town of Tempe, Ariz. I am personally familiar with the situation, because I was born within a mile of the land in question. It has absolutely no value for any purpose except for the road-making material that is contained in it. The town desires to purchase this rough, hilly tract in order to secure a convenient supply of road-making material for the improvement of its streets.

Mr. MADDEN. The value of land for road-making material may be fabulous.

Mr. HAYDEN. Not in Arizona.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, in Arizona; if it has any road material on it, it is certainly worth more than $1.25 an acre.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the value that is put upon all public land that is sold to other towns in other States.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the material?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is caliche, a lime formation suitable for use on roads.

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar.

VALIDATING CERTAIN HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 3878) to validate certain homestead entries.

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

Mr. MANN. I object.

Mr. STOUT. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. MANN. There is no information in the report on this bill, and I do not think reports of this kind ought to be brought in.

Mr. MONDELL. I can give the gentleman information on the subject.

Mr. STOUT. Will the gentleman reserve his objection for a moment?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. STOUT. This is really a very important bill. I will plead guilty to the charge made by the gentleman from Illinois, that of not making as full and complete and comprehensive report as the importance of the measure might suggest. I plead guilty to that. I will simply say that it was due largely to my inexperience in this body. I put as much in the report as I thought would be necessary for information. But for the further information of the gentleman from Illinois, although I think he perhaps is pretty well aware of the purpose of the bill, this is to permit people who have gone out into the public-land States of the West and filed upon less than 160-acre tracts and proved up on them to avail themselves of the advantage of the enlarged homestead act.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman allow me to make a brief statement?

Mr. STOUT. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, a similar bill was reported out of the committee two years ago, when I was a member of the Committee on the Public Lands. I think it passed the House, but for some reason or other failed in the Senate at the end of the session. The enlarged homestead act provides that those who are qualified homestead entrymen may take advantage of that act. At the time the act was passed the department was holding, and had held for 40 years, that anyone who had not taken four subdivisions approximating 160 acres was a qualified entryman, and therefore unless a man had taken such tracts he was qualified to take 320 acres. That ruling was modified by the department until they held that if a homestead, although it contained four subdivisions, was in fact less than 160 acres he could make an entry of 320 acres. After the department had held that for some time it suddenly reversed the ruling of 40 years and held that anyone who had made a homestead entry, even if it was only 40 acres, and had proved up on it, was not a qualified homestead entryman and could not make an entry under the 320-acre law.

In that interim, particularly in Montana, there were a number of entries made. I do not think the bill ought to be brought down to date. I think if we provide as the Senate bill did for cases before January 1, 1914, we would have provided for all of the meritorious cases.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman to say that he reported a bill when he was chairman of the committee.

Mr. MONDELL. I will not say that I reported it.

Mr. MANN. Did the gentleman have a bill like this when he was chairman of the committee?

Mr. MONDELL. No; not when I was chairman of the committee, but when I was a member of the committee.

Mr. STOUT. In the last Congress.

Mr. MONDELL. I remember the legislation very well, because I had many interviews with the department officials as to what the words "qualified entrymen" meant.

Mr. MANN. This bill the gentleman speaks of in the last Congress was intended to cover suspensions of applications down to what date?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not remember.

Mr. MANN. Was it not 1912?

Mr. MONDELL. I think so.

Mr. MANN. Now we have a bill coming down to January, 1915. Why stop there? Why come down to that? Nobody has explained or pretended to explain that. We can not pass

bills here by unanimous consent with no information whatever.

Mr. MONDELL. In some of the districts it appears the register and receiver continued to allow these entries, even after the department had held that a man who had made a homestead entry, even of small acreage, was not a qualified entryman.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think that we are entitled to information upon the point of why this was done?

Mr. MONDELL. I was familiar with the situation in every detail when I was a member of the committee. Of course, there may have been some developments since that time necessitating the bringing of the legislation down to date.

Mr. MANN. I remember the original bill. We passed it in the House as I recall, coming down to a certain date, because it was said that people had been taking these claims without knowledge and the department had been advising them that they could do so. Then they were advised not to, but they paid no attention to that. The Senate proposed to bring this relief down to January 1 last year, and the House committee proposes to bring it down to January 1 this year. Why stop there if you come down that far?

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I shall have to object, or the gentleman can ask to have the bill passed over without prejudice.

Mr. STOUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENLARGED HOMESTEAD.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 5734) to extend the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for an enlarged homestead," approved February 19, 1909, to the State of Kansas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are not the provisions of this bill practically covered by the Fergusson bill?

Mr. FERRIS. The Fergusson bill goes even farther than this.

Mr. LENROOT. It does not cover it.

Mr. FERRIS. The Fergusson bill authorized a 640-acre homestead, along the line of the Kinkaid bill. This merely authorizes them to take a 320-acre homestead, as we have done in all those States.

Mr. MANN. In the arid regions; but under the Fergusson bill would it not also apply?

Mr. FERRIS. No.

Mr. MANN. Why not?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, in the first place, the Fergusson bill has not yet passed; but in order to come under the Fergusson bill the land must be designated by the Secretary of the Interior as being arid. The Kinkaid 640-acre homestead law applies to western Nebraska, just north of this Kansas land. For South Dakota, the other day, by amendment, we made this 320-acre homestead law applicable, and we have made it applicable to those Western States; but before they can enter any of this land under the enlarged-homestead act the Secretary of the Interior must designate the land as being nonirrigable and nontimbered. This will help settle and populate western Kansas. They have needed this for a long time. Eastern Kansas is all settled and is good land, but western Kansas is arid, and this law is needed to settle it up. It is like western Nebraska, and they were given a 640-acre homestead about 10 years ago. If it was advisable to give Nebraska a 640-acre homestead 10 years ago, when land was plentiful, surely it is advisable now to give Kansas a 320-acre law.

Mr. MANN. I understand; but if he so designates, if the Fergusson bill becomes a law, they could take the 640 acres.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, no.

Mr. LENROOT. Under the Fergusson bill the Secretary of the Interior will not be authorized to designate any lands 320 acres of which, in his opinion, would support a family.

Mr. MANN. Nobody would ever claim that 320 acres of this land would support a family, because it will not. This is the same character of land.

Mr. MADDEN. How is the Secretary of the Interior going to decide what it takes to support a family?

Mr. MANN. Of course it is impossible under the Fergusson bill to ever comply with its terms and do anything, but according to its intent, it covers this case.

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

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. FERRIS. I hope the gentleman will not do that. We have made this applicable to all those Western States. That is the only way they can get this western sand-hill country settled.

Mr. MADDEN. I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know the specific reason for opening up the public domain in this wide way before granting unanimous consent.

Mr. NEELEY of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to apply particularly to the seventh district of Kansas, although it may apply to some small degree to the sixth district also. We have there, as shown by the report of the Secretary of the Interior, about 92,000 acres of unentered land at this time, and in addition to that there are approximately 200,000 acres known as the Kansas National Forest Reserve, soon to be thrown open to homestead entry. The experience of the past 25 years has shown that it is impossible for an average family to make a living on 160 acres of this land. It is the rejected land of the State. It is either sandy, rough, full of soap weed, or there is some other good reason why industrious husbandmen feel that they can not make a living and support themselves on a quarter section of it, with the result that it has remained idle and wild all these years, and will continue to be unproductive unless Congress enacts some such legislation as is here proposed.

The people who live on the entered or deeded lands in the neighborhood of these vacant lands feel that if Congress would amend the law so that the entryman could file on a half section instead of a quarter section that this would result in attracting persons of thrift from other sections of the country who could, by growing dry-land crops adapted to that section and by raising cattle, make a sort of dairy country out of it and bring it to a condition where it will be entirely self-supporting and peopled by contented home owners.

This land is now nontaxable and by reason of this fact it imposes an added burden upon those counties within which the land is located. The most of these counties are sparsely populated, generally having from 700 to 800 people and running from this up to 1,500 or 2,000 population, and in only one or two instances exceeding these figures; so that you can readily see that this is a matter of no small concern to the interested persons.

Mr. STAFFORD. How much of this same character of land has been settled in 160-acre tracts?

Mr. NEELEY of Kansas. Well, practically none. Unless the homesteader was fortunate enough to have sufficient means of his own to enable him to purchase adjoining lands he simply could not make a living on a single quarter section, and the result has been that this is the refuse part of all the public lands yet remaining in Kansas and is of such poor quality that no one has felt justified in using a homestead right and taking the chances of being able to establish a home there.

Mr. STAFFORD. Have there been any entries on lands of the same character within recent years?

Mr. NEELEY of Kansas. Practically none.

Mr. STAFFORD. Have there been any?

Mr. NEELEY of Kansas. Well, I would not want to say there have not been any. It is altogether probable that there have been isolated instances where entries have been made, but the part remaining is the residue after all that appeared to be fit for homestead purposes had been taken. About two years ago President Taft, just before the end of his term, withdrew some forty or fifty thousand acres of the land embraced in this same forest reserve and subjected it to homestead entry. Owing to the fact that it was one of the few remaining bodies of public land subject to entry anywhere in the central portion of the country, the opening was extensively advertised in the newspapers of Kansas and adjoining States for many weeks, and a paper published near the land is my authority for the statement that, notwithstanding all this advertising, not a single homestead entry had been made there within the first three weeks succeeding the opening. This, I believe, will give you a pretty good idea of the desirability of the land under the restrictions of our present law.

Mr. STAFFORD. For my part, I wish to say to the gentleman and to the committee and the House that I am not in sympathy with giving up the public domain when there are so many of our urban population who are desirous of obtaining the public lands to make a livelihood. Now, if some of this

land had been opened to entry and settled upon, I can not see any reason for increasing the size of the unit.

Mr. NEELEY of Kansas. I agree with the gentleman if the quality of the land and the location, and so forth, were such that a family could make a living on this land, but time and repeated trials have demonstrated that this can not be done with this land. I hope the gentleman will not object, and that this measure may meet with the approbation of the House.

Mr. FERRIS. If the gentleman will yield to me for a moment, I think this may appeal to the gentleman. This is the situation: Ten years ago Congress thought it was necessary, and did pass what was called the Kinkaid Act. That act applies to the sand-hill country of western Nebraska, and they gave them there 640 acres. This merely makes the general enlarged-homestead law applicable which gives 320 acres. This western Kansas sand-hill land is just the same as that which 10 years ago we gave 640 acres. If 10 years ago it was thought advisable, in view of the development of that country, to give 640 acres, surely with the remnants which are left in Kansas, just over the State line, it would not be improper to give them 320 acres.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give the information as to whether the same character of lands have been entered upon in recent years under the 160-acre unit?

Mr. FERRIS. Like the gentleman from Kansas, I think you will find that once in a great while a man will find a little head of a valley with water and make there a pond or a tank, and probably make an entry; but otherwise there has been practically no development of that country in 25 years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the provisions of this bill it will enable those who have already entered on the 160-acre limit to obtain the additional 160 acres?

Mr. FERRIS. No; it does not renew any homestead right.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Fergusson bill gave former homestead entrymen the right to take additional arid land.

Mr. FERRIS. It did; but it was more liberal than this. This merely makes the same law apply to western Kansas that we recently applied to Dakota.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will yield, I recollect very well the conditions that existed at the time of the passage of the enlarged-homestead law. The only reason we did not apply it to Kansas was that Kansas at that time had practically no public lands. These lands that the law will now apply to were at that time held in a reservation as a forest reserve. There was no forest on them, but the Forestry Bureau had reserved quite a considerable acreage there with a view to utilizing some of it in the growing of trees. They are reserving the part now that they think they can grow the trees on and restoring the balance to the public domain. That leaves this area similar to areas in surrounding States to which we have heretofore made the homestead laws apply.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it not safe to assume that the Federal forest, which comprises 200,000 acres, comprised a better character of land than the remnants of the arid lands outside the forest reserve?

Mr. MONDELL. They were worse. The only reason it was reserved as a national forest was that it was the remnant—that it was what was left. Nobody would take it, and they were looking for homestead land in Kansas——

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman said there were persons down here in Washington looking for forest reserves.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The State of Colorado, as you know, joins the State of Kansas for 400 miles. This enlarged homestead law which the gentleman from Wyoming put through applies to the State of Colorado, right along by the side of this very Kansas land, for 400 miles. We have demonstrated in our State that those people can not live on 160 acres, the same as they have in western Kansas, but they will live on 320 acres. They will go and take it and have a few cows and settle up that country.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let me ask the gentleman from Kansas whether the land in the forest reserve is of superior quality to that outside?

Mr. NEELEY of Kansas. It is infinitely inferior. The gentleman from Wyoming hit the question all right.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to consider it in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield just for a minute? I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] may have five minutes.

The SPEAKER. There will be no trouble about his getting five minutes. Is there objection to the bill being considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will read the bill. Then the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] will be recognized for five minutes.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for an enlarged homestead," approved February 19, 1909 (35 Stat. L., p. 639), as modified and amended, including section 6 thereof, are hereby extended and made applicable to the State of Kansas.

Also, the following committee amendments were read:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "provisions," insert the words "of sections 1 to 5, inclusive."

Line 7, same page, strike out the words "including section 6 thereof."

Mr. SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] is recognized.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] made certain remarks in respect to the War Risk Insurance Bureau and criticized the administration about its policy of insuring vessels going into the dangerous war zone across the Atlantic. This afternoon he made another speech along the same line. Unfortunately I was out of the Chamber when the gentleman spoke this afternoon. I read from the RECORD of his speech of yesterday. He said:

O Mr. Chairman, I wish somebody would rise now and explain why we ventured upon this hazardous business. Why was this War Risk Bureau established at the expense of the people of the United States to protect speculators?

I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, for whom I have a very high regard, that before this War Risk Insurance Bureau was established there was practically no sale for the cotton and lumber of the South and the many products of other parts of the country. Our cotton was stored in the warehouses or piled upon the docks of the South, and it was impossible to sell it to any appreciable extent to Germany, England, or other warring nations. Since the War Risk Insurance Bureau was established by the Government, up to date the statistics show that we have sold to Germany about as much cotton as was sold during the corresponding period of last year. And the facts about this War Risk Insurance Bureau that my friend criticizes are that it has been one bureau of the Government that has made money. It has been a paying business for the Government and of incalculable benefit to the business interests as well as the farmers of the country. What are the facts?

There have been 961 insurance policies issued since September 2, 1914. That was the day on which the bureau was organized and began business. The total amount insured has been $56,645,084. The premiums on the policies have amounted to $1,502,302.99. Of the above amount, the earned premium—that is, the policies that have been canceled—have amounted to $640,848.

The expenses of running this department have been only $6,766. If you count the loss to the Government of the *Evelyn* and *Carib*, the two vessels recently sunk, on which insurance was carried, we are still to the good by several hundred thousands of dollars. As I stated, the premiums that have been paid up until to-day have been $1,502,000, and we have earned the canceled premiums to the amount of $640,848. The Secretary of the Treasury and the directors of the bureau deserve great credit for the economical and yet efficient and able way in which this bureau has been conducted.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman give us the amount of the loss on the two vessels that have just been destroyed?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. The *Carib*, that was destroyed yesterday, carried $22,253 insurance on the hull of the vessel, and on the cargo there was an insurance of $235,850. On the *Evelyn*, that was destroyed the other day, there was $100,000 carried on the vessel.

Mr. MOORE. On the hull of the vessel?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; on the hull of the vessel, and $301,000 was carried on the cargo.

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

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. HELGESEN. Are these the amounts that were carried by the Government?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; these are the amounts that were carried by the Government War Risk Insurance Bureau.

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

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman's figures are correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the House whether there was any insurance carried by private insurance companies on the vessels and cargoes?

Mr. HARRISON. There was no war-risk insurance by private insurance companies carried on the cargoes or the vessels, but under the policies that the Government issues they will not issue a policy on the cargo unless the owners carry marine insurance. And in the face of the policy when it is issued the policyholder agrees that there shall be marine insurance carried to an amount at least equivalent to the war-risk insurance that the Government issues.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in this connection that——

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, there was insurance other than the Government insurance?

Mr. HARRISON. There was marine insurance on the cargo.

Mr. MOORE. I think there was some insurance outside of the cargo, was there not?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; the marine insurance. Now, Mr. Speaker, the facts show further that before September 2, when this bureau was established, the insurance on many articles was 25 to 30 per cent, and because of the creation of this bureau the insurance rates established by it forced the other war-risk insurance companies to reduce their rates to a very great extent. For instance, for the period immediately following August 1, last year, the war-risk insurance through the North Sea was 25 per cent. Now it is only 3 per cent.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to impose at this late hour on the generosity and patience of the House, and so I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this subject in the RECORD.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may have three minutes more.

Mr. MOORE. I make the same request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] may proceed for three minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] probably wants to use it himself, I suppose.

Mr. BORLAND. No; I do not want to use it myself. I only want to use about half a minute myself.

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

Mr. MANN. I give notice, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to make a point of no quorum at half-past 5.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the gentleman from Missouri want to ask me a question?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes. I want to ask the gentleman a question in regard to rates. The first rate that the Government put on cotton, as I understand, was 5 per cent. That forced the private companies to reduce their rates, and they were reduced to 3 per cent, and now it is 2 per cent on cotton. Is not that a fact?

Mr. HARRISON. That is my information.

Mr. BORLAND. Under this bill 129 vessels have been transferred to the American flag and are now carrying American products that otherwise would not be carried?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; under the new registry law that was passed, and encouraged by this bill. I want to say, now, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] made some suggestions yesterday that were good, although I heartily disapprove of gentlemen on either side of this aisle criticizing and finding fault with the administration at this most inappropriate time about its foreign policy. It is a time when partisan politics should be brushed aside, and if we disapprove of some little event or happening, we should remember the inopportuneness of the time to so express ourselves and remember that it should be a time when "silence is golden."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bureau has done a great service to the country and it should not be abolished as suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. I do think, however—and I make the suggestion in the friendliest feeling, and perhaps the plan is already being considered—that the Government issue no more policies without a clause being incorporated in them that the owners of vessels and cargoes shall follow the instructions of the belligerent nations respecting their course in the war zone. In other words, that the insurance policy should be invalidated if they go outside of that course the belligerent nations say is safe to follow. I do not believe they should be permitted to assume unnecessary and unreasonable risk and recover from the Government in case of damage or loss. These details I am sure will be worked out by the board of directors in charge of this bureau, as under the law they are empowered to do.

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

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. While the gentleman is discussing cotton, I want to make this inquiry of him, partly by way of explanation of what I have said. Is it not true that during the month of January, 1915, the cotton exports vastly exceeded those of January, 1914?

Mr. HARRISON. I understand so. If the gentleman investigates, I think he will find that we have shipped to Germany up to now about as much cotton as we shipped to that country up to this time during the preceding year and, I might repeat, up to September 2, 1914, when the War Risk Insurance Bureau was established, we had shipped practically none.

Mr. MOORE. In January, 1915, you had sent out 3,000 bales more than in January, 1914; but at the same time the number of spindles in use in the United States had been reduced 500,000.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, the gentleman is diverting from the subject under consideration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by submitting a statement in regard to the congressional service of Judge HENRY M. GOLDFOGLE, who on March 4 next will have rounded out 14 years of service in this House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a review of the services of Judge HENRY M. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. A review of his services in Congress.

The SPEAKER. Yes; a review of his services in Congress. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRISON. Did the Speaker put my request for an extension of remarks?

The SPEAKER. The Chair did, but perhaps it was not acted on. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, the pending question is on the adoption of the first committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration does not involve directly the question now being very widely discussed as to the dictation by the President in legislative matters, but that is a lively and important question just at this time nevertheless, and I avail myself of the opportunity to have inserted in the RECORD a very able editorial on the subject which appeared in the Washington Post of this morning and which is as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL DICTATION.

Within two weeks after President Wilson was inaugurated stories of Executive pressure began to come out of the congressional cloakrooms; and before the extraordinary session was six weeks old, reputable men were asserting, more or less openly, that every measure represented the judgment of the President rather than the judgment of Congress. For a time these stories made no impression on the public mind, because the country had grown accustomed to exaggerations for political purposes, and for that reason those stories were taken with many grains of salt. Then, too, the newspapers friendly to him and his more active partisans everywhere denied the President's interference, and a large majority of the people accepted the denials. Besides, many of those who knew that the President had gone far beyond any of his predecessors in an effort to coerce a legislative acquiescence in his personal opinions refused to join in the criticism against him, hoping that the occasion for it would pass.

But the last caucus held by the Democrats of the House makes it plain that patriots can not hope to see the House and Senate released from the presidential grip unless the President is brought to understand that the country disapproves his methods of dealing with a coordinate branch of the Government. It is said—and the report comes in such a way that no reasonable man can doubt it—that a spokesman of the President carried into that caucus a ship-purchase bill which he boldly represented as the demand of the President, and declared that it must be accepted without change. The Democratic caucus was not only commanded to approve the President's bill, but was commanded to approve it without amendment.

Can anybody justify, or even excuse, such a flagrant violation of every principle of this Government? All of the fathers believed that when the President was authorized to recommend such laws as he thought necessary or expedient, and to veto such laws as he thought unnecessary or inexpedient, he was clothed with as much power as any man ought to possess over the legislation of a free people; and many of the wisest among them thought that too much. If, however, the President can add to his power of recommendation and veto the secret power—the more dangerous because it is secret—of compelling the Congress to pass laws

according to his judgment rather than according to its own, the constitutional separation and independence of the three great departments will soon be utterly destroyed.

Many Democrats, though protesting against the President's interference, yield to him upon the ground that they fear a disruption of the party such as occurred under Mr. Cleveland's last administration. It is entirely praiseworthy for Democrats to avoid a division where they can do so without sacrificing their self-respect or transgressing the principles of the Constitution; but the disasters which followed the factional quarrels under Mr. Cleveland are not the only disasters which a party should fear. The trouble in Mr. Cleveland's time was that Democrats did not submit to a sufficient party discipline, while the trouble in this time is that Democrats are not allowed a sufficient liberty of thinking for themselves. One was political anarchy, the other is political despotism; and the effect of the last is certain to be as serious as the effect of the first.

Indeed, the effect must in the end be very much worse. Party demoralization, though it arise from an opposite cause, is inevitable and can not be less. It can not be possible to force Democrats, in the face of all they have ever taught, to favor the governmental ownership and operation of business enterprises, and the attempt to do so will not only alienate thousands of the most thoughtful and substantial men from the party, but it will moderate the zeal of hundreds of thousands who will remain in it, though they will have no sympathy with this departure from its established policies. Nothing so vitalizes party strength as the consciousness that the party is united in sentiment; and nothing so dissipates party strength as a feeling that the party is being driven by one man. Such a feeling must ultimately culminate in a revolt which will hopelessly divide the party, or in an abject submission which will reduce it to but a feeble shadow of its former self.

But the effect upon the Government will be more injurious even than the effect upon party organization. Such methods as those employed to force the ship-purchase bill through the Democratic caucus not only exhibit a lack of decent respect to which the individual opinion of every Democrat is entitled, but they violate the very foundation principles of this Government. If the Congress should cheerfully and of its own motion abandon the time-honored theory that the Government shall confine itself to the soverign duty of governing, leaving all business enterprises to individuals and corporations, that alone would introduce a dangerous innovation; and when that dangerous innovation is forced on an unwilling Congress it thus sets at naught that other essential principle of this Government, which requires that the legislative department shall be coordinate with and independent of the executive department.

The President may think that in driving his party he is serving his country; but he is mistaken. No man can serve his country except through an ungrudging obedience to the great principles upon which this Republic was founded; and no man can serve his party except by adhering to the principles which underlie its organization. Though the President's more partisan friends regard every criticism as an unfriendly one, he will find in time that those who tell him the truth, even when the truth is disagreeable, are his safest counselors. Sycophants may be able to mislead the President as to the sentiment of the country, but they can not in the end mislead the country as to the conduct of the President.

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on what subject?

The SPEAKER. It is too late to inquire now.

Mr. FERRIS. The question is on agreeing to the next amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 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 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, February 25, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of State, submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and requesting appropriation for representation of interests of foreign Governments growing out of existing hostilities in Europe and elsewhere be extended and made available during fiscal year ending June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1616), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

Mr. HENRY, from the Committee on Rules, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 390) creating a commission and authorizing said commission to acquire, by purchase, the property known as Monticello, and embracing the former home of Thomas Jefferson and the park surrounding the same, consisting of 700 acres of land, all of said property being located in Albemarle County, Va., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1441), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (S. 7188) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Garden City, Kans., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1443), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 5847) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey to the city of Bozeman, Mont., certain land for alley purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1444), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1366) to adjust the claims of certain settlers in Sherman County, Oreg., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1442), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GREGG, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 737) referring certain claims to the Court of Claims for finding of facts and conclusions of law under section 151 of the act of March 3, 1911, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1445), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

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. 21546) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1915 and for prior years, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 21547) making donation of condemned cannon, carriages, and cannon balls to Covington, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE: A bill (H. R. 21548) to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 21549) to promote the dissemination of information to voters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 21550) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Wellsville, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21551) to provide for the erection of a monument at Martins Ferry, Ohio, to the memory of Elizabeth Zane; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CRISP: Resolution (H. Res. 746) authorizing additional clerical assistance and messenger service in the enrolling room of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Resolution (H. Res. 747) authorizing the printing of the report of the Pennsylvania Commission on the Gettysburg reunion; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LOBECK: Resolution (H. Res. 748) making provisions for the session clerks of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, asking removal of limit on postal savings deposit

allowed each person and use of savings funds as basis of rural-credit system; to the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 21552) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21553) granting an increase of pension to Richard F. Enlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21554) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. McClane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 21555) granting an increase of pension to James Betharde; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 21556) to authorize the reinstatement of George Hill Carruth as a cadet in the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of chamber of commerce, Seattle, Wash., favoring law granting States the right to lease coal and other Government lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: Petition of G. W. Stilson, C. G. Allen, and others, of Wood County, Wis., against abridgment of freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BROWNING: Memorial of Star of Bethlehem Lodge No. 12, Loyal Patriots of America, of Camden, N. J., and citizens of Blue Anchor, Cedar Brook, Winslow, and Waterford Works, N. J., protesting against exclusion of certain publications from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of citizens of New York favoring exclusion of the Menace from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of S. C. Hogan, secretary International Association of Marble Workers, favoring H. R. 7826, the Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COADY: Petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of S. T. Dregue and 82 others of Readstown, Wis., against H. R. 20644, to exclude certain publications from use of mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of the board of directors of the associated employees of Indianapolis, indorsing the militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of New York associated dailies, protesting against an increase in the postage rate on newspapers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the United Master Butchers of America, favoring passage of a law to prevent slaughter of any calf weighing less than 150 pounds live weight; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the National Industrial Traffic of Chicago, Ill., relative to national regulation of common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of associated physicians of Long Island, favoring passage of the Palmer-Owen child labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of 168 citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging Congress to pass a law in accordance with the Constitution, that when a citizen of one State is acquitted of any and all charge of crime in another State that he be returned or allowed to return to his own State, or Harry K. Thaw should be allowed to return to his home in Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of citizens of Idaho relative to unemployment in United States; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of 106 citizens of Glendora, Cal., protesting against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petitions of sundry citizens of Olympia and Aberdeen, Wash., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., against abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: Petition of Mr. F. M. Fairchild and other citizens of Cumberland, Allegany County, Md., protesting against passage of bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Memorial of State committee of the Socialist Party of Connecticut, protesting against increase of armaments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Frank Weber, of New Britain, and Rudolph Rymarzick and 15 others, of Manchester, Conn., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. METZ: Petition of citizens of New York City and Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring H. J. Res. 377, prohibiting export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of 1,775 citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of 5,422 American citizens, protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of sundry citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., protesting against any law by Congress abridging freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *February 25, 1915.*

(Legislative day of Friday, February 19, 1915.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

LOUISVILLE & NASHVILLE RAILROAD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission transmitting in response to a resolution of August 6, 1913, the report of the commission relative to the financial relations, rates, and practices of the Louisville & Nashville, and the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, and other carriers. The report already has been printed, and the communication and accompanying paper will be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17869) providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Georgia, requests a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MCGILLICUDDY, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. VOLSTEAD managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 6631) to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poison in the consular districts of the United States in China with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5734) to extend the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for an enlarged homestead," approved February 19, 1909, to the State of Kansas with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 20040. An act to provide for the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy and to prevent the spread of leprosy in the United States; and

H. R. 21122. An act to validate certain homestead entries.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 136) to promote the welfare of American seamen in the