By Mr. LESHER: Petition of 76 citizens of Northumberland County, Pa., favoring a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONDON: Petition protesting against the sending of the military forces of the United States into Mexico and asking the withdrawal of such forces, from F. W. Kirk and 20 other citizens of Louisville, Ky.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition indorsing a bill proposed by Mr. Fred Warren "providing that those who make war shall do all the fighting," from C. W. Busby and 17 other citizens of Eustace, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, telegram opposing any action by Congress that would cause a state of war and urging Congress to prevent that calamity, from Waiters' Union No. 30, San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOUD: Petitions of Archie Sanger and 14 other citizens of Edenville, Mich., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. C. McDonald and 3 other citizens of Blanchard, Mich., favoring the Ashbrook bill, relative to increase in pensions to Civil War widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTH: Petition of 40 citizens of Indiana County, Pa., favoring a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of Lula C. Smith and others, of Rockport, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Richard Burch and others, of Eldred, and Ida E. Staley and others, of Tallula, Ill., against a juvenile-court act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of the commission on temperance of the Congregational Churches of the United States, urging the passage of the Sheppard District of Columbia prohibition bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of 545 people of Pomona, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Nevada Hulbart and 32 other citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against House bills 6468 and 491; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SANFORD: Papers to accompany House bill 13371, for the relief of Matthew J. McDermott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of sundry citizens, favoring rural credit legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SLOAN: Petition of Alexander A. M. Bulgrin and 72 others, against passage of bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of citizens of Pipestone County, Minn., protesting against House bills 6468 and 491, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Resolution of Franklin Printing Trades Association, San Francisco, Cal., favoring an embargo on export of materials for manufacturing paper; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Mrs. A. Hunter and 41 others, all of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the juvenile court bill—House bill 13048; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letter from Simon Levy Co., Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the Keating bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution from Chamber of Commerce, Venice, Cal., favoring a naval base in Santa Monica Bay, Cal.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, letter from Central Labor Union, Santa Barbara, Cal., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, letters from Henry S. Cahn, Los Angeles, Cal., and A. C. Rudolfson, San Francisco, Cal., favoring 1-cent postage on drop letters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, communications from Mrs. H. Salkey and the Jewish Sisterhood of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration.

Also, communication from St. Antonius Society, protesting against the sale and export of munitions of war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, communications from C. E. Chamberlain and 10 others, favoring the Warren bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, letters favoring the construction of highway up Mount Whitney, Cal., from Howard Huntington and M. J. Connell, of Los Angeles, Cal., and Kern County Board of Trade, Bakersfield, Cal.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition signed by Mrs. C. C. Clay, president California Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy; Mrs. T. J. Douglas, president Los Angeles Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy; Mrs. Samuel Cary Dunlap, past president of California Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy; Mrs. Grantland S. Long, State vice president, and Mrs. Allen W. Ellington, second vice president, Los Angeles Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy; Mrs. W. B. Scarborough, recording secretary Los Angeles Chapter; Miss Lulie McGoodwin, corresponding secretary Los Angeles Chapter; Miss Cora A. Mathews, historian Los Angeles Chapter; Mrs. John C. McCay, custodian of the flag, and 68 others, all of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the passage of House bill 478; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *April 22, 1916.*

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

Almighty God, Creator of all things, Thy will is law. We bless Thee that we have come to know that the law of Thy will is love and grace and truth. We come to Thee to-day under the inspiration of this season of the year. We see once more the challenge of life to the force of death. That which was dead is alive again. Thou dost give to us the pledge of our own immortality. We have about us the intimations of the life which is yet to be. We bless Thee for the assurance that wholeness of life is the conqueror over death. Thou wilt not suffer Thy holy one to see corruption. Grant us this day the especial inspiration of Thy spirit that we may enter profoundly into the meaning and message and intimation of this season and come to measure life by its infinite length and depth and height and breadth. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, April 20, 1916, when, on request of Mr. SMOOT and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

THE NAVY (S. DOC. NO. 413).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of April 12, 1916, certain information relative to a communication dated August 3, 1914, from the General Board of the Navy warning the Navy Department of the necessity of bringing the Navy to a state of preparedness, and also of a communication dated November 9, 1914, from Rear Admiral Bradley A. Fiske, senior adviser to the Secretary, warning the Navy Department of the unprepared state of the Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 98) to print as a public document the final report and testimony submitted to Congress by the United States Commission on Industrial Relations.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) authorizing the appointment of a representative of the United States Government to appear at the celebration of the landing of Sir Francis Drake on the coast of California.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12027) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri, Mr. ASHBROOK, and Mr. FULLER managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

H. R. 4701. An act to establish in the War Department and in the Navy Department, respectively, a roll, designated as "the Army and Navy medal-of-honor roll," and for other purposes;

H. R. 5835. An act for the relief of James Stanton;

H. R. 7248. An act for the relief of the United States Drainage & Irrigation Co.;

H. R. 7502. An act for the relief of Ellis P. Garton, administrator of the estate of H. B. Garton, deceased;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H. R. 7862. An act for the relief of New England Coal & Coke Co., owner of the American barges *Emilie* and *Cassie*, and Bruusgaard, Kiosterud Dampskibsaktieselskab, owner of the Norwegian steamship *Hesperos;*

H. R. 9803. An act to emancipate from certain disabilities children who have judgments of convictions for crime of record against them in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to credit the stamp account of Edward B. Craig, as collector of internal revenue for the collection district of Tennessee, in the sum of $2,034.89, being the representative value of certain internal-revenue documentary stamps which were taken from the office of said collector by an act of burglary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I have a number of petitions from citizens of Sebewaing, Mich., and also from Detroit and other points in my State, bearing upon the question of an embargo upon the shipment of arms. If the Chair will indulge me, I will call attention to one of them, in which the petitioner says:

As I am very anxious to see our country maintaining a position of neutrality so definite and absolute that it can not be questioned by anyone whose sympathies are for either of the belligerents of Europe, I am appealing to you, my representative in the upper House of Congress, to support the resolution ordering an embargo upon further shipments of war material, when it comes up for consideration.

These petitions are generally in the same form and come from patriotic citizens, and I desire that their zeal may be properly considered by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HARDING presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the City Council of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against any change in the parcel-post law, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of F. E. Everett, State highway commissioner, of Concord, and of the Auto Club, of Nashua, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for Federal aid in the construction of good roads, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Dr. Benjamin W. Baker, superintendent of the New Hampshire School for Feeble-Minded, of Laconia, N. H., praying for the establishment of a home for feeble-minded in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to present and have printed in the RECORD a letter in the nature of a petition addressed to my colleague, Senator KERN, which would have been presented by him but for the fact that he is unavoidably absent from the city.

This letter is signed by a score or more of the leading business men of Indianapolis, all of whom have been for many years identified with every movement for the growth and development of that city.

All are of German birth or ancestry, but every one a loyal American citizen.

While many may not agree with the views expressed, these men are of such high character and standing as to entitle their utterances to respectful consideration.

I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *April 12, 1916.*

Hon. JOHN W. KERN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As your neighbors, friends, and constituents, we feel that we can appeal to you in this critical hour of our country's negotiations with Germany and ask your calm and unbiased consideration of a few statements which we beg herewith respectfully to submit.

We feel confident it is not necessary to protest our loyalty to our common country to you who have known us for years, and submit that it is no test of our patriotism to entertain opinions and form judgments in good faith which may differ from those of our fellow citizens.

If, because of our blood relationships, we have sympathized with Germany in the awful contest which has been raging since August, 1914, it seems to us that this is quite natural, indeed it would be unnatural and perhaps worse, rank hypocrisy, if it were otherwise. We would resent the imputation that because we hold sympathies for Germany we have violated any of the requirements of a good faith loyalty to our country.

It is our sincere judgment that there has been no provocation by Germany, or any violation of international law by it, that would justify the severance of diplomatic relations or the declaration of war. It is our sincere judgment that the Government of Germany, as well as the German people, do not court the enemity of our Government or of our people, and would not intentionally commit any avoidable act that would bring on the ill will of our country. It is our sincere judgment that Germany would not knowingly commit the slightest act which, by any possible stretch of imagination, could be construed as an attack upon our national honor.

We submit if it should be proven that we are right in our contentions, as set out in the preceding paragraph, it would be worse than a calamity to break off relations with a country with whom we have always been at peace and with whom our relations have always been upon a basis of mutual respect and confidence.

Perhaps we have no legal foundation for advancing our ties of blood relationship as an argument against the break of diplomatic intercourse with Germany—others, no doubt, in the past, in similar emergencies, have asked for consideration because of mere financial interests—but the best instincts of a common brotherhood, it seems to us, furnishes a valid excuse for an appeal to our fellow citizens to consider our sufferings in the event of a situation such as is now threatening.

We appeal to you, as our trusted representative, to use the power of your great influence against the proposition to break diplomatic relations with Germany. With great respect,

Yours, truly,

Louis Nodroez; Fred Fahnley; Albrecht Kipp; G. A. Schmell; Wm. F. Piel; Albert Sieber; Very Rev. Ant. Scheideler, V. G., pastor of St. Mary's Church; Charles Mayer; H. O. Pantzer; F. J. Meyer; John P. Frenzel; Otto N. Vonnyer; S. E. Rauh; Jos. Keller; Lorenz Schmidt; Albert C. Zahn; Herman P. Lieber; J. C. Peters; Herman Frenzel; Theo. Stempfel; Hugo Wuelfing.

Mr. TAGGART. I also ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to present two telegrams which I have received and that they may be printed in the RECORD. One is from the German-American Democratic Club of Indianapolis, consisting of about 800 members, and the other telegram is from the Indiana Branch of the American Rights Committee, consisting of about 180 names. I ask that these two telegrams be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *April 20, 1916.*

Hon. THOMAS TAGGART,
Washington, D. C.:

Senator, this is Good Friday. It brings home to us good thoughts, kindly feelings, a reverence strengthened anew for our Savior, who died that we might live, and through this reverence is born anew the grand, the ennobling sentiment, peace on earth, good will to men. Let us, then, hope and pray that this may become a living reality and that to this end nothing will be left undone to prevent a severance of the peaceful, kind, and neighborly relations existing between ours, the grandest Nation on earth, and the German Empire. May we courteously prevail on you, our friend, to urge upon our great and good President and the Nation's Congress, commemorative of this good day, to sound the slogan to a grateful constituency, Peace on earth, good will to men.

By order of the German Democratic Club.

ALBERT SAHM, *President.*
CARL VIEBAHN, *Secretary.*

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *April 21, 1916.*

Hon. THOMAS TAGGART,
United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D C.:

Indianapolis Branch American Rights Committee consists following members:

George Ade, E. W. Arnold, M. L. Addington, Charles E. Andrews, W. C Bobbs, George Briggs, John T. Brandon, Charlon G. Eden, Harry R. Ellis, Bert Essex, Frank S. Fishback, M. K. Foxworthy, John S. Fishback, Frank C. Fishback, Frank H. Blackledge, Austin H. Brown, Henry W. Bennett, Stanley C. Brooks, Paul H. Birdsall, Willitts A. Bastian, Hays H Buskirk H. J. Barnard, Fred E. Barrett, Hervey Bates, jr., P. Bandy, Demarchus C. Brown, T. I. Foster, Arthur Grover, Harry C. Gilbert, Ralph Gregory, A. Bennett Gates, Albert H. Gisler, Lee R. Garber, Paul Gregory, Thomas J. Cameron, Alexander R. Holliday, William W. Hampton, Blythe Q. Hendricks, Col. John T. Barnett, Edward T Branham, Harry Behrmann, Alex Barry, Dr. John H. Bull, Garvin M. Brown, Edward J. Bennett, R. T. Byers, Henry O. Chamberlin, B. F. Cotharin, Charles Clark, C. J. Cooper, jr., H. Foster Clippinger, Smiley A. Chambers, Dr. E. D. Clark, John N. Carey, Christopher B. Coleman, Jefferson Caylor, William Coull, John B. Coull, James I. Dissette, Ward H. Dean, Richard A. Henry, John H. Holliday, jr., Jacquelin S. Holliday, B. S. Hawkins, A. M. Higgins, R. A. Heitbrink, C L Harrell, Ray E. Harris, Ward H. Hackleman, L. A. Hardin, P. A. Havelick, James O. Humbert, George B. S. Hah, J. I. Holcomb, J. Guy Haugh, R. D Harper, John W. Hett, John T. Jameson, Fred B. Johnson, Sylvester Johnson, F. E. Jordan, William E. Day, Frank T. Demmerly, F. T. Davenport, Samuel Dowden, F. S. Douglass, Sol H. Esarey, Ernest Kneller, Otto H. Kalff, Charles S. Lewis, Edward R. Lewis, Elmer E Locke, Eli Lilly, Ernest W. Levering, Arthur V. Lamme, Montgomery P. Lewis, Daniel B. Lufen, George J. Marott, Samuel D. Miller, Clarence Martindale, H. C. Mitchell, Joseph A. Miner, John M Judah, William P. Kappes, J. Edward Kamps, William W. Knight, Henry Knaff, John E Kinsley, Charles E. Richards, William T. Rausmussen, F. S. Rundell, R. G. Sumner, David Shreyer, Joseph K. Sharpe, James T Stewart, Wallace C. Stoneman, Jesse S. Shields, W. R. Sinclair, Lucius B. Swift, Charles C. Sloan, Samuel B. Sutphin, Thomas Stevenson, W T. Steele, Henry J. Martin, William H. H. Miller, A. H. Morris, Alfred H. Moore, Horace A. Morgan, Harry L. Mott, Donald McGibney, Felix McWhirter, Judge Robert W. McBride, Dr. Charlton McCullough, R. A. McGregor, Russell A. McNair, Clare McTurnan, Edward L. McKee, jr., Meredith Nicholson, Nicholas H.

Noyes, Clarence W. Nichols, Frank W. Olin, L. J. Osborn, J. B. Parsons, M. J. Price, Thomas D. Sheerin, Edward C. Simpson, Harry G. Sargent, Newton Booth Tarkington, Maurice E. Tennant, Harry S. Taylor, Newton Todd, Henry M Talbott, A. W. Thomson, John S. Tarkington, Preston C. Trusler, Charles J. Taylor, Fred I. Tone, M. E. Vinton, Fred Wallick, Dr. Arthur L. Walters, Will H. Wade, James A. Walsh, William R. Wimmer, Charles N. Williams, Phil C. Pfenninger, Lafayette Perkins, Maxwell O. Parry, Walter P. Pfaff, A. L. Rigsbey, H. C. Riggs, R. L. Resener, Ralph M Reard, Alex Taggart, W. Morton Herriott, Romney L. Willson, D. P. Williams, John V. Wilson, Lewis Watson, Ryland H. Wolcott, Edmund Zerner, Frank Hendrickson, Dr. David Layman, Dr Henry Jameson, Charles W. Warren, and D. Lawrence Chambers.

I am directed to send you following: We earnestly approve position taken by President in his message to Germany and oppose any measure which may tend to weaken the force of that message.

BOOTH TARKINGTON, *Chairman.*

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I present a telegram from one of my constituents. I have received many of similar purport, and I respectfully ask that this one may be read.

There being no objection, the Secretary read the telegram, as follows:

HOBOKEN, N. J., *April 19, 1916.*

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

The propaganda which has been carried on with the avowed purpose of inflaming the American people with a desire to enter this European war has never been equaled by any propaganda carried on in this or any other country. The undoubted will of the American people is that we maintain peace.

DANIEL P. TOOMEY,
East Orange, N. J.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have received from citizens of my State, I am safe in saying, 100, possibly more, of similar import.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Texas, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from sundry citizens of San Antonio, Tex., and petitions of sundry citizens of the District of Columbia, praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Hill County, Tex., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Grand Prairie, Tex., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Corpus Christi, Tex., remonstrating against the proposed creation of a juvenile court in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Oglesby, Tex., remonstrating against the adoption of section 11 of the so-called cotton-futures bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of New Mexico, praying for an investigation into the methods of handling public lands, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BRADY presented petitions of sundry citizens of Idaho, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Nez Perce, Idaho, praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LIPPITT. I have a resolution in the form of a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, protesting against the imposition of a Federal inheritance tax, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

[H. 266, January session, A. D. 1916. Mr. Sumner, of Providence.]

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS.

Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Rhode Island concerning House resolution 8929, providing for a Federal inheritance tax.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States House resolution 8929, authorizing the imposition of a Federal tax on gifts, legacies, and inheritances; and

Whereas it is held by ample and eminent authority that this form of taxation belongs properly to the several States and should be reserved strictly as a source of State revenue and not made a source of revenue by the Federal Government; and

Whereas the taxation of inheritances is already an established part of the revenue systems of 43 of the United States, a fact which would render the position of a Federal inheritance tax an unjust burden and result in double taxation in an aggravated and unwarranted degree: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island hereby declares its firm conviction that the interests of the State and of the public generally would not be conserved by the passage of said resolution, and that the imposition of a Federal tax on gifts, legacies, and inheritances would be inimical thereto.

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Rhode Island be, and they hereby are, requested to use their efforts to prevent the passage of said House resolution 8929, and the secretary of state is hereby instructed to forward a copy of these resolutions to each of them forthwith.

A true copy.
Attest:
[SEAL.] J. FRED PARKER, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. SMOOT. I present a telegram in the nature of a petition and ask that it be printed in the RECORD. I will not take the time to have it read. Let it be printed without the names.

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

SALT LAKE, UTAH, *April 21.*

Senator REED SMOOT, *Washington, D. C.:*

We believe that the American people are absolutely against war with Germany. Under the present circumstances and conditions they consider such a war the greatest calamity which could befall our country and a crime against our own people and against humanity. Millions of hearts will be broken and inexpressible suffering will be the lot of ourselves and our brethren. We firmly believe that this is the sentiment of the majority of the American Nation, and we trust and hope from the bottom of our hearts that you will do all you can to keep us out of an unjust war.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of the Literary Club of Cheshire, Conn., praying for the creation of a national-park service, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented petitions of Virginia Dare Council, No. 25, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, of Norwich; of Banner Council, No. 54, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, of Norwalk; of Lady Fowler Council, No. 58, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, of Milford; of Goddess of Liberty Council, No. 3, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, and of Quininpiack Council, No. 61, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, of New Haven; of Betsy Ross Council, No. 19, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, of Bridgeport; and of Lady Sherman Council, No. 15, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, of Shelton, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Willimantic, Conn., praying for the prohibition of the exportation of intoxicating liquor to Africa, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maine, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Portland, Me., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Oregon, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

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

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Oreg., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. LANE presented memorials of sundry citizens of Oregon, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a firemen's relief fund for the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Colville and Granger, in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Granger and Hassan, in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Rice and Centralia, in the State of Washington, praying for Government ownership of telephone and telegraph systems, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Rice and Centralia, Wash., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Lewis County, Wash., remonstrating against the proposed creation of a juvenile court in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WEEKS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Boston, Mass., praying for the creation of a tariff commission, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Worcester, Mass., praying for an increase in the Dental Corps of the Army, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of North Attleboro, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide Federal aid for vocational education, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Haverhill, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to certain widows of veterans of the Civil War, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, praying for an increase of armaments, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Worcester, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Melrose, Mass., praying for the prohibition of the exportation of intoxicating liquor to Africa, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COLT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Rhode Island, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Moosup Valley, R. I., praying for Government ownership of telephone and telegraph systems, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a resolution, in the nature of a memorial, from the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, remonstrating against the imposition of a tax on gifts, legacies, and inheritances, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PHELAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of San Jose, Sacramento, and Los Angeles, all in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Eureka, Sacramento, and Bakersfield, all in the State of California, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

RED CROSS SUPPLIES.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a telegram which I have received from my State, and I ask that the Secretary may read it.

The Secretary read the telegram, as follows:

[Telegram.]

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *April 20, 1916.*

Hon. FRANK B. BRANDEGEE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Red Cross has just issued circular announcing British Government refuses to pass Red Cross supplies for central powers. Would beg that you will protest in the Senate against virtual overthrow of Geneva principles and will not tacitly allow Red Cross to be used as aid for one side only.

YANDELL HENDERSON.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I am not particularly familiar with any order that Great Britain may have made prohibiting the supplies of the Red Cross from reaching the central powers. I think I remember to have seen in one of the newspapers the other day that such action had been taken and it was claimed by the British authorities that it was done, if I recall the reading correctly, because of fear on their part that some of these hospital supplies might be used for war purposes. It seemed to me at the time that that was a somewhat forced excuse. I had supposed hitherto that supplies to relieve the suffering of wounded soldiers could be sent into any country by the Red Cross, and I assumed that it was recognized by all belligerents that the Red Cross was sent upon an errand of mercy. I do not know what supplies the Red Cross is sending in that could be used for war purposes to any extent. I conceive that what cotton or chemicals they use for hospital purposes would not go very far in maintaining attacks about Verdun at least. Not knowing any more about it than I do I am not prepared to say anything more about it.

I have presented the telegram, and it will appear in the RECORD, hoping that the attention of the State Department may be drawn to the subject.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I have received a number of telegrams from various people and different organizations relating to our present relations with Germany. That is a matter which is in the hands of the executive department of the Government, and the situation is somewhat critical. I have not felt it to be wise or prudent to bring those matters before the Senate. I think the responsibility rests now with the President, and that he should be allowed to conduct negotiations as seems right to him.

I have therefore advised my correspondents who have been sending these telegrams that I do not think it is a time when we should indulge in criticisms; that we had better await developments and see what comes of the negotiatons that are being carried on by the proper department of the Government.

I say this because similar telegrams have been submitted here, and some of the people who have been appealing to me in various ways may feel that it is my duty to present the telegrams I have received. I want my position to be understood in that respect. I think it is a time when we should be careful about what we say, and careful about what we bring before the Senate calculated to inflame the public mind. There is agitation enough about it now, Mr. President, and I think we ought not to contribute to it. When the matter comes before the Senate, if it ever does, it should be ready to act upon it freely and independently.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BROUSSARD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 5672) for the relief of sundry building and loan associations, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 384) thereon.

Mr. HARDING, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4212) for the relief of W. E. Thomas submitted an adverse report (No. 380) thereon, which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 1293) to reimburse the Farmers' Savings Bank of Brandon, Iowa, for currency destroyed by fire, submitted an adverse report (No. 379) thereon, which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 1429) for the relief of Artemus W. Pentz, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 383) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 147) for the relief of John W. Cupp (Rept. No. 381); and

A bill (S. 2543) for the relief of the State of Kentucky (Rept. No. 382).

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred the bill (S. 4060) to limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the States in goods, wares, and merchandise wholly or in part manufactured, mined, or produced by convict labor or in any prison or reformatory, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 385) thereon.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 9909) to authorize the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Missouri River, and I submit a report (No. 378) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

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

SNAKE RIVER BRIDGE, IDAHO.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 11320) granting the consent of Congress to the Counties of Twin Falls and Minidoka, State of Idaho, to construct a bridge across

Snake River, and I submit a report (No. 377) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

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

LIEUT. ROY C. SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. From the Committee on Naval Affairs I report back favorably with an amendment in the nature of a substitute Senate resolution 106, authorizing an investigation into the case of Lieut. Roy C. Smith, and I submit a report (No. 386) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

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

The amendment was to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*" and to insert:

That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, requested to reopen and review the findings of the court of inquiry made in re Lieut. Roy C. Smith, formerly of the Asiatic Fleet, United States Navy, dated July 25, 1911, with the object of ascertaining whether these findings were based upon facts of established record, and to take and consider any additional evidence or facts which may be presented bearing on this case, and to render his findings on the whole record so made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (by request):

A bill (S. 5704) to accept the cession by the State of Oregon of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Crater Lake National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARDWICK:

A bill (S. 5705) granting a pension to Polly Giddens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 5706) for the purchase of a post-office site at Bucyrus, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 5707) providing for leaves of absence for clerks and employees in first and second class post offices; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. SIMMONS:

A bill (S. 5708) for the establishment of Winston-Salem, in the State of North Carolina, as a port of delivery under the act of June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation without appraisement of dutiable merchandise; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 5709) for the relief of the owners of the British steamship *Clearpool;* to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 5710) granting an increase of pension to William A. Greene; and

A bill (S. 5711) granting a pension to Margaret Burwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES:

A bill (S. 5712) for the relief of Ralph Deremer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 5713) granting an increase of pension to Louis Hines (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART:

A bill (S. 5714) granting an increase of pension to James S. Sisson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 5715) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. McClain (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 5716) to establish the Mount McKinley National Park, in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Territories.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 5717) granting a pension to William Lynch (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 5718) to provide for an auxiliary reclamation project in connection with the Yuma project, Arizona; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS.

Mr. ASHURST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 407) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. POMERENE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 12193), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

GOOD ROADS.

Mr. LEE of Maryland submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that in order to promote agriculture, afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products, and encourage the development of a general system of improved highways, the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads which may be used in the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, or postal matter, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

RENTAL OF BUILDINGS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I submit a table carefully prepared showing the rentals by the Government for public buildings in the District of Columbia, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

Rentals for public buildings in the District of Columbia.

[From Journal of the American Institute of Architects, February, 1916.]

	Real value.	Annual rental.	Net return to owner.
			Per cent.
Agricultural Department, Willard Building	$270,000	$9,500	1.50
Agricultural Department, 215-217 Twelfth SW	19,250	900	3.50
Agricultural Department, 216 Thirteenth SW	148,000	16,000	9.00
Agricultural Department 220 Fourteenth SW	180,000	20,000	9.25
Agricultural Department, 200-202 Fourteenth SW	28,000	3,000	8.75
Agricultural Department, 212-214 Thirteenth SW	13,000	960	5.50
Agricultural Department, 929 Seventh SW	24,400	600	.50
Agricultural Department, 221 Linwood Place NW	46,274	5,400	9.75
Agricultural Department, 339 Pennsylvania Avenue NW	45,700	4,800	8.50
Agricultural Department, 1316 B SW	19,000	3,000	15.00
Agricultural Department, rear 915 E NW	2,700	300	8.67
Agricultural Department, rear 215 Twelfth SW	5,225	600	10.75
Agricultural Department, rear 215 Linworth Place SW	750	120	14.00
Agricultural Department, 929 F NW	209,000	18,000	(1)
Agricultural Department, 818 Four-and-a-Half SW	5,650	360	8.00
Agricultural Department, 224 Twelfth SW	26,000	2,500	7.75
Agricultural Department, 220 Thirteenth SW	26,000	3,000	9.50
Agricultural Department, 215 Thirteenth SW	32,589	4,000	10.50
Agricultural Department, 1358 B SW	274,000	35,360	11.00
Agricultural Department, 1304-1306 B SW	24,250	2,500	7.50
Civil Service Commission, 1724 F NW	181,000	12,000	4.67
Commerce Department, Pennsylvania Avenue and Nineteenth NW	666,000	65,500	7.75
Department of Justice, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW	77,500	6,800	6.75
Department of Justice, 1435-1439 K NW	140,000	12,400	7.00
Department of Justice, 1013 Fifteenth NW	11,800	1,800	13.25
Department of Justice, 6, 8, 10 Jackson Place NW	91,000	6,000	4.67
Interstate Commerce Commission, 1319 F NW	460,000	39,024	6.50
Interior Department, Eighth and E NW	108,750	7,800	5.00
Interior Department, 710 E NW	128,000	12,000	7.50
Labor Department, Pennsylvania Avenue and Seventeenth NW	510,000	20,000	3.88
Navy Department, New York Avenue and Eighteenth NW	285,000	40,000	12.00
Navy Department, 730 Seventeenth NW	$21,000	$1,200	4.00
Post Office Department, First and K NE	300,000	32,000	8.75
State Department, 1653 Pennsylvania Avenue NW	86,400	4,500	3.25
Treasury Department, 450 Nineteenth NW	16,000	1,200	5.50
Treasury Department, New York Avenue near Eighteenth	24,000	2,150	7.00
War Department, 1710 Pennsylvania Avenue NW	28,800	2,100	5.25
War Department, Eckington Place NE	40,500	4,938	11.00
War Department, 1729 New York Avenue NW	113,000	7,200	4.50
War Department, Seventeenth and F NW	33,000	2,500	5.50
Total	4,721,538	412,012	8.73

[1] Entire building not taken.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have a letter from ex-Senator Blair, of New Hampshire, dealing with certain public questions in a very moderate and candid way. It is brief, and I ask permission to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

COLORADO BUILDING,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1916.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The military forces of the United States should not be withdrawn from Mexico until peace and order are fully restored and firmly reestablished throughout the whole territory of that Republic.

Political, industrial and social conditions were never so bad as now in that distracted country. They have been constantly growing worse for the last five years, and during all that time we have been morally responsible for these conditions—to Mexico, to our own people, and to the world. This is true whether the obligation grows out of the Monroe doctrine, the duty which a prosperous and powerful neighbor owes to its less fortunate neighbor under the general obligations of international law, or the dictates of the paramount sentiments of humanity which are the strongest of all laws.

These 12,000,000 peons and 3,000,000 chivalrous, cultured governing classes are our brethren. God only has made us to differ. We can help them, and must help them, even though they may not desire it and perhaps for a time will resent it.

Our southern boundary is Panama. With the Central American States we have and shall forever preserve relations of amity.

But with Mexico as she now is we can never reach the Isthmus by land until the full right of peaceable intercourse with the Isthmus by our military forces is perpetually secured to us.

With no adequate Navy (as yet), we are confronted by hostile nations or probable combinations of nations of greater sea power than our own on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and unless we have a navy on each ocean sufficiently powerful to stand off the navies of the world on both oceans how are we to defend and hold the canal if we can not march or transport our forces through Mexico, safe from the big guns of enemies on either or both oceans? And how if the canal is blockaded or closed by slides?

What Mexico might do we know from the way she deals with us in our effort to capture the bandit invader Villa.

We have watched and waited through the Taft mediation policy, and so far under the present administration, enduring murder and pillage of foreigners, and especially of our own citizens, until finally our own country was invaded and our trusty slumbering soldiers and civilians were shot down in midnight murder and their property and habitations looted and destroyed.

By every law, human and divine, it was our plain duty to pursue and capture the bandit and his men. It was nothing but an excess of politeness, approaching the serio comic, to ask the consent of Carranza at all; and now it is suggested that we get out and go away back home and sit down, leaving everything that has occurred and accumulated in the past unsettled and the future of Mexico and our relations with her ten times worse than ever.

No; it may prove to be a serious crisis, but we can not leave Mexico now without Villa, nor, in fact, without a complete and honorable settlement of everything involved in the past, with just indemnities and safeguards for the future. I have no fear of war with Germany. Let us prove to Mexico that we are her greatest and best friend. Put a common-school department into the Army bill and let Pershing establish one everywhere that he encamps until the war, if we have one, is over. That will do it, and will hasten the day when the intelligence of the people of all nations will abolish war—and there is no other way to do it. People will fight until the majority of them know better. God hasten the day when the children of all nations are in the common school.

Truly, yours, HENRY W. BLAIR.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12027) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. 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. JOHNSON of Maine, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. SMOOT conferees on the part of the Senate.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 21st instant approved and signed the following act:

S. 5229. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Warren County, Pa., to construct a bridge across the Allegheny River in the borough of Warren, county of Warren, in the State of Pennsylvania.

PENSIONS FOR SURVIVORS OF INDIAN WARS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further morning business, the calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 264, being House bill 655, to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars—we will thereby begin with the Order of Business where we stopped when the calendar was last under consideration—and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected cases, under Rule VIII.

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

The bill (H. R. 655) to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars from January 1, 1859, to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, page 2, line 10, before the word "days," to strike out "ninety" and insert "thirty," so as to read:

That the provisions, limitations, and benefits of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk War, Creek War, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole War," approved July 27, 1892, as amended on February 19, 1913, be, and the same are hereby, extended from the date of the passage of this act to the surviving officers and enlisted men of the Texas volunteers who served in defense of the frontier of that State against Indian depredations from January 1, 1859, to January 1, 1861, inclusive, and from the year 1866 to the year 1876, inclusive, and to the surviving officers and enlisted men, including militia and volunteers of the military service of the United States, who have reached the age of 62 years, and who served 30 days in the campaign in southern Oregon and Idaho and northern parts of California and Nevada from 1865 to 1868, inclusive, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 9, before the words "Black Hawk Indian," to insert "campaigns in the," so as to read:

The campaigns in the Black Hawk Indian war in Utah from 1865 to 1867, inclusive.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 23, after the word "remarried," to insert the following proviso:

Provided further, That this act shall extend also to the surviving officers and enlisted men of the organization known as Tyler's Rangers, recruited at Black Hawk, Colo., in 1864, for services against the Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 4, before the word "days," to strike out "ninety" and insert "thirty," so as to read:

Provided further, That if any certain one of the said campaigns did not cover a period of 30 days, the provisions of this act shall apply to those who served during the entire period of said campaign.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 4, line 20, after the words "military service," to insert:

Provided, That when there is no record of service or payment for same in the War Department or Treasury Department, the applicant may establish the service by satisfactory evidence from the muster rolls on file in the several State or Territorial archives: *And provided further*, That the want of a certificate of discharge shall not deprive any applicant of the benefits of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section 3, as follows:

That section 4716 of the Revised Statutes, relating to loyalty during the Civil War, is hereby repealed so far as the same relates to this act or to pensioners under this act.

And insert:

That the provisions of section 4716 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to applicants for pension under this act.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I should like to know what are the provisions of section 4716 of the Revised Statutes which this amendment proposes shall not apply to applicants for pension under this act.

Mr. SMOOT. It simply means that the statute in reference to the loyalty of citizens shall not apply.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. In section 1, page 2, line 6, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 1, page 2, line 6, after the word "year," it is proposed to strike out the date "1876" and to insert "1877."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, before we finally act on this bill, I think that those of us who do not know what it covers should be informed as to how many persons are likely to be affected by it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. Mr. President, in 1892, I think, the first pension bill was enacted relative to the survivors of Indian wars. That bill applied to all the survivors of the Modoc War. Later similar provisions were extended to the survivors of the Seminole War, and still later similar provisions were applied to survivors of other Indian campaigns. In this bill provisions similar to those which were enacted in 1892 in regard to the survivors of the Modoc War are made to apply to the survivors of other Indian campaigns.

It is impossible to ascertain the number of pensioners who would be covered by this bill, but the number of such survivors

who are now pensioned under acts which have been passed in favor of the survivors of Indian campaigns is very small. My recollection is that it embraces only some 700 or 800 pensioners. Inquiry at the Bureau of Pensions elicited no information as to the number who would be likely to be covered by this proposed legislation. It extends to all who took part in any of the campaigns on the western frontier.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if there is an enrollment any place to show who these men were?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I will say to the Senator that they are all enrolled either in the archives of the department at Washington or in the archives of the respective States. We have made the provisions of the bill apply not only to those who are shown to have been enrolled by the Government records but also to those shown to have been enrolled in the different States.

Mr. OVERMAN. They must either, then, have been enrolled according to the records of the Government or of the States?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. And none of the survivors can draw pensions under this bill if they are not enrolled in one place or the other. Is that the fact?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. The matter of enrollment must be shown either by the Federal archives or by the State archives.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is the right to secure pensions under this bill limited to those who are enrolled?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I so understand; yes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is there any limitation as to the length of time they must have served? Suppose a man only served a week?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. The man must have served for 30 days or during the campaign for which he enlisted.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry of the Senator having charge of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. What amount of money from the Treasury will this bill require?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. Mr. President, I have already stated, in answer to that question——

Mr. THOMAS. I just came into the Chamber a moment ago and did not hear the Senator's explanation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. That we are unable to state the amount, but the number of pensioners under similar acts to-day is only about 800. The Pension Bureau, however, is unable to make any estimate as to the number who would be covered by this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Colorado that as to some of the wars or campaigns mentioned in the bill, it is known that there are only two or three survivors living to-day.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely want to ascertain how we are legislating, whether we are legislating intelligently or whether we are appropriating money without any information, definite or otherwise, as to the amount to be required from the Treasury to meet this added obligation. In other words, are we proceeding with regard to this bill as we seem to be proceeding with regard to other bills appropriating money from the Treasury for private purposes?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I was detained from the Chamber until just this moment. I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if the men who served during these wars who were not enlisted by the General Government but were in the service of the States are to partake of this bounty?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I will say, in answer to the question of the Senator from Mississippi, that not only those who were enrolled as shown by the Federal archives but also those who were enrolled as shown by the State archives will receive the benefit of this bill.

Mr. VARDAMAN. What will be the amount paid under the bill? I regret I have not had an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I find that the committee in the House estimated—I do not know that they had any information from the department, because we asked for information but could not obtain any—that the number of names to be added to the pension roll under this bill would be 5,000, and that the expenditure would not exceed a million dollars.

Mr. VARDAMAN. What will be the per capita payment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. It is impossible to state.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I mean at what rate will they be paid? Will they be paid as other pensioners are paid?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. Twenty dollars a month is the amount of pension allowed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment. If there are no further amendments the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further amendments, the amendments concurred in will be ordered engrossed——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should like to have a little more information about the extension of the benefits of this bill to men other than those who enlisted in the Federal service. The limitation provided seems to be a very indefinite one.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the bill is safeguarded in every way, so far as it is possible to safeguard it. It applies to Indian war veterans who served in the early days, when Indian uprisings occurred and the Indians went on the war path. I know of one case where there are only two or three survivors left of the whole number who were engaged in the war. These men, Mr. President, in order to protect the citizens of the State during Indian uprisings entered the service. The State has a record of their service and of the organizations in which they served, and no man can get a pension under the bill unless it is shown from the archives either of the War Department or of the State that he rendered service. The bill simply grants pensions to a few veterans of Indian wars who are not pensioned at the present time. The veterans of all the other Indian campaigns have been pensioned.

Under this bill a service of 30 days is required. We have exactly followed in this bill former pension laws, and I ask the Senator, because I know that the bill is just, not to object to its consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the bill involves a million-dollar charge upon the Federal Treasury, not merely for one year, but to continue for quite a length of time, as long as these men live. They are to be granted pensions for 30 days' service, not a service to the National Government in all cases, but they can be pensioned if their names appear on the lists in the archives of the State. I do not understand that the bill really limits the service required to 30 days.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; the bill says that 30 days' service must have been rendered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. Mr. President, the bill requires a service of 30 days, or a service during the campaign. If the campaign lasted less than 30 days, that is covered by the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then, it applies to a man who has served 10 days, if that was the length of time of the campaign.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator a moment to say that many of these campaigns only lasted 30 days? In some of them—in Oregon, for instance, where the Indians went through the State with lightning rapidity—the men who rendered service against them were enlisted in the State's service and supplemented the efforts of the Federal troops, and sometimes acted without the assistance of the Federal troops. No set of men ever rendered their country a more patriotic service than these pioneer Indian fighters, and I think I can safely say, without disparagement to the Regular Army, that in many cases it could not have prevailed but for the assistance it received from the Volunteers. Many of them were young men at the time. Most of them were men in middle life.

It was suggested awhile ago that they were simply defending their own homes. That is not true. They were called from every portion of Oregon to the eastern part of the State, where they not only had no personal interests, but where they did not even know the people. They simply answered the call of the State authorities for volunteers to go and take care of the interests of the people there.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator, also, that so far as the Black Hawk War was concerned, Gen. Sherman telegraphed and told the State authorities to call out the troops. The force was organized under his orders. They had no United States soldiers there to defend them.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to state for the benefit of the Senate that this bill only covers two regiments who served from the State of Kansas. The Eighteenth Kansas, which served from June 13, 1867, to November 15, 1867, and had full four months' service. The Nineteenth Kansas were mustered into the United States service October 20, 1868, and served

until April 18, 1869, and had full six months' service; both regiments served on the frontier and in the suppression of Indian hostilities. The reports of the War Department showed that they served in all kinds of weather, and that their supply trains were stampeded, and that they were in a number of engagements with the Indians. Several Indian chiefs were taken prisoners, and the Indians were forced to return to their reservations. These statements are based upon the reports in the War Department, and not from the State alone, and are based upon the reports of the Government officers who were in charge of these two regiments. I know that the shortest service was four months, and the other regiment served six months.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, as I understand, this is not a pension for injury in the line of duty. This is a service pension. It is in no way limited to men who received injuries in the line of duty.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that there is not an Indian war pension that is any different than this. It was a reward for a service that was rendered for those parts of the country that were infested with Indians. I want to say to the Senator that, as far as the lives were concerned, there were more lives lost in those Indian wars in proportion to the number that were engaged than there were even in the Civil War.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If lives were lost, I believe in liberally providing for their widows. If they were really injured in the service, I believe in compensating them; but because a man enlisted and went out for 10 days, I do not believe in putting him permanently on a service roll to be a charge at $12 a month on the rest of the people of the country for the remainder of his life.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the department reports that there is only one case where the service was under 30 days, and, as I remember, that was 29 days. I will ask the Senator from Maine if that was not the case?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. That is true. The only campaign that lasted less than 30 days lasted 29 days.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But they did not have to be out in it all the time. They may have enlisted in the latter part. They may not have gotten really close enough to the Indians to be shot at.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I think they did.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If it were just a million dollars, and then were over, I would not object to it; but they come on our roll permanently, at an expense of a million dollars a year, as long as they live. I understood from the Senator from Maine that it had been calculated that it would cost a million dollars a year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. If the Senator will pardon me, I said that we got no information from the department, which is true, but the House estimated that it would cost a million dollars.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from Georgia is away behind the times if he objects to paying a pension to a man unless he was wounded or became diseased. We are now removing the disabilities of deserters and putting them upon the pension rolls.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, or any other Senator who has information on the subject, if they have reason to believe that this will be the last bill for Indian-war survivors who rendered some service to the Government a great many years ago?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. Mr. President, in answer to the inquiry I will say that it would seem that we have covered all the Indian campaigns by name in this bill. Of course I can not give assurance as to what may be asked in the future.

Mr. GALLINGER. I asked the question for the reason that I feel quite confident that while I served as chairman of the Committee on Pensions we passed at least three bills, in each case having the assurance that that took care of all the remaining survivors of these Indian campaigns.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then I think this bill had better go over, and let us find out whether or not this is the last.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not object.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am very much opposed to paying it.

Mr. SMOOT. I will guarantee to the Senator from Georgia that it will be the last, because the department has named all of the campaigns.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not say this in hostility to the bill. I have voted very liberally for pensions, as everybody knows, and I have wanted to be generous toward these men, who undoubtedly did imperil their lives for 30 days without authority of law; but we ought to stop somewhere. I will make the further observation that I have always had a suspicion that there were some industrious men gathering up these names and creating these rolls for the purpose of getting what we sometimes call a "rake-off." As we have guarded other bills against that class of men, I am going to offer an amendment to this bill to the effect that no part of the appropriation shall be used for the payment of commissions to pension attorneys or others.

Mr. SMOOT. There is such a provision already.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. If the Senator will pardon me, there is already such a provision in the bill. It appears on page 4:

> That all contracts heretofore made between the beneficiaries under this act and pension attorneys and claim agents are hereby declared null and void.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very well; that covers the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think we ought to know what names are on these rolls from the State, and know what we are voting, before we vote for it. I do want to know these things before the bill is acted upon; and as I have the power now to stop it for the present, I stop it by objecting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL BANKS.

The bill (S. 4256) to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, so as to permit national banks located near the boundary line of adjoining States, subject to the discretion of the Comptroller of the Currency, to select only a majority, instead of three-fourths, of their directors from residents of the State in which they are respectively located, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill has been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments, on page 2, line 12, after the word "within," to strike out "ten" and insert "fifty"; in line 16, after the word "director," to strike out "unless the capital of the bank shall not exceed $25,000, in which case he must own in his own right at least five shares of such capital stock"; and in line 19, after the words "owner of," to strike out "the required number of" and insert "ten," so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 5146 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be amended and reenacted so as to read as follows:
>
> "SEC. 5146. Every director must, during his whole term of service, be a citizen of the United States and at least three-fourths of the directors must have resided in the State, Territory, or District in which the association is located for at least one year immediately preceding their election and must be residents therein during their continuance in office: *Provided*, That whenever an association is located in a place within 5 miles of the boundary line of an adjoining State, the Comptroller of the Currency may, in his discretion, authorize such association to select, if it desires so to do, instead of three-fourths, only a majority of its directors from the State in which it is located: *Provided further*, That at least one-fourth of the other directors are residents of the said adjoining State and reside within 50 miles of the corporate limits of the city, town, or village in which the said bank is located. Every director must own in his own right at least 10 shares of the capital stock of the association of which he is a director. Any director who ceases to be the owner of 10 shares of the stock, or who becomes in any other manner disqualified, shall thereby vacate his place."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I do not know whether or not the Senator who reported the bill is present; but I suggest that, in line 20, page 2, the words "at least" should be inserted, so that it will read "any director who ceases to be the owner of at least 10 shares of the stock." I make that motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

SINKING FUND FOR REDUCTION OF NATIONAL DEBT.

The bill (S. 55) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to use at his discretion surplus moneys in the Treasury in the purchase or redemption of the outstanding interest-bearing obligations of the United States was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to repeal all provisions of existing law requiring the establishment and maintenance of a sinking fund for the reduction of the debt of the United States, and in lieu thereof authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to use at his discretion the surplus moneys in the Treasury, from time to time, or such portion thereof as he may deem proper, in the purchase or redemption of the outstanding interest-bearing obligations of the United States, and provides that the obligations so purchased or redeemed shall be canceled and retired and their respective amounts shall be deducted from the outstanding principal of the public debt.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Utah whether there are any surplus funds in the Treasury that are not yet appropriated?

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; the object of the bill is to repeal a law that has been violated from the day it was enacted. I suppose the Senator knows what the law is that we are undertaking to repeal. It requires that 1 per cent of all the revenues collected in our customhouses should be set aside as a fund to redeem the indebtedness of the United States. I will say to the Senator, however, that there has been a great deal more than 1 per cent of the national debt paid since that time, but it never has been done in conformity with the law; and the department wants this law repealed so that it will not hereafter be violated for 365 days in the year.

Mr. THOMAS. From what the Senator says I think we ought to pass the bill. His explanation is plausible.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Utah if this applies to the sinking fund?

Mr. SMOOT. The law that we are undertaking to repeal provided a sinking fund, requiring 1 per cent of the customs receipts to be set aside as a sinking fund to pay the debt of the United States; but from the day it was passed it has never been lived up to. In other words, they paid no attention to the 1 per cent or the 2 per cent, and whenever they have had the money to do so they have paid the obligations of the Government. The department therefore believes the law ought to be repealed.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Utah if there is any reason for repealing the existing law except that it has been violated?

Mr. SMOOT. There is no necessity for it to-day. The law was passed at a time when the Government of the United States had very little credit, and the people who loaned money to the United States insisted that there be a sinking fund established, and the law was passed with that in view. As I say to the Senator, there is no real necessity for it now. The Government pay no attention to it. If they have the money, they pay the obligations of the United States; and there is no necessity, as far as the credit of the Government is concerned, for having it remain on the statute books. Not only has the present Secretary of the Treasury asked that it be repealed, but former Secretaries of the Treasury have asked to have it repealed.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I have no doubt that that recommendation has been made; in fact, I know it has been made; but I think the law is a good one, and one that should be carried out by the Secretaries of the Treasury. No indebtedness should be issued by the Government, or by a municipality, payment of which is not provided for when the indebtedness is issued.

I not only think this law ought to remain on the statute books, but I think it ought to be enforced. Otherwise, we may from time to time go on incurring indebtedness and making no provision for its payment, and pile up in the end an indebtedness which might be embarrassing to the Government.

Indebtedness is always incurred for a specific purpose. As time goes on, instead of continuing it it should be paid off in some way, and there is no better way known than by establishing a sinking fund or issuing serial bonds.

Mr. WARREN. That old indebtedness has all been paid. The indebtedness of to-day is paid in the regular way, and the purpose for which this fund was created no longer exists. In following out this now we would have to appropriate, say, $60,000,000 a year, and it would, if the law were strictly construed, lie in the Treasury unusued, because it does not specifically pay any particular bonds, while the repeal of this law would leave funds so that they could be used in any proper manner.

Mr. SMOOT. And they always have been used by the department.

Mr. WEEKS. Let me ask the Senator from Wyoming a question. Would he be in favor of the passage of a bill which would apply to the present national indebtedness and would pay off a certain percentage of it every year?

Mr. WARREN. Not unless it became due or unless the action of Congress required it.

Mr. WEEKS. Oh, well, there are something like three hundred millions of our indebtedness that can be called at any time, bearing 3 per cent interest.

Mr. WARREN. If we have a surplus that is unused, it can be paid from that. Does the Senator mean that we should immediately levy a tax to pay a debt that is not yet due and at a time following the low-tariff legislation of the Democratic Party and now in the face of greatly increased military expenditures?

Mr. WEEKS. I think that should be done. I think every year some part of our income should be set aside to pay our debts. I do not think there is any other course that conforms to good finance.

Mr. SMOOT. If that were necessary to give the United States credit in order to borrow money at a low rate of interest, I would be in favor of it, but the position of the United States to-day and for the last 40 years has been such that no such necessity exists in order that she may borrow money at the lowest possible rate of interest. Therefore, Mr. President, I think myself that the existing law is useless. It does no good. It does not strengthen the credit of the United States, and if it were lived up to it would work a detriment to the United States.

Mr. WARREN. It would result in having a lot of idle money.

Mr. SMOOT. Because there would be piled up in the Treasury of the United States every day a lot of money as the customs dues are collected.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, there could be piled up in the Treasury money that could be used to retire the 3 per cent bonds which are outstanding. I object to the consideration of the bill at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

H. P. BALDWIN AND OTHERS.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the other day when we were considering the calendar I made some objection to House bill 6241, Order of Business No. 145, and entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed. I wish to state that I have no objection to the enactment of this legislation. I wanted to insert a provision giving Congress at any time the power to repeal the act; but upon examination of the law, I find that the following provision is in the original act, which, with the permission of the Chair, I will read:

SEC. 11. That Congress, or the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, with the approval of Congress, may at any time alter, amend, or repeal this act.

I therefore ask to withdraw my motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota withdraws his motion to reconsider, and the bill stands passed.

DUTY ON SUGAR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is so near the hour of 1 o'clock that under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the motion entered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] that the Senate recede from its amendment to the bill (H. R. 11471) to amend an act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I simply rose to ask that under the unanimous-consent agreement the order of the Senate may be proceeded with.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I am opposed to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina that the Senate shall recede from its amendment to the House bill, and because I am so opposed and expect to vote against it I feel it incumbent upon me to undertake to give to the Senate and to the country some of the reasons which impel me to adopt that course.

Mr. President, when the Underwood-Simmons tariff bill was passed three years ago it contained among its provisions a provision reducing the duty on sugar 25 per cent, and providing that at the expiration of three years from May 1 following its passage, or from May 1, 1916, sugar should be admitted to the United States free of duty.

Previous to that time in the so-called schedule bills of the preceding Congress the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority, by a vote in which many Republicans had joined with practically every Democrat, had placed sugar on the free list. That bill came to this body, then in the control of the Republican Party, and here, of course, it died an untimely death.

So when the Underwood-Simmons bill undertook to provide for the admission of sugar free of duty, with the single exception of the proviso for delay, it followed not only the lead of the Democratic House of the previous Congress but also, as I propose to show, it followed express and explicit Democratic pledges.

To the delay of three years carried in that bill I was opposed. It did not rest, according to my opinion then and according to my judgment now, on sound grounds. If we had promised such relief to the consuming masses of this Republic, if we had promised to leave untaxed this great necessity of life, then there was absolutely no good and valid reason suggested or urged at the time for a three years' postponement of the redemption of the pledge.

It was not insisted then that necessity for governmental revenue afforded such reason. The delay did not rest then on any such basis. It rested, according to the statements and argu-

ments of its proponents, upon a different proposition, namely, that certain interests in this country, some in the South and some in the West, that had long enjoyed the benefits of this protective duty, should have a reasonable time to prepare themselves to do without it, a reasonable time to adjust their private affairs to the policy that the Government of the United States was unwilling to continue a tax upon this food necessity.

The three years have come and gone. Late in the summer or early in the fall the present Secretary of the Treasury announced, disposing of the subject in a phrase almost, that the governmental necessity in the way of revenue required that the tax on sugar should be retained, undertaking to set up his will, his opinion, and his judgment against the express and explicit pledges of a great party. That he should be permitted to carry out such a policy not only surprises me but shocks me. That he should be allowed to so lightly set aside the pledge and plighted word of the Democratic Party is beyond my comprehension.

When the House bill, framed in accordance with his recommendations, reached this body it seemed that the very best thing that could be done by Senators who were opposed to such a surrender was to put another time limitation on it. So the Senate amended this bill so as to provide that there should be another postponement of four years of time before sugar should be admitted free of duty. It was not a pleasant thing for some of us who had labored long and hard in this country for free sugar to consent to this further delay. There were reasons why we did not regard it as necessary. There were other sources from which the needed revenue could be obtained for the Government, and there was another way in which a double amount of revenue could be obtained from this very article with no additional burden on consumption. We thought that one or the other of those two plans ought to be followed, but Democratic Senators generally, feeling that nothing better than the Senate amendment could be secured out of this Congress, proposed the amendment from which the Senator from North Carolina now proposes to recede.

What has happened? The Senator from North Carolina and his conferees and the Senate met exactly the expected opposition, faced exactly the situation we all understood when we agreed to the Senate amendment, and were exactly in the position that they knew they were to start on. Yet, without firing a shot, without a battle for the Senate position, deliberately—of course, I am not personally criticizing; I presume it was their right—but deliberately surrendered the position that the Senate had taken only a few days before. Why did we take that position if we were so ready to quit it? Why did we assert such a proposition if we were so eager to abandon it?

Mr. President, I read from the San Francisco Chronicle of March 17, 1916, an editorial headed "A unanimous Congress":

The repeal of the free-sugar clause in the Underwood-Simmons Tariff Act is now on its smooth and joyful course through Congress, with the approval of practically the entire membership.

Two or three middle of the roaders raised feeble voices of protest in the House, which, however, were drowned in the general acclaim. Congressman BAILEY, of Pennsylvania, said to especially represent the views of William Jennings Bryan, lamented that while it was true that the money from the sugar duty was sadly needed it would not have been needed at all if the Democrats had reduced the national expenses to the size of the national income.

And that is, of course, true, and, in view of the lurid denunciation of Government extravagance which appeared in the Bryan-written platform on which President Wilson was elected, perhaps Congressman BAILEY had reason to jab his brother Democrats.

A Colorado Congressman—probably not from a beet-growing district—

By the way, the paper was wrong about this, for, be it said to the enternal credit of this Congressman, his was one of the largest beet-growing districts in the West and the second largest in his own great State—

declared that it was an outrage to levy a tax which would be divided evenly "between the Government and the Sugar Trust."

The poor Sugar Trust does not seem to have any friends. If there is one thing which the Sugar Trust has fought and is still fighting, tooth and nail, it is a duty of any kind on sugar.

By the way, Mr. President, I pause here just a moment to say that at the proper time I shall demonstrate the utter ignorance or willful falsity of the man who made that statement.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, I have certain ground that I want to cover and then I will yield to him.

Mr. GALLINGER. All right.

Mr. HARDWICK (reading)—

In the bad old days it contributed oodles of money to the Democratic campaign funds in the forlorn hope of getting sugar on the free list.

Another willful misrepresentation. As a matter of fact, the Sugar Trust did contribute money to the Republican Party in at least one campaign, and also attempted to contribute to the Democratic Party, but had its contribution to the Democratic Party returned unaccepted, as the sworn evidence before a special committee of the House of Representatives demonstrated.

Mr. SMOOT. They contributed to the last campaign.

Mr. HARDWICK. The American Sugar Refining Co.?

Mr. SMOOT. Not the American Sugar Refining Co., but Mr. Spreckels and his associates.

Mr. HARDWICK. I have let the Senator interrupt me. That is one of the fallacies that his speech proposes to disclose. The Sugar Trust is the American Sugar Refining Co. Mr. Spreckels is one of the independent refiners, and he has always fought the Sugar Trust and has always contended for free sugar. Somehow or other I am never suspicious of an alleged so-called or miscalled trust that does not want the Government to let it put its hands in the pockets of the people by levying a tax. I am not suspicious of a man who asks no governmental favors and needs no tax to support his industry or run his business. He certainly is not asking any special favor at the hands of Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. His representatives, however, have asked for half a cent a pound duty on sugar, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. HARDWICK. I beg the Senator's pardon. This is one subject I am absolutely familiar with, and I must correct the Senator when he is in error. On the contrary, Mr. Spreckels himself always contended for free sugar.

Mr. SMOOT. So that the record may——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. So that the record may appear as it has been presented to the Senate, I want to say that Mr. Lowry, the representative of Mr. Spreckels, has time and again appeared before the Finance Committee in hearings and asked that a duty of half a cent a pound be put upon sugar. I do not want to take the time now, but——

Mr. HARDWICK. I would rather yield after I get through, but if the Senator insists I will yield as I go along.

Mr. SMOOT. I will not take the time because it would take too long, but I will state that it is well understood why they want one-half cent per pound duty.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah is usually accurate in any statement he makes to the Senate. The Senator is partially incorrect in the statement he now makes. It is true that on at least one occasion the gentleman to whom he refers did say that his personal opinion was that half a cent a pound duty on sugar would be better, but he has never advocated it, he has never urged it, and every time I have heard the subject discussed before any committee of Congress before whom he testified he has insisted on letting Congress or the committee know that that was his individual opinion and did not reflect the sentiment of the concern by whom he was employed. Mr. Spreckels, as the Senator from Utah knows, has long stood out as the most conspicuous advocate of free sugar on the American continent. In other words, he asks no bounty at the hands of the American Government, he asks no tax with which to run his business or to make his profit. Yet these gentlemen speak of him as the Sugar Trust. The Sugar Trust, as I shall demonstrate to the Senator from Utah later, has always demanded a duty on sugar and stands to-day, if my advice is correct for a duty on sugar. So the Senator need not console himself with the pleasing reflection that if he favors the House bill without amendment he is parting company with the Sugar Trust. He is with them still.

This article from the San Francisco paper continues:

Now that at last its fondest hopes seemed to have been realized it is cruel that a brother Democrat should accuse it of being a beneficiary of their blasting. The Congressman from Colorado, however, was in error. The Government will get the entire duty on sugar, and will not divide with anybody.

The Sugar Trust fights all duties on sugar solely from an unholy desire to put an end to the beet-sugar industry once for all. If beet sugar continues—

Just here let me pause to say that that statement is made out of the profound depths of an ignorance that is amusing. I should not have read the editorial at all if it had not had something later in it to which I wish to refer. The Sugar Trust owns a large per cent of the stocks of the western beet-sugar companies, not as large as they once did, I admit, yet a very material percentage of the stocks of most of those companies when the totals are footed up. So the paper makes the absurd mistake of saying the Sugar Trust, the American Sugar Refining Co., wants to destroy the beet-sugar industry, of which it is the principal stock owner.

If beet sugar—

The article continues—

is to be encouraged as it has been under Republican administration the Sugar Trust magnates well know that internal competition will within a few years make their own business extremely precarious.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Utah to that statement. As a matter of fact, in 1830 we produced twice as much of the consumption of sugar in this country in continental United States as we produce to-day. With all your forcing of the beet industry you neither lowered the price, compared to other countries and conditions in other parts of the world, nor have you increased the volume of the product relative to the consumption of the country. The very reverse is true. The article continues:

Upon the whole, however, our Democratic friends in Congress are to be commended for the cheerfulness and even gusto with which nearly all of them tackle their dish of crow. We all know they do not hanker for it. Indeed, they hate the very sight of it. They eat it simply because they must eat it or starve.

And when we see them almost as one man step briskly and smilingly to the counter and jab their forks into the detested bird, one hardly knows whether he should express tearful sympathy for suffering martyrs or uproarious admiration for dead game sports.

Anyhow, the beet-sugar industry is to go on.

Mr. President, without burdening this body with a purely theoretical discussion of tariff principles, there are one or two fundamental and ancient Democratic tariff principles which I think ought to be called to the attention of this body and to the attention of the country, not that I have any hope that it can now change the situation here or can alter the immediate result, but in the hope that it may bring Democrats everywhere back once more to the solid ground of the fundamentals upon which their faith on this question rests, because for one I do not believe, for one I do not concede, that the Democratic Party is afraid of its position on the tariff question and finds it necessary to avoid issue with the Republicans on that question in order to win this or any other election. If there is one distinctive issue on which the parties are at variance, it is the tariff, and if there are fundamental principles that are utterly and irreconcilably at variance between the parties on any one question it is on this tariff question. The issue can neither be dodged nor soft-pedaled, and why any Democrat should wish to do either is more than I can understand. The Democratic tariff position is right, and if we abandon it we will court a certain defeat, and, what is more, will deserve it.

And yet to-day, Mr. President, sometimes in this body and sometimes elsewhere, we hear echoed such sentiments as this: "Oh, while we are levying a tariff for revenue, of course we have got to take care of the industries and business of the country"—not accidental protection, hardly incidental protection, but protection on purpose, protection meted out not for governmental purposes and not for revenue purposes, but for selfish purposes.

Ah, gentlemen, I beseech my colleagues on this side, yield to no such heresy. Do you think the consumer at home will care what reason you give when you vote for these protective duties? What does the man at home who has to build a house care if I stand on this side of the Chamber and vote, for instance, for a $2 duty on lumber, and say, "I do it for revenue purposes," and a Republican stands on the other side of the Chamber and votes for the same identical amount of duty and says he does it for protection purposes? The man who has to pay the bill will care precious little for the reasons that animate you or me or for the motives that control your vote or mine. It is results he is looking for.

So I say, for one, although I should stand absolutely alone, I repudiate any such doctrine as this incidental and accidental protection that we hear nowadays once in a while proclaimed from high sources. It is not the ancient faith of my party; it is not its fundamental doctrine.

Mr. President, the first time after the Civil War that the fires of sectional hate and of sectional prejudice were low enough to permit a real political battle in this country, on the first occasion when we got far enough away from reconstruction and its horrors and its prejudices to have a real political battle in this country, we nominated a great Democrat, whom every Democrat in this country believes we elected President in 1876—Samuel J. Tilden. Let me read you, my party associates on this floor, just one short sentence from the ringing declaration of principles upon which we made that great fight for that great Democrat. I read from the Democratic national platform of that year as follows:

We denounce the present tariff, levied upon nearly 4,000 articles, as a masterpiece of injustice, inequality, and false pretense. It yields a dwindling, not a yearly rising revenue. It has impoverished many industries to subsidize a few. It prohibits imports that might purchase the products of American labor. It has degraded American commerce from the first to an inferior rank on the high seas. It has cut down the sales of American manufactures at home and abroad, and depleted the returns of American agriculture—an industry followed by half our people. It costs the people five times more than it produces to the Treasury, obstructs the processes of production, and wastes the fruits of labor. It promotes fraud, fosters smuggling, enriches dishonest officials, and bankrupts honest merchants. We demand that all customhouse taxation shall be only for revenue.

There is no incidental protection or accidental protection there.

Again in 1892, when the first Democrat that we had elected since the Civil War had been defeated after serving one term, we renominated that great Democrat for President—Grover Cleveland. We made a distinctive tariff fight. I want to read you from the declaration of principles upon which we then went to the American people.

SEC. 3. We denounce Republican protection as a fraud—a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purposes of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered.

There is no incidental or accidental protection there. Ah, gentlemen, I can go to an even later period. I can refer you to the platform of 1912, upon which we won the last election. You will find substantially repeated—I will not stop to read it now—the same declaration of principles that we made when we elected Tilden in 1876; that we made when we first elected Cleveland in 1884, and again made when we reelected him in 1892.

Not only that, but there is another latter-day heresy that I wish to combat as far as my feeble powers will permit. Gentlemen are saying in both Houses of Congress and outside of Congress—and especially outside of Congress—and especially those who think they will profit thereby, that they believe in some protection on everything; that they could write the free list for which they are willing to vote on their thumb nails. And that is said to be sound Democratic doctrine. If it is, I shall have to unlearn on this question all the Democracy I was ever taught, for I was taught that one of the fundamental Democratic principles was that a tariff should be levied in this way: First, either no tax at all, or the very lightest possible tax upon the food necessities and upon all the necessities of life generally; second, a moderate tax, and a moderate tax only, upon the comforts of life; and, third, the highest tax consistent with revenue purposes upon the luxuries of life. I think I can demonstrate, Mr. President, to the Senate and to the country that that is not only my individual view, but that it is ancient and fundamental and accurate Democratic faith. I am not going back any further than recent platforms to show authority for that proposition. Here is what we advocated in 1884, when we elected Grover Cleveland:

Sufficient revenue to pay all the expenses of the Federal Government, economically administered, including pensions, interest and principal of the public debt, can be got under our present system of taxation from the customhouse taxes on fewer imported articles, bearing heaviest on articles of luxury and bearing lightest on articles of necessity.

In the Democratic Campaign Book, prepared for the campaign of 1912, which was sent out through this country, especially to Democratic speakers and Democratic newspapers, in referring to the record of the preceding House of Representatives, a majority of which was Democratic, we said:

It—

Referring to the House of Representatives—

has made an excellent record in revising the tariff downward to a revenue basis, having passed measures thus affecting the schedules of most vital moment to the people, namely, wool, cotton, metal, chemical, and has placed sugar and other necessary food products on free list.

It was on that declaration of principles that we asked the American people to support us in the last election.

Mr. President, in 1914 there was another general declaration on this subject in the campaign book we then sent out to the American voters. We said by way of encomium upon ourselves:

It—

The Democratic tariff law—

reduces the duties formerly paid on sugar and abolishes the duty entirely in 1916.

That was when we were asking to have this very Congress elected. We said again:

It abolishes all duties on meats, fish, dairy products, flour, potatoes, coal, iron ore, lumber, and upon many classes of farm machinery and office equipment.

In other words, we were boasting that we had carried out the ancient Democratic doctrine of placing articles of prime necessity upon the free list.

Mr. President, no man acquainted with the industry can dispute for one moment the proposition that sugar is an article of prime food necessity. Without undertaking to go at length into a dissertation upon that subject, I think I can show that all medical and health experts agree to that proposition. It has been insisted in some quarters, in this Chamber and elsewhere, that a great percentage of the sugar consumed in this country went into the manufacture of confectionery, ice-cream

soda, and such articles as that, and gentlemen therefore sometimes assert that sugar is not one of the articles of prime necessity of life.

It is not a fact that the larger per cent of our sugar goes into these manufactures. As a matter of fact, two-thirds of the sugar consumed in this country—or practically that percentage—is consumed directly upon the table, and in its direct refined form, the people eating it, whereas about one-third of the total consumption of sugar enters into the manufactures I have mentioned and other kindred manufactures. For instance, the per capita consumption of sugar in the United States in 1910 was 81 pounds; and the greatest experts in this country say that careful investigation shows that of the 81 pounds consumed per capita in that year 53 pounds were directly consumed and the remainder only went into manufactures. Senators can figure the percentage for themselves.

Now, Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senate to recent Democratic utterances on this subject of sugar.

First, I read from the platform of 1912. In commending the schedule bills that had been passed by Congress, which was in session at the time the Baltimore convention convened, our party in its national platform used this language:

> We call the attention of the patriotic citizens of our country to its record—
>
> Referring to the House of Representatives—
>
> of efficiency, economy, and constructive legislation.
>
> It has, among other achievements, revised the Rules of the House of Representatives. * * *
>
> It has passed bills for the relief of the people and the development of our country; it has endeavored to revise the tariff taxes downward in the interest of the consuming masses, and thus to reduce the high cost of living.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt that the Democratic national platform in 1912 indorsed the free-sugar bill passed that year by the House of Representatives. Gentlemen may contend that certain transactions that occurred in the privacy of a committee room might tend to show otherwise; but I dispute the soundness of that view or the accuracy of that conclusion. In the first place, all the convention knew and all the great masses of the American voters knew was the Democratic platform as it was written and as it read; and, in rebuttal of the statement made by my good friend, the distinguished senior senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD], the other day on the subject, I called attention to the fact that during the last session of Congress the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], himself a distinguished and prominent member of our party and chairman of the Baltimore convention, gave testimony in direct contravention to the understanding of the Senator from Louisiana, and stated to this body and to the American people that there could be no doubt that that convention had pledged the Democratic Party to the cause of free sugar. Not only that, but I will refer to the contemporaneous construction of Congress and call to mind that the Congress which passed the Underwood-Simmons bill as soon as the election was over, while the platform pledges were fresh in our minds, put sugar on the free list, although this vexatious delay of three years was agreed to. When the delay of three years was proposed I warned my colleagues then that if they acceded to that delay the chances for free sugar would be very much less; that either something would happen or some pretext would be given to renew this fight in the interest of the people who get a bounty out of this system of taxation on this great article of food necessity; and you see what has happened.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. HARDWICK. I will yield to the Senator briefly or I will yield to him later at any length as soon as I can cover some ground which I desire to cover.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, I merely want to say——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Georgia in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield; yes, sir.

Mr. BROUSSARD. What I desire to say will take only a minute. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact—I know he does not want to make any statement that is not borne out absolutely by the facts—that the Senator from Kentucky, while a very prominent member of the convention at Baltimore, being permanent chairman of that convention, in his address declared for free sugar specifically by name, following that declaration of the chairman of the convention the committee on resolutions reported the platform, the chairman of the convention, the Senator from Kentucky, at no time taking part in either the drafting of the platform or in the preliminaries or the argument in behalf of the platform to be submitted and adopted by the convention.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is true enough, Mr. President; but the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the permanent chairman of that great convention, ought at least to have had as much ordinary comprehension of what was happening and what the platform meant as the average Democratic masses or as the average American voter had; and if the Senator from Kentucky, the chairman of that great convention, could not know about these cloak-room conferences, how on earth could the Democratic masses or the American voters know about them, and of what real importance are they?

Now, let us see. Not only that, but one of our greatest achievements—the one that we boasted most about—was the routing of the sugar lobby here in the last Congress. Why, when we went to the people of the United States in 1914, in the congressional election, we devoted page upon page to the exploitation of that great achievement. We told about how they had misused the franks of distinguished and illustrious Senators who are still Members of this body. We told about how a gentleman named Mr. Oxnard had gotten rich out of capitalizing the tariff and turning his watered stock into good, hard cash at the expense of the consuming public. We told all the details about the feverish and unnatural and reprehensible activities of this lobby that was here to fight free sugar.

Ah, Senators, I have been informed that many years ago a great Senator from Missouri stood on this floor, when Jackson had beaten one of the bank bills, and there was exultation on the Democratic side of the Chamber over the accomplishment of that much-desired result, and the boast was made: "We have driven this beast to the jungle." Benton replied: "Yes; you may have driven her to the jungle, but she will return from the jungle with all her whelps."

His words were prophetic in that case; and without change they could well be applied to all we have said and boasted about the sugar lobby, and our exposé of it, and our relief of the people of the United States from the enormous burdens and exactions that are imposed upon the consuming public by means of the tax on sugar.

Mr. President, it is insisted that we must have this duty because the Government needs it, because the Government can not get along without it; that we must prepare for war in order that we may maintain peace; that we must have a larger Army and a greater Navy, and can get the needed revenue in no other way. Sir, if that were true, and absolutely true, however much I regretted to do it, I would vote for the motion now presented by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. But I insist that it is not true, either in form or in substance, that we are obliged to levy this tax for the purpose of governmental revenue, and I will tell you why.

Do we need revenue, and revenue only, with no incidental or accidental protection, from schedule E, the sugar tariff? If we do, why is it that we have not followed the example already given us by Germany, by France, by Belgium, by Russia, by Austria-Hungary, by Spain, yea, by every important country on this earth that raises any considerable amount of revenue out of sugar—Great Britain raises only a small amount—except the United States? In those countries, and every one of those countries, they levy a tax on consumption, direct and professed; not indirect and insincere.

Is a tariff a tax on consumption? Every Democrat so contends; so, after all, when we lay a tariff tax we are levying a tax on consumption. But there is this difference between the two kinds of taxes, consumption taxes both. Under one plan, the European plan, every dollar of the tax levied goes into the Government till. Under our plan, the so-called American plan—and I am not proud of it—one half of it only goes into the Government Treasury, while the other half goes to enrich the domestic producers of sugar, both in continental United States and in its insular possessions.

Why do I say that? Because sugar in many respects is one of the most highly illustrative items to which tariff principles and tariff theories can be applied. What is the situation to-day with reference to the production and consumption of sugar in this country? We consume almost 4,000,000 long tons a year. It is estimated for this year, I think, that our consumption will be three million eight or nine hundred thousand tons. Of that amount, we produce one-fourth, 25 per cent, in continental United States—cane sugar in Louisiana and beet sugar in the West—25 per cent more in our insular possessions, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and some small amount from the Philippines. The other 50 per cent we import from abroad, through the customhouse, nearly all of it, over 99 per cent, coming from the island of Cuba, justly called the sugar bowl of the world.

We levy at present a tax of 1 cent a pound at the customhouse door. Every pound of Cuban sugar pays that tax. No pound of Louisiana sugar, of western beet sugar, of Hawaiian

sugar, of Porto Rican sugar, or of Philippine sugar up to 100,000 tons per year pays a cent; and yet every pound of Louisiana sugar, of Hawaiian sugar, of Porto Rican sugar, of Philippine sugar—every pound of domestic sugar, in other words—costs the American consumer just as much as every pound of Cuban sugar, on which the duty is paid. What is the result? We levy on American consumption, upon the stomachs of our people—yours and mine, Senators—a burden of $86,000,000 a year, and of that amount we put $43,000,000 in the Treasury of the United States and at the same time we put $43,000,000 more in the pockets of the sugar producers.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. The statement was made the other day, I think by the Senator from Michigan, that $100,000,000 was invested in the beet-sugar business in the United States. That was an extravagant statement of the amount, as I shall try to show before this debate is over; but assuming, for the sake of the statement, the correctness of the amount, and then doubling it so as to represent the amount invested in the cane-sugar production—say, $200,000,000 or $250,000,000—the percentage of $43,000,000 which is thus given to this industry is enormous, and of itself represents a profit that is far and away beyond the average profit derived by capital invested in ordinary business.

Mr. HARDWICK. I quite agree with the Senator; and I say another thing to the Senator, and I measure my words: Since we have had this tariff duty on sugar, beginning with the Dingley bill—I am willing to go only back that far—beginning with the Dingley bill, the consuming masses of the United States have paid ten for one for every dollar invested in any branch of the sugar industry in the United States and in all of its insular possessions. We had far better buy them out and stop the profit if we would put it on plain business principles.

Now, my fellow Democrats, if we want revenue and nothing but revenue, why do we not get the most revenue that we can get with the least burden? Do you say to me now that it is a new and an untried thing, and that our people do not like excise or consumption taxes? My reply is twofold. In the first place, this tax, a consumption tax on sugar, will be paid by the great refiners of the country and possibly a few of the great beet factories; actually, in my judgment, less than 100 people would pay it—fully as few people as pay the tariff tax to-day—so there would be no groaning, no burdening, no protestations from the American people, if you are afraid of that.

Ah, but they say it is a new and untried thing. I say not. It has been tried in the most highly civilized countries of this earth, and in nearly all of them. We do not have to tread a new and untrodden path. We have the laws already written by the great nations of Germany and Austria-Hungary and France and all these other great European countries. We have their experience in the administration of the laws. We can give no such paltry excuse as that. A 1-cent tax on all the sugar, domestic as well as foreign, would double the amount of revenue that the Government gets, and would not increase the burden on the consumer one single penny, for the reason I have already explained.

If so—and no Senator who investigates the question can deny it—why do we not levy the tax in that way? If we must have it, and we must have it out of sugar—a food necessity of life—for Heaven's sake let us levy it so that when we tax the stomachs of our people, so that when we charge them a tax on this prime article of food necessity, no private, selfish interests will be subsidized in the process, but every penny of this hard-wrung money will go into the Public Treasury.

Mr. President, in that connection I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a carefully prepared table or plan showing exactly how this consumption tax can be adjusted to each degree of raw and refined sugar and what the result would be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that may be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 75° would be 0.568 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 76° would be 0.588 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 77° would be 0.6096 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 78° would be 0.6304 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 79° would be 0.6512 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 80° would be 0.672 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 81° would be 0.6928 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 82° would be 0.7136 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 83° would be 0.7344 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 84° would be 0.7552 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 85° would be 0.776 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 86° would be 0.7968 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 87° would be 0.8176 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 88° would be 0.8384 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 89° would be 0.8592 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 90° would be 0.88 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 91° would be 0.9008 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 92° would be 0.9216 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 93° would be 0.9424 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 94° would be 0.9632 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 95° would be 0.984 cent per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 96° would be 1.0048 cents per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 97° would be 1.0256 cents per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 98° would be 1.0464 cents per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 99° would be 1.067 cents per pound.

The rate on sugar testing by the polariscope 100° would be 1.088 cents per pound.

The application of such a tax for 1916 would work out about as follows:

	Test.	Production (long tons).	Rate per pound.	Revenue realized.
	°		*Cents.*	
Philippine raw sugars	88	175,000	.8384	$3,286,528
Hawaiian raw sugars	96	575,000	1.0048	12,941,824
Porto Rican raw sugars	96	350,000	1.0048	7,877,632
Louisiana and Texas raw sugars	96	175,000	1.0048	3,938,816
United States refined from Cubans, etc	100	1,875,000	1.088	45,696,000
Domestic beet refined	100	750,000	1.088	18,278,400
Estimated consumption	.....	3,900,000	.....	92,019,200

Mr. HARDWICK. Now, if we do not do that—and we did refuse to do it; I presented such an amendment and urged it upon the Senate committee, and they would not accept it—will not the people of this country be driven into the irresistible and irrefutable conclusion that we did not do it simply because we wanted to give a certain amount of protection to the beet and cane producers of this country? Undoubtedly. They can arrive at no other just conclusion. There is no escape from it. You can twist it as you will, you can get off all the sophistry you please about it, you can argue until we are all blue in the face, but, after all, the common, sober sense of the American people will be strong enough to understand that we retain this tax in its present form because we found it necessary not to raise a certain amount of revenue for the Government but to afford a certain amount of protection to certain interests in this country. We had just as well understand what we are doing. I have studied this question a great many years. I am not going blindly into any vote on it. I know what my actions about it mean, and I know what my vote on it spells. Therefore I find myself utterly unable to support the motion made by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

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

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I understood the Senator from Georgia to say, first, that no duty should be imposed upon sugar because it is a prime necessity of life, entering into the daily consumption of the people.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator understood me correctly.

Mr. BROUSSARD. And that if there must be some revenue derived from sugar, that revenue should not be collected at the customhouse, but should be collected just before it enters into consumption, or at the factory. Now, would the Senator carry that doctrine to other necessities of life? For instance, second in importance in Louisiana to the sugar industry is the rice industry of that State. Upon that article there is a duty imposed under the Underwood bill. Would the Senator carry out his theory of abstention from the imposition of taxes upon the necessities of life so as to extend it to rice as well as to sugar?

Mr. HARDWICK. I think I understand the Senator's suggestion, and I am going to reply to it with candor.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I should like, while the Senator is replying——

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator pardon me just a moment? After I cover the ground I have set out, I will yield with pleasure to the Senator, but——

Mr. BROUSSARD. Just in the same connection I want to continue the question.

Mr. HARDWICK. Very well; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Would the Senator then, if he would apply that to rice as well as to sugar, apply it to cotton cloth and other manufactured articles upon which a duty is now imposed? Would he also put a production tax upon these things, so as to obviate the necessity of collecting any duties at all at the customhouses of this country?

Mr. HARDWICK. Replying to the Senator's question, I wish to say that wherever it was necessary to levy a tax on a food necessity of life, and that article was a competitive article—namely, an article produced in considerable degree in this country, and to a considerable degree imported from a foreign country—the course I have suggested here ought to be followed. My answer to it is, in a broader and a more general way, that I can not see to save my life why we should not levy, from my standpoint and from my view of the tariff, a tax solely on noncompetitive products graded, as I have said, heaviest on luxuries, more moderate on comforts, and lightest on necessities. That would be my answer to every suggestion involved in the Senator's question.

The Senator has anticipated just a little the very argument I was to about to make. I say that we do not have to get this revenue from sugar at all. If we did, we ought to get it so that all of it would go into the Government Treasury and none of it into private pockets, but we do not have to get it from sugar at all.

It appears from the last monthly summary of the foreign commerce of the United States, that during eight months ending January, 1916, we imported nearly $65,000,000 worth of coffee into this country; that during the same period of time we imported fifteen and a half million dollars worth of tea into this country; and during that same period of time our sugar importations amounted to a little less than $80,000,000—$65,000,000 of coffee, fifteen and a half million dollars of tea, and $79,000,000 of sugar. What Democratic reason can you give for letting sugar be taxed while coffee and tea come in free? If I were a Republican I could answer you. I would say, "I let the sugar be taxed because I want to build up an American industry with a protective tariff, and I did not tax coffee and tea because there is no industry to stimulate in this country of that sort, and besides they are necessities of life, and I dislike to tax them." But what Democrat can answer that question? They are all breakfast foods—coffee, sugar, and tea. There is no coffee and there is no tea produced in this country. Half the sugar we consume is produced in this country. Yet it is proposed under Democratic principles, forsooth, to tax one necessity of life produced in this country and not to tax the other two that are not produced in this country and in the other two instances, to wit, coffee and tea, if you did tax them every dollar of the tax would go into the Public Treasury. Now why do you not do it? If you want to be consistent, if you want to be logical, if you want to be Democratic about this thing, coffee and tea are not any more necessities of life than sugar and why not tax them all? Are you afraid of the cry that you are taxing the breakfast table? If that is it, why do you tax sugar and leave coffee and tea untaxed?

Then again let us take another article. During this same period of time ending January, 1916, we imported into this country $73,802,459 worth of crude india rubber. Crude india rubber is a noncompetitive product, largely used in this country, although not entirely, in making articles of luxury and not of necessity. Yet crude india rubber comes absolutely untaxed into this country although most of it is used in the luxuries of life, and sugar that every poor man as well as every rich man must have is taxed, and crude india rubber is untaxed. Why this difference? A Republican will answer that crude india rubber is not produced in this country and therefore the imposition of a tax would not aid American industry. What answer, however, can a Democrat who does not believe in protection make?

Now, let me make one more illustration. I concede it is the most extreme one, in all probability, that can be made in the schedules. During this same period of time, eight months, ending January, 1916, we imported into this country a little over $65,000,000 worth of raw silk, absolutely untaxed, free of duty. Raw silk is a noncompetitive product. If you levy a tax on it you foster no industry, you benefit no local industry. Therefore I can understand why Republicans do not tax raw silk, but why Democrats should not I do not know. If it is true that our silk factories could not stand foreign competition without free raw material, then why could we not afford to increase the duties on manufactured silk, the same being a luxury? I ask the Senate and I ask the country, Under what Democratic theory do we leave raw silk untaxed and raw sugar taxed? Are the backs of the rich to go unburdened, while the stomachs of the poor pay the bill?

I wish next to invite the attention of the Senate and of the country as briefly as may be to certain facts and conditions relating to our domestic sugar, both cane and beet, both continental and insular, prior to the breaking out of the European war, and then I want to undertake to tell you as briefly as I can what has happened since then and the result of that war. I am going to take up, first, the case of Louisiana and the production of cane sugar there, because it is nearest my home; and, of course, I love my Louisiana friends a little better than people not quite so close to me and not so nearly related by ties of blood and affection. So I take the Louisiana case first. The facts I am going to give are undisputed facts, not only proven by the testimony of witnesses through long and laborious investigation but agreed to by the unanimous report in most instances, in fact, of a committee, almost half Republican, of the other House of Congress.

The cost of producing a pound of cane sugar—that is, raw sugar—in Louisiana is 3¾ cents. The cost of producing a pound of raw cane sugar in Java is 1½ cents; in the Philippines, 1¾ cents; in Porto Rico, Cuba, and Hawaii, about 2 cents. I hope the Senate will have those figures fixed in its attention. There is no dispute whatever about these facts, as will be seen on examination of the evidence submitted to the special committee on sugar and from the report of that committee and from recent hearings before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. From the above figures it is perfectly apparent that, so far as the production of cane sugar in Louisiana is concerned, it is nothing more nor less than a hothouse proposition. The cost of production is being gradually but surely lowered in Cuba, the Philippines, Porto Rico, Java, and, I think, in Hawaii. In Louisiana I do not believe that it is being lowered at all, but, if anything, is increasing. It is my judgment that the Louisiana sugar-cane industry can not and will not long survive free sugar. Indeed, I do not believe, as I have stated more than once, that the industry can continue and prosper in Louisiana even under our present rate of duty, and that it is practically certain that its doom is already decreed by the fixed and unalterable laws of nature. Let me state some of the reasons for this opinion. In Louisiana the sucrose in the cane is from 6 per cent to 7 per cent. In Hawaii it is from 14 per cent to 15 per cent; in Cuba, from 10 per cent to 11 per cent, occasionally 14 per cent. In Cuba the cane is only planted once in every 10 years, and in Louisiana it must be replanted, or practically replanted, every year. In Cuba frost never interferes with the maturing of the crop, whereas in Louisiana the cane has to be cut early in October; hence its sucrose contents are low, as I have already shown. It seems to me that for these reasons it is perfectly apparent why Louisiana can not profitably continue to produce cane sugar in competition with tropical countries; and if she is driven out of the sugar business it will not be the unkindness of the Democratic Party that accomplishes this result, but the stern decree of the God of nature, for sugar cane is the natural product of a strictly tropical country, and Louisiana is located too far to the north for its successful cultivation in competition with tropical countries. Great and insuperable as are these natural disadvantages, Louisiana labors under certain other disadvantages growing out of inefficiency, which contributes to the high cost of production in that State. Antiquated machinery and open-kettle mills might be mentioned in this category, for as a whole the industry in Louisiana is inefficiently organized, nor is it well equipped. This will be readily seen when it is remembered that in Louisiana 210 mills produce an annual average of 330,000 tons, whereas in Cuba 174 mills produce annually 2,328,000 tons.

Mr. THOMAS. What are the figures?

Mr. HARDWICK. Three hundred and thirty thousand tons in Louisiana, against 2,328,000 tons in Cuba. The labor cost in factories in Cuba and Louisiana is practically the same, and for field labor Louisiana pays hardly as much as is paid in Cuba. It appeared in the sworn testimony before the special committee that in Louisiana the sugar planters pay the following rates for field labor: Seventy-five to 80 cents per day to men; 75 cents per day to women and $1 per day in harvesting time; whereas

in Cuba for the same class of labor the planters are paying from $1 to $1.25 per day, and in Cuba the women do not work in the fields.

Mr. President, I am not going to elaborate that; Louisiana is too far north; there is not enough sucrose content in her sugar. The frost comes there too early and the cane has to be cut too soon. She can not and never will compete successfully with the tropical countries. Her cost of production, 3¾ cents a pound, according to the sworn evidence of best citizens and most successful planters, is almost double that of Cuba, almost double that of Hawaii, and more than double that of Java.

What are we to do? That a few planters in Louisiana may maintain a hothoused industry, are we to forever tax 100,000,000 American people?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. GALLINGER. I know the Senator from Georgia does not want to be interrupted, but——

Mr. HARDWICK. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to ask him a question for information merely. If the labor cost is substantially the same in Cuba and Louisiana, how does the Senator account for the greatly increased maximum cost of production in Louisiana?

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator has just come in?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. It is on account of the difference in the sucrose content of the sugar cane and the differences in season. There is not as much sugar in the cane they raise. That is the trouble.

Mr. GALLINGER. That accounts for it?

Mr. HARDWICK. That is it. It is just the law of nature, that is all; a decree of nature entered in due and regular form. You will have to repeal a law of nature if you are going to enable Louisiana to compete successfully with these tropical countries. To use a familiar illustration, you can raise bananas or oranges in the State of my friend from New Hampshire if you put a hothouse there and make the American people pay the cost of it; but I do not believe that is right, I do not believe it is democratic, I do not believe it is American to take a few people and for their sake make 100,000,000 people pay more for every pound of this food necessity that they must eat.

The situation is not vastly different with reference to the sugar-beet industry, and I shall endeavor to demonstrate it.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the Senator can also demonstrate that the natural advantages which the sugar beet has in the arid and semiarid regions of the United States will make it a still more dangerous competitor of the Louisiana industry as time passes.

Mr. HARDWICK. I quite agree with the Senator about that. He has stated it so well that I shall not undertake to elaborate it here, especially as I have much ground to cover.

Mr. President, I am going to ask the permission of the Senate to insert in my remarks certain newspaper articles and certain observations relating to the stock watering of the beet-sugar companies.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

According to the last statement issued by Mr. Truman G. Palmer, representing the beet-sugar factories, it appears that there are now located in the United States 76 factories engaged in the production of beet sugar. These factories are located in the following States: Colorado, 17; Michigan, 16; California, 13; Utah, 6; Idaho, 5; Wisconsin, 4; Nebraska, 2; Montana, 1; Minnesota, 1; Kansas, 1; Iowa, 1; Illinois, 1; Indiana, 1; and Arizona, 1. From the reports of Bradstreet's Commercial Agency it appears that the total capitalization of these 76 factories is $141,410,000, and that their combined capacity for slicing beets in tons per day is 63,550 tons.

These figures demonstrate beyond all question the extent of overcapitalization of the companies that operate these factories.

Why? Let us see what the beet-sugar men have themselves sworn before several of the House committees. In the hearings on the Payne tariff bill before the House committee Mr. F. R. Hathaway, secretary and treasurer of the Michigan Sugar Co., estimated the cost of a beet-sugar factory to be $1,000 per ton of daily beet-slicing capacity. At the hearings before the special committee on sugar during the last Congress, Mr. Henry T. Oxnard, of the American Beet Sugar Co., made exactly the same estimate, as did Mr Charles W. Nibley, of the Amalgamated Sugar Co. of Utah. While Mr. Oxnard at a subsequent time did seek to raise his figures, and while some others testified to a slightly higher figure than $1,000 per ton, yet other witnesses swore to even lower figures, notably Mr. E. N. Combs. of Colorado, fixing the figure at $600.

On the whole, therefore, I believe we may safely take $1,000 per ton of daily slicing capacity as the true basis of cost and the real value of a beet-sugar factory. On that basis the true value of all the beet-sugar factories in the United States does not exceed $63,550,000. Indeed, according to the unanimous report of the special committee of the House on sugar during the last Congress, we estimated the amount of this investment at a somewhat smaller figure, $60,712,500, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] agreed to that figure, along with his other Reoublican colleagues on the committee. So that it appears the beet-sugar factories of this country as a whole are capitalized at from two to two and one-half times their actual value. While we are considering this question of the overcapitalization of the beet-sugar factories, it might be as well to call the attention of the committee to the facts about the three largest of the beet-sugar companies and to see exactly to what extent this mania for overcapitalization has affected them.

First, let us take the Great Western Sugar Co., a Colorado concern, but chartered "under the laws of New Jersey"; but that charter, Mr. Chairman, was granted before the days of New Jersey's regeneration. [Laughter and applause.]

It was capitalized at $30,000,000, one-half preferred and the other half common stock, but of this stock only about $24,000,000 was issued. Its nine factories, all located in Colorado, have, according to its last statement a total daily beet-slicing capacity of 10,600 tons, which ought to represent a real value of approximately $10,600,000—on the basis of $1,000 per ton. So that its stock is more than one-half water, except so far as it may, perhaps, now represent accumulated and undistributed earnings. Under oath the company returned its property for taxation in the State of Colorado at $2,500,000 as late as 1910 or 1911. Although its stock, under its New Jersey charter, was originally more than half water, yet it manages to pay 7 per cent interest per annum on its preferred stock, or $1,050,000, and 5 per cent interest per annum on its common stock, or $750,000. This means a total annual dividend of $1,800,000 on a real investment of $10,600,000, as already explained, or about 17 per cent dividend on the actual investment. Nor do these dividends represent anything like the total net earnings of this largest and greatest of the beet-sugar factories, as I will now proceed to show the committee. It must be recalled that the American Sugar Refining Co., commonly known as the Sugar Trust, owns 26 per cent of the common stock and 38 per cent of the preferred stock of the Great Western (report of special committee, p. 13) according to the admissions of both the Great Western and the trust.

During the recent investigation of the Sugar Trust in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, among the letters of the Sugar Trust was discovered a most interesting letter from Mr. Chester S. Morey, of Denver, Colo., president of the Great Western Sugar Co., to Mr. Washington B. Thomas, then president of the American Sugar Refining Co. This letter was dated March 19, 1910, and read as follows:

"MY DEAR MR. THOMAS: Inclosed herewith I hand you copy of the financial exhibit and income statement. This is the form in which we expect to publish these statements, and they will also be used when we make application to list our stock on the New York Exchange.

"You will notice that this year, in addition to the regular 2½ per cent depreciation which we have been deducting for the last three years, we have set up $1,000,000 in depreciation reserve. I do not want this year's earnings to appear as large as they would if we had not made this entry. Of course this can be changed if the board of directors does not approve of it.

"You will note that our total surplus is shown by these statements as a little over $5,000,000. This does not include any surplus from the Billings Co., the Great Western Railway Co., and other corporations, which really add nearly $2,000,000.

"Our sugar is invoiced at 4 cents, and judging from present market indications there is at least $1,000,000 profit that will show up in next year's business. The value of our real estate and railroads over and above the amount at which they are carried is at least $5,000,000, so that the actual surplus is nearer $9,000,000 than $5,000,000.

"Am pleased to say that at some of our factories the farmers are signing up acreage and feel more encouraged than I did a week ago.

"The details of these statements I will bring with me when I come to the stockholders' meeting."

When it is recalled this company was chartered in 1905 and it is seen by the above letter that in five years, by 1910, it had accumulated a surplus of $9,000,000, besides paying dividends for fully that amount, as I have already shown, and also allowing the regular 2½ per cent for depreciation, it will be seen that this company's annual net profit on its real investment during these five years was 36½ per cent—17 per cent for dividends, 17 per cent for surplus, and 2½ per cent for regular depreciation. It thus appears that in the short space of five years it made a total of 182½ per cent on the actual capital invested. No wonder that its president, Mr. Morey, juggled the entries, according to his own letter; no wonder that he said, never expecting his letter to become public, "I do not want this year's earnings to appear as large as they would be if we had not made this entry."

Let us next look into the American Beet Sugar Co., a concern operating six factories, two in California, three in Colorado, and one in Nebraska, with a total beet-slicing capacity of 5,300 tons per day. According to the standard of $1,000 per ton of daily beet-slicing capacity, the factories of this corporation represent a real value of $5,300,000, and yet we find this company, with the water injected into it somewhat more freely than usual, capitalized at $20,000,000—$5,000,000 preferred stock and $15,000,000 common stock. And it appears that in seven years from the time of its organization it had paid annually 6 per cent interest on the actual investment and had cleared seven and one-half millions besides, for at the end of that time its common stock, which had no value whatever in the beginning, was selling at $50 per share, while its preferred stock, with a guaranteed dividend of 6 per cent, was selling above par. In seven years it paid $2,100,000 in interest on its preferred stock, and its earnings created a value of 50 cents on the dollar for its common stock—pure water—or $7,500,000. This is a total of $9,600,000 on the investment of $5,000,000 in seven years, or a little over 190 per cent, or 24.3 per cent per annum on the actual investment. It must be remembered also that we have not been able to learn the whole truth about the profits of this company in any such way as we discovered it in Mr. Morey's case. Personally I do not doubt that their profits have been fully as great as those of the Great Western, if we could find out just how they have kept their books, as we did in the other case, but it seems to me that the showing is strong enough as it is.

In reference to the earnings of this company, I next invite your attention to an article in the Beet Sugar Journal of April, 1911, as follows:

"American Beet Sugar Co. sets new high record. The report of the American Sugar Co. for the year ended March 31, 1911, shows total income of $8,357,012, an increase of $1,347,368 over the previous year, and a surplus, after preferred-stock dividends, of $1,643,659, equal to 10.95 per cent earned on the $15,000,000 of common stock, compared with $1,097,252, or 7.31 per cent, earned in the previous year. The common stock has not yet paid any dividends. The preferred pays 6 per cent. Comparative results for the past three years follow."

"Then are given the figures for 1911, 1910, and 1909. For 1909 the gross receipts were $7,135,326; total income, $7,156,855; expenses, interest, tax, etc., $5,863,713; balance, $1,293,143. Well, now, we will take 1910: Gross receipts, $6,983,772; total income, $7,009,644; expenses, tax, interest, etc., $5,612,391; balance, $1,397,252. For 1911: Gross receipts, $8,344,792; total income, $8,357,012; expenses interest, tax, etc., $6,413,353; balance, $1,943,659. Preferred dividends, $300,000 in each of the years 1911 and 1910 and $245,400 in the year 1909, leaving a surplus of $1,643,659 in the year 1911, $1,097,525 in the year 1910, and $1,047,743 in the year 1909. 'The general balance sheet as of March 31 shows total assets of $22,577,371.'

"The reserve for working capital is $1,825,637, against $832,151 a year ago, and there is a reserve for betterments and improvements of $377,246, a new item. Bills payable to the amount of $1,266,000, which appeared in the previous balance sheet, have been paid off. H. R. Duval, president, says: 'The surplus has been applied to working capital, which is now adequate for ordinary operations. The company is now free of all debt. There was an increased production of 196,741 bags, exceeding that of any former year. The increase was principally due to California, though Grand Island increased 31,704 bags. In Colorado the decrease was 88,624 bags. Due largely to increased efficiency of the plants, the cost of making sugar, as compared with previous campaigns, was somewhat diminished. Taxes increased $30,989, of which $25,560 was the Federal corporation income tax. Depreciation and maintenance cost $344,842—was $13,119 less than last year.' The design of this expenditure (included in the above statement in expenses) is to keep the plants up to their original condition."

It appears from the above that during the year 1911 the American Beet Sugar Co., after paying its preferential dividend of 6 per cent on its preferred stock (real value) earned 10.91 per cent on $15,000,000 of common stock—water. This represents in all an earning of $300,000 (interest on preferred stock) plus $1,643,659 (surplus), or $1,943,659, which, in turn, is almost 39 per cent profit during the year ending March 31, 1911, on the real investment.

I next invite your attention to a statement in the American Sugar Industry of March, 1912, in reference to the profits of this same company—the American Beet Sugar Co.—for the year ending March 30, 1912:

"The net earnings of the American Beet Sugar Co. for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1912, will probably not exceed 12 per cent, instead of the 15 per cent estimated last December. The reason assigned for this is that the company began to sell its 1911 crop too early. Sales were made in advance of production in order to take advantage of what seemed a very flattering profit. Sugar prices advanced and it is estimated the difference to the company amounted to between $300,000 and $500,000. The company then went to the other extreme and held back the remainder of the 1911 crop on a declining market."

As the dividends on the preferred stock are fixed at 6 per cent and are paid before any other dividend and before any surplus is laid aside it is quite evident that the 12 per cent "net earnings" refers to the amount of surplus set aside, which is figured from the basis of the amount of the common stock, so that it appears that for the year ending March 31, 1912, the American Beet Sugar Co. earned $300,000, interest at 6 per cent on its preferred stock, plus $1,800,000, surplus, the equivalent of 12 per cent on $15,000,000 worth of common stock, or $2,100,000, which is a little more than 40 per cent on its real investment.

One more illustration of this mania for overcapitalization among the beet-sugar factories and of the excessive profits they hope to conceal by this operation, and I shall pass on. We will next take the Michigan Sugar Co., from the State of my friend Mr. FORDNEY.

The present capitalization of the Michigan Sugar Co. consists of $3,703,500 preferred stock and $7,471,107 common stock, a total of some more than eleven millions. Here, again, we find "the trail of the serpent," for it appears from its own statement that "the trust"—the American Sugar Refining Co.—owns 35 per cent of all the common stock and 55 per cent of all the preferred stock of the Michigan Sugar Co. This company operates six factories, all located in the State of Michigan, with a total beet-slicing capacity of 5,450 tons per day. This represents, according to the rule laid down by Mr. Hathaway, its own secretary, an investment of approximately $5,450,000, and yet, as we have already seen, its present capitalization is more than double that amount. It was chartered in 1906, with an authorized capital of $9,000,000, one-half preferred and one-half common stock, not all of which was issued. It simply represented at the time of its charter an attempt to form a small, local beet-sugar trust among a number of Michigan factories that had been previously independents and competitors of each other. It was simply a Michigan manifestation of the prevailing "trust-organizing" mania with which the country was then mad, and was attended by the one invariable sympton of the disease, to wit, overcapitalization.

Let me now call your attention to certain reliable trade reports in friendly journals touching the profits this company has made.

I quote, first, from the Beet Sugar Journal of May, 1910:

"The Michigan Sugar Co. reports a profitable year. The regular annual meeting of stockholders of the Michigan Sugar Co. was held at the Eddy Building, Detroit, Mich., Wednesday afternoon, May 25, 1910. There was a representative attendance to hear the statement of the officers as to the year's business. The year was a profitable one, the company being able to show a surplus of $3,025,000 after expending $3,500,000 for labor and beets, and also paying regular dividends, not only on the preferred, but on the common stock as well. As the Wednesday meeting was the regular annual meeting, no dividend was declared."

I next invite your attention to an extract from the Beet Sugar Journal of July 6, 1910:

"Offers of 121 for stock in the Michigan Sugar Co. have been made within the last month, and the stock is now considered one of the best on the Detroit or, for that matter, any market. The enormous profits, coupled with the favorable prospects, are the causes for the increase in interest and price in stock. The net profits of the Michigan Sugar Co. in 1909 exceeded $1,500,000, and the financial statement submitted at the annual meeting last month showed a surplus of $3,000,000. By a person in close touch with the workings of the company it is stated that the earnings from the sale of the by-products is almost enough to meet the dividend payments. The stock has trebled in value in little more than a year.

"'Michigan sugar stock is now one of the best investments possible,' says a local broker who has been prominent in handling the stock; 'there are more buyers for it than there is stock for sale, and probabilities are an even higher mark than already touched will be reached before the break comes. All Michigan sugar companies are prospering. When the "trust" came into the State some years ago it smashed many independent companies, but in recent years, due to the improved methods of growing and manufacturing, which permits large profits to the farmer and extraordinary profits to the factory, several independent companies have been rehabilitated and are now sharing in the general prosperity.'"

It appears from the above that from 1906 to 1910 the Michigan Sugar Co., besides paying 6 per cent on its preferred stock, made three millions in profits, "trebled the value of its stock in little more than a year," and made almost enough money from its by-products to pay its dividends. In four short years it paid back every dollar of real money invested in it, or fully 25 per cent per annum.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am going to discuss now the practical situation that the beet-sugar people faced prior to the breaking out of the European war.

But the beet-sugar companies insist that, even if they have prospered marvelously under the Dingley and Payne rates, this does not prove that they can stand alone without any aid whatsoever, and they further insist that after three years, when this great necessity of life shall be untaxed, that they will perish beneath an avalanche of German and Cuban sugar. Let us look into that a little. In the first place, let me call your attention to the fact that our American beet-sugar factories have one great advantage over their foreign beet competitors in that while our factories produce refined sugar, ready for table and trade uses without further process of manufacture, that is not true of the German or any other foreign beet factories. In foreign factories the manufacture is not carried so far, and the sugar produced by them has to go through a process of refining, as our cane sugar does, before it is ready for table and trade uses. This process of refining costs the foreign beet-sugar man fully 0.4 cent per pound.

Nor is the difference in the cost of factory labor, if any, a serious handicap to the American factory, as the total labor cost of manufacturing does not exceed 14 cents per 100 pounds.

Fuel, relatively a far more important item of expense, is more abundant here than abroad and is much cheaper, especially in the West, where this industry is located, and oil is largely used as fuel.

Besides these considerations it must be remembered that the difference in geographical extent between this country and Germany gives to our domestic sugar factories a natural protection growing out of freight rates, which is most important and to which I will advert later. All of those considerations are important, however, and must not be overlooked.

Now, let us consider the freight-rate question just a moment, and then I will pass to a discussion of the question from the standpoint of the producer of sugar beets, the farmer, if you please. When the Brussels convention, after agreeing on everything that affected the production, importation, and exportation of sugar as in and between the various European countries that were the powers signatory—by the way, let me say that there was a very ludicrous statement made on the floor the other day about the Brussels conventions. It has been years since the Brussels convention has been in effect, yet some gentleman the other day in discussing this question insisted with an air of solemnity that the Brussels convention had something to do with the present situation. Now, let us see.

When the Brussels convention came to consider the protection that their beet sugar needed against tropical cane sugar, the sugar scientists of the world agreed that a tariff duty of one-half cent a pound, or, to be exact, 0.47 cent per pound on raw sugar and 0.53 cent per pound on refined sugar was sufficient.

Let me say to my friend from Utah that is the reason why Mr. Lowry has always insisted that that was the amount of duty that they should have.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not hear the Senator's remark.

Mr. HARDWICK. I say when the Brussels Convention was in session all the European scientists agreed that the natural advantage of cane over beets amounted to 0.47 cent on raw and 0.53 cent on refined, and therefore Mr. Lowry, the gentleman to whom the Senator referred, always contended as his personal view that there ought to be a duty of half a cent a pound.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. Since the Senator has referred to this question, if he will allow me a moment I will state my opinion as to the reason why Mr. Lowry wanted half a cent a pound duty on sugar.

Mr. HARDWICK. Would the Senator rather do that later? I will yield before I get through.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator does not want to be interrupted——

Mr. HARDWICK. I will yield now. I have wandered from that point and I do not think it is important. That is just my own opinion of Mr. Lowry's view.

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

Mr. SMOOT. I will wait and state it in my time.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will yield to the Senator in my time, but a little later if he will permit me.

To continue: This decision was made after the most careful estimates as to the cost of production of beet sugar in Europe and of cane sugar in the various tropical countries, and after carefully considering the cost of transporting the cane sugar across the seas and finally to the consuming centers of the various European countries.

Now, so far as the latter element, namely, the cost of transportation, is concerned we must remember that it is practically negligible when compared to similar cost of transportation in our great country. So highly developed are these European countries in the matter of transportation that canals and water routes of all kinds intersect and traverse every part of the more important of them. On these canals the rates on heavy freight, like sugar, are so low that they are almost a negligible factor. As a result, German beet sugar has very little, if any, more protection over tropical cane than the amount of the duty—one-half cent per pound. On the other hand, even after foreign sugar, cane or beet, reaches our coast there are large parts of our great territory that it can not reach at all without paying a far greater freight rate than the differential that the Brussels convention has fixed between European beet and tropical cane sugar. The territory which this freight-rate protection would preserve to the beet factories is far greater than they can possibly supply with sugar if they will supply all of the territory in which a reasonable profit on actual investments will enable them to sell.

There are great regions of the country in the very vicinity of many of these factories where the freight rate on sugar is from 70 to 80 cents per hundred pounds, and this is the natural territory in which these factories can best operate and sell their product at a reasonable profit on the actual investment and yet as cheaply as the consumer could buy it from anyone else.

Now, let us see how German beet or Cuban cane could drive the American beet factory out of business, provided the American beet factory is willing to content itself with a fair and reasonable profit on the actual investment. Let us first take German beet sugar. Its cost of production, refined, is 2.415 cents per pound. The cost of ocean freight, Hamburg to New York, and insurance is 0.12 cent per pound. This would make a cost of laying it down at New York, duty free, 2.535 cents per pound.

To this figure, according to the sugar experts, should be added 0.18 cent per pound to make up the difference in grade between the Hamburg sugar and our beet sugar. This makes a total cost of 2.715 cents per pound delivered in New York. Now, take our beet sugar. The Spreckles Sugar Co. (beet), of California, admits that it is producing it at a cost of 2.70 cents per pound. The Oxnard (Cal.) factory of the American Beet Sugar Co. is admittedly producing it at a cost of 2.81 cents per pound, and according to the testimony of Mr. E. U. Combs, of Colorado, the Great Western Sugar Co. has produced it at a cost of 2.56 cents per pound.

Most of these figures can be verified by consulting page 23 of the report of the sugar committee. Mr. Combs's figures can be verified from the testimony taken by the committee. Now, let us go one step farther. The report of the sugar committee, taking the figures submitted by the beet factories themselves, found the average American cost of production to be 3.54 cents per pound. The difference between that figure and the German cost, laid down at New York, is only 0.735 cent per pound, and I submit that even this difference is more than equalized by advantages in freight rates that our domestic producers will have in a territory far greater than they can supply. Besides, in considering these questions, we must remember that the cost figures I have given to-day are simply the ex parte statements of the beet-factory people, made while they were battling to uphold the tariff, made while they were urging that there was a large difference in the cost of production here and abroad, and hence, from their standpoint, an absolute necessity to maintain the protective duties. Under these circumstances, I insist that, without reflection on any of these gentlemen, we are bound to take their statements with at least one grain of salt, to construe their evidence most strongly against themselves, to accept the lowest rather than the highest or even the average figures they gave us.

Again, our domestic beet factories insist even if they could survive competition with German beet sugar they could not survive the competition with cane from Cuba. The cost of producing a pound of raw cane sugar in Cuba is about two cents a pound. I have stated that already.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to inquire of the Senator if these are not the cost figures given by the select House committee on sugar, of which the Senator was chairman?

Mr. HARDWICK. They were given by witnesses before the committee and they were agreed to by the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. It was the conclusion of the committee?

Mr. HARDWICK. It was the conclusion of the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator where the committee got the information or upon what testimony did it base its conclusion as to the cost of foreign sugar?

Mr. HARDWICK. I will tell the Senator with pleasure. We had there the greatest experts in the world, for instance, Mr. Wallace P. Willett, of New York, said to be the greatest sugar expert in the world, and who had expert knowledge on that question. We had other gentlemen before the committee testifying under oath who had large plantations and operated them in Cuba, Porto Rico, and Hawaii.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to say to the Senator that my object was simply to bring out the source of information as to the cost of foreign sugar, inasmuch as the Senator had already given that information as to domestic sugar.

Mr. HARDWICK. We had absolute and direct proof. We had the greatest experts we could secure. We had people who claim to have engaged in the business either in Porto Rico, Cuba, or Hawaii. I think in all cases there was sworn evidence. I will state to the Senator that the figures I am giving have been the result of the most exhaustive and elaborate congressional investigation of this question that was ever undertaken.

Mr. NORRIS. I hope the Senator does not get the idea that I am questioning his figures. I only asked for the purpose of bringing out all the information. I am somewhat familiar with that investigation.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am glad the Senator gave me an opportunity to do it. I understand the Senator knows that. I just want to make an observation now. Let us take the situation in Cuba. The cost of producing a pound of raw cane sugar in Cuba is around 2 cents (report sugar committee, p. 230). This is raw sugar, and to it should be added 0.5 cent per pound, cost of refining (report, p. 23), also approximately 0.12 cent per pound, cost of freight and insurance to New York, or a total of 2.62 cents per pound, not materially or substantially different from the figure at which German sugar can be laid down at New York, and there is therefore no more danger that Cuban competition will overwhelm any properly located, honestly managed, fairly capitalized American factory than that German competition will do so. Indeed, if the American cost of production is what I firmly believe it is, somewhere around 2.75 cents per pound, the difference in cost of production between American beet sugar, on the one hand, and German beet and Cuban cane, on the other, is so small as to be almost if not wholly negligible.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows, however, that in the hearings before the Committee on Finance of the Senate it was testified that they could produce sugar at $30 a ton, which would be a cent and a half a pound, and as far as San Domingo is concerned, wherever they received an offer of $30 a ton they sold as little as they could; when they received an offer of $35 a ton, of $1.75 a hundred, they sold very freely, and when over $35 a ton was offered them they always sold ahead as far as they could.

Mr. HARDWICK. I suppose the Senator is quite right about that. That is human nature. People, I take it, in all lines of industry do that. They try to sell at the highest prices they can get and they hold back as long as they think they can get any more. That is true of cotton, corn, sugar beets, wheat, and everything else.

Mr. SMOOT. I made the statement because of the fact that the Senator was basing his estimate on the sugar cost of 2 cents a pound, which is $40 a ton in Cuba. I doubt very much whether sugar costs 2 cents a pound in Cuba.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, I am afraid he has misapprehended my statement. I was giving the cost of production. Of course they all, foreign and domestic producers, make as much profit as they can out of the sale of their product all the time. I am merely showing whether or not they could compete.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator, in showing the cost to the beet-sugar companies, had the books of the company before the com-

mittee; they were thrown open; all the information was given that could possibly be given; no information was kept back; the cost to the company was given to the committee; but such is not the case in Cuba nor in any other part of the world. I may take occasion, if I have time to-day, to quote from Mr. Willett, because I think he is one of the greatest experts in the world on the sugar question.

Mr. HARDWICK. He is one of the greatest experts in the world on that question.

Mr. SMOOT. I know the gentleman very well, and I repeat, I consider him one of the best experts in the world on the sugar question.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I think there is one element entering into the question of the cost of the production of beet sugar, information as to which was held back from the committee. My recollection now is that I was not able to find anything upon the subject in the testimony. That element has reference to the by-products from the manufacture of beet sugar, which amount to about 47½ cents per ton of beets for sirup, and so forth.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator from Colorado is right in a way and he is wrong in a way. Testimony of that nature was before the committee, but I did not include it in my estimate. It probably ought to be included.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator's recollection regarding the testimony is much better than mine; but in estimating the cost of the production of anything allowance should be made for everything that is of value either by way of a by-product or otherwise.

Mr. HARDWICK. I quite agree with the Senator. Probably the cost of producing beet sugar could be slightly lowered when that is taken into consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in the statement made by the sugar companies, in arriving at the cost of sugar, I see that all of their expenses and all of their receipts of every name and nature are taken into account. The books are balanced, showing actual cost, and if beet pulp is sold for 25 cents a ton and the sirup is worked over, and a profit is derived from it, the amount goes into the treasury of the company just the same as receipts derived from original sugar production. Then the production of the plant is considered in connection with the receipts of the company and a showing is made of exactly what the cost of production of a hundred pounds of sugar beets is to the factory.

Mr. HARDWICK. Of course, the committee was not infallible; we may have made mistakes, and we may have left out some of the items of receipts from by-products suggested by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]; but I think, in the main, the Senator will find that the figures we gave in regard to the cost of production are substantially accurate both for this country and foreign countries. I think if the Senator will look into that matter carefully he will find that to be the fact.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator will pardon me for calling his attention at this point to the statement of Mr. Oxnard. In 1889, when speaking of the cost of the production of sugar, he said:

> Greater than all of the above assurances of the permanency of the sugar industry in the country is the fact that sugar can be produced cheaper here than it can be in Europe

Mr. HARDWICK. I thank the Senator from Colorado for the reminder.

Mr President, there is one other phase of this beet-sugar question to which I want to refer before I pass on to something else.

But our beet-sugar factories insist that even if it be granted that fuel is cheaper here than abroad, and that their machinery is better than that of their foreign competitors, and that the factory labor cost is so small a proportion of the total cost of producing a pound of sugar as to be almost negligible, and therefore that any difference in factory wages is not an important factor, that still there is one overwhelming and unanswerable reason why they should have a protective tariff on sugar, and that reason is to enable them to pay the American farmer a higher price for his beets than he could otherwise get or than the farmer of any other country gets for his beets. It is therefore insisted that, after all, the man the duty protects is the American farmer, and in his name the beneficiaries of the duty attempt to call a halt on this movement to untax one of the great necessities of life. Let us look into this question and weigh it carefully. Mr. President, I sometimes think that there are more appeals to ignorance, to passion, to prejudice, in the name of the American farmer than of any other name that I can think, unless it be possibly that of the American laborer. Why the intelligence and honesty of both of them should be so often affronted is more than I can comprehend, and yet it does seem to me that this particular appeal "in the name of the American farmer" is the most unjust and unjustifiable one that I have ever heard, and I protest against it as emphatically as I can in behalf of the great masses of the American farmers throughout the country, who constitute the very backbone of its prosperity and well-being, and who demand no more than a square deal and an even chance to earn their living in the sunshine of the Almighty, unhampered by unnecessary burdens and unfair discriminations against them, and demanding neither discriminations in their favor against other people, nor special privileges of any kind whatsoever.

In the first place, take the whole body of American farmers everywhere. Have you no regard for their rights and their interests? Do you propose to make fish out of one kind of farmer and fowl out of another kind? I do not believe, as I will undertake to show you later, that the removal of this duty will make it necessary for the factories to pay the farmer any smaller price for sugar beets, nor do I believe the beet factories will be able to get the beets at a lower price, nor that the farmers will stand for such unnecessary reduction in price, but even if it did mean that the farmer must take a lower price for his sugar beets, which I utterly dispute, what then? It appeared from the testimony of many witnesses who were sworn by the sugar committee and were engaged as farmers in the production of sugar beets in the various Western States that the net profits per acre of the sugar-beet farmers varied from $19.20 to $76. Taking the average of the figures given by the first 14 witnesses on this subject, it would appear that the average net profit per acre of the sugar-beet farmer throughout the West was about $43.37 in the year 1911. According to the figures of the Department of Agriculture, the average net profit of the American farmer in the production of wheat was $3.07 per acre, and the average net profit of the American farmer engaged in the production of corn was $8.15 per acre. The above averages do not include any allowances whatever for rent of land. These are given by the department for the year 1909, but I do not believe that the figures of 1911 or 1912 will materially vary from them. The estimate of the average net profit of the American farmer engaged in the production of cotton is not above $6 per acre. It is often much less, but certainly never much larger. Now, is the American farmer who makes $3.07 on his acre of wheat, or $6 on his acre of cotton, or $8.15 on his acre of corn, to be taxed in order that other American farmers, infinitely smaller in number, shall be allowed to make $43.37 on an acre of beets? It is not right; it does not appeal to our sense of fairness and of justice between man and man.

Now, I will put into the RECORD, Mr. President, certain foreign and domestic prices paid to the farmers for their product during the year 1911, if I may have the permission of the Senate to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission to do so will be granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

> In California the price of beets in 1911 was $5.30 per ton of beets grading 16 per cent, and a contract has been made for an increase of 75 cents per ton for the year 1912. (Hearings, p. 3873.)
>
> In Utah and Idaho the ruling price is $5 per ton and freight, which makes the beets cost, delivered at the factory, over $5.60 to $5.65 per ton. (Hearings, p. 797.)
>
> In Colorado and Nebraska the price averages from $5.50 per ton to $6.50 per ton. (Hearings, pp. 400, 888.)
>
> In Michigan and Ohio the customary contract calls for a payment by the factory of $4.50 per ton for beets testing 12 per cent sugar with 33⅓ cents per ton for each additional per cent of sugar in the beets, with a minimum guaranty of $5 per ton. (Hearings, p. 719.)
>
> Compare these prices with the prices paid in Europe. Mr. Czarnikaw, of London, one of the most eminent authorities on sugar conditions in the whole world, states that the usual price paid for beets in countries that are parties to the Brussels convention—and that includes most of the beet-sugar producing countries in Europe—was $5.11 to $5.48 per ton. Messrs. L. Behrens & Son, of Hamburg, fix the price at from $5.32 to $6.70 per ton. Messrs. H. J. Merck & Co., of Hamburg, reporting for the district of Stettin, fix the average price at $5.78 per ton. In Posen the price varied from $5.59 to $6.49, the average being $6.27 per ton. In Belgium and Holland the average in 1911 was $5.79 per ton.
>
> It will be noted that the American figures I first gave were those of the beet-sugar factory people and that it is difficult if not impossible to find the average price paid throughout the country from those figures. I therefore call your attention to the last annual report of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, in which it is stated that the average price paid to the farmers of the United States for sugar beets for the year 1911–12 was $5.50 per short ton, and for the three previous years $5.35 per short ton.

Mr. HARDWICK. In that connection, and for the present edification of Senators from beet-sugar States, I wish to refer to the following letter addressed to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], and used by me, with his permission.

In this connection, I may state that the French Government has fixed the price by statute as a war measure:

NEW YORK, *April 10, 1916.*

Senator CHARLES S. THOMAS,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Weekly Statistical Sugar Trade Journal of April 6, quoting from the "Centralblatt," states that a price for sugar beets in Holland has been decided upon as 24 florins ($9.65 per ton) for 14 per cent beets, with an allowance of 1½ florins (60 cents) for each degree of sugar contents above 14 per cent.

The Statistical Sugar Trade Journal has now given us the following sugar-beet prices for the campaign of 1916:

	Per ton.
Holland—	
For 14 per cent	$9.65
For 16 per cent	10.85
Austria-Hungary	8.12
French Government	9.65
German Government in Belgium	8.49
United States	5.54

Respectfully, yours,

FRANK C. LOWRY.

Mr. President, I think I shall soon be able to conclude what I wish to say on this subject. The situation that I have just been outlining to the Senate and to the country with reference to sugar conditions, sugar prices, was the situation prior to the outbreak of the European war. At the outbreak of the European war conditions changed in the twinkling of an eye, because the great bulk of European beet sugar was withdrawn from the export markets of the world.

England, for instance, the greatest sugar-consuming country in the world, next to the United States, and sometimes ahead of the United States in that respect, bought her supply of sugar from Germany and Austria-Hungary; but with the withdrawal of several million tons of German and of Austria-Hungarian, Belgian, and French beet sugar, a different condition came. We have been face to face with a condition like this: A consumption as great as ever, and possibly greater—because soldiers require an unusual amount of sugar—and a decreased production. German and other European beet fields have been planted in wheat and other food supplies. The great reservoirs of export beet sugar from Austria-Hungary, Germany, and other central European countries are no longer available. So prices have soared; and yet, because of that condition, thoughtless gentlemen are fond of flippantly saying: "Well, you reduced the tariff on sugar 25 per cent, but in spite of that reduction the price of sugar rose." Ah, gentlemen, what an insult to the intelligence of the people to whom such observations as that are addressed. No matter how much the price rose, it would have risen that much more if the duty had not been reduced. If the duty had been 25 per cent higher, the price would have been just 25 per cent higher also.

Not only that, Mr. President, but I propose to put into the RECORD the prices taken from Willett & Gray's Sugar Journal, the recognized American authority and one of the recognized world authorities, showing that from the time the Underwood-Simmons bill went into effect until the war broke out the price of sugar did fall, and that it fell correspondingly with the reduction of the duty. Of course, after the war broke out normal conditions no longer prevailed; the conditions became abnormal, and the duty was so small a relative factor in price fluctuations that it was hardly appreciable. I ask permission to put that in the RECORD, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

	Period of weeks.	Average in-bond price, 96° raws.	Cuban duty, 96°.	Duty-paid price, raws.	Average net price, refined.
		Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
1904	5	2.091	1.348	3.439	4.36
1905	2	2.092	1.348	3.44	4.45
1906	14	2.072	1.348	3.42	4.375
1907	6	2.085	1.348	3.433	4.566
1911	3	2.102	1.348	3.45	4.566
1913	16	2.089	1.348	3.437	4.229
1914	(1)	2.04	1.01	3.05	3.819

(1) Mar. 1 to June 1.

Mr. HARDWICK. Now, Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to some things connected with the people for whose benefit, to the extent of 50 per cent at least, we are going to retain the duty on sugar, their present situation, the lack of present necessity for it, and the lack of present justification for the imposition of such duty. I read first from the San Francisco News Bureau of Monday, March 6, 1916:

HAWAIIAN SUGAR STOCKS.

Honolulu.—While stocks continue to climb, investors, speculators, and all persons interested in Hawaiian sugar stock or its profits, which means practically all the business men in the Territory, are wondering how large a part of the millions now held in reserve will be paid out in special dividends. That extra dividends will be declared by most of the companies is generally conceded on all hands, though no intimation of any official nature has been given out that any such plan is in the wind. Dividends of from 20 to 30 per cent and even higher in some instances were paid by the sugar companies during 1915—

This refers to the Hawaiian companies—

but without exception those on a paying basis piled up huge reserves—

That is in addition to the dividends paid—

because of the then uncertain prospect of the sugar tariff. Free sugar is not even a remote danger, and there is no prospect of an early termination of the European war to reduce prices.

They are gloating over the soaring prices which our consuming masses must pay—

With land and mills in the best condition ever known in the history of the industry on these islands, and with bulging treasuries, it is held certain that big dividends will be paid—

Paid when?

as soon as the bill repealing the free-sugar clause has safely passed Congress and been signed by the President.

As soon as the bill repealing the free-sugar clause has safely passed Congress and been signed by the President they will cut the melon, and not until then, for fear that we might have a glimmer of intelligence, an interval of sanity, and not do this thing.

Sixteen companies had on hand cash balances totaling $8,751,000 at the end of 1915, according to the best obtainable information.

Here is another melon that is almost ripe; and as soon as this bill "speeds on its joyous way through this Capitol to the other end of the Avenue" and receives there the Executive approval, doubtless this melon also will be cut. I quote from the New York News Bureau of March 30, 1916:

It is understood that the Great Western Sugar Co. has been ripening a melon that is almost ready for plucking. This company, one of the largest beet-sugar producers in the world, has prospered enormously since the war lifted raw-sugar prices to the highest level of years. The common stock, of which there is $10,544,000 outstanding—

And, by the way, according to the testimony every dollar of this $10,544,000 common stock is water—

has advanced from 50 last September to the present market of 200.

Mr. THOMAS. It is 206 now.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator from Colorado informs me that it is 206 now.

There is likewise $13,630,000 7 per cent preferred outstanding, the authorized amount of each issue being $15,000,000. The American Sugar Refining Co. is a substantial minority stockholder.

Great Western Sugar has paid common dividends of 5 per cent since January, 1910.

Not one dollar of that common stock is real value; it is all water.

The company issues no financial statements, but it is said on authority that the 1915 earnings were safely over 50 per cent on the common stock. For the current year, if sugar prices hold, the company may easily earn $70 a share. Therefore, so far as earnings alone count, the company could easily multiply its present dividend, but because of the uncertainty regarding possible tariff reduction directors have so far stifled the temptation.

Here it is again—

But, because of the uncertainty regarding possible tariff reduction, directors have so far stifled the temptation.

They also were afraid that we might have an interval of reason, that we might return to sanity and hesitate about this thing.

Great Western had approximately $10,000,000 cash on hand at the beginning of the present year and about the same amount in sugar. It is likely that current liabilities were small, so that the excess current assets were probably equal to $200 per share on the common stock, setting off plants against the preferred stock issue.

Great Western Sugar is in a position to pay a handsome extra dividend in cash or to capitalize part of its bulky surplus by the declaration of a stock dividend. The belief is prevalent that some such action is a near-by probability.

When? When this bill passes; after the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] shall prevail and this bill completes its joyous way through this Capitol to the other end of the Avenue to receive the Executive approval.

I desire now to refer to the Hawaiian sugar companies. I quote from the San Francisco News Bureau, March 10, 1916:

HONOKAA SUGAR EARNINGS.

Honolulu-Honokaa Sugar Co. and the Pacific Sugar Mill, by the purchase of 175,000 shares of stock in the Hawaiian Irrigation Co. (Ltd.), the price totaling more than $95,000, now own practically all the shares in the latter corporation, according to reports presented to Honolulu and Pacific Sugar shareholders at their annual meeting.

I am not going to read all of this article, but I ask permission to print the remainder of it in the RECORD. It shows very large earnings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that course will be pursued.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The annual report of F. A. Schaefer, president of Honokaa, follows in part:

"The cost of producing a ton of sugar was considerably reduced, viz, from $65.136 to $54.242, these figures not including bond interest, etc., while the net profit on the crop over and above all charges was $161,849, which includes a charge of $17,720 sinking fund on the bonds, which is payable to the trustees during this year. During the year the directors, on the authorization of the stockholders, purchased a four-sevenths interest in 122,500 shares of the Hawaiian Irrigation Co. (Ltd.) for the sum of $81,475, paying for the same in cash. This purchase gives to this company and its neighbor, Pacific Sugar Mill, practically all of the shares of the Hawaiian Irrigation Co. (Ltd.) and is expected to prove very advantageous."

Referring to the annual report of F. A. Schaefer, president of Honokaa Sugar Plantation, refers to the fact that the cost of production was reduced approximately $11 per ton.

Mr. HARDWICK. Furthermore, Mr. President, I ask permission to present and have printed a table showing that the 16 Hawaiian companies during 1916 made dividends of $8,751,000, as per the list attached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter will be printed as requested.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 15, 1916.]

SIXTEEN HAWAIIAN COMPANIES HAD $8,751,000 CASH ON HAND.

(By Charles Remington.)

Sixteen Hawaiian sugar plantations, according to actual figures in some instances and estimates in others, closed the year with $8,751,000 cash on hand. This fund has been built up during the past two or three years in anticipation of free sugar. Now, that the likelihood of free sugar in the next few years is practically past, the fund will be kept nearly intact for the purpose of meeting this or other unforeseen viscissitudes. The fund, however, is deemed large enough by most of the plantations, so that stockholders in most instances can reasonably expect a full distribution of 1916 earnings, which promise to break all records. The amount of the cash balances on hand December 31, 1915, were:

Ewa	$593,000
Hawaiian Agricultural	600,000
Hawaiian C. & S. Co	1,316,000
Hawaiian Sugar	550,000
Honomu	240,000
Kokaba	390,000
Koloa	90,000
Maui Agricultural	1,122,000
McBryde	71,000
Olaa	453,000
Oahu Sugar	1,000,000
Onomea	715,000
Pepeekeo	400,000
Pioneer	415,000
Waialua	398,000
Wailuku	400,000
Total	8,751,000

Mr. HARDWICK. I will next call attention to some of the stock quotations and show how they have jumped since it has been found that we are going to stick to this policy of protecting the sugar industry and since the war began.

The preferred stock of the American Beet Sugar Co.—and the preferred stock, of course, has a guaranteed income attached; it is pretty nearly a fixed value—was selling at $65 on March 1, 1914, while on February 1, 1916, I think that is the date meant to be given, it was selling for $95. The common stock of the American Beet Sugar Co. sold for $20 a share on March 1, 1914, and for $68 on February 1, 1916.

Mr. THOMAS. And it is selling for $74 now.

Mr. HARDWICK. And it is selling for $74 now, my friend from Colorado suggests.

The preferred stock of the Great Western Sugar Co., which has a guaranteed income to it, rose from $91 on March 1, 1914, to $112 on February 1, 1916, and the common stock of the same company, during the same period, rose from $45 to $140, and is selling now for $200, indeed, for $206, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] advises me.

The Michigan Sugar Co. common stock rose from $35 a share March 1, 1914, to $102 a share on February 1, 1916, and now it is $112, as my friend from Colorado states.

So they all have a share in this thing. There are "melons" enough for all of them, but lemons only for the consumers of the country.

Now, I will refer to some of the Porto Rican sugar companies. The South Porto Rico Sugar Co. common stock sold for $30 March 1, 1914, and for $170 on February 1, 1916.

Central Aguirre Sugar Co. preferred stock sold at $35 on March 1, 1914, and at $165 on February 1, 1916. The common sold for $15 on the first date and $167 on the second.

Mr. THOMAS. And it is now selling for $181.

Mr. HARDWICK. And it is now selling for $181, my friend from Colorado suggests.

I am not going to detain the Senate any longer on this phase of the question. The "melon" is ripe; it is to be cut, and, although the war has increased immensely the price of sugar, we are going to add to it just a little bit more by retaining the duty of 1 cent a pound. If we take it off, no matter to how high a level the war may send the price, we would reduce it from that high level at least 1 cent a pound——

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator think so long as the war conditions exist the tariff has any effect on the price of sugar?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes, sir; absolutely. That has been demonstrated mathematically. Let me give the Senator a further answer to that question, and I am glad he has asked it, for, perhaps, I have not made that plain. There are many other considerations besides the tariff that determine the price of a product, such as supply and demand, and a number of other considerations of that character. I think I have named the most important. With the great reduction in the supply and no corresponding increase in the demand, but, on the contrary, if anything, an increase in the demand for sugar, of course the price must soar, even if the tariff remains stationary; but no matter how high it goes, the price will go just that much higher if you raise your tariff duty. The tariff duty is just that much more added to the price.

On the other hand, no matter how high the price is, if you take the duty off sugar will go down in price that much, even from the high level where other conditions send it. That has been repeatedly and mathematically demonstrated with special reference to the sugar tariff; it has been proven by undisputed figures by all the greatest sugar experts in the world that that is true and that that has been the effect on the price of sugar of every tariff change that this country has made respecting that commodity. Of course, sugar will be high as long as the war goes on, because the world has not the supply of beet sugar from central Europe from which to draw; but if the tariff is raised, the price will be that much higher, and if the tariff is lowered the price will be that much lower.

Well, there may be two or three views of that. The practical politician might say, "Well, the war has carried the price of sugar so high anyhow that, even if you take the duty off, the price of sugar will still be higher than it was before the war broke out, and therefore the people will not know that you have done anything for them by reducing or removing the duty." But is that the logical way of looking at it? Is that the statesmanlike way of looking at it? Is that the way the American Senate, the American Congress, and the American President ought to look at it? If war conditions have made the price of this great article of food necessity higher than it was before the Underwood-Simmons bill passed, then there is all the more reason why we should reduce it as much as we can and lay no tax whatever upon it.

Mr. President, there are only one or two things more I desire to say about this matter before I am ready to vote on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

It has been one of the favorite statements of gentlemen who opposed free sugar that the trust will be benefited by it. Some of them may not know any better. I think, however, that some of them ought to be informed once and for all time on that subject.

Of course before you start out on an undertaking like that you must have it clearly and definitely understood what is means by "the trust." I do not think the Senator from Utah, for instance, would disagree with me that in the common acceptation of that term as applied to the sugar industry "the trust," commonly called and generally known as such in this country, is the American Sugar Refining Co.

Mr. SMOOT. I agree with that.

Mr. HARDWICK. It is by far the largest of the refiners, larger than all of its competitors combined, unless my memory of the figures is in error; and while it has some active competition and some tolerably strong competition and some honest competition, yet after all it towers head and shoulders above them all, and as Mr. Atkins, its president, said—he coined that famous phrase—"it holds the umbrella for all the rest."

I have heard the statement made in this debate by Senators who ought to know better and who ought not to make it that "the trust favors free sugar." I want to refer gentlemen of that kind to the testimony, and I am going to read it right here in the Senate now. I read from the hearings before the

Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on the Underwood-Simmons bill when that bill was pending before the committee of that body.

Mr. Atkins, vice president of the American Sugar Refining Co.—the trust, and the only trust, I want to say to the Senator, after two years' investigation, that I have been able to discover in this industry—in testifying before the Ways and Means Committee on January 15, 1913, stated as follows:

Mr. HARRISON—

Mr. Francis Burton Harrison, of New York, then a Member of the House of Representatives and now Governor General of the Philippine Islands, was conducting the hearing, or this part of it—

Mr. HARRISON. I would like to ask the witness a question. Mr. Atkins, you are vice president of the American Sugar Refining Co., which is popularly known as the Sugar Trust?

Mr. ATKINS. It is sometimes referred to as that.

Mr. HARRISON. Do you appear here representing the sentiment of the directors of that company?

Mr. ATKINS. Yes, sir; with their authority.

Mr. HARRISON. Are you in favor of free sugar?

Mr. ATKINS. I am not and my company is not.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. At that same hearing I think the Senator must admit that Mr. Charles R. Heike, secretary of the American Sugar Refining Co., testified——

Mr. HARDWICK. This was the testimony of Mr. Atkins before the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. Heike was secretary of the American Sugar Refining Co.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not want to yield to the Senator for that, because I can state it. I am perfectly acquainted with the facts.

Mr. SMOOT. So am I.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Heike was the secretary.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I say.

Mr. HARDWICK. He said his personal opinion was in favor of free sugar, but that he did not undertake to speak for his company; he knew his company opposed it. They always opposed it, and he stated he wanted it distinctly and clearly understood that this was only his personal opinion. By the way, he was at outs with them then. He was not in their employ at that time. He had been their secretary. His connection with the company had been severed then.

Mr. SMOOT. He testified that he was the secretary.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think he had severed his connection with it at that time. If I am in error I shall be glad to be corrected. He died soon afterwards. He had a whole lot of trouble, and was indicted about some of the frauds in connection with the weighing of sugar.

Mr. SMOOT. He without doubt died after he testified.

Mr. HARDWICK. Of course he did not die before he testified, but I think that at the time he testified he was no longer the secretary of the American Sugar Refining Co. He died soon after that, and my recollection is—the Senator can go back to the hearings and verify that——

Mr. SMOOT. I have them here.

Mr. HARDWICK. I know; I have them, too. The Senator says he has the hearings. Do they say that he was at that time the secretary?

Mr. SMOOT. I will turn to the testimony.

Mr. HARDWICK. All right. The Senator can correct me if I am in error. My recollection of it is that he said he had been secretary, and that he was no longer the secretary; that he no longer had any connection with the company. I think I am right about that, but if I am wrong it does not matter. The Senator can correct me either now or later on. But I know I am right about this; if my recollection was not correct about the other matter, it is about this—that when Heike expressed his individual opinion, he said, "Why, I am a free trader about everything, but I want you gentlemen to understand that this sentiment does not represent the position of my company at all, and nobody on this earth but me is bound by it." Now, there is no need of talking about whether the trust wants free sugar or not. Here it is. The trust swore, through its vice president and its acting executive—it had no president, or no active one, at that time—that he was speaking by authority of the directors and for his company, and that he was opposed to free sugar; so I do not think that the statement ought ever to be made again, in this body at least, that the "trust" favors free sugar. The exact reverse is true. The trust opposes free sugar now, and has always done so.

Now, Mr. President, just one other thing. We are about to pass on this motion of the Senator from North Carolina, and I find myself utterly unable to vote for the motion, although I know it is to prevail. I am willing to vote against it even if there is no vote but mine against it. I find myself unable to agree to the course that a majority of my Democratic colleagues on this side, from the very depths of their ignorance of this question, I think, in all charity to them, feel impelled to adopt. I believe if they understood it, as I think I know it after years of study, they would suffer almost any penalty, I have such a high opinion of each and every one of them, before they would do any such thing as this. In my judgment they surrender the very citadel of the Democratic tariff position by any such action as this; and, feeling that way about it, it is impossible for me to join in any such surrender.

I have spoken all over my State in favor of free sugar. At the request of the Democratic National Committee I was sent during the last campaign to many places where it was thought that a sugar argument would prove potent, to plead for the election of a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress, and to give free sugar as one of the reasons why we ought to elect both. I find it impossible, therefore, to yield my convictions on this subject. They are as strong as it is possible for human convictions to be. They are matured after years of study and years of investigation. I have no criticism and no feeling of unkindness toward my colleagues, Democratic or Republican, who feel that they must join in this movement and help "speed this bill in its joyous passage" through this body. For one, I simply can not do it; and I would that we still had in this body, on both sides of this aisle, more Senators who would join me in this effort to stand by the real interests of the consuming masses of the American people.

When this same Mr. Atkins was testifying before the special committee of the House, of which I had the honor to be chairman, and we asked him why not have free sugar, he ventured this observation:

They have never been able to get a reduction of the duties on sugar for this reason. There are 17 States in the Union producing beet sugar. Every one of these States has two Senators. There are 34 Senators, and every one of these Senators is a Republican. * * * They have never had an opportunity to get that reduction down. The probability is that they can not get any reduction now (1911) in the face of such strong opposition as that is.

So that the head of the Sugar Trust said at that time, in 1911, that there were 34 reasons why we could neither get free sugar nor get a material reduction in the duty on sugar from this Congress—34 reasons, 2 Senators each from 17 beet-producing States. That was his observation. Is he right?

Ah, Mr. President, the great men of this country, the men who have written its great tariff laws in the past, even when they did not agree with my party, even when they did not hold the views that I hold and occupy the position that I occupy on this great question, were not insensible of the country's real interests in respect to it.

When William McKinley reported the McKinley bill to the House of Representatives he said on the floor of that body on May 20, 1890:

I would have preferred, Mr. Chairman, if the article of sugar could have been left in the tariff schedule upon the dutiable list. This, however, was not practicable in the presence of an almost universal sentiment in favor of the removal of the entire duties upon this article of universal family use.

McKinley said he would like to keep it on the dutiable list, but it was not practicable, because the American people would not permit it—even then, in 1890.

In the same debate the gentleman from Maine, Mr. Dingley, used this expression:

The duty collected on sugar and molasses the last fiscal year was $55,975,610, or nearly 2 cents per pound. Adding to this the increased cost of 275,000,000 pounds of sugar produced in this country, equivalent to the duty of 2 cents per pound, and the duty imposed on these articles was practically a tax of $63,500,000, or $1 per head, on the people of this country.

Inasmuch as there is scarcely another article of common use not now on the free list which can not be promptly produced or made here nearly or substantially to the extent of our wants, the transfer of sugar and molasses to the free list will afford conspicuous relief to the people of this country.

Mr. President, Mr. Dingley was frank. He admitted that you added the amount of duty to the price of every pound of sugar, domestic as well as foreign, that was consumed in this country.

Again I read from another distinguished Republican of long and honorable service at the other end of this Capitol, Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON, of Illinois, who on May 20, 1890, said, when the McKinley bill was up:

Mr. Chairman, the placing of sugar on the free list will relieve each inhabitant, rich and poor, of $1 per annum of tax, and at least 50 cents of extortion levied by the sugar refiners.

The gentleman from California asks, Why give a bounty to the producers of sugar in the United States? Well, I answered my friend, I am not anxious to give a bounty if you do not want it. My principal anxiety is to place sugar on the free list and relieve the people from this great burden of taxation.

In 1894, when the Senate amended the Wilson bill, the late Senator Allison, of Iowa, said on this floor on June 8, 1894:

If I had my way, I would strike from this bill every vestige which provides a duty on sugar.

Mr. President, if I stand alone in this matter I am opposed to the motion made by the Senator from North Carolina. If we need revenue, we can go to many other places with far more fidelity to Democratic principles to raise it than to this common necessity of life. If we need a revenue and can get it nowhere else except from sugar, then we ought to provide that every dollar that we wring from the necessities of our people shall go into the Public Treasury, and not a penny of it into private pockets.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I believe the Government of the United States will be obliged to raise a very large amount of additional revenue in carrying out the policy of preparedness; but in doing so I believe it is the duty of the Representatives of the people in Congress assembled to raise this revenue where it will be felt the least, to raise it from the gigantic fortunes which under our system of government have grown up in this country. I think we should have a progressive inheritance tax, as they have in every one of the European countries, and from that source we ought to raise not less than two hundred millions per annum, and in that way meet the cost of preparing to defend this country and the wealth of this country.

It is a character of tax which will fall without oppression upon any person in the Republic. It certainly will not wound the feelings of the individual who has accumulated a gigantic fortune from whatever source, be it from the unearned increment or from the development of monopolies or the manipulation of the stock exchange, because he is dead; certainly it will not wound the feelings of the man who leaves the estate, because he has passed beyond the point where he has any care one way or the other for the possession of property. He has gone to a country to which he can not transfer his control over material things. It will not wound the feelings of his heirs, for the reason that when a man receives an inheritance of a million dollars he will not very closely measure whether or not the Government has taken over a small percentage of that vast inheritance.

We have in this country estates which go into the hundreds of millions of dollars; and I believe we ought to impose a tax, not upon the food of the people of this country but upon these gigantic estates. I do not wish to see this tax levied upon the breakfast table—to use that figure of speech—when just to that degree it relieves great estates from a tax which a wise public policy would impose upon them in any contingency. These estates have been growing so large that we have already reached a point in this Nation where a just public policy ought to abate them as containing within themselves and their prospective growth a menace to the peace and to the liberty of other men.

When a man has in his estate a thousand million dollars and can transfer it to a single individual, it is difficult for the human imagination to look forward and ascertain how great these fortunes will grow under a law permitting the perpetual life of corporations; and when they grow in this way they involve the material domination by their owners over the lives and over the happiness of hundreds of thousands and of millions of other people without any adequate control by law. I think the liberty of the world and the happiness of the world require that there shall be some decent limitation put upon the dangerous accumulation of property.

I regret very much that this issue has arisen; and I believe that the country ought to understand that we can raise these funds from these gigantic estates and remove this tax from the food of the people of this country; and I want to express my earnest opposition to any tax on sugar, though I realize that the demands on the Treasury are so great that many of my colleagues are persuaded they can not escape the demand for the tax on sugar.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I want to say only a word. I understand other Senators desire to speak on this subject, but I can not let this opportunity go by without paying tribute to a very distinguished Member of this body, in view of this vote about to be taken.

Men of various attainments secure seats in the Senate. Some are particularly noted for wisdom, others for oratory, a few for looks [laughter]; but there is one Senator here, able, affable, brilliant, and likable, who, when this vote is taken to-day, must be crowned as the only really successful prophet of the Senate.

I remember a very warm September evening when the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] was referring to the record of the Democratic Party and taking to task rather severely the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], who is the Senator I have in mind, because of the position the distinguished Senator from Louisiana was taking at that time as to the sugar tariff. The Senator from Louisiana said:

In conclusion, Mr. President, without claiming the gift of prophecy, I say unhesitatingly that in my judgment, before the three years have rolled around which will place sugar upon the free list, dismantle the factories of Louisiana, condemn thousands of people there who are now in easy circumstances to poverty and distress, and bring ruin upon a great many engaged in sugar production in our Western States, Hawaii, and Porto Rico, the Democratic Party will hear from the people of this Nation in no uncertain tones.

Mr. President, the three years have not as yet expired, but the prophecy made at that time by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is now to be fulfilled. The brilliant and oratorical Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] at that time referred to the fact that the Senator from Louisiana was headed toward the Republican Party, and now it appears that the Democratic Party almost en masse on this protective-tariff question is headed toward the Republican Party. While the Republican Party has not as much room now as it had in 1912 and is becoming more crowded every day, it still has plenty of room to welcome all these distinguished converts to the protective-tariff policy.

I wish I had time in this connection to refer more in extenso, in a perfectly good-natured way—because I am rather enjoying this matter—to the speech made by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. He is one of the great orators of this body and of the country. He referred that evening, with the galleries crowded, to the speech of the temporary chairman at Baltimore for free sugar, and to his own speech at Baltimore in which he referred to free sugar, which seemed to have been received with applause from the convention. He said, in substance, as I remember, that the Democratic Party was going to lift one hundred and forty millions of taxation from the backs of the people by giving them free sugar; that this meant 140,000 homes for the poor laboring men of this country, homes valued at a thousand dollars each—and now what is going to become of all these 140,000 homes that our good Democratic friends were going to save to the laboring people of this country?

He said, among other things:

For 125 years—

Referring, I suppose, to the sugar people—

they have had their hands in the pockets of the American consumer, taking just a little; that is all. Just a little from each of 20,000,000 breakfast tables; just 2 cents upon each pound of sugar that the poor man carried home: that is all. "But it is just a little, and therefore you ought not to stop us from petty pilfering."

That is the language, he assumed, of those who were pilfering.

There are many interesting parts to this speech, which is worthy of the careful perusal of every one. I am surprised that the Senator from Kentucky has not appeared, before this terrible outrage is consummated and sugar restored to a protective tariff basis, in time to "save the child."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] also elucidated, in a speech previous to that time, some views on this subject. It seemed he had received a telegram from the Commercial Club of Moore, Mont., advising him to stand pat for a proper protection of the sugar and wool industries. The telegram says:

Standing pat for a proper protection of the wool and sugar industry will be appreciated by your constituents in this vicinity.

The Senator from Montana put in the RECORD of that date, May 16, his reply to this commercial club.

I assure you—

He said, among other things—

that I am standing pat, but I am standing pat for the people. I must respectfully decline to stand pat for the protection of the wool or sugar industry or any other special interest enjoying special privileges for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many. * * * I can not surrender my convictions.

In one of the speeches of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] on this subject he referred to the position of the President on this matter. He said also that this infant was 124 years old; that it was ready to be weaned. Now, they have added three years more to its age; it is 127 years old, and why should it not be weaned now? And he referred to the President writing upon the color lance of the Democratic Party:

No compromise; I am seeking none; I ask none; I want none. I am for free sugar and I am for free wool.

Oh, consistency, thou art a jewel! but thou art not found in the Democratic Party.

He also said:

The President, Woodrow Wilson, has been denounced as a dictator. Why? Because he has dared to stand for the faith as written in our platform. * * * Because he believed in and advised in favor of free meat and free bread and free sugar and free wool he is denounced as a dictator. But the American people will answer at the ballot box and say, "If that be dictation, then long live the dictator who stands for that doctrine in our American life."

Where is that doctrine now? Ask of the winds that far and near strew the broken planks of the Baltimore platform.

And so, Mr. President, I might go on and refer to the other parts of these speeches. They are worth reading. And we find our Democratic friends now embracing protection to sugar. I say this in no spirit of criticism. I am glad they have discovered that changing conditions in life call for changed economic policies; that free trade, while beautiful in theory, is not best for our country—and we have had a great many doctrines along the lines of the "new freedom" set aside. We find free tolls in the Democratic platform set aside; free sugar now set aside; free silver sometime ago set aside; free trade, which will probably be hereafter entirely set aside.

All these children of Democracy seem lost in the wilderness of the "New Freedom." No more should their platforms denounce all protection as fraud and robbery. Let the St. Louis platform at least except sugar. They can not be blamed for what they are doing. They are acting wisely; and when Democracy acts wisely let us give them due credit. We ought to congratulate them and not find fault with them, and I am sure we do not. We join with them because we believe in the doctrine of a protective tariff; and as they are becoming converted in great numbers and marching down the aisle to the mourners' bench—"hitting the trail," so to speak—we can almost in imagination hear the choir as it sings:

While the lamp holds out to burn
Protection Democrats may return.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have enjoyed the remarks of my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] quite as much as any Republican possibly could. Indeed, I have been cheered by the fact that the Senator has found a prophet in Israel upon this side of the Chamber.

I remember the debate very well to which the Senator referred. I was much interested in it, and deprecated it somewhat as a controversial matter between two good Democrats. I confess I did not at the time pay much attention to the prophecy of my friend from Louisiana, and it had not dawned upon me that he was inspired until my attention is called to it by the Senator from Iowa.

That prophecy, however, Mr. President, has had its fulfillment in a great world-wide calamity, the causes of which have been a subject of some speculation to me until now. In view, however, of what the Senator has said, I perceive in the European war a manifestation of divine displeasure against the Democratic tariff, for it is that which prompts the action which the Senate is about to take. It is somewhat remarkable, too, that the U-boat controversy between the United States and Germany culminated at a psychological moment, thereby forcing the hand of the Democratic majority and requiring it to continue the duty upon sugar indefinitely, because the Government needs the revenue.

Verily my friend should rejoice, not only because he thinks Democrats are coming to the attenuated Republican fold but also because of this providential interference in behalf of protection, forcing the hand of its Democratic opponents and impelling them to assume the inconsistent but, in the opinion of the Senator from Iowa, the very happy position of protection apostasy.

But, Mr. President, there is another unexpected outcome in this situation, not a fulfillment but the overthrow of prophecies monotonously uttered upon the other side of the Chamber. I recall that during the discussions over the tariff in 1913 the Democratic caucus received constant and universal denunciation at the hands of Republicans who abhor caucuses but delight in conferences. Then and many times since they predicted that the people would rise up against the caucus and consume it in the fierce fires of their indignant wrath. But no such catastrophe has occurred or is likely to occur. Quite the contrary.

We have had two caucuses recently upon this subject. The first committed the Democratic Party to the extension of the duty for four years, and we acted accordingly. Almost immediately after the conference committee had its meeting with the House Members, who did exactly what we knew they would do. They insisted upon their own provision and refused to recede. Thereupon another caucus was called and informed of the situation. Thereupon we abandoned our stand and gracefully or otherwise accepted that of the House conferees.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will permit me, he certainly does not want to misrepresent the matter in saying that we had one conference.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly not.

Mr. SIMMONS. We had repeated meetings for a week.

Mr. THOMAS. I accept the Senator's correction. Several meetings were held, but they all began and ended the same way. We did not stand by our guns.

However, what I wish to emphasize is that Republican prophecy regarding the outcome of Democratic caucuses has not only miscarried, but we have reached a period when the Republican minority proposes to accept the dictates of a Democratic caucus and vote in accordance with its requirements. Whether the fulfillment of the prophecy of the Senator from Louisiana is worse than the miscarriage of the oft-repeated prophecy of the other side I will not attempt to determine.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. OLIVER. I simply wish to ask the Senator whether the measure as now proposed emanated from a Democratic caucus. I was not aware of it.

Mr. THOMAS. I supposed everyone knew that.

Mr. OLIVER. We do not know anything that happens in the caucus on the other side.

Mr. THOMAS. Not always, but frequently; and when we act agreeably to the Republican purpose the news is apt to travel pretty fast.

Mr. President, I simply have a word to add. I did not intend to speak at all again upon this subject, but inasmuch as I am upon my feet I will refer to the capitalization of the beet-sugar companies, and I do that in view of certain statements made by my very genial friend, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], a few days ago. I may concede, so far as the principle of the thing is concerned, that it makes no difference whether $1 or $100,000,000 is invested in the enterprise, although the larger the amount the more serious would be the evil consequences of a given line of legislation if injury were to flow from it. It must have been upon that theory that the sum total grew so largely in the vision of the Senator from Michigan. If my memory serves me aright, he told the Senate that something like $100,000,000 had been invested in the sugar-beet industry in the United States. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] made the suggestion that it was very much more than that. I made some inquiry of the Senator from Michigan as to the foundation for this statement, because my own investigations in regard to the subject did not justify the conclusion.

I think that unless all the water that has been poured into beet-sugar capitalization is to be considered as money actually invested, the assertion of the Senator from Michigan can not be sustained by the facts. I investigated this subject thoroughly some three years ago, and in a speech in September, 1913, upon the general subject of protection to sugar I considered that as of prime importance to the general proposition. I then stated my conclusion, as follows:

The cost of beet-sugar mills was formerly placed by manufacturers of sugar-mill machinery and by the sugar men at $1,000 per ton of slicing capacity. There was no question about it 10 or 15 years ago. That figure then seemed to be sufficiently large, notwithstanding the fact that most of the machinery then employed in the industry was imported from Germany. Our manufacturers at that time had not reached the point in production where they were able to supply the demand for such machinery. A thousand dollars per ton slicing capacity, therefore, seemed then to be ample. But since then other sugar men have estimated the cost of sugar factories at $1,250 to $1,500 per ton of slicing capacity.

I then referred to Mr. Blakey, who was and is a standard author on the subject, and quoted from him as follows:

The capitalization per ton of daily slicing capacity in 1889 was $1,097; in 1904, $1,502; and in 1909, $2,458.

This progressive increase of cost occurred in the estimates notwithstanding the fact, Mr. President, that the cost of machinery to the beet-sugar manufacturers was decreasing instead of increasing, the demand being supplied more and more, and finally altogether, by American manufacturers.

There were 76 companies at this time, as reported by the Hardwick committee. This was January, 1913. Their total daily slicing capacity was 63,550 tons. This represents an investment of capital, at $1,000 per ton, of $63,500,000; at $1,250 per ton, $79,437,500; at $1,500 per ton, $95,325,000. The total capitalization was $141,410,000.

Mr. President, I think there can be no question but that 50 per cent of the capitalization of one hundred and forty million and odd dollars then invested in beet-sugar factories was water, pure and simple, and I have no doubt in my own mind that the proportion is really greater. For example, the Great Western

Sugar Co., capitalized for $15,000,000 preferred stock and $15,000,000 of common stock, which last is admittedly water, represents as preferred stock the capitalization of the constituent companies at the time of their consolidation in the present organization.

To show how this preferred stock was watered through the subsidiary concerns I need only to refer to one of them, the Sterling Sugar Co., of Colorado. Its equipment was second hand and secured from a Saginaw factory in Michigan. It cost the Sterling Co. $300,000. Its slicing capacity was 600 tons per day, and probably cost $600,000 originally. That concern was thrown into the combination at one and a half million dollars; that is, one and a half million dollars of the $15,000,000 of the preferred stock of the Great Western Co. The $600,000 was increased 150 per cent before it was merged into the preferred stock of the existing company, which regards that stock as representing money actually invested.

The notorious disproportion between the preferred and the watered stock of the American company is, of course, familiar to every Senator.

Now, let me refer for a moment to the United States Sugar & Land Co., located at Garden City. That represents an actual investment of $900,000, but it is capitalized for $8,000,000, an amount so far in excess of the actual investment as to be startling even in these days. I have the word of a very prominent official of the Great Western Co. regarding the subject to which I am now referring. Speaking of the attempt of the same people to establish a factory at Sheridan, Wyo., and of his desire to do away with the possible competition resulting from such an establishment Mr. Boettcher, in writing to Mr. Morey, says:

> But I fear I will not be able to do anything with them, as they tell me they have sold their common stock of the Garden City plant, which they are now building, at $50 per share and upward. They frankly admit that this common stock is all water and does not represent anything; that is the way they are making their money. They feel they can do the same thing in Sheridan and claim they have a ready sale for their common stock. Most of their stock is sold.

Now, let me refer for a moment to the Michigan Sugar Co., which is one of the organizations in the Senator's own State and in which the American Sugar Refining Co. is a large stockholder. It has a daily slicing capacity of 5,450 tons. Its actual cost was about $5,500,000. It is capitalized at $12,500,000, and the company's balance sheet for 1913 gives good will as a consideration for $5,000,000 of its water. Its good-will item was valued in previous years at $500,000 only.

I think, Mr. President, I have called attention to enough specific instances to justify the contention that instead of $100,000,000 or $141,000,000 of actual cash invested in this business 50 per cent of that amount is a very liberal estimate. This capital has been paid back twice over since these companies were formed and their water is selling above par. We are now about to donate to these companies, so richly watered and well endowed, the power to levy a tax indefinitely hereafter upon the consuming millions of the United States of 1 cent per pound on sugar manufactured by them, or $43,000,000 per year, an amount of money equivalent to 43 per cent of $100,000,000 and 30 per cent of $141,000,000, the only compensation for which is the collection of a similar amount upon the sugar that is imported from other countries to make up the deficiency and which is paid into the Treasury of the United States. This is unnecessary. It is wrong. It is without justification.

For my part I can not afford to cast my vote now differently from the manner in which I cast it in September, 1913, upon this question. For my part, Mr. President, I can not resist the conclusion that the governing motive for this legislation is not a necessity for revenue, because if it were so we would substitute for this act an excise tax of 1 cent a pound upon all sugars, domestic and foreign, and thereby realize a revenue of $86,000,000 pear year to meet our constantly increasing needs, every dollar of which would go to the Government.

Mr. President, I can not by any system of reasoning of which I am capable of understanding justify the necessity of changing our position simply because conditions are changed which require a continuation of this revenue. If that position is correct, we ought to restore the duties on wool because we need the money. If our position is correct, we ought to restore the duty on iron and steel and upon all the other additions we have made to the free list. It is not correct, Mr. President, and the masses of this country will not accept it as correct, albeit my friend the Senator from Iowa is so ready and so willing to welcome to the depleted ranks of his own party the former conquering hosts of democracy. But he will not get them.

Now, Mr. President, I have said all I care to say. I have already trespassed too long upon the patience and the time of the Senate. I had occasion to express my views upon this subject when the bill was before the Senate for consideration. There are other Senators who wish to be heard and who have a greater claim than myself upon the remaining time for this discussion.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not intend to-day to enter into a general discussion of the necessity of the tariff upon sugar, nor will I take the time of the Senate to state the reasons why the sugar industry of this country is more than prosperous at this time. I am not going to deny that the sugar companies of the United States are making exorbitant profits at this time, more than they ever dreamed of making, and that the dividends they will pay in the near future will be such that the American people would not submit to if the American people did not know the actual reason for it.

There is not a Senator who does not know that the condition of the world brought about by war is the cause of the extreme high prices asked for sugar. It is for that reason, Mr. President, and that only, that the sugar companies of this country are as prosperous as they are to-day.

I believe that all the sugar companies of the country ought to divide a part of the profits that they are making to-day with the farmers who raise the beets, and I am very proud to say that the sugar companies of my own State and of Idaho have given to the beet growers a part of the extra profits that have been made by them brought about by the conditions existing in the world to-day, for they declare——

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that the States the Senator has mentioned constitute honorable exceptions to the general rule. There are no increases that I know anything about in my State.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. While the Senator from Colorado is giving his testimony I desire to give mine. They are paying the highest prices for beets in my State ever paid.

Mr. SMOOT. The way the officers of the Utah and Idaho sugar companies proceeded to give the beet grower a part of the profits was to give each grower a given number of pounds of refined sugar for every ton of beets produced by him during the year. That was done without solicitation, and I hope to see it continued as long as the price for sugar continues as high as it is at the present time.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. HARDING. I only want to ask the Senator from Utah if he is aware that all contracts with the cane growers of the Hawaiian Islands are fixed on a basic price of sugar in New York according to the advance in the market?

Mr. SMOOT. I will state to the Senator from Ohio that I am aware of it. I was only speaking of the beet-sugar industry in this country at present, and I have not the time to go into the question of production of cane sugar in Hawaii.

Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] has tried to make it appear that Mr. Claus A. Spreckels is working for the interest of the people and wanted the duty on sugar removed because of his love for the people. On July 21 and 22, 1913, in addressing the Senate on the subject of sugar, I quoted from the testimony of Mr. Spreckels in substance as follows:

> The beet-sugar growers make the competition severer all the time. I have been carrying on a campaign to reduce the tariff, which is not beneficial to the cane-sugar refiners. I want free trade.

On August 12, 1913, Mr. Spreckels addressed a letter to me, as follows:

FEDERAL SUGAR REFINING CO.,
SMITH & SCHIPPER, AGENTS,
138 Front Street, New York, August 12, 1913.

Hon. REED SMOOT,
Senator from Utah, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I note in a speech that you made in the United States Senate on July 21 and 22 you quote me as saying: "The beet-sugar growers make the competition severer all the time. I have been carrying on a campaign to reduce the tariff, which is not beneficial to the cane-sugar refiners. I want free trade."

Kindly state your authority for making this assertion.

Respectfully,

C. A. SPRECKELS.

I answered that letter August 14, 1913, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 14, 1913.*

Mr. C. A. SPRECKELS,
Federal Sugar Refining Co.,
138 Front Street, New York, N. Y.

SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of August 12, 1913, stating that you note in a speech that I delivered in the United States Senate on July 21 and 22 I quote you as saying: "The beet-sugar growers make the competition severer all the time. I have been carrying on a campaign to reduce the tariff, which is not beneficial to the cane-sugar

refiners. I want free trade." You ask me to kindly state my authority for making this assertion. I gladly do as you request, and refer you to your testimony given before the Hardwick committee, with reference to the sugar tariff.

On page 2269 the following questions were asked you by Mr. HINDS, and your answer likewise appears:

"Mr. HINDS. And they [the beet-sugar people] make the competition severer, if it is competition?

"Mr. SPRECKELS. Yes.

"Mr. HINDS. Continually?

"Mr. SPRECKELS. Yes, sir. They have frequently come as far as Pittsburgh." (C. A. Spreckels, 2269.)

On page 2275 appears the following:

"Mr. HINDS. Mr. Spreckels, you have been carrying on a campaign to reduce the tariff as beneficial to the cane-sugar refiners?

"Mr. SPRECKELS. I have.

"Mr. HINDS. Of course, that will be damaging to the beet-sugar refiners?

"Mr. SPRECKELS. To some extent it will." (C. A. Spreckels, 2275.)

The following appears on pages 2277 and 2278:

"Mr. HINDS. In other words, perhaps, you would take it [the tariff] off, would you not, and have free trade?

"Mr. SPRECKELS. I would have free trade.

"Mr. HINDS. You would have free trade in sugar?

"Mr. SPRECKELS. Absolutely." (C. A. Spreckels, 2277 and 2278.)

This is my authority for making the statement I did in my speech.

Respectfully,

REED SMOOT.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Who signed the letter?

Mr. SMOOT. I signed the letter in answer to the demand of Mr. Spreckels to know by what authority I made the statement attributed to him in the Senate on July 21 and 22, 1913. The Senate will notice that I quoted his exact words. I never received a letter from Mr. Spreckels in answer to my letter of August 14, 1913.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the Senator will permit me, I think it is notoriously true that every shipment of sugar made by the Spreckels concern for a long period preceding the free-trade bill contained a circular in favor of free sugar.

Mr. SMOOT. There is not any question about that, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I saw a number of them myself, and I think they were sent out pretty generally.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that I suggested that the amount of capital invested in the sugar companies of the United States was over $100,000,000 because I had seen that statement so many times, and I thought it was well understood; and I find in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee of the House a statement of Mr. Lowry giving the exact figures quoted by the Senator from Colorado. Mr. Lowry says:

I call attention to the fact that the cost of erecting a beet-sugar factory is based on $1,000 per ton slicing capacity.

He gives the names of the companies, the location of the plants, the capitalization, including bonded indebtedness, and the daily slicing capacity, showing that their capitalization, including bonded indebtedness, was $141,410,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator from Utah permit me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. I will say that I obtained my figures from the Hardwick committee, from Mr. Blakey, and from two other sources also. Those were the principal ones. They are practically identical.

Mr. SMOOT. These are identical with the figures which the Senator quoted; for I followed him very closely in his statement as to the capitalization of the different sugar companies to which he referred in his remarks this afternoon.

Mr. President, Mr. Lowry may know more about the construction of a sugar mill than do the men who put up the money for constructing it; he may know more about the cost of operating a sugar factory than does anybody else in the United States; but I doubt it. Mr. Lowry acted as an agent for Mr. Spreckels. There was an organization formed called the Wholesale Grocers' Association of America.

Mr. HARDWICK. The committee of the Wholesale Grocers' Association of America was the title.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; the committee of the Wholesale Grocers' Association of America. It consisted of Mr. Lowry and Mr. Spreckels.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. They constituted the total membership.

Mr. SMOOT. The amount of money collected to make that propaganda was $12,000. Not a single soul paid a dollar of the $12,000 but C. A. Spreckels. Nobody spent a cent but Mr. Spreckels's henchman, Mr. Lowry.

I made the statement, in an interruption of the Senator from Georgia, that Mr. Lowry had testified before committees of Congress that he was in favor of a duty of 50 cents a hundred on sugar. Let us see if I was correct. I can refer not only to one place, but I can refer to half a dozen places, where he testified that——

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator pardon me just there?

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

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not think that that fact was disputed. The difference between the Senator from Utah and myself came about in this way: He said Mr. Lowry expressed it, that that was his individual view, and that the concern for which he worked had also favored free sugar.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, Mr. President, he is speaking here as the secretary of the Association of Wholesale Grocers. Mr. FORDNEY asked him this question:

Mr. FORDNEY. You said the duty you recommend on sugar is higher than the duty collected by foreign countries generally?

Mr. LOWRY. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. The duty you recommend?

Mr. LOWRY. The duty that gives a certain bounty——

Mr. FORDNEY (interposing). Let me get this right. I understood you to say that the duty you would recommend be placed on sugar, which is a reduction, is a higher rate than that collected by lots of foreign countries on imported sugar?

Now, I turn to Mr. Lowry's direct testimony, and he says:

In amplification of this I desire to file the attached statements, one under the caption of "Our high tariff on sugar from the consumers' standpoint" and the other a "Protest," which directly refers to the majority report of the Senate Finance Committee.

The statements filed are as follows:

"Our high tariff on sugar from the consumers' standpoint."

This gives the rate of duty that was then enforced. Then this follows:

Rates we propose—

Not what Mr. Lowry proposes, but the "rates we propose."

While he was testifying he was in the employment of Mr. Claus A. Spreckels. Nobody paid him a cent while he acted as secretary of that association but Mr. Claus A. Spreckels.

These are the "rates that we propose"——

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. I have no doubt the Senator's statement is true; but does the Senator not recall that in the testimony before the lobby committee it appeared that the beet-sugar association also had a means of raising money, consisting of a levy of 2 cents a bag upon sugar, and producing many more than $12,000 every year for use in Washington?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is no question at all about it. The beet-sugar people have donated to a fund for the purpose of offsetting, if possible, the efforts on the part of Mr. Spreckles and other sugar-refining concerns to destroy the sugar industry of this country.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

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

Mr. SMOOT. I will do so in a moment.

I am going before I close to tell the Senate just why Mr. Spreckels and most of the sugar-refining companies—perhaps to be technically correct I should say Mr. Lowry instead of Mr. Spreckels, although Mr. Lowry was representing Mr. Spreckels, and meant Mr. Spreckels when he referred to "rates we propose," and this includes the so-called independent refineries. Free sugar was not wanted, but they wanted about one-half a cent per pound duty imposed on sugar. If Senators will have patience with me, I will tell them why they desired this ideal rate, and it was for no love they had for the people. It was for a selfish purpose.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator from Utah yield to me right there?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield right there, he uses the expression "so-called independents." The Senator will not dispute the unanimous conclusions of the committee which under specific authority investigated this very question, and on which his party had distinguished representation, to the effect that Mr. Spreckels was a real competitor of the trust, will he?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I can show by the quotations of sugar in the New York market that there was scarcely a day that Mr. Spreckels did not follow the American Sugar Co.'s prices up or down. The quotations were identical nearly every morning in the year. If you will take Willett & Gray's reports to-morrow morning, you will find that the quotations for to-day will be exactly the same, whether there be an advance over the

prices of the day before or whether a reduction. I do not believe that if they are truly independent and want to compete with the Sugar Trust, so called, that they would always be following it in its prices as they have done in the past.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HARDWICK. Will it bother the Senator for me to have a little colloquy with him on that point?

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all.

Mr. HARDWICK. I shall not take up much time. As a matter of fact, if the Senator will take the Weekly Sugar Journal of Willett & Gray, will he not find, or has he not found, that many times first one and then the other cut their prices? Finally, of course, there is an equilibrium of prices, but I challenge the Senator to prove the statement that he has just made. He can not do it to save his immortal soul. In my opinion, if the Senator will look a little further, he will find that on various occasions, first one and then the other of all the refineries put the price down; but gradually, of course, there is an equilibrium restored.

Mr. SMOOT. If I were a betting man, Mr. President, and the Senator from Georgia were the same, I would challenge him now for a bet that I could take to-morrow morning's quotations from Willett & Gray, of New York, and the quotations of every one of the refineries of the United States would be found to be exactly the same.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I am surprised that the Senator should make any such statement as that. The proposition of the Senator is very attractive, and if I were not so religiously minded I think I would accept it and stake a large sum on that proposition; but I will say to the Senator——

Mr. SMOOT. I am not a betting man, but I will assure the Senator that if I were a betting man I would accept his proposition, and I would place no limit on the amount.

Mr. President, I have referred to the rates on sugar and was about to call the attention of the Senate to that matter, when I was interrupted. Now, practically, these are the rates that "we propose," quoting from Mr. Lowry: Refined sugar, per pound, sixty-two hundredths of a cent; raw sugar, 96 per cent test, 60 cents per hundred, or six-tenths of a cent a pound. He then goes on and says that—

Under reciprocity treaty, importations from Cuba pay 20 per cent less in both cases.

Or, in other words, the 96-test sugar that comes from Cuba would be 60 cents less 20 per cent, which would make it 48 cents per hundred. All sugars that come from Cuba are 96 per cent sugars. See how clever the sugar refiners of this country are! They know if they can get a 50-cent rate on sugar, with a 20 per cent reduction from Cuba—and all of our importations, with the exception of a few thousand tons of sugar comes from Cuba—that that would be a protection of 40 cents a hundred pounds. With that 40 cents a hundred the refiners know that they can destroy the sugar industry of this country, and when it should be destroyed they would impose an exorbitant price for sugar upon the people of this country, as they did in 1911, when they had the power to do so, and raised sugar until it reached, in New York City, 7½ cents a pound and remained so until the beet sugar produced that year came into the market.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator certainly knows that at the time of which he speaks the beet-sugar men had disposed of their sugar in October at prices much less than that figure and delivered at the price for which they had contracted. So, instead of being an act of philanthropy, it was simply poor business.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah does not know any such thing. The Senator from Utah knows that the price in New York began to advance in July, 1911, when there was no beet sugar on the market, and he knows that the price increased to 7½ cents a pound, and the Senator further knows that just as soon in October as the beet sugar entered the market the price of sugar began to drop. The Senator knows another thing——

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator says I "know better." I want to tell the Senator that I know what I state to be a fact, that beet sugar was sold prior to the rise and delivered after the rise, because the beet-sugar people could not help themselves. "Philanthropy" and "beet sugar" are inconvertible terms.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know anything about what the Colorado sugar companies did——

Mr. THOMAS. I am talking about the entire situation.

Mr. SMOOT. But I do know that other companies did not sell their sugar earlier, and I know that the entry of beet sugar on the market brought down the price of sugar in New York, and it began to drop just as soon as the beet sugar was offered for sale. Furthermore, that is not the only time, Mr. President, that conditions similar to those of 1911 have happened. It happens nearly every year, but not to so marked an extent.

The sugar-refining companies do not want free sugar. If they had free sugar, they would have to compete with the sugars of Austria, the sugars of Germany, the sugars of France, and the sugars of the other countries of the world. They want the duty just high enough so that they can control the American market and secure the advantage they have always enjoyed of the preferential rate granted to Cuba of 20 per cent reduction; they want it low enough so that they can destroy the American sugar industry and at the same time handle only Cuban sugars. The committee hearings are full of testimony showing that the sugar refiners of this country were apprehensive of the growth of the sugar industry in this country, for every pound of domestic sugar produced took from them the opportunity to bring in from Cuba and refine an equal amount of sugar.

The beet-sugar factories were interfering with their trade. Even Mr. Atkins, of the American Sugar Refining Co., the trust, so called, testified to that effect. He wanted a reduction of the duty on sugar, but he did not want free sugar. Mr. Atkins and his predecessor conceived the idea that if they bought a controlling interest in all of the beet-sugar factories of the country they could see to it that there would be no further extension of the beet-sugar industry in the United States, and they undertook to acquire a controlling interest, and in many States did acquire such an interest. They are not, however, holding as much stock in beet-sugar companies as in the past. They are selling it just as fast, I understand, as they can. I will say that while at one time they owned a majority of the stock of the sugar companies of Utah and Idaho they do not own a cent in those companies to-day.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. According to the last annual statement of the American Sugar Refining Co., their investments in beet-sugar stocks are nearly as large as ever, and 50 per cent of their income is derived from the profit upon that stock. I think, with the exception of the sales of their holdings in the Utah companies, their interest in the beet-sugar companies of the country is practically what it was in 1913.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I know that every dollar of stock they owned in the sugar factories of Utah and every dollar of stock they owned in the sugar factories of Idaho has been sold. I know that Mr. Warren, testifying as to the Michigan factories, stated that most of the holdings of the American Sugar Co. in Michigan factories had been sold.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator when the testimony of Mr. Warren, to which he has referred, was given?

Mr. SMOOT. I should not have used the word "testimony."

Mr. THOMAS. Was it in 1913?

Mr. SMOOT. No; it was not at that time; it was in a statement made to a newspaper, as I remember it. I think it was less than a year ago.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I think I may say upon Mr. Warren's authority—for he ought to know, and he told me—that the sugar refining company does not own a dollar's worth of stock in the Michigan company.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I must proceed. I am not finding fault at all with the position taken by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] or the position taken by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. They are consistent in their position. They believe in free sugar, and always have believed in free sugar, no matter whether or not the removal of the duty would wipe out the sugar industry in the United States.

How often have we heard upon the floor of the Senate the expression "hothouse industries"! Why, Mr. President, we have heard it not only in regard to sugar, but in regard to many other articles; we have heard it in regard to dyestuffs; and now it is almost the unanimous opinion of the American people that there was a mistake made in not protecting dyestuffs sufficiently to enable the establishing of the industry in this country.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the Senator knows better than I do that the chief opponents of the establishment of a dye industry in this country were the great textile manufacturers of America.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to admit that the textile manufacturers of this country opposed an increase of the duty upon dyestuffs; and, when I say "dyestuffs," I refer to the coal-tar products.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Colorado is in error when he says that the manufacturers are opposed to a duty upon dyestuffs at the present time.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not say anything about the present time; I was talking about the past, and the reason why the industry had not been established. The statement was made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and admitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] several days ago.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I admit now that in the past the textile manufacturers did not want to increase the rate of 30 per cent on coal-tar products.

Mr. THOMAS. Not only did they not want an increase, but they prevented the regulation of the duties upon the intermediate products so as to make an industry of that kind impossible here.

Mr. SMOOT. I will not go that far. I think the Senator has gone too far when he says that. I will admit this——

Mr. THOMAS. I can only appeal to the result. We have not any such industry.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly aware of that. How many times have I stood upon this floor when we have had the question up and told the Senate of the United States of the only way that a dyestuff industry could be established in this country? I said the other day, and I say now, that under the present duties on dyestuffs it is impossible to establish such an industry in this country and maintain it.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if the real facts in the case are not that, under the condition of German trust control in dyestuffs the year before the war, it was the universal sentiment, not only of the manufacturers, but of almost everyone else who had studied the subject, that it would be impossible to impose a duty that would establish a dyestuff industry in this country? And is it not true that under present war conditions a proper duty would almost inevitably establish and maintain this industry and that the manufacturers of this country are almost a unit in demanding such a duty?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Utah to say—I think he must have made the statement inadvertently—that a mistake was made in not providing a sufficient protection for the dye industry. I do not know whether the Senator meant to say that the mistake was made by the Republicans or made by the Democrats, because the Senator knows, as a matter of fact, that no material change in the duty on coal-tar products was made in the present law as compared to the rates under the Payne-Aldrich bill.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is mistaken there.

Mr. SIMMONS. I say there has been no material change.

Mr. SMOOT. The present law imposes a duty of 30 per cent upon coal-tar products.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Some coal-tar products.

Mr. SMOOT. Some coal-tar products—that is well said—but the intermediate products have been placed upon the dutiable list at 10 per cent, and we know that it is impossible to get many of them anywhere except from Germany.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was only speaking about the finished product, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. We were talking about establishing the industry, and if you impose a duty upon the things that enter into the finished product you impose that much of a burden upon the manufacturer; and that burden was not upon him when the Republican tariff act of 1909 was in force.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is the only material difference, namely, the duty on the intermediate products.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the duty on coal-tar dyes is the same as under the preceding tariff law, and the duty upon the intermediate products was placed as it was at the insistence of the representatives of the textile manufacturers of the United States.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah allow me a moment?

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

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. LIPPITT. In order that there may be no misconception in regard to those duties, allow me to say that the duty on synthetic indigo and the duty on alizarin, one being the foundation of the very important color blue——

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I was speaking of coal-tar dyes only.

Mr. LIPPITT. Those are coal-tar dyes.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, no.

Mr. LIPPITT. Of course they are. Alizarin is an extract, and so is synthetic indigo. They are both coal-tar colors.

Mr. THOMAS. I am obliged to the Senator for the information. My impression was that they were not coal-tar dyes.

Mr. LIPPITT. I was going to say that synthetic indigo, which is the color used in dyeing blue, and alizarin, which is the color used in dyeing red, are both on the free list while aniline oil, which is the foundation for black, is dutiable at 10 per cent. Those three colors, and other coal-tar derivatives, such as anthracine and indanthrine, constitute a very large proportion of the total colors that are used in the United States. There is a catch-all clause in the schedule on dyestuffs, stating that on all coal-tar products not otherwise provided for there shall be collected a duty of 30 per cent, but there are very few things of any importance that come in under that part of the schedule.

Mr. THOMAS. But the Senator knows that under the duties provided by the Payne-Aldrich law and previous laws there was no established dye industry in the United States of any consequence.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah knows that, following the passage of the tariff act of 1913, a number of chemical industries which had lived in this country before, particularly in the city of St. Louis, had to go out of business, because of the reduction in the tariff upon their products. I know of an industry—and I think the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] would corroborate me if he were here—which had to close its doors, and all its machinery was thrown into the junk heap. That is not all. The Senator from Utah knows that the manufacture of oxalic acid in this country has a remarkable history worthy of repeating; but I have not the time now to go into that, except to say that under the duty imposed by the Underwood law it has been found impossible to maintain that industry in this country.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. I could go on and enumerate a great many items, Mr. President, in the chemical schedule, but we are discussing the sugar duty, and it is now 35 minutes after 4.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what I was going to suggest to the Senator. I understand that other Senators desire to speak upon the sugar question.

Mr. SMOOT. If other Senators desire to be heard, I do not want to prevent them. I simply want to state, in conclusion, that I am in full accord with the statement made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], that the man who knows more than any other living man about the sugar conditions in the world is Mr. Willett; and I want to briefly call the attention of the Senate to the testimony of Mr. Willett in regard to the sugar industry of this country. I wish the Senate to know that he, like every other American citizen who has studied this question from every point of view, knows that domestic sugar reduces the cost of all sugar consumed to the people of the country. Mr. Sulzer asked a question of Mr. Willett during the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, as follows:

> What, in your judgment as an expert, would bring about a permanent reduction of the cost of manufactured sugar to the consumers of the United States?
>
> Mr WILLETT By increasing the amount of domestic production and in Porto Rico and Hawaii; that is, by increasing the quantity of sugar within the United States to the extent that we would be required to purchase no sugar whatever at world prices. Last year we bought only 77,000 tons at the world price. We were as near as that to that condition in 1910. We did come within 77,000 tons of being entirely free and independent of the world's prices, whereas a few years before we had been importing 6,700,000 tons.

Now, Mr. President, I want to state once more that if the present rate of duty upon sugar could be maintained without a question and the people of the United States knew that it would remain for 20 years, long before the 20-year period expired we would be producing every pound of sugar consumed by the American people. I can point to four States in this Union that can produce sufficient sugar not only to supply all the demand of the American people to-day, but produce sugar enough to supply the demand if the consumption in the United States were three times what it is to-day. I may be asked why do they not do it. Simply because they do not know what is going to happen to their industry; and I tell you that it is impossible to produce sugar in this country as cheaply as it can be produced in the

tropical countries of the world or as cheaply as it can be produced in Austria or in Germany or in Russia.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

Mr. SMOOT. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. What would be the situation in this country to-day with reference to that article of necessity, sugar, if it were not for the domestic production that our friends upon the other side say was artificially stimulated and unconstitutionally protected? What would be our situation, in view of the present European war, with reference to that product, especially with the usual and ordinary sources of their supply cut off?

Mr. SMOOT. Why, the situation would be about like this: Instead of paying the exorbitant price we are paying to-day—$7.10 a bag, I believe, for the last sack that I bought here in Washington—instead of being $7.10 in Washington, more than likely it would be $12 or $15 a bag. Not only would that apply in the United States but it would apply to all the peoples of the world.

Not long ago I called the attention of the Senate of the United States, right after the beginning of the war, to the fact that the first advance that was made upon sugar, the advance of 2 cents a pound on the sugar that was consumed by the American people, and was being paid, was sufficient for the Government of the United States to erect factories enough to produce all the sugar that the people consumed. I say so now, Mr. President; and as the price has increased from that time, the statement can apply to it with more force than when I made it here immediately following the beginning of this war.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, is it not a fact that that country is being penalized most in the present price of sugar which produces none, and those countries are benefiting by the lowest price of sugar which produce most?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that is an economic question, and it is just as sure to be the case as that the night follows the day; so there is no necessity for me to discuss it further now. I will yield the floor, therefore, because I know there are other Senators who desire to speak.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Then, Mr. President, I will address myself to the Senate in my own time.

I just want to say this—and I am not going to occupy more than a moment, because I know the Senator from North Caroline [Mr. SIMMONS] expects to get a vote in a few moments, and perhaps the Senator desires to say something himself before the vote is taken.

I think it is perfectly safe to say that the price of sugar in England, which was about 9 or 10 cents, the last quotation I saw, is higher than here because they produce none themselves. They are buying their sugar in large quantities from Cuba, paying a huge penalty for their neglect. The heavier the burden that is put upon Cuba the higher the price of sugar will be. If we were dependent upon Cuba and had no domestic production of our own we would be at the mercy of the sugar producer. That would be a most undesirable situation for our country to be in, and a policy of national dependence does not commend itself to thinking people; and I rejoice that even at this late day there is some evidence upon the other side of the Chamber that they are forsaking their false idols and coming to our view upon the question of protection to this industry.

I have no word of criticism to offer. Indeed I rather rejoice that the industry is to be partially saved through this belated act of repentance. All Senators know that if this free-trade law had been permitted to go into full effect May 1 it would have marked the beginning of the end of the domestic sugar industry.

I am glad that my honored friend from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], whose motives are always good and whose patriotism can not be questioned, has shown the courage and good judgment not only to take this action but to take it gracefully, admitting by his course the untenable position which his committee and himself occupied in connection with the present tariff law, for which Senators upon the other side were responsible. That the Underwood-Simmons law is a failure all should admit; that the sugar schedule has proven a failure all now admit.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not know of any other Senator who desires to speak. If so, I will yield. What I have to say will not take over 10 or 15 minutes. I do not desire to enter into any discussion of the sugar question further than to make a few general observations with reference to the present status of the matter and the attitude of the party to which I belong with respect to it.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] was good enough to speak kindly of me in connection with the action of the conference committee in receding from the Senate amendment. The Senator need not have complimented that action on my part, because I assure the Senator it was taken very unwillingly, and the bill as passed by the House was accepted not because the conferees desired to accept it, but because they were led to believe that with the conditions in the House it was improbable that body would accept the Senate substitute.

Mr. President, upon this question of sugar, as I took occasion to say when this bill was before the Senate on the 10th day of this month, both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, so far as their legislation goes and so far as the public utterances of the leaders of these two parties in the House and Senate illustrate the positions of the parties they represented, have been on both sides of this question. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] has read some speeches from Democrats, some of them favoring a duty upon sugar and some of them advocating free sugar.

Mr. President, following the example of the Senator from Iowa, I could entertain the Senate for hours in reading declarations on the part of leading Republicans of this body and of the House in 1890, 1894, and 1897 in favor of free sugar, a principle of the Republican Party, and declaring that a tax upon sugar was an outrage against the people. I could read from speeches of that great leader of the Republican Party, probably the greatest authority in his day in that party, upon the subject of tariff taxation, Senator Aldrich—expressions with reference to this question made in 1890 and 1894 on the McKinley and Wilson bills of the most extreme character against any tax on sugar, denouncing it as an unjustifiable and indefensible outrage upon the American people and declaring if he could find a stronger term of condemnation he would employ it. I could read also similar utterances at that time from such great Republican leaders as Hale, Allison, and Morrill. I could also read from the speeches of Senator Aldrich in 1897, while he was Republican leader of this body, when the Dingley bill was passed, declarations to the effect that it was with great reluctancy he was willing to give up the old position of the Republican Party, yielded its position in favor of free sugar, but that the revenue necessities of the Government seemed to make it possible to put it on the free list at that time.

I think, to be frank about it—and I do not want to play any politics upon this subject—both of the great political parties of to-day in their legislation with reference to sugar have been governed very largely by the revenue necessities of the Government. I do not say altogether, but largely.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator knows that no politics are being played on either side of the Chamber on this matter.

Mr. SIMMONS. I said I did not think that was the case.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator did say that; but I want to ask the Senator, in all seriousness, if the extreme utterances to which he alludes on the part of Republican leaders can be found since the beet-sugar industry became an accomplished fact?

Mr. SIMMONS. I find them uttered in 1894 and 1897. The beet-sugar industry antedated both of those dates.

Mr. GALLINGER. There was some beet sugar produced in this country before that time.

Mr. SIMMONS. In 1890 and in 1897 the beet-sugar industry in this country had assumed quite considerable proportions, though not so large as now.

Mr. GALLINGER. But does the Senator find anything as late as 1897?

Mr. SIMMONS. Since 1897 the Republican Party has stood, so far as I know, for a duty upon sugar; but a few days ago, when I called up the sugar bill, I read to the Senate an extract from the speech delivered in 1897 on the Dingley bill by Senator Aldrich, then the leader of the Republican Party, upon this question, expressing great regret that, on account of the revenue necessities of the Government, the old-time principle of the Republican Party of free sugar could not be adopted.

Mr. GALLINGER. And at that time a bounty was placed on sugar.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; there the Senator makes a great mistake. The bounty was placed on sugar in 1890, when the McKinley bill was passed; but when Senator Aldrich made the speech to which I have referred, in which he declared that a tax upon sugar was an outrage, and when he made the speech a few years later in which he declared that on account of the revenue necessities of the Government he regretted that the party was unable to apply the Republican doctrine of free sugar, there was no proposition on either of those occasions to put a bounty upon sugar. The Senator from New Hampshire knows perfectly well that in 1894, when we were considering the Wilson bill, which placed a duty on sugar—the Senator was a Member of this body at that time——

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. He knows that Senator Peffer, a Populist Republican Senator, offered an amendment to put sugar upon the free list, and every Democrat voted against that amendment, and every Republican voted for it. He knows there was not at that time any suggestion or expectation that the Democratic Party, which then was in possession of both branches of Congress, would put a bounty upon sugar.

Mr. GALLINGER. But there was very little sugar being manufactured in this country, except in Louisiana, at that time.

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, I think the Senator is entirely mistaken about that.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very little.

Mr. THOMAS. What are the dates to which the Senator refers?

Mr. SIMMONS. Eighteen hundred and ninety-four and eighteen hundred and ninety-seven, when the Wilson and Dingley bills were before Congress. The question when the Wilson bill was up was not free with a bounty but free sugar, or dutiable sugar. And the Republicans under these circumstances voted for free sugar on the motion offered by Senator Peffer, under the leadership of Aldrich, Hale, and Allison.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, the beet-sugar industry was introduced here in 1889.

Mr. SIMMONS. I can not submit to further interruptions, because, as the Senator knows, this is to be voted on in a few minutes and my time is very short.

Mr. GALLINGER. Just one word. I want to say simply that the Republican Party placed a bounty on sugar to protect the domestic industry, and the Republican Party is not responsible for having repealed that law.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; and in answer to that I say that for seven years after the beet-sugar industry was started in this country the Republican Party apparently, at least, stood for free sugar.

Mr. GALLINGER. With a bounty.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; not with a bounty in 1894, because you knew when you voted for the Peffer amendment to the Wilson bill that you would not get any bounty upon sugar, and you did not at that time suggest any bounty upon sugar.

Now, Mr. President, one other thing. Senators on the other side are twitting us with the suggestion that the present duty on sugar which the pending bill proposes to make permanent is a Republican protective duty. They are taking the sweet unction to their souls that we, in the vote we are going to cast to-day, are following them and voting with them. We will vote not for a duty placed on sugar by the Republicans but for a duty placed on it by the Democrats. It is neither a protective duty nor a Republican imposed duty. We found a high protective duty upon sugar when in 1913 we went to write the present tariff. As we found a high protective duty upon many other things; but we revised these duties, and to reduce them to a revenue basis according to the standard of a revenue tariff established in the act of 1913.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I can not yield until I finish what I wish to say; if the time for debate has not expired, I will yield to the Senator. We made the same ratio of reduction in the present tariff act in the duty on sugar that we made in the duties that the Payne-Aldrich Act imposed upon other things of like character and importance. We made substantially the same ratio of reduction from the Republican protective rates upon sugar that we made upon woolen goods, substantially the same ratio of reduction that we made upon cotton goods, and substantially the same ratio of reduction that we made upon iron and steel and other staple commodities.

SEVERAL SENATORS. How about wool?

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to ask my friends upon the other side this question: Do you claim that our duties upon woolens, our duties upon cotton goods, and our duties upon steel and iron are protective duties?

Mr. SMOOT. You have no duty upon wool.

Mr. SIMMONS. I said upon woolens, not upon wool. You have habitually denounced the duties we placed on woolens, cotton goods, iron, steel, and so forth, as free-trade duties; and though we made the same ratio of reduction upon sugar that we did upon them, you now pretend to think and claim the duty retained on sugar is a protective duty. You know if under these circumstances the duties we retained on these things are free-trade or revenue duties, then by the same token the duty retained on sugar is a free-trade or revenue duty.

Mr. GALLINGER. You put wool on the free list.

Mr. SIMMONS. I did not say wool; I said woolens. We put wool and some other things on the free list, just as you put over 50 per cent of all imports in your law on the free list.

Mr. President, I repeat, we claim that the duties which we imposed in the present tariff act upon woolens, and upon iron and steel, and upon cotton goods, and other things of like character, were revenue duties; and as we reduced the duty upon sugar in the same ratio, applying the same principle, the duty we wrote on sugar is likewise a revenue duty, and not a protective duty. I say to the Senator from New Hampshire that was the contention of his party when the present tariff act was under discussion in Congress. Your party opposed that bill upon the ground that the duties it imposed were not protective; and you denounced them all, including sugar, as free-trade duties.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, does the Senator prefer not to yield this afternoon?

Mr. SIMMONS. I would prefer not to yield just at this time. I will yield to the Senator in a minute, if I have time.

Now, Mr. President, the Senators say we are following them. They are wrong. We are voting to continue the very identical duty that we fixed upon sugar; and we fixed it upon the idea that as we were going to continue sugar on the dutiable list for three years we ought to reduce the rate to a revenue basis, just as we sought to reduce the rates of the articles I have referred to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. SIMMONS. Just one minute. If the present duty upon sugar was not a protective duty then, it is not a protective duty now.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, just one word. I want to ask the Senator if, when the party to which he belongs fixed the present rate—and he was a very prominent actor in that economic tragedy——

Mr. SIMMONS. I tell the Senator that the "economic tragedy," as he calls the Democratic tariff act, aided by our Democratic financial legislation, lifted the business of the country out of the depressed condition in which we found it when we came into power and restored prosperity before the war. I could read from clippings I have before me hundreds of extracts from great trade agencies and great metropolitan newspapers and declarations of great captains of industry, proclaiming that prosperity was not coming but had already arrived, and to stay.

Mr. GALLINGER. May I finish my sentence? When that duty was placed on sugar, and the reduction was agreed to, did the Senator expect that two or three years afterwards he would be in favor of repealing that part of the law?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I will say to the Senator that I expected that in two or three years sugar would go upon the free list.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. But as we temporarily continue the duty, we fixed the duty in the meantime according to the Democratic idea and the Democratic standard of a tariff for revenue, just as we did with respect to these other things; and it is this revenue duty we now propose to further continue and not the protective duty of the Payne-Aldrich Act.

Mr. GALLINGER. You provided to take it all off. That was your idea.

Mr. SIMMONS. We provided that at the end of three years sugar should be untaxed. And in the meantime we repealed the high protective rates of the Payne-Aldrich Act and put sugar upon the same basis as other dutiable articles.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator really contend that when we join with him in passing the bill he is contending for there will be no protection in the law?

Mr. SIMMONS. I contend this: That we believe in free sugar.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. That if conditions would permit, we would have free sugar.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. That we did not put it on the free list immediately because of the conditions; that in continuing it we applied to it the same Democratic standard of what is a revenue duty that we applied to other articles placed on the dutiable list in the bill, and that now, when we vote to make this duty permanent, we are not voting with you or for protection on sugar.

Mr. GALLINGER. The old fellow in Maine said he was "for prohibition, but agin' its enforcement." That is about the attitude of the Democratic Party.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is an old gag that has no application here, and I think, with deference to the Senator, requires no answer. It does not apply to me. I am in favor of free sugar, so far as that is concerned, and if the circumstances would permit I would be in favor of letting it go upon the free list on the 1st day of May. But they do not permit, and I am happy that in continuing this duty we are continuing it upon the basis of

a tariff for revenue, according to the standards which we fixed in our present tariff law.

Mr. SMOOT. The standard of free trade.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator says "the standard of free trade." Are the duties upon the other schedules of that bill upon a free-trade or revenue basis? If they are, this duty on sugar must be upon a free-trade or revenue basis also, because we made like reductions, as I repeatedly said, on sugar as on the other articles taxed in it.

Does the Senator from Rhode Island wish to interrupt me now?

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator from North Carolina has only five minutes. As some of the subject matter about which I wanted to ask him has been gone over by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], I will not take his time unless he has finished.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have only four minutes left and I will not longer occupy the floor, but yield it to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of interest to the Senator's descriptions of free-trade and protective duties. The duty on sugar under a Republican tariff was 1.33 cents a pound. The duty on sugar under a Democratic tariff was 1 cent a pound, and it was to go on the free list on the 1st day of May, 1916. The Senator from North Carolina seems to consider that a duty is a revenue duty if it is 1 cent a pound, that it is a revenue duty if it is nothing a pound, but that if it goes above 1 cent a pound it immediately becomes a protective duty. He describes the reduction in the duty on sugar as being exactly in the same ratio that woolens were reduced, that cottons were reduced, and I suppose perhaps if he had thought of it he would have said silks, because he referred to other textiles. There was a duty of 50 per cent left on silks, there was a duty of 35 per cent left on woolen goods, and there was only a duty of less than 20 per cent or about 18 per cent left on cottons, and sugar was to have gone on the free list entirely.

I fail, myself, to understand how duties of percentages of that kind can all be revenue duties. As a plain matter of fact, everybody in the Senate knows that the reason why this duty is put upon sugar is because the Democratic tariff, which was described as having for its sole object the raising of revenue, only succeeded in producing $127,000,000 less revenue than the same amount of imports would have produced if the Republican tariff that it supplanted had been left in force.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before the Senator from North Carolina leaves the Chamber, I should like to ask him just one question. Suppose the revenues of the Government should become sufficient to meet the requirements of the Government, would the Senator then be in favor of putting sugar on the free list again?

Mr. SIMMONS. I undoubtedly would, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 5 o'clock p. m.). The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] that the Senate recede from its amendment to House bill 11471.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. THOMAS called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when Mr. BANKHEAD's name was called). My colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] has been called away from the city on official business. If he were here, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SHEPPARD (when Mr. BECKHAM's name was called). The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] is absent on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT].

Mr. BRADY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], and I therefore withhold my vote. If privileged to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. I transfer my pair to the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], who is absent, but I am informed that if present he would vote "yea" on this question. I therefore feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], but on this bill I am privileged to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. TAGGART (when Mr. KERN's name was called). The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] is unavoidably absent to-day. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I understand, however, that he would vote the same way I intend to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SHEPPARD (when the name of Mr. SMITH of South Carolina was called). I wish to state that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent on official business.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "yea."

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."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I am informed that the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], with whom I have a general pair, would vote as I intend to vote on this question. I vote "yea."

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. I am not sure how he would vote on this question. Therefore I will withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea," and I think the Senator from Kentucky would vote the same way.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], but I understand from his colleague that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I therefore vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. OWEN (after having voted in the negative). I should like to ask whether the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. OWEN. I am paired with that Senator and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. CHILTON. My colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. BRADY. I am advised that the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], with whom I am paired, would vote "yea" if present. I am therefore at liberty to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (after having voted in the affirmative). I wish to inquire whether the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have a general pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and let my vote stand.

The result was announced—years 59, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—59.

Ashurst	Harding	Oliver	Smoot
Borah	Hollis	Overman	Stone
Brady	Johnson, Me.	Page	Sutherland
Brandegee	Jones	Phelan	Swanson
Broussard	Kenyon	Pittman	Taggart
Burleigh	La Follette	Poindexter	Thompson
Chamberlain	Lippitt	Pomerene	Tillman
Chilton	Lodge	Ransdell	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	McCumber	Robinson	Underwood
Colt	McLean	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Walsh
Cummins	Myers	Sheppard	Warren
Dillingham	Nelson	Simmons	Williams
Gallinger	Newlands	Smith, Ariz.	Works
Gronna	Norris	Smith, Mich.	

NAYS—10.

Gore	Husting	Martine, N. J.	Vardaman
Hardwick	Johnson, S. Dak.	Smith, Ga.	
Hughes	Lane	Thomas	

NOT VOTING—27.

Bankhead	du Pont	Lea, Tenn.	Sherman
Beckham	Fall	Lee, Md.	Shields
Bryan	Fletcher	Lewis	Smith, Md.
Catron	Goff	O'Gorman	Smith, S. C.
Clapp	Hitchcock	Owen	Sterling
Clarke, Ark.	James	Penrose	Weeks
Curtis	Kern	Reed	

So the Senate receded from its amendment.

Mr. CHILTON. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 24, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *April 22, 1916.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

O Thou who art infinitely wise, all powerful, whose love encircles all, we thank Thee that under the dispensation of Thy providence we are brought once more to the anniversary of the greatest event in all history, the resurrection of the "Son of Man," confirming the longings, hopes, and aspirations which have filled the hearts of men in all generations in the unbroken continuity of life, which will adjust all wrongs, clear away misunderstandings, fill all hearts with love, and unite mankind into one family.

There's a wideness in God's mercy,
Like the wideness of the sea;
There's a kindness in His justice,
Which is more than liberty.

There's no place where earthly sorrows
Are more felt than up in heaven;
There's no place where earthly failings
Have such kindly judgment given.

For the love of God is broader
Than the measure of man's mind,
And the heart of the Eternal
Is most wonderfully kind.

Help us, we beseech Thee, to add life unto life, strength unto strength, love unto love, that we may be prepared for the transition which waits on all. It is written "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. For I am persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CELEBRATION OF LANDING OF SIR FRANCIS DRAKE ON THE COAST OF CALIFORNIA.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have taken from the Speaker's table Senate concurrent resolution No. 20, now as amended by the Senate Senate joint resolution 121, and have the Senate amendment concurred in.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thought this was a House resolution.

Mr. KENT. It was originally passed in the House and amended in the Senate. It was entirely my fault——

The SPEAKER. But how did it get another number in the Senate?

Mr. KENT. Because it was a concurrent resolution and was amended to be a Senate joint resolution, and the Senate has given it a new number.

Mr. MANN. It being amended to be a joint resolution, they did not feel authorized to change the number, but they have amended our amendment by changing the number.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk began the reading of the amendments.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, those are the House amendments. The Clerk should read the Senate amendment to the House amendments.

The SPEAKER. Those are the House amendments.

Mr. MANN. There is a Senate amendment to the first House amendment, and undoubtedly it is there, if the Clerk will find it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) authorizing the appointment of a representative of the United States Government to appear at the celebration of the landing of Sir Francis Drake on the coast of California, with a further amendment, as follows: Strike out the numerals "20" after "S. J. Res." and insert "121."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent for the present consideration. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. It is a privileged matter.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Minnesota rise?

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Philippine question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the Philippine question. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CALL OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not——

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves the call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adair	Dyer	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan
Bacharach	Eagan	Jones	Platt
Barchfeld	Eagle	Kearns	Porter
Beales	Edmonds	Keating	Pou
Bennet	Edwards	Keister	Price
Browne	Fairchild	Kelley	Roberts, Mass.
Browning	Farley	Kennedy, R. I.	Rogers
Bruckner	Finley	Kettner	Rowland
Brumbaugh	Fitzgerald	Kiess, Pa.	Russell, Ohio
Burnett	Flynn	Kreider	Sabath
Butler	Focht	Lafean	Sanford
Byrnes, S. C.	Foss	Lazaro	Scott, Pa.
Caldwell	Frear	Lehlbach	Sears
Caraway	Freeman	Lewis	Sherley
Carew	Gallagher	Liebel	Siegel
Carlin	Gallivan	Linthicum	Small
Carter, Mass.	Gardner	Lobeck	Snell
Casey	Gillett	Loft	Snyder
Chandler, N. Y.	Glass	McClintic	Stedman
Chiperfield	Godwin, N. C.	McCulloch	Steele, Pa.
Clark, Fla.	Goodwin, Ark.	McKinley	Swift
Coleman	Graham	Maher	Switzer
Conry	Gray, N. J.	Miller, Minn.	Taggart
Cooper, Ohio	Griest	Moon	Tague
Costello	Griffin	Mooney	Talbott
Dale, N. Y.	Guernsey	Moores, Ind.	Thomas
Darrow	Hamill	Morgan, La.	Treadway
Davis, Minn.	Harrison	Morin	Vare
Decker	Hart	Moss, W. Va.	Venable
Denison	Haskell	Mott	Ward
Dewalt	Heaton	Mudd	Watkins
Dies	Heflin	Murray	Whaley
Dill	Henry	Nelson	Williams, W. E.
Doughton	Holland	Nichols, Mich.	Wilson, Fla.
Driscoll	Hood	O'Shaunessy	Wilson, Ill.
Drukker	Humphreys, Miss.	Padgett	Winslow
Dupré	Husted	Patten	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 286 gentlemen have answered to their names—a quorum.

Mr. KITCHIN. I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

INCREASE OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 12766, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 12766. An act to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Would that interfere with my privilege?

The SPEAKER. Not a particle.

Mr. MANN. Would the gentleman be willing to let his request go over until Monday?

Mr. HAY. Will the gentleman say if it does go over until Monday there will be no objection to it?

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

Mr. HAY. I do not see that there is any use of letting it go over if there is going to be objection.

Mr. MANN. I stated to the gentleman yesterday morning that I had not had a chance to examine the Senate amendments, and I have not had a chance yet, but I will have a chance to do so before Monday.

Mr. HAY. I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the ranking member of the Committee on Military Affairs on that side of the House has had ample opportunity to look into it. I do not want to press the gentleman. If the gentleman will say there will be no objection to this request on Monday, I will withdraw it now.

Mr. MANN. If I say there will be no objection on Monday, I might as well say there will be no objection now, for the very reason I want to examine the Senate amendments and see whether there will be any effort made for some vote in the House on the subject.

Mr. HAY. I am perfectly willing, if the gentleman desires it, to let the bill be called up, and if the gentleman wants to do so he can make a motion to concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. MANN. I will be very frank with the gentleman and say that I will have to object this morning to unanimous consent on it. Whether I would object Monday or not I do not know. I have not examined the Senate amendments, and I expect to do so before Monday.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman say?

Mr. HAY. I insist on my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. Then it is referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

BRIDGE ACROSS FOX RIVER AT GENEVA, ILL.

Mr. COPLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Speaker to take from the desk the bill S. 5415 and lay it before the House?

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the Senate bill, a similar bill being on the House Calendar.

Mr. COPLEY. This is exactly similar to the bill H. R. 14387.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 5415) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Fox River at Geneva, Ill.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chicago & North Western Railway Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the States of Wisconsin, Illinois, and Michigan, its successors and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Fox River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation in the city of Geneva and State of Illinois in accordance with the act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges across navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House bill of similar tenor, H. R. 14387, will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a change of reference of the bill H. R. 14822 from the Committee on the Judiciary to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The Chair could not understand what the gentleman was saying, there being so much noise.

Mr. MANN. This may be very interesting, but we can not hear it.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill H. R. 14822, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. This same bill was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANN. What is the bill?

Mr. OGLESBY. It is a bill to prevent the desecration, mutilation, or improper use of the flag within the District of Columbia. The Committee on the District of Columbia had the bill under consideration, and suggested a number of changes, and in order that it might not be in position where we had too many amendments I reintroduced the bill, and I think it was an error when it was referred to the other committee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of suffrage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of suffrage.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is not a communication by some other individual than the Member?

Mr. CRAMTON. In part, and part a communication by me—both very brief.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 14345, for the relief of J. P. Patterson, has been referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER. If it is a private bill the chairman of the committee to which it is referred can change it himself. The Speaker has nothing to do with it.

Mr. ALMON. The chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads suggested that I make the request.

The SPEAKER. It does not make any difference what the committee requested. It is a private bill, and all the gentleman has to do is to write on the back of the bill where he wishes it to go.

JUVENILE COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON], under a special order, is entitled to speak not to exceed 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker: Since the Menace, a paper published at Aurora, Mo., a paper which would rather be a religious bigot than be right, has preferred to be an alarmist rather than truthful concerning the House bill known as "the juvenile court bill," I have concluded to make a short statement relative to the bill.

After having laid down the general principle that the bill is of Catholic origin and has for its principal purpose the placing of Protestant children in "Roman Catholic prisons," that hysterical paper then complains of other alleged wrongs in the bill. One of these is that persons under 17 years of age who violate the law may be placed in institutions "other than public institutions." Another complaint is that the hearing or trial of youthful offenders may be "private" instead of public. And another is that the records of the court proceedings may be withheld from the public.

I wish to say that the proposition to place youthful offenders in institutions "other than public institutions" is conceded by the world over to be better than placing them in public institutions with hardened criminals. Forty-four States out of the forty-eight which compose the United States have a similar law. Such a law has been enacted in Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

In each and every one of those States that law was enacted by a non-Catholic legislative body.

The second complaint is that no hearing against a youthful offender should be "private." Such hearings are permitted to be private or in chambers in the States of Alabama, Arizona, Delaware, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, and Washington—17 in all. Non-Catholic legislatures enacted that law in those States.

The third objection made by this hysterical alarmist is that the "records" of hearings concerning youthful offenders may be withheld from the public. All modern trend of humane and charitable thought is now in that direction. A similar law is upon the statute books of Georgia, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Virginia. The Virginia law was adopted only year before last, while that of New York was adopted as late as last year.

The bill about which this religious bigot complains so bitterly, and with so little reason, extends clemency and mercy and at the same time holds out hope to the childish offender, yet redeemable from a life of crime, instead of dealing with him or her as a hardened, professional criminal of mature years, for whom there is no hope and for whom there should be little or no clemency.

The Menace, the bigoted critic of the bill, boldly makes the assertion that under its provisions Protestant children will be committed to "Roman Catholic prisons," notwithstanding the fact that section 25 of the bill provides in plain language that the judge of the court, in committing children to institutions "other than public institutions," shall commit them to a "custodial agency" holding the same religious belief as the parents of the child or to some institution or association governed by persons of like religious faith. Therefore, the judge of the court could not send a Protestant child to either a well-conducted Catholic institution, to a Catholic home, or to the alleged "Roman Catholic prison," of which the Menace speaks just as though such a thing really existed. Under the provisions of the bill the judge of the juvenile court would be required to select a Presbyterian "custodial agency" for a Presbyterian child, a Methodist "custodial agency" for a Methodist child, a Baptist "custodial agency" for a Baptist child, a Jewish "custodial agency" for a Jewish child, an Episcopalian "custodial agency" for an Episcopalian child, a Congregationalist "custodial

agency" for a Congregationalist child, and a Catholic "custodial agency" for a Catholic child only.

As I have already said, similar laws, enacted by non-Catholic legislative bodies, are now upon the statute books of 44 out of the 48 States of the Union.

If a girl of 12 or 14 years should be arrested for an unchaste offense against the law, can any person charitably inclined tell me or anybody else why her trial should be opened to the morbidly curious and the scandal monger? If a girl of like age should be rescued from a bawdy house and placed in a Masonic orphan asylum, or in a Methodist orphan asylum, or in a Baptist orphan asylum, or in a Presbyterian orphan asylum, or in a Catholic orphan asylum, and there be reformed and afterwards become a good woman, can anyone tell me why the legal record which committed her to the custody of any of these institutions should be held for all time as a public record against her past life, a life which she has left behind? Why should any wicked man, either for the purpose of lustful or pecuniary blackmail or for any other purpose, be permitted to go and get the record of her past, which could not possibly be used for any good purpose but of necessity could be used only for an evil purpose?

As I have said, the most modern thought is upon the charitable and merciful side of this question; and the States of Georgia, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Virginia have already enacted laws to shield reformed girls and boys, rather than to have them forever confronted with a record against which they could not stand in any new community to which they might go.

As already said, neither of the three complained-of provisions of the bill is a pioneer one. The people of every civilized land have come to treat youthful offenders with more charity and less severity than is meted out to the confirmed criminal who, by his many and repeated unlawful acts, has put himself beyond the sympathies of tolerant men and women.

The proposed law for the District of Columbia is not an ice-breaking, pioneer one for the District of Columbia as the incendiary impostor would have his uninformed readers to believe.

Complaint is made against the bill because a child can be "summoned" to appear before the court instead of being dragged there by force. Further complaint is made that a child may be "summoned" to appear in court "without the consent of the father or mother or guardian." Without a considerate juvenile court law the lawbreaking child would be forcibly arrested and taken into court without the consent of the father, mother, or guardian. I ask which is the more humane, and which is better for the future of the child, and even more considerate of the father and mother?

Unless the law make a difference in the manner of arrest, trial, and commitment of the youthful offender and those of mature years, then the youthful offender instead of being quietly "summoned" to appear before the court would be dragged through the streets by uniformed officers, just as is done with the hardened, shameless criminal.

I am constrained to believe that all this furor has been raised by this religious bigot simply because it has happened that the bill was introduced by a Catholic, and because it makes it possible for offending children of Catholic parents to be put into Catholic institutions, just as the offending children of parents of any other religious denomination may be placed in institutions of their faith.

The same bigot prefers to mislead rather than to enlighten when undertaking to convey the apprehension and grave fear that the trial of youthful lawbreakers behind doors closed to the uncharitable traducer is for some mean and debasing purpose rather than a shield between the unfortunate boy or girl and the scandal monger, whose principal pastime is to tell from man to man the frailties and misfortunes of others, even those of the youth of our land.

The same self-constituted guardian of liberty which peddles its false alarms at 25 cents a year to every gullible who can be found to buy them would have it believed that the bill now before Congress is the first to make provision for "private" instead of public hearings of charges against youthful breakers of the law, while in fact, as I have said, substantially the same law is upon the statute books of 17 of our States, put there by non-Catholic legislatures.

If it is true, as this religious bigot would have you believe, that the purpose of the bill is to commit youthful offenders to "Roman Catholic prisons," let us see who these Menace-made, villainous plotters against our boys and girls are.

I introduced the bill at the request of those who prepared it. The bigoted alarmist may say that because I, a Catholic, introduced the bill is sufficient proof of itself of its unholy purpose. I was asked to introduce the bill because I happened to be chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which committee all District bills are referred for consideration. Among those who asked me to introduce the bill is Judge J. W. Latimer. Is he a Catholic, taking orders from the Pope to fill "Roman Catholic prisons"? No; Judge Latimer, whose post-office address is at the Municipal Building, Washington, D. C., is not only a non-Catholic, but a Mason in good standing.

Next, let us see whether or not Catholics drafted this bill so that "Roman Catholic prisons" might be filled.

A Presbyterian Attorney General of the United States selected a committee of five persons who were deemed competent to draft the bill, and fair-minded enough and broad enough to write a bill free from both religious prejudices and religious preferences, in keeping with the Constitution of the United States. The five persons selected were Miss Julia C. Lathrop, Washington, D. C.; Bernard Flexner, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. William J. Kerby, Washington, D. C.; Mr. Walter C. Clephane, Washington, D. C.; and Mr. William H. Baldwin, Washington, D. C.

Are they Catholics doing the bidding of the Pope? Let us see what and who they are.

Miss Julia C. Lathrop in religious belief is a Congregationalist, not a Catholic; Mr. Flexner is a Jew, not a Catholic; Mr. Clephane is a Presbyterian, not a Catholic; Mr. Baldwin is also a Presbyterian, not a Catholic. Dr. Kerby is the only Catholic among them all.

Miss Lathrop was appointed by President Taft as Chief of the Children's Bureau of the United States and was reappointed to that responsible and honorable position by President Wilson.

The Board of Trade of Washington appointed a committee to look into the merits of the bill. That committee carefully considered it, item by item, and with a few minor changes approved it.

Was that committee made up of Catholics in order to run people into "Roman Catholic prisons"? Again, let us see. The chairman of that Committee was Mr. Louis A. Dent, an Episcopalian and Mason, not a Catholic. Another member of that committee was Mr. Merritt O. Chance, also an Episcopalian and Mason, not a Catholic. Another member was Mr. George A. Shinn, a Presbyterian and a Mason, not a Catholic. Another member was Mr. Thomas W. Smith, a Methodist and a Mason, not a Catholic. Another member was Mr. J. Lawrence Solly, a Baptist, not a Catholic. Another member was Mr. S. W. Curriden, a Presbyterian, not a Catholic. Another was Mr. Mathew E. O'Brien, a member of no church, but an Odd Fellow, a Knight of Pythias, and a Mason, not a Catholic. Another member was Mr. Edward S. Schmid, a Lutheran and a Mason, not a Catholic. Another member was Mr. D. W. Thayer, a Presbyterian and a Mason, not a Catholic. Another member was Mr. William H. Baldwin, a Presbyterian, not a Catholic. Another member was Mr. Walter C. Clephane, a Presbyterian and the son of a Mason, not a Catholic. Another member was Mr. John H. Zabel, the only Catholic out of the whole lot.

Can any sane man be made to believe that that committee connived at a proposition to fill "Roman Catholic prisons" with American citizens?

Congressman TINKHAM, who is in charge of the bill upon the floor of this House and who is its principal advocate, is a thirty-second degree Mason. Is he, too, trying to fill "Roman Catholic prisons" with the children of his fellow Masons?

When this bill becomes law the execution of its provisions will be with Judge Latimer, a Mason, not a Catholic. Is it true of him that he will violate his oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States and use his high office to fill "Roman Catholic prisons" with Protestant children?

I ask the Masons of this House and the Masons of this country if they believe, in view of all of the facts, that this bill, written by non-Catholics, will place American citizens in "Roman Catholic prisons"? [Applause.]

LOCK AND DAM, NO. 6, GREAT KANAWHA RIVER, W. VA.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. LITTLEPAGE] asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I want to crave your indulgence for a few moments. Yesterday morning I asked unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 12455, which I had prepared and introduced in the House, and at my instance was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, be transferred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. One of the ablest parliamentarians in this Chamber, I believe, misconceiving the purport of the bill, objected, and it was therefore passed over.

I want to read the bill to the House. I feel that I am entitled to this relief; that my constituents are. It is a private bill that does not hurt the Government, does not cost the Government one cent, but pays the Government an annual rental. It will afford a great accommodation to a vast number of people, in fact many thousands of by best people. It is a local measure affecting my district only, and no other Member of the House is directly or indirectly interested in the matter except as a matter of public policy. The bill reads:

A bill (H. R. 12455) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to lease to Charleston-Dunbar Traction Co. a certain strip or piece of land owned by the United States Government on the Great Kanawha River in West Virginia.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to lease, at a nominal rental value of not exceeding $25 per year, to the Charleston-Dunbar Traction Co., a corporation, its successors or assigns, the strip of land 15 feet wide and 601.8 feet long, or approximately twenty-one one-hundredths of an acre, which said strip of land is situated at or near United States Government Lock and Dam No. 6 of the Great Kanawha River improvement, near the city of Charleston, in the State of West Virginia, which said strip of land said Charleston-Dunbar Traction Co. is now occupying with its track: *Provided*, That said annual rental shall be promptly paid as required by the Secretary of War, and that the United States Government shall sustain no loss or expense by reason of said lease to said traction company: *And provided further*, That said traction company shall not fence up said strip of land unless required to do so by the Secretary of War, and shall, at its own expense, keep up and maintain the existing crossings over said traction company's line on the Government's property: *And provided further*, That said traction company shall not remove its station or stop upon or near the Government's said property as said stop and station is at present located.

This bill, as stated, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I thought at that time that that was the proper committee, and some of our oldest Members say so yet. I do not want my bill destroyed by their differences of opinions. The Committee on Military Affairs considered the bill, was in favor of the bill, and directed me to so report it, but it was suggested by one of the most distinguished and best Members of this House, Mr. KAHN, of California, that the War Department be consulted. I acted on his suggestion and consulted the War Department. The Secretary of War, through Col. Taylor, approved the bill, but suggested in a letter, with his report, that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors should as well act on the matter, doubtless his opinion being based on the fact that the original bill authorizing the appropriation for the improvement of the Great Kanawha River, in which this lock is situated, came from that committee. That committee, through its chairman, Mr. SPARKMAN, still feels that it should be consulted and should consider the bill. The Secretary of War feels so. I am helpless unless this House comes to my relief, and have sought this opportunity to confer with you. I am entitled to have you help me to help and protect my people. Now, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, Mr. HAY, of Virginia, one of our very ablest Members, a man of splendid qualities, whom every member of his committee loves, Democrats and Republicans alike, said it was all right with him to make the reference. Mr. SPARKMAN's committee, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, meets Monday. If I do not get this permission to-day to refer it to that committee, I can not get the bill acted upon in time.

Judge Grosscup and his associates of Chicago, Ill., and Hon. Fred Paul Grosscup and his associates of Charleston, W. Va., have expended nearly $600,000 in the Great Kanawha River Valley. They are all fine, in fact noble, people, and are materially assisting in the development of my section. This interurban line connects Charleston with the town of Dunbar. Lock No. 6, about midway between the two cities, where the Government owns about 6 or 7 acres of land, having purchased it at the time the locks were put in there. The land occupied by the traction company is on a hillside. It will not bring 20 bushels of corn to the acre. It is very poor land and steep. It is within 3 miles of my home. The strip occupied is approximately 1,200 feet from the lock chamber and 300 or 400 feet away from the dam. Does not in the slightest interfere with or injure the Government property.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from West Virginia yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. By what authority did the railroad company get the use of that land in the first place?

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. By permission of the Secretary of War, he having leased it to the traction company. I thank the gentleman for that question. The Secretary of War now claims that having leased it for five years, and having no authority to lease it longer than five years, expiring August 1, 1916, he must now have the permission of Congress that he may continue or renew the lease.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this bill be referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. This is a personal matter to me, relating to a matter in my own district—local in its very nature and of vital interest to me and mine——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to take the bill named from the Committee on Military Affairs and refer it to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 12717.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12717) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on yesterday afternoon the gentleman from Indiana had pending an amendment which, without objection, the Clerk will again report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 51, after line 13, by inserting as a new paragraph the following:

"For investigating a method for the eradication of the Hessian fly in wheat by the process of spraying, $50,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] is recognized.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto may conclude in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. LEVER. I will make it 25 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina modifies his request and asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto conclude in 25 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is addressed to one of the most important industries connected with agriculture. The wheat crop of last year was worth more than a billion dollars. The farmers produced a billion dollars of new wealth. In the previous year the wheat crop was also worth approximately a billion dollars. And yet in spite of that fact there was a greater loss of wealth through the destructive ravages of the Hessian fly in the wheat crop of those two years than occurred in any other business in this great country.

The growth of wheat is adapted to every State in the Union. Yet there is less effort on the part of the Agricultural Department, it seems to me, to eradicate the Hessian fly and stop its ravages than is devoted to any other subject connected with the Department of Agriculture. The reasonable and practicable way to exterminate this pest is by some insecticide sprayed upon the growing plant. The eggs are deposited upon the blade of the growing plant, the life is germinated there, and then the insect works its way into the stalk of the plant, destroys the joint, and the wheat becomes worthless. The advice of the department, as given in bulletins, is for the farmer to wait until after the frost season has set in, so that the frost will kill the germs of life in the eggs laid on the plant. If that plan had been followed last year in the great Mississippi Valley south of Lake Michigan, there would have been no wheat sown there until too late in the season for it to germinate. There is no better wheat-producing soil in the world than in the Delta of the Mississippi, in Louisiana, and Mississippi. Yet if the farmers there should wait each year under the instructions of the Agricultural Department they would not be able to sow their wheat until long after the sowing season had passed, and frequently after Christmas or New Years. An insecticide can be prepared, either in a powder or a liquid form, and sprayed upon the growing wheat, destroying the life of this insect, or the life germ in the egg, and so protecting wheat from the ravages of this pest. In comparison to the great loss sustained annually by the farmers of this country from the ravages of this pest, the appropriation of $50,000 for experi-

ments by scientists to discover some method along this line is a very moderate sum indeed, when we take into consideration the amount that would be saved to this industry in this country each year. It is a matter of vital interest to the farmers of the country. I may add it is not alone of interest to them but to the entire population of the country, who are concerned in the food supply. We should here do all we can to encourage the industry of farming and particularly the branch of wheat culture. It is not enough to say we are trying some plan to rid the plant of this enemy, but should make it possible for the department to avail itself of every opportunity to discover some more effective means than it has so far discovered.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULLOP. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I think we are all of us very much interested in what the gentleman is saying. What I want to inquire is whether the Government has made any experiments along this line, and if not, then whether experiments have been made by private parties?

Mr. CULLOP. I thank the gentleman very much for asking that question. The Government has made no experiments along this line, as I have been informed by it. I called the attention of Prof. Webster to it last December when Congress convened. He was very much interested, and I told him about an experiment made by a farmer in my district. He assured me that the matter would be taken up by the department with Purdue University.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I would like three or four minutes more. I want to give this illustration, which I think is important.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has fixed the limit of debate.

Mr. CULLOP. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two or three minutes to answer the question of the gentleman from Michigan. I think I have some valuable information on this subject.

Mr. LEVER. I presume the Chairman has reserved five minutes for me, and I ask the gentleman to take two minutes of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for two minutes out of the time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. CULLOP. Prof. Webster promised me that he would take up the matter without delay, and have it investigated through Purdue University; but shortly after that Prof. Webster, unfortunately, died, on January 3, 1916, before anything had or could be done in the matter.

A farmer living in Monroe County, Ind., a tenant on what was known as the Dunn farm, adjoining the campus of the State university, some years ago had a field of wheat in an orchard on the farm. In the spring he sprayed the orchard in order to kill the insects on the fruit trees and some of the spray fell upon the growing wheat. The rest of the wheat in that field was destroyed by the Hessian fly, but on the part around the fruit trees which had been sprayed there was an abundant yield. It was the purpose of the department, under the direction of Prof. Webster, to look up this man, through the aid of Purdue University, and find out what insecticide he had used.

Now, science is able to conquer the evils with which agriculture is compelled to contend; but unless some appropriation is made to direct the attention of the department it will not take the necessary interest and make the investigation which is required. There is no more important matter than this in the Agricultural appropriation bill; and I ask the adoption of this amendment. [Applause.]

I am informed by the department that of the appropriation proposed in this bill only $5,000 is proposed to be devoted to this important subject. This, I contend, is wholly inadequate when we consider the magnitude of this industry, its importance to 8,000,000 farmers who yearly suffer from the ravages of this pest, and the welfare of the people of this country. I urge for these reasons its adoption, believing, as I do, that conditions existing require it and that if adopted it will serve a most useful purpose to the entire country.

We should do what we can here to promote the great farming industry, because upon it the country's welfare depends, and this matter is of such vital importance that it deserves serious consideration in order that this great industry may be encouraged.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to support any appropriation which looks to the eradication of the pest that destroys the wheat crop, the great basic crop of our country. I have no more knowledge than most Members of the House of the method by which the destruction of this pest can be accomplished. If it is possible to destroy it by means of spraying, and that information can be given out to the farmers, there is no doubt that the money will be well spent.

The wheat crop of this country last year was 900,000,000 bushels. It is one of our biggest crops, our basic crop, probably the most widespread crop that we have. I think it is now claimed that the production of corn exceeds that of wheat in value and that wheat has dropped to second place, but that can only be a temporary condition, and eventually and permanently wheat must be the great basic staple crop of the Mississippi Valley and of the farming regions of this country. As I have said, last year we produced 900,000,000 bushels of wheat. That wheat was not only the stock in trade of the farmer, but it was the raw material of the country mill. Every small town has its flour mill, which manufactures flour from the wheat grown in the vicinity. Wheat used to be, and still ought to be, one of the great export crops of this country; and if it were not for the cheap wheat lands of Canada I doubt not that wheat would be one of the great export crops of this Nation. To-day the American wheat farmer is confronted with competition which is world-wide. Every bushel of wheat raised in Kansas or Missouri comes in competition not only with every other bushel of wheat raised in those States but with the wheat of Canada, with the wheat of Argentina, with the wheat of Australia, with the wheat of Siberia, and of all the other great wheat-producing regions of the world. The price of wheat is fixed in the strongest competitive market under the strongest competitive conditions of world-wide competition. No man who produces wheat can figure on fixing the price of his own product. It is normally fixed at Liverpool under world-wide competition, and the only things that we can improve are the conditions of production at home and the cost of transportation to the great markets of the world.

I have voted repeatedly for items in this bill for the eradication of pests which afflicted only a very small section of our agricultural industry, pests relating to the citrus-fruit crop, which is a very trifling thing compared with the great agricultural interests of the West; pests relating to the chestnut-tree blight; and things of that kind, which are insignificant compared with the great basic crops of the Nation. But here is a great wheat crop of 900,000,000 bushels, worth over a billion dollars, affected by this widespread pest; and, as I say, I do not know whether the spraying proposition is a good one or not, but, so far as I know, no way has been found of controlling the Hessian fly. I believe, however, that science can find a way to control it. I know in the country at large last year, even with the 900,000,000 bushels, we produced an average of less than 13 bushels per acre. I do not believe that a country in Europe produced less than 20 or 25 bushels an acre, and we must bring our standard of farming up by scientific methods in the Department of Agriculture until we have fuller returns for the agricultural products to the tiller of the soil. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this amendment, because it makes it possible for the Government to institute investigations by which it may be determined whether there is a remedy for this great evil to the wheat growers of the United States. Under present conditions and circumstances, there practically is no way for the farmer to provide against the evil of the Hessian fly. He does not know that the Hessian fly is on his wheat crop until the crop is practically ruined. Therefore it is necessary for him to be advised and informed in advance of some remedy that he may apply to the wheat that will be there, ready on the approach of the Hessian fly when he does come on the scene.

Now, as has been suggested by the gentleman from Missouri and others, last year the wheat crop amounted to more than 900,000,000 bushels, valued at more than a billion dollars. I notice, within the last two or three weeks, that according to the forecasts of the Department of Agriculture and of the bureaus of the State departments of agriculture over the country the prospects are that this year there will not be more than 75 per cent of a crop of wheat raised, and a large proportion of this decrease is due to the Hessian fly, of which we are complaining to-day.

I do not know that it is possible, any more than I knew on yesterday it was possible, to manufacture potash out of kelp; but if it is possible for the Government of the United States by investigation to provide some remedy so that the farmer can protect his wheat crop against the ravages of the Hessian fly, so that this great crop of 900,000,000 bushels may be saved to the people, this is a very paltry sum to be provided for the investigation and demonstration of that remedy.

The wheat crop is a peculiar crop. In some States they raise winter wheat, in some spring wheat; but whether it be winter

wheat or spring wheat, it is always subject to the ravages of the Hessian fly, because the fly can come in the fall of the year or the spring of the year, and whenever it does come it secretly bores its way into the stalk of wheat, and before the farmer knows there is anything wrong his wheat is ruined, and there is no help for it.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly.

Mr. RAKER. This item is not in the bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Can the gentleman or the gentleman from Indiana or the gentleman from Missouri give any explanation of why it was not included in the general bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. I can not.

Mr. LEVER. The item is in the bill, as a matter of fact. It is in the item for the investigation of insects affecting cereals and forage crops.

Mr. RAKER. I asked the question because the committee has been so willing, and the gentleman from Kentucky and others have presented the matter so well, that it seems strange that it was not in the general bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's compliment.

Mr. CULLOP. There is no provision in the bill for the process of spraying or the discovery of a process by spraying.

Mr. BARKLEY. While it is in the item in gross for all cereals, of course there are many cereals besides wheat, and the appropriation that would be devoted to wheat out of the $114,000 would be very small. This amendment applies especially to wheat.

Mr. RAKER. I am in hearty sympathy with the amendment, and I think there should be this additional sum for this particular purpose.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, there has never been any disposition on the part of the Committee on Agriculture to refuse to recommend appropriations for any good purpose to enable the department to make investigations in important matters of this kind. The committee did consider very carefully the question and the amount of money needed by the department for work in connection with the diseases of cereals and forage crops, and money has been provided in the item that carries $114,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understand that some of this other money, the $114,000, could be used for this purpose if the bureau thought proper?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. If the attention of the bureau is not specifically called to the Hessian fly, will they be apt to conduct investigations for that purpose?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that the attention of the department was called to the Hessian fly years ago, and it has been carrying on systematic work, bending every energy, using every known means for its eradication or control since 1905. There is a misapprehension in regard to this matter. Members seem to labor under the impression that the department has been doing nothing in the matter of the Hessian fly. Sprays have been used, and with some measure of success, but the department has reached the conclusion, and says it without hesitation, that their investigations have enabled them to apprise the farmers of the coming of the Hessian fly so they can prepare against it. They say, further, that if the instructions given by the department, the suggestions made, are followed, the farmers will avoid any serious damage.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What do they do to avoid serious damage? Everyone who is familiar with farming knows that the Hessian fly is a serious pest.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The methods and times of sowing the wheat are set forth, and directions are given for each particular locality, and the department tells us that if their directions are followed the injury will not be serious. Of course it is barely possible that some gentleman in Indiana has discovered a material for spraying which is something new and cheap enough to justify its use, something the officials of the department have not in their 11 years been able to discover, but I doubt it very much. Spraying will kill the Hessian fly, of course, but it is expensive to spray a wheat field. There are some wheat fields in this country which contain several acres, and spraying would be an expensive operation.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. Has the department at any time ever made any effort to discover a remedy for the Hessian fly by spraying?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Sure, and while they have reached some measure of success, they recommend the other method, and they have issued a bulletin giving directions and offering suggestions to farmers, apprising them each year whether or not the fly is coming or is liable to come, and the methods to be employed and particularly the times of sowing to prevent serious damage.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. Is not the only method that the department proposes for the treatment of this subject to advise the farmers by means of its natural enemies in connection with the campaign, and induce farmers to plant the wheat at a fly-free date; that is, after the frost season occurs?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is just what I have said, that after all investigations made by the officials of the Bureau of Entomology and by other bureaus, they have found this matter of the time and manner of planting to be the most helpful, and they make a recommendation to that effect, and have practically given up, after a full investigation, the matter of using a spray or of finding a spray which can be recommended.

Mr. CULLOP. The gentleman is aware that the fly occurs in the spring of the year after the frost season is over?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The principal damage was at first, and I believe is yet, to the winter wheat, and there was no trouble to the spring-wheat area; but lately the fly has infested the spring-wheat area as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture since 1905 has been making investigations to find a remedy against the ravages of the Hessian fly. They propose, out of this appropriation of $114,000, to expend $5,000 during the coming fiscal year for a continuance of these studies.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I have only three minutes, and I decline to yield. It is now argued by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] and others supporting his amendment that this is a mere bagatelle as compared to the total value of the wheat crop. That is true. No one controverts that, but I want to call the attention of members of the committee to this fact, that the Department of Agriculture through its 10 years of study has not as yet reached a definite conclusion as to what is the best method of controlling the ravages of the Hessian fly. In other words, this whole proposition is still in a scientific and experimental stage. Five thousand dollars is all that the department asks to continue its scientific investigation. It is not a question of going out into the field to employ means and men and material to eradicate the Hessian fly; if it were, a larger appropriation might be justified, but this is an appropriation to enable the department to continue its scientific investigation.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Does this mean laboratory investigation?

Mr. LEVER. Laboratory and field—chiefly field investigation.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What is the extent of the field investigation?

Mr. LEVER. They have some six or eight field stations scattered throughout the country.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman state where they are?

Mr. LEVER. That takes my time, but I will put it in the RECORD. The stations are located in North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Indiana, Kansas, Tennessee, South Dakota, Missouri, and Oregon.

Mr. BARKLEY. And also what they can do at these stations with $5,000.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, the gentleman is wrong in that. This is not a question of eradicating the fly, it is a question of gathering scientific information, and you can do as much at six or eight stations in getting fundamental, basic facts as you could at 100 stations.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I must ask the gentleman not to interrupt as I have only a few minutes. If we can find a remedy the Committee on Agriculture is willing to appropriate money to apply the remedy, but until we have the remedy, let us not appropriate $50,000 here, of which the only use we could make would be to employ a number of additional scientific experts—boys who have graduated in chemistry at some college—students just out of college. The department through this amendment would be directed to spend this money, and the department would spend the money. They would put these youngsters on the road and eat up the $50,000, when the same results can be had, according

to their own estimates, for $5,000 by concentrating it in the hands of one or two genuine trained scientists and experts. I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LEVER) there were—ayes 24, nays 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that by unanimous consent all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto was closed. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar cane, etc., and the cigarette beetle and Argentine ant, $64,400.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The Bureau of Entomology gets $868,880, which is a large sum, for the investigation of bugs or insects. It is a great deal more in the aggregate than we get for some very worthy projects in the river and harbor bill; twice as much, at least, as went this year to all the States of New England for the improvement of their ports and rivers; but notwithstanding that, I think it is proper we should have a careful investigation of all these bugs and that there should be scientists employed by the Government to see that we get rid of them as rapidly as possible.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I really have not the time. I am with the gentleman and shall support the item; I am not antagonizing it. I am in favor of the removal of bugs that affect the health of man or that tend to destroy the health and happiness of animals. To prove the necessity for the appropriation for the proper control of our bugs and insects and germs, I send to the Clerk's desk a bit of verse attributed to Mr. Roy Atwell, a comedian, who seems to have given deep thought to this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read in the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

In these days of indigestion
It is oftentimes a question
As to what to eat and what to leave alone,
For each microbe and bacillus
Has a different way to kill us,
And in time they always claim us for their own.
There are germs of every kind
In any food that you can find
In the market or upon the bill of fare.
Drinking water's just as risky
As the so-called deadly whisky,
And it's often a mistake to breathe the air.

Some little bug is going to find you some day,
Some little bug will creep behind you some day;
Then he'll send for his bug friends
And all your earthly trouble ends;
Some little bug is going to find you some day.

The inviting green cucumber
Gets 'most everybody's number,
While the green corn has a system of its own;
Though a radish seems nutritious,
Its behavior is quite vicious,
And a doctor will be coming to your home.
Eating lobster cooked or plain
Is only flirting with ptomaine,
While an oyster sometimes has a lot to say,
But the clams we eat in chowder
Make the angels chant the louder,
For they know that we'll be with them right away.

Take a slice of nice fried onion
And you're fit for Dr. Munyon;
Apple dumplings kill you quicker than a train.
Chew a cheesy midnight "rabbit"
And a grave you'll soon inhabit—
Ah, to eat at all is such a foolish game.
Eating huckleberry pie
Is a pleasing way to die,
While sauerkraut brings on softening of the brain.
When you eat banana fritters
Every undertaker titters,
And the casket makers nearly go insane.

Some little bug is going to find you some day,
Some little bug will creep behind you some day;
With a nervous little quiver
He'll give cirrhosis of the liver;
Some little bug is going to find you some day.

When cold-storage vaults I visit
I can only say what is it
Makes poor mortals fill their systems with such stuff?
Now, for breakfast, prunes are dandy
If a stomach pump is handy
And your doctor can be found quite soon enough.
Eat a plate of fine pigs' knuckles
And the headstone cutter chuckles,
While the gravedigger makes a note upon his cuff.
Eat that lovely red bologna
And you'll wear a wooden kimono,
As your relatives start scrapping 'bout your stuff.

Some little bug is going to find you some day,
Some little bug will creep behind you some day;
Eating juicy sliced pineapple
Makes the sexton dust the chapel;
Some little bug is going to find you some day.

All these crazy foods they mix
Will float us 'cross the River Styx,
Or they'll start us climbing up the milky way;
And the meals we eat in courses
Mean a hearse and two black horses,
So before a meal some people always pray.
Lucious grapes breed 'pendicitis,
And the juice leads to gastritis,
So there's only death to greet us either way;
And fried liver's nice, but, mind you,
Friends will soon ride slow behind you.
And the papers then will have nice things to say.

Some little bug is going to find you some day,
Some little bug will creep behind you some day;
Eat some sauce, they call it chili,
On you breast they'll place a lily;
Some little bug is going to find you some day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the chorus be read.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think we have had enough of that now. I shall have to object to that.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the motion of the gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask unanimous consent that debate close on this paragraph and all amendments thereto in 10 minutes?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, suppose the gentleman let the debate develop on this a little, and then see whether it is desirable to close it.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think there is going to be any difficulty in reference to this.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not know, but I want to get a little information.

Mr. LEVER. I will make it 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there seems to be some ridicule on the other side, and this is a very important matter to some of us gentlemen here——

Mr. LEVER. Let me say to the gentleman from Kentucky that when he has been here as long as I have he will find the best way to handle an item of this kind is to say as little as possible.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I do not want to say anything unless it is necessary, but I did not want to be precluded from saying something if it be necessary.

Mr. LEVER. This is an exceedingly important item, and I am satisfied there is no opposition to it.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Will the chairman answer a question before the request is put, because I want to see whether I shall desire to offer an amendment or not? I notice in line 14 it is merely for the "investigation of insects."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, whose time is this?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has not been recognized. The Chair was waiting to see whether there would be any agreement.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the gentleman from South Carolina withhold his motion in that connection.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no motion pending.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I reserved the right to object just to get a little information from the gentleman from South Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been no proposition really put before the Chair.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, let me modify my request. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman——

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to save time.

The CHAIRMAN. Wait until the Chair puts the proposition. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not know that I will want any time, but I notice in line 14 the language is "for investigation of insects," and in line 23 "for investigations and demonstrations."

Now, what I am interested in, and what the representative of every tobacco State is interested in, is this: We are interested in the demonstration of the method of destroying, for instance, the tobacco hornworm by insecticides, and I want to

know whether under the language used that can be done or whether it will be necessary, following the analogy of line 23, to put in the word "demonstrations"?

Mr. LEVER. No; I will say to the gentleman from Virginia under the language in the item at line 14 the department would do the demonstration work the gentleman has in mind. The department would not do it as demonstration work, but it would have the same practical effect. The department says that its investigations of the hornworm in tobacco have not been completed, and the demonstration work in connection with it is only incidental, but in that investigation the practical result is just the same.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The demonstrations we are interested in will be performed under the present language?

Mr. LEVER. Without a doubt in the world.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This carries some more money for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how is this time to be divided?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Illinois desires five minutes, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY]——

Mr. MANN. There are six or eight gentlemen asking for time.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] wants five minutes——

Mr. SAUNDERS. I want five minutes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. And I want five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Gentlemen who have asked for time would consume nearly an hour, and I am satisfied there will be no motion to strike out this proposition at all, and I feel satisfied if such a motion were made it would not carry. I would like to get along with this bill to-day. If the gentlemen desire to discuss it rather than have it expedited, of course the chairman is helpless to close debate on these small items. He realizes that.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I want five minutes. I have not consumed any time in this debate, and I have never consumed any time on the Agricultural bill. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. That is very true.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands the proposition of the gentleman from South Carolina, it is to allow 20 minutes' debate, 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER], and 5 minutes——

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I temporarily withdraw the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HAWLEY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania called attention to the size of this appropriation. I rise to remark that the Department of Agriculture finds there are some 20,000 different kinds of bugs and other pests that infest the crops of this country. Not all of these are active at any given period. There are about 600 that are active at a time, but not always the same 600. The solution of the problem in any one section of the country does not settle it for every other section, for the reason that climatic conditions will change the life history of a pest in a new section of the country—that is, a section new to it—and create a new problem. Although the appropriation runs very close to $900,000, the amount of work that is to be done under it, and the enormous loss every year to crops by reason of the destruction occasioned by these pests is so large, that the amount is small in comparison with what will be saved to the agricultural interests of the country.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. I will.

Mr. TILSON. These are all for investigations, as I understand it. What steps are taken to bring the results of these investigations home to the people who suffer from the ravages of these insects?

Mr. HAWLEY. Information given to the public as a result of these investigations.

Mr. TILSON. How is it given to the public?

Mr. HAWLEY. There are two separate appropriations in the bill for demonstration work—one for the crops of the South and one for the crops in the North—under which agents are sent out to inform the people. And under the Lever-Smith agricultural extension bill this extension work will be very largely increased. The purpose of the whole investigation is to get information, sound and accurate, to be given to the farmers for their benefit, and put it in such a form and present it in such terms that they can readily understand it and make use of it.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to this paragraph, and I would not be opposed to it if the appropriation were greater than it is. But I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that this is only for one section of the country. It includes only certain things as specifically set out in the paragraph, and no one of these things is more important than the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] that was defeated just a few moments ago.

Now, we were told by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture that it was not necessary to set out in the appropriation a specific item to investigate the ravages of the Hessian fly and to determine some means for eradicating it. Then I would like to know why it is necessary in this provision of the bill to use language, "For investigation of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar cane," and so forth.

There are at least four paragraphs in this bill that provide for the investigation of insects that are injurious to cotton. There is one provision in this bill that gives $500,000 for the further investigation of the boll weevil and its effect upon the cotton crop. We have carried that appropriation for 10 years. Five million dollars has been expended, and year after year, notwithstanding the fact that the department has told Congress that there is no remedy for this boll weevil except crop rotation, notwithstanding they have published bulletin after bulletin upon that subject, they tell us that this appropriation must be made to keep up the boll-weevil investigation. You can not get $50,000 to investigate a subject that causes more loss to this country every year than the boll weevil does to the cotton crop.

Now, I want to reply to a statement that was made by the chairman of the committee in reference to the ravages of the Hessian fly. Why, they seem to think that the Hessian fly does all the damage in the fall of the year, and the department has recommended that the farmer sow wheat after the frost has come and killed the larvæ of the Hessian fly. If you wait in some sections of this country to sow your wheat after the frost comes, the wheat will not come up, and you will have none. More crops are destroyed by this insect in the months of March and April than in any other month of the year, and the ravages of the fly are so great in those months sometimes that the farmers plow up their wheat fields and plant them to corn.

This appropriation is no more necessary for these insects—the tobacco insects and the cotton insects—than for the investigation of the Hessian fly, and not nearly so important, yet we appropriate only $5,000 to prevent the destruction of that great wheat crop by the Hessian fly! And now you give $500,000 for the boll weevil in one section, and in three other sections of this bill they provide the money to investigate the insects affecting the cotton crop. It is not a fair division of this money. It is not a fair division of the investigation of the Department of Agriculture. It seems to me that no one who voted against the appropriation of $50,000 for the investigation of the Hessian fly can vote for this proposition and claim to be consistent.

That is all I care to say about it.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to answer the metric argument, the poetic logic, of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who, in his original poetic effusion, has a purpose which has perhaps escaped a great many of the producers on the floor, his evident purpose being to discourage generous consumption of farm products. I want to say that the gentleman is entirely consistent in this matter, because if he were personally filed as an exhibit in the case he would demonstrate the fact that he has taken his own advice and consumed as little as possible.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Very briefly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not want his words taken down, does he? [Laughter.]

Mr. SLOAN. I am willing that you should do anything with the words so long as you will spare me personally. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will not move that the gentleman's words be taken down this time.

Mr. SLOAN. I will say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is endeavoring to discourage consumption, so that production will not be so remunerative——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am very much opposed to tuberculosis, if the gentleman pleases. [Laughter.]

Mr. SLOAN. I will say that the gentleman, in order to make an impression on the scales—and this is for the public, not for the particular membership here—I want the public to know that in order to make any impression on the scales at all you must take him to the jewelry store and weigh him on the troy scales, where 12 ounces instead of 16 make a pound. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. That is because he is of great value. [Laughter.]

Mr. SLOAN. Oh, yes; he is very valuable. Tied up in a small package. He has splendid qualities. If his general physique were developed as his brain has been, he would be walking alongside the giant from New Hampshire, Mr. SULLOWAY, casting a shadow on the splendid form of the man who, we understand, walks in the valleys of the White Mountains and drops a shadow on the peak of Mount Washington. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The debate on this paragraph has been exhausted.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have been anticipating this personal attack for some days. [Laughter.] Ever since the river and harbor bill was under discussion I have looked forward to that sad moment when I should become the victim of the wit and cruel sarcasm of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN]. It is a misfortune that my avoirdupois does not come up to the standard of the gentleman from Nebraska. As it is I must fall back for defense upon those lines so familiar to bugologists and so appropriate to the incident and the paragraph:

> Big bugs have little bugs upon their backs to bite 'em,
> And little bugs have lesser bugs, and so ad infinitum.

[Laughter.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I have an inquiry to make.

Mr. LEVER. Then I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman give me some information about this paragraph? What is the cigarette beetle?

Mr. LEVER. It is an insect that attacks tobacco, cigars, and cigarettes.

Mr. MANN. It does not confine its attention solely to cigarettes?

Mr. LEVER. No. It bores a little hole in the cigar and cigarette.

Mr. MANN. Well, while I do not smoke cigars, I have no objection to gentlemen going after bugs who bore holes in them or bugs who smoke them, for that matter.

Mr. LEVER. The little bug bores out of the tobacco.

Mr. MANN. If it is simply to protect the cigarette, I do not know but what it would be a good thing to strike it out and make an appropriation to increase the number of cigarette beetles.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, that is but a name given to it.

Mr. MANN. What is the Argentine ant?

Mr. LEVER. That is an insect that attacks sugar cane. We brought it in from Mexico some years ago, I understand, in the hope that it would be an enemy to the boll weevil.

Mr. MANN. Are they still investigating with that?

Mr. LEVER. It is a small appropriation, I believe—$3,000 in the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I had thought, when the Agricultural bill was up, I would make a reference to the work that is being carried on in Hawaii in discovering one kind of insect that attacks another.

Mr. LEVER. That comes on the next page.

Mr. MANN. It is not under the Agricultural Department, by the way. I am not going to take the time of the House to do that. I did not know what the Argentine ant was. But, in a word, I may say that in Hawaii the organization of sugar planters there, through the aid of the entomologists, by a world-wide search that took a number of years, discovered an insect that fed upon another that was absolutely destroying the sugar industry of Hawaii. In another case they did the same thing, and where they were giving up sugar plantations in Hawaii and devoting them to other purposes which were not successful they now find that they can control these insects. They keep a supply of the enemy insects on hand, so that they can send them to any place, where they rapidly breed and attack the plant-destroying insect. The history of that discovery is one of the most entertaining stories that ever was told. It is more interesting than a brilliant detective novel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] is mistaken in saying that this paragraph for the investigation and demonstration of insects affecting tobacco, relates to only one section of the country. For instance, if he will look to the paragraph he will see that it relates to an investigation of insects affecting tobacco without any limitation as to locality. This investigation concerns and is of interest to many sections of the United States, including the State of Missouri.

Mr. BOOHER. That comes under the item for the investigation of insects affecting southern field crops.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Read a little further and you will find these words: "including insects affecting cotton, tobacco, sugar, rice," and so forth. Tobacco is raised in quite a number of States, and as far north as the State of Connecticut.

Like these other crops, tobacco has its own peculiar and distinctive pest. What the boll weevil is to cotton, the army worm to corn, the Hessian fly to wheat, the San Jose scale to the apple and other fruits the insect known as the tobacco horn worm, is to tobacco.

Every one who is at all acquainted with the growth and production of tobacco, knows that the tobacco worm is a very serious pest. While the Agricultural Department, and scientific investigation generally, has failed to develop an effective treatment for the Hessian fly, they have been more successful with respect to the horn worm. These worms come from the eggs of a large moth which are deposited on the leaf of the tobacco plant. The young worms grow rapidly, and may be styled the original tobacco chewers, since they live entirely upon the tobacco leaves, attaining full size in a comparatively short time. Until a few years ago the method of keeping the growing tobacco plants, free of worms, was by hand picking. When labor was abundant, and cheap, this method was inexpensive and comparatively effective. But these conditions no longer prevail in the tobacco sections. Labor is scarce and high, so that hand picking which has always been a tedious, laborious, and dirty work, owing to a gummy exudation on the tobacco leaves, has become a very serious problem for the tobacco raisers. Coincident with the shortage and high price of labor, the tobacco raisers turned to the insecticides which had been so effective in the warfare upon other insects. Having before them, as an object lesson, the distinctive effect of Paris green upon the potato bug, the tobacco planters in some sections, notably in Tennessee and Kentucky, experimented with considerable success, with that poison. But the trouble with Paris green, is that while it is an effective insecticide, its use has certain attendant features that render it undesirable.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say to the gentleman that in Tennessee they are now using arsenate of lead to a great extent.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I had not completed my statement.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I make this remark in reply to the statement that they use Paris green.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I had not completed what I set out to say. As I said, the planters have been using and for that matter still are using to some extent Paris green as an insecticide for the tobacco worm in the States of Tennessee and Kentucky, but there are very grave objections to its use, and the agents of the department have discovered another insecticide, powdered arsenate of lead, which is equally as effective, in fact, more effective than Paris green, and is free from its objectionable features.

The use of Paris green is objectionable for the following reasons. First, it has an irritating and slightly injurious effect upon the operator, sometimes causing bleeding at the nose. Second, it causes dead or burned areas on the leaves, known as burn or Paris green burn. At times this burning is so serious that the damage done to a crop on which Paris green has been used for insecticidal purposes amounts to as much as 25 per cent of the gross value of the crop. Under very bad conditions. the loss from burn sometimes exceeds this figure. Third: Light rains wash the Paris green, after it has been applied, to the base of the leaves, weakening the strength of the stems to such an extent that many leaves either drop off before cutting time, or else during the process of cutting. Fourth: Paris green can not be applied to tobacco when it is nearly ripe, in sufficient quantities to do satisfactory insecticidal work, without grave danger of burning at this critical stage of the crop. The satisfactory use of this insecticide is very dependent upon weather conditions. Hot summers, and low humidity for an extended period, may produce a condition of the tobacco plant, very susceptible to Paris green burning. However, at other times, Paris green has been applied when weather conditions have been favorable, with eminently satisfactory results. But upon the whole, for the reasons that have been given, the planters using Paris green have taken large chances, and at times have suffered considerable losses, when the weather conditions have been unfavorable. Arsenate of lead causes none of these troubles. It neither

weakens the leaf stems, nor burns the leaf surface. It may be applied to the tobacco plant in any kind of weather, and at any stage of growth, without injury. Moreover its use and application is not objectionable to the operator, and requires no special dress, or outfit. These are very distinct advantages, and while arsenate of lead is more expensive than Paris green, yet comparing the advantages and disadvantages of the one, with the advantages and disadvantages of the other, the balance, on the whole inclines very decisively in favor of arsenate of lead.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. How is this arsenate of lead applied to the tobacco plant?

Mr. SAUNDERS. It is applied with a dust gun. The powdered arsenate of lead must be mixed with a carrier. This carrier may be powdered lime, or dust, but preferably finely sifted, freshly burned wood ashes, and it is applied by means of the dust gun to the leaves of the plant. This application may be made at any stage of the tobacco growth. It may be made, as I have indicated either in wet, or dry weather. It has no injurious effect whatever upon the tobacco. This paragraph is intended to enable the Agricultural Department to extend the knowledge and the use of arsenate of lead, and to inform the tobacco raisers of the most approved and effective methods of application through agents who will be sent into the tobacco areas, to conduct tests and afford instruction to the planters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will ask five minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVER. I hope we may conclude this debate in five minutes, and I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. With pleasure.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the expense per acre of the application of this lead arsenate?

Mr. SAUNDERS. According to careful experiments the cost of keeping an acre of tobacco hand-wormed in a year when worms are plentiful, is from $6 to $10. A like number of worms can be killed by the use of arsenate of lead at a cost of from $3 to $5 an acre. The same relation of cost exists, when the worms are not so abundant.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is it necessary that people have further instructions in order that they may properly treat tobacco with this insecticide?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; this insecticide has not come into universal use, and the appropriation provided will enable the Department of Agriculture to bring the benefits and advantages of this particular agent to the attention of the planters, and instruct them in detail as to the most improved methods of application. Experience has shown that the use of new devices is much expedited, if instruction is directly afforded by competent agents. The new dust guns are provided with an 8-inch fan, and two refillings of these guns will be sufficient to dust an acre. The best results will be secured, if the arsenate is applied on a still morning, or evening, when the dew is upon the tobacco plants.

Mr. TILSON. May I ask the gentleman one other question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. This includes tobacco which is grown in my own State?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Nevertheless at the beginning of the paragraph it says:

Southern field crops.

Just where does Connecticut tobacco come in on that?

Mr. SAUNDERS. This appropriation is for investigations, including demonstrations, of insects affecting crops, commonly known as southern field crops, but the investigations and demonstrations are not limited to the South. They may be conducted wherever these crops are raised. For instance tobacco is a southern field crop, and might almost be called a Virginia field crop, but tobacco is raised in Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, and possibly in some other States outside of the South. The purpose of this appropriation is universal, and is intended for the benefit of the tobacco farmers, wherever they may be found.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, part of the State of Kentucky raises a great deal of tobacco. There is a great deal raised in my district.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Under the peculiar language of this paragraph would the department be allowed to expend a portion of this money for the benefit of the tobacco raisers in Connecticut and Missouri?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. BOOHER. Then, ought not the words "southern field crops" to be stricken out?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not think that is at all necessary.

Mr. BOOHER. The department usually construes these laws very strictly.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I have never heard that the Department of Agriculture has limited its investigation, and instruction relating to tobacco raising, and the insects preying on tobacco, to the South, or excluded Missouri, Ohio, West Virginia, or Indiana, or any other State from the benefit of its work.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think a great deal of the credit for discovering the use of arsenate of lead is due to Mr. A. C. Morgan, who is connected with the Agricultural Department, and I understand the purpose of this increased appropriation in this bill is to extend the demonstration of it.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, for the purpose of extending the knowledge, and developing the use of this great discovery—because it is a great discovery. For instance, in my own district, the universal use of this insecticide would remove a burden of at least $500,000 a year from the tobacco raisers.

Mr. BOOHER. I am in favor of the appropriation, but I want to be sure that under this paragraph it can be used in other tobacco fields besides those of the South.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The gentleman may add the words—

That the language used shall not exclude demonstrations in the State of Missouri.

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, no; why not strike out the words "southern field crops"?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Personally, I have no objection to that. The omission of these words would leave the meaning of the paragraph precisely the same with respect to cotton, tobacco, rice, and sugar cane.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does not the word "southern" there describe the crop, and not the location?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Undoubtedly. These crops are properly described as southern field crops, but there is nothing in the language used to confine the investigations to any particular locality.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You understand that, and the gentleman from Kentucky understands that, and I understand that, but it is not at all certain that these people over here in the Agricultural Department understand it, so it ought to be made perfectly plain.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, I think it ought to be made plain, if it is not plain already. But to my mind, the meaning of this paragraph is entirely clear.

There is one great advantage in connection with the use of arsenate of lead, to which I should like to call attention.

Mr. CULLOP. Tobacco was originally a southern crop, was it not?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, we claim it for Virginia.

Mr. CULLOP. That is where it was first raised or discovered in this country?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, so history tells us.

Mr. CULLOP. Now, is it not called a southern field crop simply by way of description, but not limiting it to crops in the South?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not think the language limits it to the South at all. The words "southern field crops" are descriptive, and the application of the appropriation would be made to every crop mentioned in the paragraph, wherever found, or raised. The tobacco horn worm is an insect of very rapid growth; he lives about 20 days. To show you how highly advantageous it is to use this poison, when the worms are small, the following facts are given. Approximately speaking, in the first 10 days of the insect's life the worm consumes about 8 square inches of leaf surface, while in the latter half of his existence he consumes about 200 square inches of leaf surface, or in other words, eight times as much in the last half, as in the first half of his destructive activities.

When the worms are small it is difficult for the hand picker to find them all. They are easily overlooked. He finds the same difficulty with the larger worms during the hot hours of the day. They crawl down into the "ruffles" at the base of the leaves, and thus escape observation. Of course in the exercise of the most painstaking diligence by making a careful search of each leaf, all the worms large and small, may be discovered, but the time required for this process would add materially to the already high cost of hand picking.

Mr. TILSON. How long does the effect of the arsenate of lead last on the leaf?

Mr. SAUNDERS. About 6 days, possibly a little longer; it is more enduring than Paris green, and that is one great advantage in the use of this poison.

Some interesting experiments have been conducted by the Department of Agriculture in relation to the arsenate of lead. Two fields were taken for these experiments. On the first field Paris green was used, on the second diplumbic arsenate of lead, in powdered form. This form contains about 33 per cent of arsenic acid, and is the one recommended. On the day of application about one-third of an inch of rain fell in dashing showers. Two days after the application of the poisons, the tobacco plants in the respective fields were examined. It was found that 91 per cent of the worms had been killed by the arsenate and 83 per cent by the Paris green. On the fourth day after application the number of worms on the arsenate of lead plat was further reduced. The arsenate of lead continued to be effective after the Paris green ceased to be operative. An experimental acre of tobacco near Clarksville, Tenn., was kept free of worms in the summer of 1913, by the use of arsenate of lead, from the time that the worms appeared, until they ceased to appear. Four applications were made. The first dosage was applied when the worms were small, and later dosages were made from time to time. There was no hand worming, and no tobacco was injured either by the worms, or the arsenate. When conditions are favorable tobacco may be kept free of worms by two, or three applications of the poison in a season. The department recommends a thorough application of the arsenate. The number of pounds required per acre depends upon the size of the tobacco plants. When the tobacco is small 3½ pounds to the acre is recommended, while 5 pounds should be used when the plants have attained full size. The advantage in using this poison when the worms are small, is clearly afforded by the figures given showing the prodigious increase in the voracity, and destructive capacity of the worms after they attain full size. Moreover the toxic effect of the poison upon the worms is greater in the early days of their life period, than in their later stages. On the whole it may be said that the experience and investigations of the Agricultural Department are altogether favorable to the use of arsenate of lead in the tobacco fields. It has been proved to be as efficient for the destruction of the horn worm as Paris green for the potato bug, and as the various toxic sprays, for the destruction of the insect life that preys upon the apple, and other varieties of fruit trees.

The one thing that remains is to bring this agent into universal use, so that in time the tobacco grower will as little think of hand worming his tobacco, as a gardener of attacking the bugs on his Irish potatoes, by the same tedious and unsatisfactory process. The work that the Agricultural Department is doing in aid of better and less laborious farming, should be introduced directly to the farmers. It is not sufficient to distribute literature relating to the discoveries that scientific investigators are annually making in this department. This distribution of bulletins is well enough in its way, and has performed a great service, but we must not stop at this point. Properly trained, and equipped men should be sent out to make demonstrations, and afford full instructions. Men may disregard a good thing that is only brought to their attention through the medium of print, but they are always impressed by a successful demonstration. Nor should we be niggardly in this matter. These are the things that really concern and interest the farmer. Annually he produces billions of dollars of wealth, yet the appropriations for the benefit of agriculture do not exceed $25,000,000 a year. The same budget that carries this pitiful sum for agriculture, carries hundreds of millions for our military establishments, with a constant and clamorous demand for even greater sums. How much longer shall this gross disparity continue?

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, lines 14 and 15, strike out the words "affecting southern field crops."

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 17, after the word "ant," strike out the figures "$64,400" and insert the words "and for the the elimination of the mosquito, $64,400."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a new paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, after line 17, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"For the investigation and devising means for the reduction of insects affecting watermelon and cantaloupe plants, $25,000."

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, this amendment might have been more appropriate perhaps under the provision beginning at line 19, but that seems to affect only truck farming. Formerly the growing of watermelons and the cantaloupes was practically truck business, but in the last few years it has grown enormously beyond that condition, and now it is one of the growing and most important industries of the country. A vast amount of money is invested now in the business, and as the industry has grown the pest came to destroy it. It works upon the plant and vines after they have been cultivated for some time, and as a rule invariably kills them or so affects them that they become unproductive.

Now, the importance of this industry which seems to be practically a new one, the department has not kept step with the growth of the industry, either in the treatment of the enemies of the plant or the crating, refrigerating, and shipping of the fruit after it has been matured and ready for market. This matter is of so much importance that I hope if this amendment is adopted young boys will not be sent out to spend this money, but that it will be placed into the hands of experienced and competent men, where every dollar appropriated for the department should be placed, to be expended because of the great interest it affects throughout the entire country, and the treatment of this pest be made by the most experienced talent the department can secure.

This industry affects nearly every section of the country—the Atlantic coast, the Mississippi Valley, the Pacific coast, the entire country from the Lakes to the Gulf and from ocean to ocean. A large amount of capital and a vast amount of labor every year is expended in this industry, but frequently when the crop is about to be harvested this pest comes along and destroys the entire crop.

In the section from which I come this is a most important industry, and a large amount of capital in my district is invested in it. We produce a cantaloupe equal to the Rocky Ford, which is one of the most celebrated varieties in the country.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULLOP. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman want to make a real proof to the Members of the House?

Mr. CULLOP. When the season comes I will be glad to, for I have done it before on former occasions.

Mr. MANN. Now the gentleman is talking real business.

Mr. CULLOP. If the gentleman will help us get this appropriation through, so as to preserve the crop and prevent the pest from destroying it, no doubt the producers would be glad to furnish all the gentleman from Illinois desires and make proof of their superior quality.

Mr. MANN. Oh, we do not know yet whether it is worth preserving.

Mr. CULLOP. If the gentleman from Illinois will examine the statistics of the country he will find that it is and well worthy of all its friends ask here. He will find it is worth many millions every year. People engaged in this industry yearly suffer great loss from the ravages of the enemies of these plants, and as a consequence the consumer suffers because of the shortage of the crop and the increased price charged for the limited supply. It is the province of this department to promote the business of those engaged in tilling the soil, encourage those employed in this useful line of business, and in so doing it assists the consumers as well as the producers. It improves thereby opportunities of all the people. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MANN. Statistics are a poor substitute for cantaloupes. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was about to put the question. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this proposed paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state for the benefit of the committee that the Department of Agriculture is now doing work along the line suggested by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP]. There are two items in this very bureau under which this character of work is being done—the

item on page 51, beginning at line 19, and then the item beginning at line 4 on page 52. It is purely a scientific research work, and the department has been given all estimated for on this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting forests, $50,770.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 18, after the word "forests," strike out the figures "$57,770" and insert the words "and for the elimination of the mosquito, $50,770."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the paragraph.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is true that the paragraph reads "For investigation of insects affecting forests" and that the amendment proposes the elimination of the mosquito; and it is also true that in the paragraph just passed provision was made for a variety of projects, including an investigation of the southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar cane, and so forth, and to that was added the cigarette beetle and also the Argentine ant—all of these in the same paragraph. If they were germane in that instance, it seems to me that this is germane in this instance.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the Chair will notice that this is a specific item which comes in, however, under a general heading. It is all under the heading "general expenses, Bureau of Entomology," and among other things provided for in the general heading—the general heading being applicable to each of these items—is the following:

And the study of insects affecting the health of man and domestic animals * * * in connection with the following investigations.

This is one of the items of "the following investigations," so that the paragraph itself in the bill now provides for the study of insects affecting the health of man and domestic animals in connection with the investigation of insects affecting the forests, and undoubtedly we can specifically add the study of mosquitoes, and while it might seem on the surface, and would be the case if it were an item by itself, that the study and investigation of insects affecting forests could not be held to include mosquitoes, because they do not affect forests, yet, at the same time, they do affect the health of man, and under the bill they must study, in connection with the investigation of insects affecting forests, insects affecting the health of man.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is existing law.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, if it is the wish of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to provide money for the extermination of mosquitoes beyond anything that the river and harbor appropriation bill did not take care of, it would be better to take up the item on page 52, beginning with line 7. It seems to me that this is not germane to the item under consideration.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the Chair has always held on this bill that these forest items segregated in the bill constituted separate and distinct paragraphs. That is true, I know, with reference to the forest unit items, and while it is true that these items themselves if in order at all are in order under the general language which precedes them, at the same time I think the universal ruling of the Chair has been that these are separate paragraphs, and my colleague on the committee [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] is entirely correct. The gentleman's amendment would undoubtedly be germane to the paragraph to which the gentleman from Michigan referred a moment ago, but I do not feel that it is germane to this item.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman wants the Chair to determine what the functions of mosquitoes are. That is not for the Chair to determine; that is for the committee to determine. The language of the bill authorizes the study of insects affecting the health of man. It is not for the Chair to say that a particular insect affects forests and does not affect the health of man unless he knows more than all of the Agricultural Department combined.

Mr. LEVER. We have an item on the next page to which this is germane.

Mr. MANN. I understand, but all of these items, by the language, are under the general heading for the study of insects affecting the health of man and domestic animals in connection with certain investigations.

Mr. LEVER. Let me ask the gentleman this question in good faith, because I would like to get the information myself. I suspect that the gentleman's amendment, as a separate paragraph, would be in order, but as an amendment to the segregation which the committee has made and which Congress is making, it seems to me that it is not germane.

Mr. MANN. I think it is germane under the general language. I doubt the propriety of inserting that kind of general language and then endeavoring to hold it down.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances, in view of the explanation made, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. TRIBBLE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 11320. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Twin Falls and Minidoka, State of Idaho, to construct a bridge across Snake River;

H. R. 6241. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, and extending the control of the Public Utilities Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to said franchise and its holder; and

H. R. 9909. An act to authorize the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Missouri River.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations and demonstrations in bee culture, $20,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am pleased to note that the Agricultural Committee is recognizing the importance of the bee industry. We are certainly a wasteful people, but there is no instance that I know of where there is so great a waste as that going on with respect to the valuable food product produced by bees.

Mr. Chairman, it is estimated by competent authorities that the value of the honey now produced in this country is from $20,000,000 to $25,000,000, and that that amount might easily be doubled with very little work and almost no expense in addition if the manner of handling the bees and the subject of bee culture were better understood. I observe that the intention of the increase in this appropriation is evidenced by the use of the word "demonstrations," and evidently it is intended that some of this appropriation should be used for demonstration work. I wish the appropriation were larger, and yet I would have to confess, perhaps, it might be difficult to use a very large sum of money in this connection, owing to the fact that the subject is so little understood and competent demonstrators can not be easily obtained at this time, but as the agricultural colleges have taken up this subject and in the course of time they will be able to get competent demonstrators and probably a larger sum will be expended in that direction.

I have here a pamphlet in my hand issued by the bee-keepers' association of my own State, in which there is a picture of a very comfortable farmhouse which was built with the proceeds of one year's production of honey by the owner thereof. My State produces very large quantities of honey, though not so large as some of the other States. Many of the Southern States produce but very little honey, and yet I will say for the information of the gentlemen from the South that the experts of the department say that it is that portion of the country where the greatest amount of honey ought to be produced, where it will be easiest to produce a large amount of honey if proper attention were given to it.

Some little demonstration work has been done in this connection with very beneficial results, but so careless are methods at the present time and so little is this subject understood that they have found many persons engaged in this industry who

only get 10 pounds of honey to a hive, whereas some get 50 pounds, 60 pounds, and some even get 100 to 110 pounds. This business not being now well understood a great deal of honey goes to waste. People should get, as I have said, with very little expense, a larger result from their work. One of the prominent bee keepers in my State is a man 85 years of age. He pursues this work possibly as a mere matter or recreation because it does not require any great amount of strength but principally headwork to carry it on. He has been very successful with it and each year gets a large amount of honey, which in itself is a demonstration of how easily this work may be carried on. I hope that this appropriation will continue to increase, because there is no way, I think, that the money could be used more profitably. The Bureau of Entomology has accomplished much by its investigations, and has already saved to the bee keepers of this country more than the cost of carrying on the whole bureau. It has shown that there is a great loss in the care of bees in the winter. Sometimes bee keepers lose 25 per cent of their hives, and as a rule about 10 per cent. A greater portion of this might be avoided. There is a great loss also from what is called "foul brood," which attacks the bees, but which with proper care could be avoided. I think right here is a place where the money is well expended; perhaps more profitably than any other part of the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes?

Mr. ANDERSON. I might want a minute or two.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt the committee did a wise thing in increasing this appropriation, but I very greatly regret that the committee inserted the words "and demonstrations." As a matter of fact, I will confess that if my attention had not been for the moment diverted I should have made the point of order against the new language. I think it is a very great mistake for the Government to enter into the work of demonstrations along lines of agricultural investigation unless such demonstrations are absolutely essential. My opinion is—I am not an expert on bee culture—but my opinion is that there are a great many people in the country who know very much more about the raising of bees than anyone in the Department of Agriculture. I have no doubt but what there are a great many people in this country who are abundantly qualified to demonstrate the proper methods of bee culture. It is wise and proper for the department to make investigations and to publish the results of those investigations to inform the people as to the methods that seem to bring success, to inform them as to the nature of the diseases and the difficulties met with in bee culture, but to spend Government money for the purpose of making actual practical demonstrations—which I assume is what is intended—when there are thousands of intelligent people doing that is in my opinion a waste of public money.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the bee-culture associations of the various States universally indorse this appropriation and recommend that it be made?

Mr. MONDELL. I have no doubt but what that is true. If the gentleman had listened to what I said he would have understood that I am in favor of the appropriation and of the investigation as it has been carried on in the past and as it would, I assume, be carried on in the future. I think it is probably wise to increase the appropriation, but I think it is well-nigh a waste of public money for the Government to start a demonstration bee farm somewhere and embark on that line of endeavor. The same amount of money spent in investigating the methods of those engaged in bee culture and in the dissemination of information regarding the facts will do very much more good than it will in carrying on actual demonstrations.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understand it is not the purpose of the department nor the wish of the association who ask for this additional appropriation to have any experimental bee farm or colony or anything of that kind established, but rather that there should be a field worker go out and impart knowledge to the people, which, as the gentleman says, would be quite appropriate and entirely proper.

Mr. MONDELL. I think that is entirely proper, but it is not necessary to enlarge the language of the appropriation in order to do that. I take it for granted that is what the department is doing now.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] what is intended to be done under this annual demonstration?

Mr. LEVER. I will be glad to give the gentleman information. The department for 10 or 15 years has been investigating bee culture in this country, and they have gathered a great many facts that the bee keepers of this country—800,000 of them—think are very valuable to them. They have discovered that during the winter anywhere from 10 to 25 per cent of the bees of the country are lost on account of improper care of the bee during the wintertime. Now, the department has also through its investigation found that a great many bees are dying on account of certain diseases known as American and European foul-brood diseases, which are causing a great deal of destruction. This matter was brought to the attention of the committee by the president of this National Bee Keepers' Association, and there was urged upon the Members individually necessity for this appropriation.

Mr. MANN. What I want to get at is as to the process they propose to adopt.

Mr. LEVER. Now, this is what they are going to do. They are going to take the information that they have been gathering and which has accumulated in the department and go out to the beekeepers and educate them just exactly as they do demonstration work along other lines. They are coming in personal contact with the bee people, and with the $5,000, of course, they are going to make an experimental demonstration in one or two States.

Mr. MANN. That is what I wanted to know. They used to keep bees over here in the Agricultural Department——

Mr. LEVER. I think there is no purpose to establish a bee farm, or anything like that.

Mr. MANN. I do not know of any other way in which they will demonstrate.

Mr. LEVER. They will do it in cooperation with individuals.

Mr. MANN. Well, $5,000 will employ two or three men. They can not do much demonstration in connection with other people. They may at some one place.

Mr. LEVER. That is very true. They can not do a great deal of it, but the committee felt that they would let them see if they could get some good results from the demonstration work, and if so, then it would be in the province of Congress to enlarge the work.

Mr. MANN. I judge from what the gentleman says that they do not know what they are going to do.

Mr. LEVER. That is largely true. They want to see what they can do.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. My understanding is that they know what they propose to do——

Mr. MANN. Is not the process they propose to adopt what the gentleman from Iowa knows?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes. I know what they propose and what they expected. They said that the ordinary field demonstrators that went out to demonstrate with reference to crops and animals did not understand this subject; that they expected to send a man out to go along with them and give them instructions on it, and talk at these meetings that they had with the farmers, and to spread this knowledge as far as they could with this small appropriation. Of course it would depend on the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. MANN. If that is what they are going to do, it is a waste of money.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is not any conflict in the gentleman's statement and mine. The process is to go out in the field and in cooperation with the individual beekeeper try to get him to adopt certain methods as to better control of the diseases of the bees and as to their wintering that the department has worked out. Whether or not that method of teaching is to be successful I do not know.

Mr. MANN. They can do that all by the bulletins which they send out. A man who keeps bees can read the bulletins, and will know just as much by what they teach as by a man talking to him.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman ought to be aware——

Mr. MANN. I used to keep bees and know something about them. Did the gentleman ever keep bees?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No, I did not; but I am speaking on the authority of the highest expert in this country.

Mr. MANN. On the theory, then, that the man who goes out knows more about it than the man who keeps the bees.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I suppose the gentleman would not accept the information of the head of the bee association on this subject?

Mr. MANN. That is what I will. But the gentleman does not say it will do any good unless you send a man to go to another and talk to him.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has expired on this paragraph.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understood I was to have two minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate be extended for five minutes in order that the gentleman, a member of the committee, may have that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, one important feature of the value of bee culture has apparently been overlooked in this debate. That is the relation of bee culture to fruit growing. There are, as I understand, some varieties of fruit that are sterile to their own pollen.

In other words, unless some of the pollen from trees near by can be carried to them there will be no fruit. The bee serves that purpose. It carries the pollen from one tree to another, and there are many well-authenticated instances where the production of fruit orchards has been very materially increased by the use of bees in the orchard.

Now, with reference to the purpose for which this appropriation is to be used, I have a communication here from Mr. Root, representing the National Bee Keepers' Association, which gives his idea of the purpose for which the additional appropriation is to be used. He says:

County agents are already at work in all of the States carrying on extension work, but these men are not posted in regard to beekeeping, for the agricultural colleges where they were trained only began teaching beekeeping within the past five years. With an increased appropriation the Bureau of Entomology could send trained men to instruct these agents, who could in turn inform the bee keepers how to increase the production of honey materially and at the same time prevent the spread of bee diseases and the work of the moths.

The purpose, as I understand it, is not to send men out to demonstrate directly to beekeepers, but to coordinate the work through the regular county agents. In other words, the idea is to instruct the county agents in order that they may carry on the bee cultural instruction in connection with their other work. The difficulty is not that the men who make a business of keeping bees do not understand the industry; the difficulty is that thousands of men keep bees as an incident to their regular farming, and those men do not know, many of them, how to take care of the bees and how to get the largest production from them. The purpose is to carry this information to that class of men.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting tropical and subtropical fruits, including insects affecting the orange, lemon, grapefruit, mango, etc., $17,100.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, this item is one that will be of interest and has been of much value. There are other matters also in connection with the fruit industry in this country, not only in California, but elsewhere, that are of much interest and in which the fruit growers are vitally interested, and one of those is the matter of frost prevention.

On the 16th of December I presented the following bill:

A bill (H. R. 366) making an appropriation for a series of thorough and elaborate investigations and experiments for the purpose of devising and perfecting a system of frost prevention in the citrus and deciduous fruit regions, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $100,000 be, and is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for a series of thorough and elaborate examinations and experiments for the purpose of devising and perfecting a system of frost prevention in the citrus and deciduous fruit regions in the United States, to be considered by and under the direction and control of the Agricultural Department of the Government.

The committee did not see its way clear to place this item on the bill this year; but I feel satisfied, with the data and evidence that will be presented at the hearing on the next bill, that we shall be able to have at least $100,000 placed upon that bill for this work.

I have a letter here from Mr. W. D. Tidwell, secretary of the Western Jobbers' Association of America, on this subject, He says:

THE WESTERN FRUIT JOBBERS' ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Denver, Colo., March 4, 1916.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RAKER: Acknowledgment is made of yours of February 29, inclosing several copies of House bill 366. I sincerely trust that this bill will be approved by the Committee on Agriculture.

When we think of the enormous amount of money invested in the deciduous and citrus fruit industry in the United States, and the great losses that have been caused by frost, the amount of money appropriated is indeed very, very small; but nevertheless, I believe, would be one of the best investments that the United States Government could make, for it would mean the saving of millions of dollars to the fruit industry of the country.

Wishing you every success, I am,
Yours, very truly, W. D. TIDWELL, *Secretary.*

I have received other telegrams and letters from California and Colorado on the same subject, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CAL., *January 7, 1913.*

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER,
Representative Second Congressional District California,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The Los Angeles Examiner believes as a first step toward securing the application of human ingenuity to solving the frost problem that has just been so acutely presented that the Agricultural Department should take a hand. The Examiner believes that Congress should make a generous appropriation for the purpose of having the United States Agricultural Department make a series of elaborate experiments for the purpose of devising and perfecting a system of frost prevention in the citrus-fruit region. The most thoughtful men of this region are firmly convinced that if the United States Government, through the Agricultural Department, will, through experiments, provide a system of frost prevention that a repetition of our recent experience will be impossible. May we ask you to use your influence to secure an adequate appropriation to conduct this work?

LOS ANGELES EXAMINER.

—

SAN BERNARDINO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
San Bernardino, Cal., January 17, 1913.

Hon. JAMES P. ROBINSON,
Chairman of House Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As you are probably aware, the orange industry of southern California has been greatly damaged by frost within the last two weeks, the present orange crop in most sections being an entire failure, the trees also being greatly damaged, and the loss to the grower running into millions of dollars.

Mr. JOHN E. RAKER, our Representative from California, has introduced a bill in Congress asking for an appropriation of $100,000 to be used for experimental purposes for the prevention of the destruction of citrus fruit by frost. We ask that you kindly give this bill your favorable consideration and support, and we assure you that no appropriation made by Congress during this session will be of greater advantage to any industry than this one.

Thanking you in advance for what you may do for us, I am,
Yours, very truly,

W M. PARKER,
President Chamber of Commerce.

—

DENVER, COLO., *January 18, 1913.*

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your favor of January 14, I herewith inclose a copy of an article I have prepared for The Fruit Grower, of St. Joseph, Mo.

In this article I have suggested the general lines along which I believe the investigations should be carried out. I would very much appreciate if you would inform me about the passage of your bill, and, if passed, how the work will be organized. I am much interested in such work and hope to take part in it at least as a corresponding coworker.

Wishing for a speedy passage of your bill, I am,
Respectfully, yours, W. V. CEDERBORG.

—

WHAT WE DO NOT KNOW ABOUT FROST.

[By G. V. Cederborg, Ch. E., Denver.]

After the disastrous freeze in the citrus districts of California January 8 this year, the problem of frost prevention is brought before us stronger than before. The freeze came as a link in a cold wave that enveloped the whole country and broke low-temperature records in many places. The orange and lemon groves of California are generally fairly well supplied with modern frost-fighting appliances, but this cold wave was too much for the orchard heaters. The papers have told us that the crop was completely annihilated. Probably the first report will be modified and we after some time find that a not inconsiderable part of the crop was saved by those using heaters. Be that as it may, the loss runs in many millions and something must be done to prevent its recurrence if it is possible for human efforts to do so.

To persons interested in frost prevention it was therefore good tidings to hear that Mr. JOHN E. RAKER, Congressman from California, has introduced a bill asking for appropriation of $100,000 for the perfection of a system of frost prevention in the fruit-growing districts of the country. Mr. RAKER will undoubtedly get his appropriation; he ought to, by all means. One hundred thousand dollars is a small amount compared with the enormous sum lost in California, not only in the loss of this year's crop but in the loss of vitality of young trees.

Supposing that the bill carries, what can the Government do to aid in the perfection of the desired system of frost prevention?

Naturally the Weather Bureau will come in for the lion's share of the work; in fact this institution is always doing work along this line. We will look to the Weather Bureau for information about the causes of frost, the general causes producing such extensive temperature disturbances as the last one, of which the California freeze was a part, and also the local causes affecting only limited areas. We want to hear from our agricultural experiment stations and colleges in regard to various problems that confront the fruit growers in the different localities. We want to draw on the ingenuity of our inventors and engineers as to the perfection of frost-fighting apparatus. Last, but not least, we want to enlist every fruit grower in the country in the work.

There will be no lack of willing workers; what we need is a leader. We want a general staff to prepare the plans for the campaign and we want an organization so that the work of the various investigators can be made to cooperate and the results be given to the whole people. I would suggest that an eminent meteorologist be appointed leader of the work, and that this leader will gather around himself a staff of active or corresponding associates from the agricultural colleges, from the fruit growers, and from the manufacturers of frost-fighting appliances. This "frost board" should apportion the work; it should

call upon the Weather Bureau for statistical information; it should send out field parties of trained investigators to make careful frost surveys of typical fruit sections; it should also endeavor to create cooperation with the growers by inducing these to organize locally for fighting and studying the frost.

In the report from this frost board we would want a complete statement from the Weather Bureau on all that is known about the general and local causes of frost. We want to know what phenomena it is that occasionally send cold waves over the whole continent, and we want to know if there is a possibility that we ever will be able to prevent or moderate the same. The climate depends to a great extent on absorption and radiation of the solar heat, and over this absorption and radiation we have a certain influence through the cutting or planting of forests and crops, through the draining of swamps, etc. Isn't it possible that succeeding generations will be able to regulate the climate through such means and eliminate the danger of cold waves?

One thing is certain, if we can not make the general changes that would alter the climate of a continent we can make changes that would affect local weather conditions. Isn't it possible that by changing the covering of the mountains and waste lands surrounding many of our orchard districts we could create conditions that would materially lessen the danger of frost?

We all know what the topography has to do with the liability of frost in a locality. We know that an orchard with good air drainage will seldom or never get frost, while certain orchards, poorly located, will be damaged every time there is the least bit of chance. Many of our fruit districts are located in valleys surrounded by mountains; the orchards on the slope will escape while those on the valley floor will be damaged by the frost. If a land is troubled by poor water drainage we would dig ditches for the water and possibly dam it up in other places. Can not we do the same in regard to the air drainage—remove obstructions in some places and create artificial obstructions in others?

The frost problem is in many ways the same as the flood problem. A bare mountain offers no obstructions to the rapid downflow of water; a heavy rainstorm will drain off immediately and possibly flood the valley below. In the same way the cold air produced by radiation on the mountain meets no obstructions, but trickles down the mountain side very rapidly. On a forested mountain the rain water is delayed on the down route by the vegetation, and so is the cold frost-producing air. Couldn't we by planting trees and shrubs delay the bulk of the frost drainage above the orchard until morning, when the sun would destroy it? And when a stream of cold air comes down in the valley isn't it possible that we could find out means to make it change its direction to a certain degree? The fruit growers often tell us that the frost moves in streaks. Couldn't we make the cold streak fall outside the orchard and the warm streak through the orchard?

Isn't it possible that by lighting fires in places where the currents of cold air are known to descend these could be broken up then and there, so that we wouldn't need to fight that particular body of cold air all over the valley? Isn't it possible that by the judicious distribution of orchard heaters over an entire district a much greater protective effect could be produced than when every grower works only for himself?

When everything is boiled down together the question is: Couldn't the work of frost fighting be made much more efficient through organization? Couldn't State or local authorities compel each grower to do his share of the work? As it is now, one man who smudges his orchard must heat not only the cold air that by rights belongs to his land, but also that of his non-smudging neighbors.

In each district there should be a "frost chief," a man chosen not only for his knowledge of meteorology but for his qualities as a leader. He should be in cooperation with or possibly in the employ of the Weather Bureau. His business should be not only to lead the actual fight, but also to make such preliminary work as could be done between seasons to lessen the danger of frost.

In regard to the carrying out of field experiments, it is of course desirable that these should be made during the regular smudging season. It is, however, possible that a considerable part of the work could be done between seasons. The study of radiation phenomena and of local air currents could possibly be done during the whole year. Instead of spreading the work over a great number of places it would possibly be of advantage to select one typical district and study that thoroughly before extending the work to all the many different fruit districts.

Another phase of the frost problem that should be the object of investigation is frost insurance. It will be many years before we will be able to eliminate all danger of frost; meanwhile something should be done to distribute the loss of such calamities as the last freeze in California.

—

SAN BERNARDINO, CAL., *February 6, 1913.*

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER,
United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE: Mr. W. M. Parker, of this city, asked me to write to Congressman Lamb in re your bill for prevention of injury from frost, etc., and also to send you a copy of the letter. This I am doing herewith.

At any time that I can be of any service, it goes without saying that you have but to command me.

Sincerely, yours, BENJ. F. BLEDSOE.

—

SAN BERNARDINO, CAL., *February 6, 1913.*

Hon. JOHN M. LAMB,
Chairman Committee on Agriculture,
United States Congress.

DEAR SIR: I am advised of the pending consideration of a bill introduced by Hon. JOHN E. RAKER, of California, for the appropriation of the sum of $100,000 for experimental investigation in the matter of frost prevention, or prevention of injury to citrus fruits by frosts.

I regard this bill as of vital importance to an industry representing over $500,000,000 by way of investment in California alone. The loss to the industry in California this year because of our recent freeze is incalculable; its repetition, at least within a decade, would prove calamitous in the extreme. Many communities will feel its baneful effects for twice that length of time.

If come preventive means can be discovered, no stone should be left unturned in order that such discovery may be made. The importance of the citrus industry justifies this appropriation; the future of the industry would seem to require it. As a loyal Democrat I urge its favorable consideration by your committee.

Very respectfully, yours, BENJ. F. BLEDSOE,
Judge of the Superior Court.

While much good is being accomplished in many localities and some crops are entirely saved, yet in nearby places the crops sometimes are entirely ruined. It is manifest that there should be a systematic investigation and determination of some proper method or means by which millions of dollars' worth of fruit in this country could be saved. While we are providing for destroying insects, in some years after you have expended your money and engaged your corps of assistants and get ready to do your work, Jack Frost has come along in the spring and destroys your entire crop. That is not only applicable to the State of California—and I suppose there is less there to affect the crops ordinarily than in any other State in the Union—nevertheless we find that in other fruit-growing States the condition is certainly serious and many times the entire crop is lost. Sometimes those frosts have occurred after an interval of three years, and sometimes after an interval of two years, and then, again, a longer period may elapse before they return. I am hoping and believing, and not without good reason, that in the next bill such an item will be placed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in connection with my remarks these letters and telegrams that I have on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSTER). The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting certain letters and telegrams. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations and control, in cooperation with the Federal Horticultural Board, of the Mediterranean and other fruit flies, $33,200.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. I remember we created or provided for a Federal Horticultural Board a year or so ago. I wish the gentleman from South Carolina would tell us what constitutes the Federal Horticultural Board?

Mr. LEVER. The Federal Horticultural Board is composed of a number of gentlemen in the department selected from the various bureaus serving for that purpose. The Chief is Dr. Marlatt. There are five members, I believe.

Mr. MANN. Have they any legislative authority over the importations into the United States?

Mr. LEVER. Well, I do not know just what the gentleman means by legislative authority.

Mr. MANN. They are authorized by an act of Congress?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; they are authorized by an act of Congress.

Mr. MANN. Do they have any controlling authority over the quarantine of fruits, and so forth, brought into the country?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; they have full control over that. This work is being done in cooperation with them.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations, identification, and systematic classification of miscellaneous insects, including the study of insects affecting the health of man and domestic animals, household insects, and the importation and exchange of useful insects, $57,980.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Page 52, line 8, after the words "miscellaneous insects," strike out the word "including," and at the end of the same line, same page, after the word "insects" insert the words "including mosquitoes."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think almost every Member of the House in his sober moments will agree with me that the mosquito is a pest that ought to be eliminated if it is possible to do it. For a number of years we have been making efforts to get a provision of this kind in the Agricultural bill, but the chairman of the committee and his fellow members have usually insisted that the mosquito is an insect that pertains more to the human kind than to brute animals. But I think that question is now pretty well disposed of when we consider the opening paragraph with reference to the general expenses of the Bureau of Entomology, which provides that there shall be a study of insects affecting the health of man and domestic animals, and so forth.

I am not asking by this amendment to have any change in the appropriation, but simply to have a direction made to the bureau to study the mosquito with a view to its ultimate elimination. There should be some action by the Federal Govern-

ment in this regard, because in view of the universality of the pest it is impossible for the States alone to rid themselves of this nuisance. Mosquitoes are not restricted to State lines.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Does not the gentleman think the language included here—

affecting the health of man and domestic animals—

would include mosquitoes as well? Mosquitoes affect the health of man in our country. If a mosquito gets hold of you he affects you very materially.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is right about that. The mosquito also affects the health of animals. I think there is no question about that. Animals do not enjoy the mosquito any more than humans do. Therefore it is pertinent to the general purposes of the bill and pertinent to the purpose of this particular appropriation.

Mr. RAKER. What I was asking the gentleman was whether or not under this language the department would not have the power and does not now have the power, and, as a fact, has it not been investigating the mosquito as well as the house fly?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It may be that the chairman of the committee will have something to say on that subject. If the Department of Agriculture now takes any interest at all in this subject, it is to a very limited extent.

Mr. RAKER. There has been a bulletin issued on the house fly, and I suppose it was done under this item. That bulletin is certainly of much value to every housewife, and to every person in the country.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will permit——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. LEVER. The investigation of the mosquito has been going on in the Department of Agriculture since 1913, and the program for next year contemplates the expenditure of $7,010 in the study of the mosquito, in its relationships to the health of both man and of animals.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think it is time we make a start on the work of eradicating this mosquito pest?

Mr. LEVER. We have been started since 1913.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman will help a little more if he will permit this amendment to go through.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think the amendment affects the situation at all. It only leads to trouble, because if you set out the mosquito somebody else will set out red bugs or something else.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think that is not altogether fair. We have gone very far in the investigation of these many kinds of bugs that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] refers to. The gentleman from Oregon said that scientists had discovered as many as 20,000 varieties of bugs. He did not undertake to name them all.

Mr. LEVER. If there is anyone who can do it, he can.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yet I venture to say that there is not one of the 20,000 that is such an infernal nuisance as the mosquito. There is no exception of locality; no State of this Union is immune. The mosquito is found in Michigan, California, and New Jersey. Let me say that many States are doing the best they can to meet this situation. I know that New Jersey makes an appropriation for this purpose. Pennsylvania, or at least Philadelphia, does the same thing, and it is done in other States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that the debate close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RAKER. Will not the gentleman state that what has been done has consisted of the draining of swamps or, where that was impracticable, in the pouring of oil on the surface of the water, and have not those means been effective?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Those two means have been used. Oil was used to clean up Panama, under Dr. Gorgas.

Mr. RAKER In our State they have been doing that for six years.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And I think it was California oil that was used in Panama. I understand it was a very deadly brand of oil.

Mr. RAKER. And where the mosquito has been exterminated we have been able to lessen and to a great extent to eradicate malaria in those districts.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It helps in that regard. Let me say this, that where a State in good faith is undertaking to meet this situation, which is undoubtedly a nuisance and which is unquestionably prejudicial to the health of the people, why should not the Federal Government, so far as it is necessary, assist to the extent of cooperating with the States? That is about all this suggestion is. If New Jersey, for instance, is making appropriations—and it had an excellent entomological board some years ago, and that board cleaned up swamps, in an effort to make the seaside resorts more attractive—if New Jersey makes an appropriation, how is it possible for that State to control the mosquitoes which pass across the river and over the borders of the State? There must be some cooperation on the part of the Federal Government. A number of States are doing the best they can, and they need this Federal assistance. In my judgment there is no reason why they should not have it. If we can afford to spend money for the eradication of the cattle tick—and we have done that lavishly—if we can afford to spend money for the eradication of the potato bug—and that ought to be done—if we can spend money for the extermination of the house fly, why not spend money for the elimination of this worst of all insect pests?

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. As a matter of fact, does not the United States Government now cooperate with the States experimentally—I know it does in Connecticut—in the investigation of other things?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; but here is something everyone acknowledges—the conditions that prevail everywhere in regard to the mosquito are known to all of us—everyone is afflicted alike—and yet we hesitate to make provision that there shall be Government cooperation with the States.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I come from a place where they do not have mosquitoes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh; I have been bitten by mosquitoes in Chicago.

Mr. MANN. Nearly all such get bitten [laughter], but what I wanted to inquire is whether the object of the appropriation is to discover if mosquitoes will bite; and, secondly, if the way to get rid of them is to abolish the water courses of the country because that is where they all breed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If you keep your water courses clear—if the channels are deep—you will help to eliminame the mosquito, because a mosquito thrives where water is stagnant, where the water is not moving, and where there is miasma.

Mr. MANN. Dry up the water courses and you get rid of the stagnant water.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, but brush will remain, and old tomato cans will fill up with rain water, and mosquitoes breed in them.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, the department has been doing some work with the money appropriated for the purpose. I do not know really how we can meet the situation submitted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He says the States seem to be able to take care of the mosquitoes while they are in the States, but they have no control over mosquitoes coming from other States. I do not know how he can meet that situation unless he will propose and secure passage of an amendment of the migratory bird law and make it include mosquitoes. I suppose the gentleman from Pennsylvania is equal to that task, because he has been able to engraft a mosquito provision on the river and harbor bill. [Laughter.] I believe, by his persuasive eloquence, he could get a mosquito amendment on the migratory bird law to take care of the migratory mosquito.

Mr. TILSON. The interstate commerce law has been made to do duty in everything else; might he not use that?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Evidently a good way to take care of the mosquitoes has been found. The gentleman from Pennsylvania speaks of it—putting oil on the water and taking care of the stagnant places. With the aid of the Federal Government, the difficulty has been located and a remedy has been found, and nothing remains to be done except to spend a little money and use a little effort, and it is up to the States and the people of the localities to furnish the money and do the work themselves. It is not incumbent on the Federal Government to follow either one of these troubles in the States, to find not only the cause and discover the remedy, but actually furnish the

money to do the work of overcoming the trouble and eradicating this difficulty. There is surely a limit to the kind and amount of work the Federal Government should be asked to do, and a limit to the amount of money it should be asked to contribute for the relief of troubles existing in the States. After a remedy for evil conditions has been found the people of the States ought to spend their own money in applying it.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. One trouble is that the mosquitoes refuse to respect State lines; they do not hesitate at all to go from one State which may eradicate a part of them into another State which takes no means to eradicate them at all.

Mr. MANN. Forbid them by law.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Well, the gentleman will have to have something like the migratory-bird law. I can not think of anything better. The remedy suggested is as reasonable as the question which the gentleman asked.

I wish to state what is being done with the $7,000 of this appropriation.

The department says the object is to determine the requirements for the protection of individuals on plantations and elsewhere against malarial mosquitoes.

The procedure is as follows: An estate of 20,000 acres situated at Mound, La., has been selected for an intensive study of mosquitoes of that region and their relationship to agricultural problems. Comparative studies will be made at other points.

As to the result, a careful preliminary survey has already been made of the plantation and the past malarial history correlated with the productiveness of the plantation. A careful estimate has also been made based upon observations of the actual cost of malaria to one of the plantation units in the reduction of productiveness.

That is a statement in general terms of what the department has done and is doing. Perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania can understand it better than I can, but that is what the department says about it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is there any specific appropriation in this bill for mosquito investigation?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Out of this appropriation the department proposes to expend $7,010 on the mosquito proposition.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is nothing here to show it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is what the department says it will do with the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MOORE) there were—ayes 14, noes 21.

The Clerk read as follows:

For general administrative expenses connected with above lines of investigation, and for miscellaneous expenses incident thereto, $3,000.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, in 1912 I introduced a bill in regard to the investigation of rubber, again in December, 1915, and I will read it. It is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 369) making an appropriation for the investigation, study, and testing of sagebrush and greasewood which may be used for producing rubber, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $5,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the investigation and study of methods and testing sagebrush and greasewood which may be used for producing rubber, alcohol, and acetic acid, including their utilization.

Mr. Chairman, this subject has been taken up with the Department of Agriculture in the Bureau of Chemistry. I have furnished to the department on several occasions the raw sagebrush and raw greasewood from the West, also samples of rubber extracted from sagebrush and greasewood. This country at the present time is paying exorbitant prices for rubber of all kinds to make rubber goods, tires for automobiles, which are exceptionally high and expensive. The field from which this material can be produced, if a proper process is found, is enormous. Practically all of the Rocky Mountain and the Pacific coast States have millions of acres of sagebrush lands, which brush is not only of no present known value, but a detriment to the country, so far as we have been able to discover at the present time. It can be cleared, and it reproduces itself in a year and a half or two years. In other words, the supply is enormous. There is practically no limit to it. The samples presented to the Bureau of Chemistry produce a fair quality of rubber. We have no rubber plants in this country, and it is well worth a small expense in making investigations to find out a process by which this product can be extracted from the sagebrush and the greasewood, the quantity of which is so enormous in the Western States.

I am getting further data also of material, and believe that by the time the committee again takes up this subject under the proper head I will be able to get a favorable report from the Department of Agriculture and a report of the committee to the end that this enormous product, so extensive, might be utilized instead of going to waste, as is the fact to-day.

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

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Is it not true that private parties have been making investigations along these lines for quite a number of years and is it not also true that some rubber or product resembling rubber has been produced from these plants?

Mr. RAKER. Yes. There are men at the University of Nevada and in Carson and down in the southern part of my State who have sent me samples, and who believe that if the Government, through its many agencies, with its ability, would investigate the subject, they would be able to devise some method by which this valuable and now extensive product might be taken from what to-day is a useless thing, scattered over so many million acres in the West.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. In view of the probability of the investigation resulting favorably and supplying this very much needed article, does not the gentleman think that we ought to quit giving away these public lands that are covered with sagebrush?

Mr. RAKER. Oh, no; because——

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman does not have much faith in the experiment, I am sure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in regard to giving away the public domain, in the first place, it would be an incentive to place hundreds of millions in the West, because the product is becoming valuable, from which we could extract rubber, would result in clearing the land and in helping the settler. In other words, he would get some return from the clearing of the sagebrush and the greasewood, and thereby make it answer two purposes. After the land has been once cleared of sagebrush and plowed, in two years you will find a growth again of sagebrush 2 or 3½ feet high covering the entire tract, and in three years, except for the old stock, you would not even know that the land had ever been cleared. So, as a matter of fact, it will answer to the advantage of the Government, first, in assisting in clearing the land, and, second, in getting a by-product that now is destroyed, and hence it would be an incentive to fill these arid and semiarid tracts of land in the West and bring about crops of wheat and rye and hay, whereby we might increase our food supply and reduce the price; and I have such unlimited confidence in the chairman and the members of this committee that upon the presentation of the facts at their next consideration of this bill, knowing the importance of it and what it means to the development of the West, I believe we will eventually have an item in the bill that will authorize the department to go into this great enterprise.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I believe the paragraph is new in the bill?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the purpose of providing specifically for general administrative expenses connected with these various lines of investigation, when the department now has authority to expend any or all sums out of the preceding items for a like character of work?

Mr. LEVER. The committee and the department felt that the administrative expenses ought to be set out in this bureau as it is in practically all other bureaus. Heretofore this amount and this authority have been carried in the item immediately preceding, and we felt that we ought to know what they are spending from time to time in general administrative work.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will this item in the bill prohibit the bureau from expending any sums whatsoever from prior sums for administrative work?

Mr. LEVER. It will not change existing law.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the ruling of the Comptroller of the Treasury, when an item is carried in an appropriation bill specifically designating the character of work for which the appropriation may be used, no other item may be utilized for that same character of work. I am in sympathy

with that construction and with the purpose of this amendment, if that is the intention.

Mr. LEVER. The intention of this item is to provide a specific appropriation for general administrative expenses of the bureau itself. As I understand it, in the item above, for instance, where you have a $57,000 appropriation, there may be expended from that item certain administrative expenses, but they are not general administrative expenses, and all general administrative expenses for the bureau; that is, for work immediately connected with the chief of the bureau and which is not carried elsewhere must be carried in this item.

Mr. STAFFORD. I take it this is a limitation on the bureau's activities for expending any of the foregoing appropriations for administrative expenses?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And that the comptroller will not visé any appropriation out of the other respective items?

Mr. LEVER. It would not be authorized by the appropriation.

Mr. WINGO. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WINGO. Does the chairman think that $3,000 will be sufficient to cover the general administrative expenses of this department?

Mr. LEVER. That is all they estimated for; that is, for this bureau.

Mr. WINGO. I think there is something in the suggestion of the gentleman that where you specifically put out an appropriation for general administrative expenses, then they could not use, for instance, any preceding amount authorized for the general expenses of the work, such as, for instance, paying the salaries of employees.

Mr. LEVER. No; they would not have authority under this item, and I do not think they should have it.

Mr. WINGO. I agree with the chairman——

Mr. LEVER. I think it ought to be segregated.

Mr. WINGO. I agree with the chairman that you ought to segregate and specifically limit the amount of expenditure for administrative purposes, but it occurred to me possibly in connection with the idea that they could use, for instance, some of the preceding item of $57,000, they might be led into a position where it would be such as they would not have sufficient funds.

Mr. LEVER. I think we can risk the department's judgment on that, and they only ask for $3,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preventing spread of moths, Bureau of Entomology: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the continued spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths by conducting such experiments as may be necessary to determine the best methods of controlling these insects; by introducing and establishing the parasites and natural enemies of these insects and colonizing them within the infested territory; by establishing and maintaining a quarantine against further spread in such manner as he shall deem best, in cooperation with the authorities of the different States concerned and with the several State experiment stations, including rent outside of the District of Columbia, the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and for medical supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the immediate relief of foremen, scouts, and laborers, and other employees injured while engaged in hazardous work under this item of appropriation, and all other necessary expenses, $305,050.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against the language in lines 4 to 7, page 53. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested, as I have no doubt other Members were, in the statement made a few moments ago by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN], a member of the committee, giving his views as to the proper limit of governmental activities under the appropriations carried in this bill. He expressed the opinion that the Government should investigate thoroughly, should disseminate information, should inquire into causes and develop remedies, and should leave the States and individuals to apply the remedies. Now, I am wondering why the committee in considering this matter of the brown-tail and gypsy moths, are not following up the policy thus outlined or suggested by the gentleman from Michigan? As I understand it, in the case of this appropriation the Federal Government has not only sought the cause, determined the remedy, but proceeded to apply it. As I understand it, under this appropriation the Federal Government for a number of years has hired large forces of men to destroy the moths, and actually entered upon the work of applying the remedy.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit, let me say that the department has cooperated with the States in which the gypsy and brown-tail moth occur. The States involved are appropriating, according to my recollection, almost the amount appropriated by the Federal Government. The statement was made before the committee by Dr. Howard, who has charge of this work, that they had about determined in their own minds that there was no hope in the immediate future of exterminating or eradicating the brown-tail or gypsy moth and that the present plan was to continue their quarantine and control of this as much as possible, with a view of holding it in check, in status quo, as it were. Now they have discovered, however—and they think it is promising—a parasite for the gypsy moth, I think it is, and last year they turned loose upon the gypsy moth 17,000,000 of these little parasites, and the result so far, in my judgment, from the testimony before the committee, is promising; and it is possible, if we can keep up the control over and a strict quarantine with this appropriation, that the time may come when the parasite will take care of the gypsy and brown-tail moths. It is a curious thing in insect life that nearly every insect has an enemy which will in time prevent or destroy it. That is the thought of the committee in this matter.

Mr. MONDELL. But at the present time and under the appropriation carried in the bill the department does actually engage in the work of destroying these moths?

Mr. LEVER. That is true.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. This particular problem is one of the most serious that we have to deal with in this bill. These moths eat the leaves on the trees, multiply in great numbers, and can reproduce themselves in every section of the United States. We are endeavoring strictly to limit the territory which they may infest. If we should relax our diligence and these moths should be spread by vehicles, such as wagons or automobiles, or on lumber or through materials in transportation, or by other means, and should get into the southern forests and then out into the western forests, they would not only destroy the great timber product of the United States, but they would destroy the fruit-growing industry.

Mr. MONDELL. That is a pretty broad statement——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. How many varieties of trees do these moths attack?

Mr. HAWLEY. They attack all deciduous trees, and they attack the evergreens when there are no deciduous trees for them to live upon.

Mr. MONDELL. Has that latter fact been determined?

Mr. HAWLEY. I asked that question of the representative of the department when he was before the committee at this last hearing, and he made that statement. Some of the evergreen trees are attacked more readily by them than others.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, does the gentleman believe that we should continue to appropriate something like $300,000 indefinitely on this work, in view of the fact stated by the chairman of the committee, that it has now been demonstrated that it was impossible to eradicate the moths?

Mr. HAWLEY. I believe we should appropriate the money necessary to confine these moths to the localities where they now are until such time as the parasites may be multiplied in sufficient quantities to reduce them below the harmful point, as they have been reduced in the European countries from which they came, or until the moths have been reduced by other means.

Mr. MONDELL. And as they probably would be here if the moth got out of this particularly favored locality into a region less favorable, where nature would develop the parasite.

Now, as an illustration, I think we sometimes get overexcited about these things. I remember when Western States proposed appropriations of $1,000,000 a year for the eradication of the Russian thistle. Well, we did try to eradicate the Russian thistle, but we did not make very much headway, and it spread all over the country. It has not proven such a terrible pest as we had supposed it would be, although it is bad enough, in all conscience. The migratory grasshopper develops in the Rocky Mountain region, along the foothills of the eastern slopes of the Rockies, and when we have a few favorable seasons, warm, dry springs, those insects increase in such numbers that they migrate in great numbers to the eastern regions. But as soon as they reach humid territory nature develops in these migratory creatures certain parasites that kill them. While they may do great harm for a year or two, and formerly, when our fields were few and far between, the grasshopper frequently cleaned up great communities, in later times, when our grain fields are more widely extended, the damage is not so great. In no case do these hoppers flourish more than two or three seasons when they reach the humid regions.

Now, we might have started in to expend millions of dollars annually to exterminate the migratory Rocky Mountain grasshopper. We would not have gotten anywhere. By leaving him alone, nature provides a remedy. Would not nature provide a remedy for this moth before its ravages become extensive.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. The two illustrations the gentleman has chosen, I think, are not apt in their application to the difficulty raised by these two moths.

Mr. MANN. Well, are they not very apt to show that if you find the proper parasite and develop it, it will destroy much trouble from these insects, and is not that what we are trying to do here?

Mr. MONDELL. Nature develops these parasites whenever the creature gets out of the favorable environment.

Mr. MANN. Not unless the parasite is inherent in the locality.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask to close debate on this in 12 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to close debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto in 12 minutes? Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWLEY. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] referred to the Russian thistle as possibly to be comparable in destructive agency to the moths which this paragraph relates to. The Russian thistle does not go out throughout the country and live on trees by eating the leaves off.

Mr. MONDELL. I think "the gentleman from Wyoming" made no such suggestion as that.

Mr. HAWLEY. But I was going to prove to the gentleman that his illustration was not valid.

Mr. MONDELL. But the grasshopper illustration is.

Mr. HAWLEY. I will come to the grasshopper.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. In a moment. These moths migrate for a considerable distance, and they spread, if not hindered, with considerable rapidity, and they live on the leaves of the trees and kill the trees. A gentleman who was formerly a Member of this House, now a United States Senator from Massachusetts, said to the committee during the hearing on this subject that despite his best efforts a number of trees on his own estate had been killed by these pests.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. A large number of beautiful pines on my place at home have been killed recently by a beetle, but I do not believe the Federal Government should be called upon to come out there and exterminate those pests.

Mr. HAWLEY. Now, if the gentleman will allow me to proceed, if these moths are not confined to the territory where they now are, but spread throughout the Appalachian region, which will be a native habitat for them in a short time, they will destroy all the deciduous trees and the fruit trees, including the great peach orchards in Georgia and other Southern States. They have been found in a few instances far West, according to the statements that have been received. They are sent there on nursery stock.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman inform the committee whether or not the spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths has been practically stopped by virtue of the bill that passed your committee and finally became a law? I refer to the quarantine bill.

Mr. HAWLEY. The danger from it has been reduced, but you can not say they have been absolutely stopped. It depends on the efficiency of the enforcement of the law.

Mr. RAKER. Could the gentleman inform the committee whether or not there is considerable nursery stock going from State to State that does contain the gypsy and brown-tail moths, which is not prevented by the present quarantine bill?

Mr. HAWLEY. We have only had one or two instances that I now recall where there was a little outbreak in any place, but it was readily detected and the trees all destroyed and the place cleaned up.

Mr. RAKER. Does the same condition apply to some importation of foreign stock?

Mr. HAWLEY. They originally came with the importation of foreign stock, but there is now no more of that being delivered in the United States from infected districts abroad.

Mr. RAKER. It is practically eliminated?

Mr. HAWLEY. They are not allowed to ship infected stock from infested districts in the Old World unless there is no danger of the stock being infested, and when it reaches here it is examined again, and if there has been any moths overlooked in the preparation of the shipment those shipments are seized and destroyed.

Mr. RAKER. Then the importation of these various insects, by virtue of the various quarantines, so far as the imported stock is concerned, is practically eliminated?

Mr. HAWLEY. I think it is practically eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. I had some more remarks to make in answer to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I may want a little more than five minutes.

This is an appropriation for the control of the gypsy and brown-tail moths. I am not familiar with those moths, and I hope I will never have the privilege of seeing either one of them in my own section of the country. They are exceedingly destructive. Nothing in the way of trees can live against them unless you can destroy the moths and in some way prevent their propagation.

Now, that is true of a good many insects that are destructive of certain plants. Those insects which are native in the country never bother us very much, because it is the law of nature that wherever a pest occurs, it must either become supreme and kill everything within its range, or else it must be controlled by some pest, which attacks the first pest; and throughout the world, wherever there is any animal life which is a pest or dangerous, it has an enemy which attacks it in its native habitat. But you can move the pest animal or insect from one country to another without carrying with it its enemy, and whenever you do that you are liable to get to the point where the pest becomes of such destructive power that there is hardly any way to control it unless you can find the parasite which attacks it.

I spoke a moment ago of the experience in the Hawaiian Islands, and I am going to say a word more about it. The brown-tail moth and the gypsy moth are imported. They have in this country no natural parasite which attacks them. The Agricultural Department has been engaged in a search in the original habitat of these moths endeavoring to find and bring here and acclimate a natural parasite enemy. Whether they have yet succeeded they do not know. They have the parasites. They have introduced a number of parasites here. Whether they will prove successful in exterminating the gypsy moth and the brown-tail moth I do not know.

I am going to narrate very briefly a fairy story. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] referred to the grasshopper. The sugar planters out in Hawaii were met with what is called a leaf hopper, a very small insect, which propagated rapidly and threatened the absolute destruction of the sugar cane in the Hawaiian Islands. They tried every method they could, and they could not control it. They commenced to give up their sugar plantations. They finally found an entomologist who said that he thought the only course to pursue was to ascertain the original habitat of the leaf hopper and there find the leaf hopper's parasite. They did not know where the leaf hopper had come from.

This entomologist went to China, and went all through China in the regions where sugar cane is produced, and found parasite after parasite which lived upon a leaf hopper somewhat similar, and he sent the parasites to Hawaii. It was not the parasite of this leaf hopper, and it did no good. He went to the East India Islands and met with the same experience. He worked at this year after year, incurring all the dangers that a white man could incur in tropical jungles, looking for a leaf hopper, not merely upon the sugar cane, but upon various other things that leaf hoppers live upon, as, for instance, various kinds of palms. He went to Australia, and went beyond Australia, and in a little island some distance from Australia he found the original habitat of this leaf hopper that was absolutely destroying the sugar cane in Hawaii.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask for five minutes, notwithstanding the limit of time fixed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. He started home with the parasites; he was taken down with typhoid fever in Australia and nearly died, and lost his parasites. He went back the next year and obtained more of the parasites, but found that he could not probably take them as far as Hawaii without their dying on the way. He obtained the consent of the Australian Government to propagate those parasites in Australia and set up a plant there and

propagated them and obtained a new brood, and landed finally in Hawaii with a small number of the parasites of this leaf hopper.

By that time the planters in Hawaii had given up hope. They had tried parasite after parasite with no effect, but they had finally found the real parasite. This little incident discloses the value of entomological work, because this man's discovery of this parasite has saved hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of land and sugar-cane land and sugar cane in Hawaii which they had given up as practically lost. They could not have continued the production of sugar cane in the Hawaiian Islands with success if they had not found the parasite of this leaf-hopper, so small that it can hardly be detected by the naked eye; the leaf hopper itself is so small that it is hardly noticeable. They have done that by scientific research and study along scientific lines, and have demonstrated the possibility of controlling all of these natural enemies imported from another country if we can only find in the original habitat the enemy which followed each enemy and killed it off—the parasite. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF BIOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Salaries, Bureau of Biological Survey: One biologist, who shall be chief of bureau, $3,500; 1 chief clerk and executive assistant, $1,800; 1 administrative assistant, $2,250; 1 financial clerk, $1,600; 3 clerks, class 3; 5 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, $1,260; 5 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, $1,080; 3 clerks, at $1,000 each; 2 clerks, at $900 each; 1 clerk, $840; 1 clerk, $720; 1 preparator, $1,200; 1 preparator, $900; 1 messenger, $720; 1 photographer, $1,300; 1 game warden, $1,200; 1 draftsman, $900; 2 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $480 each; 1 messenger boy, $360; 1 laborer, $600; 1 charwoman, $240; in all, $44,030.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last word. The Chair desires to state that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] reserved a point of order on the new words on page 53.

Mr. MONDELL. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question in regard to the salaries mentioned in this particular paragraph. I find it also running all through the bill—for a laborer at $600 and at another place a laborer at $480. What is the explanation of such low salaries for laborers?

Mr. LEVER. As the gentleman will notice, there are "two messengers, messenger boys, or laborers at $480 each" and one laborer at $600. One is a laborer, and the others have a dual capacity. They may be laborers or messengers.

Mr. DILL. I understand that; but as to the other one there is no limitation. It says "laborer."

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. DILL. Do I understand by that that the man draws only $50 a month?

Mr. LEVER. That is true.

Mr. DILL. And he works a full day?

Mr. LEVER. He works eight hours a day.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, I notice running all through this bill that there are provisions for the payment of just such low wages to laborers.

Mr. LEVER. I wish the gentleman would say "and through every other bill."

Mr. DILL. I think that is true; through every other bill also. Now, I understand from reports that an investigation is going on before one of the committees of the House as to the wages received by Government employees, and the testimony adduced before that committee shows that this Government is paying wages on which it is practically impossible to support a family. It seems to me that such a condition ought to be remedied, and I think that a Government with the wealth, power, and standing of the United States when it pays employees at the rate of $40 or $50 a month is doing a thing that it ought not to do. It seems to me this condition should be remedied, and we should begin in this bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DILL. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the gentleman believe that an increase of wages on the part of the Government would tend in any way to increase the wages that are paid generally over the country.

Mr. DILL. I am not certain that it would increase wages over the country, but it seems to me it would have a good effect. At any rate it does not seem to me that this Government ought to set the example of paying wages as low as the wages mentioned here when we criticize corporations for paying the same wages.

Mr. BAILEY. If the Government should increase wages, would not that have the effect of decreasing the wages of the people who furnish the money to pay the wages of Government employees?

Mr. DILL. Gentlemen who criticize great corporations for paying such low wages would certainly stand in a much better light than they do now when they vote for appropriation bills which authorize the payment of wages so low that no one can support a family on those wages.

Mr. BAILEY. Would not the gentleman prefer to do something that would tend to advance wages in general?

Mr. DILL. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. How would the gentleman do that?

Mr. DILL. That opens up a great question, and I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania will agree with me that this is hardly the place to discuss that great economic problem; but I do want to register my protest against the payment of salaries so low as some of those contained in this bill to men who work six days a week and regular hours every day. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Bureau of Biological Survey: For salaries and employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, furniture, supplies, traveling, and all other expenses necessary in conducting investigations and carrying out the work of the bureau, as follows:

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like the attention of the chairman of the committee [Mr. LEVER].

I have assisted in the preparation of nine appropriation bills in support of the Department of Agriculture for the promotion of the agricultural development of the United States. During that time the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has been a member of the Committee on Agriculture, and in the preparation of the last three bills, including the one now pending, he has been its chairman. By reason of his vigor and ability he has been an important member and worthy of study. In addition to the appropriation bills several measures of general legislation of great importance have been considered by the committee, and a number of them reported to the House and passed. Others are pending and active. Mr. LEVER has been a decided factor in all this legislation. While he has always shown a commendable and effective interest in the solution of problems affecting southern agriculture, and deserves the everlasting gratitude of that portion of our people for his services to them, he has been friendly to the study of and taken an intelligent interest in the problems confronting all other sections of the country.

He has the love, confidence, and admiration of every member of the committee, as he has of the House, because of his ability, diligence, efficiency, and broad sympathies.

Several laws of great value bear his name or owe their existence to his indefatigable energy.

If statesmanship consists in a painstaking analysis of questions relating to the public welfare and in submitting solutions that will result to the public good and securing their adoption, Mr. LEVER is a statesman. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the maintenance of the Montana National Bison Range and other reservations and for the maintenance of game introduced into suitable localities on public lands, under supervision of the Biological Survey, including construction of fencing, wardens' quarters, shelters for animals, landings, roads, trails, bridges, ditches, telephone lines, rockwork, bulkheads, and other improvements necessary for the economical administration and protection of the reservations, and for the enforcement of section 84 of the act approved March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," $21,000, of which sum $2,500 may be used for the purchase, capture, and transportation of game for national reservations.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if this provision includes the bird reserves as well?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; this provision takes care of them.

Mr. RAKER. There are 69 of these bird reserves, created for the purpose of protecting native birds. The first Executive order creating a reserve for the protection of native birds was dated March 14, 1903, when the Pelican Island Reservation in Florida was established. Native birds in the Canal Zone were protected by Executive order of date March 19, 1913. These 69 bird reserves are scattered all the way from Midway Island in the Pacific to Alaska and Porto Rico.

I ask unanimous consent that I may insert at this point an article prepared by Mr. Frank Bond, chief clerk, General Land Office, on the subject of bird reservations.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the article to which he refers. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, is this article already published?

Mr. RAKER. It has not been published in the daily papers.

Mr. MANN. I mean by the department.

Mr. RAKER. No; this is not a department matter. This article was inserted in the Reclamation Record for April, 1916. It is only a column and a half long.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

BIRD RESERVATIONS: THEIR PURPOSE AND FUTURE.

[By Frank Bond, Chief Clerk, General Land Office.]

Beginning with the first Executive order creating a reservation for the protection of native birds, dated March 14, 1903, when the Pelican Island Reservation, Fla., was established, there have been created by action of the President 69 reserves for this purpose, and in addition the birds upon the Canal Zone were protected by an Executive order of March 19, 1913. These 69 reservations are scattered all the way from the Midway Islands in the Pacific and Alaska to Porto Rico, and are divided among States and possessions as follows: Alaska, 10; Arizona, 1; Alabama and Mississippi, 1; Arkansas, 2; California, 3; California and Oregon, 1; Florida, 10; Hawaii, 1; Idaho, 2; Louisiana, 4; Michigan, 2; Minnesota, 1; Montana, 2; New Mexico, 2; Nebraska, 1; Nevada, 1; North Dakota, 2; Oregon, 3; Porto Rico, 2; South Dakota, 1; Utah, 1; Washington, 11; Wisconsin, 2; Wyoming, 3.

The purpose of some of these reserves is to furnish safe winter refuges or refuges for migrants, both spring and fall; of others to provide breeding grounds and their protection. Roughly speaking, the kind of birds protected are the plume birds and the edible waterfowl and shore birds. There are also protected upon some of the reserves waterfowl that may not be classed either as edible, for they are not edible, or as plume birds, strictly speaking, although millions have been slaughtered for their quills and wings. These birds embrace the sea birds, whose usefulness as scavengers makes them economically worthy of protection. From an economic standpoint the most important reservations are those which protect the edible waterfowl during the winter, breeding and migrating periods. These birds of course are the prey of the cold-storage and market hunters, and their winter feeding resorts became in the past veritable slaughter grounds.

Among the breeding reserves, which also are resting places for migrants in large numbers, are Klamath Lake and Malheur Lake, in California and Oregon, and among the reservations, used largely by birds which have gone South to spend the winter season, are some of those along the Gulf coast, such as Breton Island Reservation, northward from the mouth of the Mississippi River. Prior to the creation of the Breton Island Reservation in 1904 reports of special agents of the Audobon societies and others indicated that upward of 200,000 wild ducks were slaughtered during the winter seasons for cold-storage purposes. This, of course, has all been stopped within the limits of the several reservations where edible waterfowl winter. The two greatest slaughter grounds in the West—Malheur and Lower Klamath Lakes—were covered by reservation orders in 1908, and one of the purposes of this article is to call especial attention to these two, because they are fields of great local activity to secure the abandonment of the reservations or such modifications of their boundaries as will render them practically useless for the purposes for which they were created. It should be borne in mind that territory of value for bird-reservation purposes is becoming more and more rare, and it is probable that comparatively few new reservations of any great value will be created hereafter, especially reservations for the protection of the edible waterfowl. There can be no doubt that reserves of this character, while valuable now, can be made very much more valuable in the future by proper care and administration, and it is the belief of all who have made a study of the bird-protection movement that the reservations now created should be maintained without the surrender of any territory or further modifications of their boundaries unless there are very grave reasons therefor. It is not believed that throwing open any part of such reservations for the use of a few settlers, who probably without exception will be required to supplement what they can raise in the way of farm products by what they can collect with their guns and traps, is in any degree a fair exchange for what the people of the United States, as a whole, have a right to expect and will receive if these reservations are maintained intact and properly administered.

Special effort is now being made to throw open to settlement large tracts of the tule lands within the Klamath Lake Reservation, and the propagada therefor indicates that as a preliminary step toward such action, which will destroy the usefulness of the reserve as such, a considerable number of persons have gone within the reserve, and it is now proposed to give them the marsh lands which they have unlawfully entered. Of course these people are not interested in the birds except to the extent that they may be able to hunt and kill them when they get a footing within the reservation, but a wise public policy will not permit a very few persons thus to destroy a reservation which is not only a valuable source of food supply for thousands at the present time but is bound to become much more valuable in the future.

Mr. RAKER. This article shows the purposes of these bird reserves. We appropriate $21,100 for these 69 reserves, 2 of which are in my immediate locality. This appropriation is wholly inadequate to carry out the purposes of the Executive orders. I have been in communication with the departments having charge of these bird reserves, in the hope that we may get an adjustment in some 35 to 45 homestead claims located in what is known as the Klamath Lake Reservation. These claimants insist that this land is valuable for agricultural purposes. Most of them are living upon the land. My purpose is not to destroy game preserves at any time or under any circumstances, if they are necessary for that purpose, but when the land is more valuable for agricultural purposes, for homesteading, it should be so used. I have great hope that the Department of Agriculture, and in this particular instance the Biological Survey, who have control of the bird reserves, in connection with the General Land Office, may be able to have a commission appointed from that department to make an investigation to determine this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I can not afford to object, but I will ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, a part of this article relates to the territory in my district. Some 35 settlers have gone on the land where the reserve has been created, and some onto reclamation projects. I want to take this opportunity, without any criticism of the department, to the end that my people may be properly sustained in their rights to say that behind them stands the entire body of citizens of Siskiyou County—the judge, the board of supervisors, the grand jury, and the people—believing and insisting that this land is valuable for agricultural purposes and that no part of it will be used or taken from the bird reserve that might be necessary for that bird reserve.

Personally whatever land is necessary for the bird reserve and for the protection and propagation of edible fowl, ought to be maintained, and that which is not necessary but is more valuable for agricultural purposes, ought to be used for that purpose.

But I do not feel justified in submitting to this article, to the indictment of my people and those who are desiring to obtain a homestead upon Government land, that their one object and purpose is that they may destroy the edible wild fowl and thereby destroy a bird reserve or a proper location for a bird reserve.

Some might desire the land, thinking it is located in a good position, but the department I am satisfied is trying to arrange this matter without any antagonism either for or against the settlers, and that they will be able to come to some adjustment. I felt as though I could not let this pass without calling it to the attention of the committee.

In discussing the matter with the department they say that one of the reasons, and I am satisfied that it is true, that a proper result has not been had at the present time is a lack of funds. There are 69 reserves from Alaska to Florida, some of them covering a territory of a hundred thousand acres, and sometimes one man has to look after a reserve of a hundred thousand acres, and you can readily see that this wild life that ought to be protected, which is of value to the country, should have, if we are going to maintain this reserve, sufficient men to maintain them properly, give them proper protection, proper regulations, and a sufficient number of men, so that the regulations may be enforced and the bird preserves, because of their great value, properly looked after by the general public. Many thousands and even millions of edible fowl are reared on these preserves.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 55, in line 1, after the word "States" strike out the figures "$21,000" and insert "$25,000."

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation carried in this item for which it is expected to accomplish is ridiculously small. It is something like $300 for each reservation, and the reservations are not all bird reservations. The item includes the big-game preserves at Dixon, Mont.; Wind Cave National Park, S. Dak., and Jackson Hole, Wyo. On one of these preserves the United States Government has spent $50,000, and one of the bird preserves is a large group of islands in the Hawaiian group called the Laysan Island Reserve, which covers 5 degrees of longitude.

A year ago poachers got on the islands and killed over 300,000 albatrosses for their breasts, leaving the bones and dead birds strewn around over acres of ground. This great reservation has no warden and the devastation was not discovered until an expedition went there some time after. There were some birds left, and in the course of time I suppose they will repopulate the islands if not again destroyed.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Of what economic value are these birds when they are off on this island where nobody can see them?

Mr. PLATT. I do not know what the economic value may be of the birds on this particular preserve. The geese and ducks on the great Laysan reserves are of immense value.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I understand that; but I am speaking of these birds that you say were killed on this island.

Mr. PLATT. They had an economic value to the people who killed them, or they would not have gone there after them.

Mr. MANN. Were they of any economic value living? Do they add anything to beauty or anything else? What value is it to have a lot of birds on an island that no one visits, and these birds do not go anywhere else but stay there?

Mr. PLATT. I do not think it is true that they go nowhere else.

Mr. MANN. Where do they go?

Mr. PLATT. Some of them may not be migratory, but others fly back and forth between the islands of the Hawaiian group, and perhaps farther.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the island to which the gentleman refers is a little island five or six or seven hundred miles away from the large island of Kawaihae. I do not understand that those birds go anywhere else.

Mr. PLATT. The reserve includes a number of small islands extending over 5 degrees of longitude. The birds go back and forth among that group of islands, and some of them farther.

Mr. MANN. They may go back and forth among some of the smaller islands in the group where no one lives. They do not go to any island where anybody lives. That is my information, though I may be wrong about it.

Mr. PLATT. The gentleman from Illinois knows much more about the Hawaiian Islands than I do, for I have never visited them. I am not sure about the habits of the albatross, but I know some of the birds of those islands fly considerable distances.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I quite agree with the gentleman generally.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman refer to Laysan Island?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Those birds, I understand, travel all over the South Sea Islands.

Mr. MANN. Oh, they do not go anywhere. They go out in the ocean and fish and then go back home.

Mr. PLATT. The economic value of the bird reservations lies largely in the reservations along our coasts or off the Delta of the Mississippi, where thousands and thousands of ducks and geese which nest in Canada and North Dakota and other Northern States, but mostly in Canada, congregate in the wintertime. There are a few of these bird reservations on the Atlantic seacoast. There is one in Wisconsin, which is a rock in Lake Michigan, I believe. Some of the reservations are small and some of them large.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman suggests an increase of $4,000 for what particular purpose?

Mr. PLATT. To provide wardens for a few of these reservations which have no protection at all now. Anybody who wants to go and kill the birds can do it without let or hindrance.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Has the gentleman any communication from the bureau to know whether they can use the money for that purpose?

Mr. PLATT. Yes; I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that I have talked with the bureau officials. I am very well acquainted with several of the officials of the Biological Survey, and they have told me that they have been severely criticized for not protecting the birds on these reservations, though it was impossible to do more than they have done with the appropriation set aside for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more. He is the only authority in this House on birds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest that the time is limited.

Mr. MANN. Then I ask unanimous consent that that time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Does the gentleman know at what places these wardens would be put?

Mr. PLATT. Some on the Atlantic coast reservations, which are generally barren marsh islands where no one lives, and they need patrolling. There is no money now to provide anybody to go from one to the other except at long intervals. They need a motor boat, among other things, so that they can get from one island to another.

It is not necessary that each island in the coast reservations should have a separate warden, but they should be visited frequently to see whether any damage has been done and to punish those who kill the birds. I may say that the bird reservations are all mapped in one of the Biological Survey bulletins, though it does not include the last few established. There were two or three new reservations put in within the past year or two, and one which was adopted last year had to be abandoned for lack of funds. Another has been turned over to another bureau. It will be noticed that there is a little variation between the report of the committee, which says there are 69 bird reservations, and the hearings, which put the number at 68. There were 70. One had to be abandoned and another was turned over to another department because of lack of funds. They have done a great deal of good. There is no doubt that some birds are actually being saved from extermination by these bird reservations. Take, for instance, the heath hen, which used to be abundant all over the East. It is now to be found only on the island of Marthas Vineyard, where it is under stringent protection by the State of Massachusetts and is slowly increasing. A good many other birds are being saved in the same way where they can collect in the winter or at certain times. Most of them are winter reservations, though a few reservations in the North are nesting reservations. The birds concentrate closer together in the wintertime, and they need places where they can not be slaughtered.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows a great deal about birds, and his information has a good deal of weight with me. Does the gentleman think that this additional money can be used profitably so as to save and protect birds?

Mr. PLATT. I am very sure that it can. I am sure that this little increase of only $4,000 more will do a good deal of good. It will just about provide salaries for the three or four wardens who are most needed.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman state whether or not the committee reported the number of wardens or made an appropriation for the full number of wardens that the department estimated for?

Mr. PLATT. I know that the Biological Survey asked for more money than the committee gave it, as will be seen from the hearings.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would like to inquire if there is anything being done looking to the destruction of squirrels, that are the greatest enemy of song birds that we have?

Mr. PLATT. The greatest enemy of the song bird is the domestic cat, which ought to be destroyed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon, because the domestic cat has to be somewhere near a house, while the squirrels are scattered all around. For example, take the Capitol grounds. We have lots of squirrels here, with the result that you can not find a bird's nest in all these trees.

Mr. PLATT. Oh, yes, you can. I think there are too many red squirrels that are destructive of birds. The gray squirrel does occasionally destroy birds, but not generally, if my information is correct.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman what is the aggregate area included in the various bird reservations throughout the United States?

Mr. PLATT. I shall have to refer the gentleman to the bulletin of the Biological Survey for that. I do not remember the figures. I think perhaps the gentleman from North Dakota can tell him.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has announced that he recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota for five minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I desire to ask a question of the gentleman from New York. Is it not a fact that the item of $21,000 provided in this paragraph also includes work in respect to wild animals?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. In addition to all this work about which the gentleman has been talking in connection with the preservation of bird life?

Mr. PLATT. It does. The item includes the work of hedging, ditching, telephone lines, and all sorts of things in connection with the preservation and maintenance of the Montana National Buffalo Range. It is not only a matter of bird preservation, but is spread over these thousands of acres in reference to animals.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman expects the $4,000, if he gets it, to be used specially for bird preservation.

Mr. PLATT. That is what the Biological Survey wants it for.

Mr. MANN. I will not vote for it unless that is the expectation.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The buffalo, which once thickly populated the western plains, has became almost extinct. The Biological Survey is entitled to much credit for the excellent work done in picking up and caring for the few remaining specimens. The buffalo in the various herds in the United States and Canada number a little more than 4,000. About half of them are in Canada, and of the Canadian supply most of it was obtained from herds purchased in Montana. It was a mistake to let them get out of our country. Those we have left are receiving the most careful attention and every effort is being put forth to guard against losing them through disease or otherwise. For that reason the buffalo have been cared for in more than one park, so that an epidemic could not carry off all of them. That was the chief reason for the establishment of Sullys Hill National Park, located on the shores of Devils Lake, N. Dak. It was also recognized that North Dakota was a portion of the region where the buffalo thrived before the advent of the white man. It is the habitat of the buffalo, and the herd to be transferred there from Montana will doubtless increase rapidly, and later help fill the growing demand for buffalo in the municipal parks of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will act favorably upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. With proper care and encouragement the time will come when the buffalo will be found outside of the parks. They will be found on the farms, helping to take care of the meat supply and furnishing those delightful robes which contributed so much snugness and pleasure to the sleigh rides of long ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. HERNANDEZ].

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, what I desire to inquire is in connection with the next paragraph.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. There is an amendment pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The question before the committee is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Upon a division (demanded by Mr. LEVER) there were—ayes 39, noes 16.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 55, in line 3, after the word "reservation," insert:

"For the purchase of what is known as the 'Scotty Phillips' herd of buffalo of South Dakota for distribution among the national parks and national monuments, $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, such purchase to be made by and in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on this amendment and paragraph is closed.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to address the committee for five minutes on this amendment.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of information. Some time was reserved for gentlemen on this subject who did not use that time, and there must be five or six minutes left under the original arrangement.

The CHAIRMAN. If gentlemen did not use that time it is not the fault of the Chair. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Colorado would not offer on this proposition a separate paragraph to the bill?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I have sent it up as a separate paragraph to come in at this place.

Mr. LEVER. Debate has been concluded on this paragraph.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me say to the chairman of the committee that I have not taken any time on this bill.

Mr. LEVER. That statement has been made by dozens of men on the floor——

Mr. MANN. I understand this is offered as a separate paragraph.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It is offered as a separate paragraph to go in at this point.

Mr. MANN. Then debate is not closed.

Mr. LEVER. Then I ask unanimous consent that debate on the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado and all amendments thereto shall close in 12 minutes, and I am reserving the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Colorado offers this amendment as a separate paragraph?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of making sure of the preservation and perpetuation of the American bison. I have all my life been a very great admirer of the buffalo. When I was a small boy I lived for several years at my father's cattle ranch on the plains of western Kansas. There were hundreds of thousands of buffalo in that country at that time, from 1870 to 1874, and I used to lasso buffalo calves. My father sent several pair of them to the various parks of Chicago, Cincinnati, and other places. We raised quite a little herd of them with our cattle. They are a noble animal of which I have always been fond. At the present time the only fine herd of pure buffalo in the world, or at least the best one, is at Fort Pierre, S. Dak., what is known as the "Scotty Phillips" herd of buffalo, of about 500 head. They are pure-bred, fine specimens of buffalo, and there will be about 100 calves this spring. Mr. Phillips died several years ago and, I understand, his heirs desire to dispose of this herd and close the estate. I have understood that unless they are purchased by the Government or somebody within some reasonable time that the animals, or many of them, may be butchered.

They can butcher and sell them for more than the price they offer to sell them to parks; but the owners naturally want to see them preserved. They hold them at $250 a head.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand there is a demand for pure buffalo from zoological societies. Do you understand in spite of that demand that these buffalo would be butchered by this family who own the herd?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I have no personal knowledge or direct information, but I have several times heard that the family has been trying for several years to wind up the estate, and the demand from the various zoological gardens and parks is only for a small number for each place, which amounts to comparatively little, and that they want to close out the entire herd. The State of South Dakota purchased 24 head of them in the spring of 1915 and placed them in a State game park in the Black Hills. The State paid $250 a head for them. And I may say that a number of public-spirited citizens throughout the country have contemplated making a purchase of the entire herd and presenting it to the Government of the United States. That certainly would be a very patriotic and noble thing to do. And if the United States Government does not buy that buffalo herd I certainly hope some admirer of the buffalo will do so, because it would be the most colossal loss and grievous mistake of this entire generation if the American people would allow that herd of pure buffalo to be slaughtered. It might result in the extermination of the buffalo species. I do not suppose $100,000 would be enough to buy the entire herd, but that would buy enough to preserve them for all time if they are properly cared for.

Now, it seems to me that the Government of the United States ought to purchase them, if it can, at a reasonable figure. The amendment I offer would give the Secretary of the Interior discretion to go and buy that herd, or buy the major portion of it, and preserve them in the various national parks throughout the United States and breed them up and supply them to all the buffalo parks of the world. As a matter of fact, it would be an immensely profitable transaction for the Government of the United States to engage in, and we would at the same time preserve the buffalo. If I was a wealthy man I would buy the herd and present them to Uncle Sam.

I might say that I have a bill providing for the purchase of a few of them for our Colorado national parks, but, of course,

I do not know that we can pass a bill of that kind. My bill reads as follows:

A bill to authorize the establishment of game preserves and sanctuaries in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to reserve and set apart for a game preserve and sanctuary public and reserved lands of the United States in and adjacent to the Rocky Mountain National Park and the Arapahoe National Forest, in Grand County, Colo., and in and adjacent to the Colorado National Monument, in Mesa County, Colo., said reserves to be of suitable area and character to carry out the purpose and intent of this act.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to purchase, either at private or public sale, not exceeding 200 buffaloes from the "Scotty Phillips" buffalo herd in South Dakota, or from such other herd or herds as may be for sale within the United States, and to transfer and remove one-half of the buffaloes so purchased to each of the game preserves and sanctuaries herein authorized.

SEC. 3. That the sum of $75,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to carry out and administer the provisions of this act, is hereby appropriated.

It is something that I think the Agricultural Committee, instead of spending so much money on some bird island in some place, ought to take up. There are dozens of items in this bill calling for more than I ask for, and scarcely any of those items are as important as this. If we can preserve the American bison we would be doing a hundred times more for the American people and future generations than we are by preserving some bird sanctuary out in some ocean.

Mr. PLATT. Does the gentleman know that the United States Government owns 12 per cent of the American buffalo and that the Canadian Government owns 50 per cent of them?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Our Government ought to own more than Canada does. The western part of the United States was the native home of the American bison, and the last wild buffalo in this country was killed about 20 years ago in one of the remote and wild mountainous parts of Colorado. Colorado was, I believe, their last native stamping ground.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It is a fact that the Canadian Government gets most of their buffaloes from Montana, is it not?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think that is true. And at the same time the Canadian Government is breeding up buffalo in the same manner that the American Government ought to breed them up and preserve them. I want sometime to address the House more at length on this subject. The robes of these animals are worth over $100 apiece, and the heads are worth from $100 to $400 apiece. The females bear a calf every other year.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Why provide in the Agricultural bill for $100,000 to be expended by the Secretary of the Interior? Why not by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, that is a mere matter of detail. I would just as soon the Secretary of Agriculture would buy them. I do not care anything about that. I am thinking about preserving the American bison. I do not care who buys them. My thought is that they ought to be preserved, and this bill is the place where Congress ought to consider it.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman in his amendment is taking it away from the Agricultural Department and putting it in the Interior Department.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The Interior Department has charge of the national parks, generally speaking, and I thought these animals, if they were put in those parks, would naturally come under his jurisdiction. But I want to preserve the buffalo, and I do not care who does it. I would be perfectly willing to have the chairman of the Agricultural Committee do the purchasing and have full discretion in regard to it. The only question is, I think, the committee ought to give attention to this matter, which is more important than the matter of some insects, where we are spending $400,000 on a blue-tailed coddling moth, where we could preserve the best buffalo on earth for $100,000. I earnestly feel that my amendment ought to be adopted, Mr. Chairman. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this amendment is not in order on this bill and is not authorized by any existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] want to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No, sir. I do not care to argue the point, if the chairman insists upon it, because I presume that possibly it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The clerk will read.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. LEVER. Let the next paragraph be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The last word went out on a point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $5,000, the same to be available until expended.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order for the purpose of obtaining information. I notice in the wording of the paragraph there is some money now available for that purpose. Will the gentleman inform the committee how much is available and what is the purpose of this additional amount that will remain available until expended?

Mr. LEVER. I will give the gentleman the information by reading from the report.

In the appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915 an appropriation of $5,000 was made for the improvement of the game preserve in Sullys Hill National Park, N. Dak.

That amendment was put on in the Senate.

A similar sum was included in the appropriation act for the present fiscal year It was thought at the time that $10,000 would be sufficient to provide for the fencing of the preserve and the construction of the necessary buildings, corrals, roads, etc. It was found, however, that the fencing alone would cost nearly $10,000. The contract has been let for the construction of the fence, which will be completed by June 30, 1916, but no funds are available for making improvements on or for stocking the preserve. An item of $5,000 accordingly has been included in the bill for the fiscal year 1917 to provide quarters, barns, animals, warden service, and maintenance expenses for one year.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is sufficient information, Mr. Chairman, and I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. What was the original estimated cost of the fence?

Mr. LEVER. There was no estimate at all on this. The original item was put in the bill in the Senate and was held in conference. Then an appropriation of $50,000 was carried in the bill, again put in in the Senate. The department says that $10,000 has been found necessary for the fence alone. It is a tract of land of some 800 acres, as I recall.

Mr. MANN. My recollection is that it was stated at first that the whole thing would not cost over $10,000. I may be mistaken about that, but that is my impression.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman is correct about that.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether the Agricultural Department made an estimate or not.

Mr. LEVER. The Senate item was originally $10,000, and it was reduced to $5,000 in conference.

Mr. MANN. It would seem to be more than passing strange if the Department of Agriculture were not able now, with the enlightenment of the present day, to come within 50 per cent of the actual cost of constructing a simple fence.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think the Agricultural Department has ever made an estimate on the proposition.

Mr. MANN. Very likely.

Mr. LEVER. The committee took the matter into its own hands and put the sum in.

Mr. MANN. That estimate may have been made by a distinguished United States Senator; and if so, I think that, coming from that source, they did pretty well.

Mr. LEVER. I am inclined to think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $400,540: *Provided*, That of this sum $15,000 shall be used for the destruction of ground squirrels on the national forests and other public lands: *Provided further*, That of this sum not more than $5,000 may be used in investigating the disease of wild ducks in the Salt Lake Valley region of Utah: *And provided also*, That of this sum not less than $125,000 shall be used on the national forests and the public domain in destroying wolves, coyotes, and other animals injurious to agriculture and animal husbandry: *And provided further also*, That of this sum not less than $125,000 shall be used on the public lands, national forests, and elsewhere in the Western and Northwestern States for the protection of stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies by the destruction of wolves, coyotes, and other predatory wild animals.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of amendments to offer.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can not offer amendments when a point of order is pending.

Mr. COX. Am I recognized, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the chairman to this language:

Provided further That of this sum not more than $5,000 may be used in investigating the disease of wild ducks in the Salt Lake Valley region of Utah.

That is a new item, is it not?

Mr. LEVER. That item has been in the bill for two years.

Mr. COX. What on earth can anybody find out about the disease of wild ducks?

Mr. LEVER. I will ask the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HOWELL], who is more familiar with that subject than I am, to answer that question.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I will say for the information of the House that for several years past there has been a very destructive disease appearing among the wild ducks in Salt Lake Valley. In one year alone it was estimated that over 4,000,000 wild ducks had died as the result of this disease. Our game warden and our gun clubs were baffled in their efforts to determine the cause of the disease. Finally, an appropriation of $5,000 was obtained, and the work of investigation was undertaken by the Biological Survey. Representatives of the department were sent out, and for two seasons they have been investigating the cause of this mysterious disease which has wrought so much havoc among the ducks in the Salt Lake Valley.

Mr. COX. What have they found out?

Mr. HOWELL. They have not yet determined positively as to the cause, but their investigations lead them to the conclusion that it is not a disease, but that it results from alkali poisoning, and the remedy for it is an abundant supply of fresh water for the ducks.

Mr. COX. Where do they get the alkali? Is the alkali in the water?

Mr. HOWELL. Oh, yes. The main cause of the trouble has been the alkaline pools of water along the shores of the lake.

Mr. COX. Have they brought to that section of the country any remedy at all for the destruction of the wild ducks?

Mr. HOWELL. As I said, the results of the investigation have shown that where the ducks can be placed on fresh water they rapidly recover from the effects of this alkaline poisoning. I will say to the gentleman, further, that it is a very interesting fact that the investigation of ducks in Salt Lake means, in effect, an investigation of the ducks of a vast region of country which assemble at Salt Lake.

Mr. COX. Suppose they do finally determine that the disease is due to the alkaline poisoning. That will not do any good unless you change the ducks to some other place, will it?

Mr. HOWELL. Let me finish the statement. The ducks that gather in Salt Lake Valley are found by actual experiment to have a region of flight extending to southern California, Oklahoma, and all of the surrounding States and Territories. The Great Salt Lake is the gathering place or rendezvous of the wild ducks of that great intermountain country and as far south as southern California and Oklahoma.

The Bureau of Biological Survey have also been investigating the effect of lead poisoning upon ducks. It has been ascertained that upon the hunting grounds that ducks frequently die from the effects of absorbing the leaden pellets left on the hunting grounds from the ammunition fired at them by sportsmen. Ten pellets of No. 6 shot will cause the death of a Mallard duck. They are trying to find a remedy to relieve the poisoning resulting from this cause.

Mr. COX. That is two diseases, then, that they have probably discovered. What are they going to do with the ducks after they have discovered them and have announced the fact of these two diseases?

Mr. HOWELL. The department has already done a great deal of good through these investigations, and a great improvement in the situation has been effected.

Mr. COX. Has it prolonged the life of any of the ducks or saved any additional ducks?

Mr. HOWELL. The department has had the hearty cooperation of sportsmen's clubs, whereby artificial ponds of fresh water have been made in proximity to the alkaline waters, and in that way the disease has been very materially checked and the great loss of wild fowl materially diminished in that region.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask that the gentleman have more time if he wishes it.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the gentleman's time will be extended five minutes.

Mr. HOWELL. I do not think there is any appropriation of $5,000 in this bill that will be productive of greater benefit to the wild fowl than this appropriation. As I have said before, the Salt Lake Valley is a rendezvous of the wild fowl from all the intermountain country, and as far as California and Oklahoma. They assemble there in the fall by the million. Any steps that will protect wild fowl is of prime public importance. If it can be done to a very limited extent by the expenditure of a paltry $5,000, it would be foolish economy to withhold it.

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

Mr. HOWELL. Yes.

Mr. COX. No doubt the gentleman has taken this matter up thoroughly with the department. Did the department give him any assurance whatever that it would ever be able to determine just the cause of this disease of the wild duck, and the remedy that will really help the people by keeping the wild ducks alive?

Mr. HOWELL. I think the department has already about reached the conclusion that so far as this malady that has appeared in the Salt Lake Valley is concerned, it is the result of alkali poisoning, and about the only remedy necessary is an abundance of fresh water. When the ducks are taken from these alkaline ponds and placed in fresh-water ponds they recover very rapidly.

Mr. COX. There will be no necessity for continuing this appropriation next year, will there?

Mr. HOWELL. I hardly think so. The department would like to continue the experiment another year. That is the statement made; but all their investigations lead them to the conclusion that the main remedy for this particular disease is an abundance of fresh water. When the ducks are taken from the alkaline waters and given access to fresh water, they rapidly improve and get well; but the department wishes to investigate this subject of lead poisoning, which they have found to exist quite widely in the ducks on sporting grounds.

Mr. MANN. What does the gentleman propose to do with his point of order?

Mr. COX. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BOOHER. I renew the point of order on the last paragraph, and proviso on page 56, which reads as follows:

Provided further also, That of this sum not less than $125,000 shall be used on the public lands, national forests, and elsewhere in the Western and Northwestern States for the protection of stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies by the destruction of wolves, coyotes, and other predatory wild animals.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved on the proviso.

Mr. BOOHER. I want to get some information from the chairman of the committee. I would like to ask how it is intended to use this $125,000 for the destruction of wolves, coyotes, and so forth?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] has handled this particular matter in the bill, and I will ask him to explain it.

Mr. BOOHER. This proviso proposes to appropriate $125,000 for the suppression of rabies by the destruction of wolves, coyotes, and other predatory wild animals. Is it proposed to hire hunters to destroy these animals, or what?

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman allow me to make a preliminary statement?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. Rabies appeared in the southern part of the State of Washington about three years ago and spread very rapidly from there through eastern Oregon into northern California, into Nevada and Idaho, and over onto the borders of Utah in the last year. The coyotes bite one another and spread the disease. They bite other wild animals, dogs, cows, sheep, and horses, and thus spread the disease among domestic animals. Thirty-five persons have had to take the Pasteur treatment at the University of Nevada, and I understand that some 12 persons, who came from eastern Oregon, and some others from other parts of that section had to take the same treatment. Now we propose to destroy the coyotes by systematic extermination—by hunting, trapping, poisoning, or in any other way in which they can kill them.

Mr. BOOHER. Do the department expect to use the people now engaged in the Forest Service as guards and supervisors to do this work?

Mr. HAWLEY. They have armed a number of these forest rangers and supervisors, and they have employed a few experienced trappers.

Mr. BOOHER. I see by the bill that we have 168 forest supervisors, 82 deputy supervisors, 240 rangers, and 80 guards. Now, are all those men armed when they are out upon their work?

Mr. HAWLEY. I think all of them in the regions where there are predatory animals carry guns. That may not be so in every case; but, speaking generally, I think it is.

Mr. BOOHER. Does the State of Nevada appropriate any money to pay a bounty for the destruction of the animals?

Mr. HAWLEY. I understand the State of Nevada has appropriated $100,000, the Wool Growers' Association has appropriated $10,000, the other States will also make appropriations, and other stock growers will also supply sums of money and arm their own men with the idea of aiding in the extermination of these animals.

Mr. BOOHER. Is there any bounty paid by your State for the scalps of these animals?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes; we pay some bounty.

Mr. BOOHER. How much is the bounty for a coyote scalp?

Mr. HAWLEY. I can not tell the gentleman. The legislature appropriates a flat sum to be expended in bounties, but I do not recall how much the bounty is.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. In the State of Idaho we pay $2.50 for each coyote head that is brought into the county seat, and I have a telegram here from the governor, that came yesterday, in which he states that Idaho paid out $60,000 last year in cooperation with the Federal Government toward the extermination of these rabid animals.

The telegram is as follows:

BOISE, IDAHO, *April 19, 1916.*

Hon. ADDISON T. SMITH,
House of Representatives, Washington:

Idaho paid bounty on predatory animals from March 10 to January 1, $47,222.50. Claims accumulated since January 1 but not yet adjusted amount to about $15,000, making over $62,000 for 12 months. Levy on all stock animals produces approximately $30,000 revenue annually for payment of bounties, and direct appropriations from general fund of $25,000 annually produces annual bounty revenue exceeding $55,000.

M. ALEXANDER, *Governor.*

Mr. BOOHER. Then the State is doing all it possibly can?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes. I think every State is doing that, and the Stock Growers' Association are contributing money for the same purpose.

Mr. BOOHER. Is this appropriation intended to be expended in killing these animals in forest reserves or outside of them?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. In the forest reserves and on the public lands.

Mr. HAWLEY. The intention is to exterminate the animals. The coyotes and wolves that have rabies are a menace to the people of that large area, and to the horses, sheep, and cattle, particularly to sheep and cattle, and large numbers have been destroyed through them. It is proposed to kill these coyotes and wolves on the forest reserves, on the public lands, and elsewhere, wherever they can be found.

Mr. BOOHER. The money carried in this appropriation would be expended on Government lands, would it?

Mr. HAWLEY. Not necessarily. It says "and elsewhere" in line 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, in view of the great sums of money appropriated in this bill for the eradication of insect pests, fruit diseases, the brown-tail moth, boll weevil, gypsy moth, wheat rust, and so forth, amounting to several millions of dollars, all of which pertains to land in private ownership, it comes with poor grace for Members of this House from eastern districts to oppose this appropriation for destroying these rabid animals on the public lands.

Not only is the presence of these animals destructive of domestic animals, but human beings are in constant danger of being attacked by them. Their bite is so venomous that animals attacked communicate the disease to other animals, and human beings attacked invariably succumb unless the Pasteur treatment can be applied immediately.

The prevalence of this disease among wild and domestic animals throughout the central portion of the intermountain country calls for the most active cooperation on the part of the Federal Government with the States, counties, and the various live-stock organizations if it is to be eliminated. I have numerous clippings from newspapers in southern Idaho containing accounts of the damage which is being done by rabid animals and the effort that is being made to eradicate them, which I will not take time to read, but which show a most deplorable situation. Dogs, cats, hogs, cattle, and horses, made insane by rabies, their whole nature changed, are intent on biting any object within their reach.

The coyote, naturally a timid creature, avoiding a human being, becomes ferocious and fearless when suffering from rabies, and the cow, naturally tame and gentle, is transformed into a most dangerous beast, with the characteristics of a tiger. The urgent necessity of making the appropriation must be evident to any unprejudiced person. The Federal Government owns the larger portion of the country infested, and Congress should help to protect the lives and property of the people who are endeavoring to settle up the West and make its resources available to those living in the more thickly populated sections of the country.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I renew the point of order. I would like to inquire what is the necessity of providing separately $125,000 for the suppression of rabies when we are carrying in a prior item $125,000 for the destruction of these very same animals on the national forest and public domain? Why not increase the appropriation that has been carried, as it is one that we all are interested in.

Mr. HAWLEY. If the gentleman will yield, I think the division of the item arose in this way: The first proviso, on the bottom of page 55, was put in the bill in the Senate last year, and certain methods will be used by the department in the expenditure of that money. The last proviso is new in the bill this year, the situation having become acute, and the department may want to use a somewhat different method or process of eliminating the animals having rabies than they would use under the preceding proviso. That is the history of these items.

Mr. LEVER. I think there is another explanation. If the gentleman will turn to page 55, line 23, he will see $125,000 shall be used on the national forest and public domain. Then on page 56, lines 1 and 2, the provision is that it shall be used on the public lands of national forests and elsewhere in the Western and Northwestern States.

Mr. STAFFORD. My point is this, whether under the authorization carried in the first proviso authorizing the destruction of wolves, coyotes, and other animals injurious to animal husbandry the department has the authority to destroy these animals when they are infected with rabies on private land.

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MANN. They could go to New York City and do it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why do you make an appropriation of $125,000 in two places, simply changing the phraseology as far as other private lands are concerned? Is it the purpose to pursue these coyotes and wolves on private land?

Mr. LEVER. My understanding of the situation is this: Under the first proviso the operations of the Department of Agriculture will be confined to public lands and national forests, but the national forests are harboring places and breeding places for these animals of all descriptions. In the northwest country they have had recently an outbreak of hydrophobia among the animals, which has caused a great deal of damage, and, as my friend from Oregon has said, 40 or 50 people have been bitten by these mad animals. So the committee felt that inasmuch as the national forests, as a public domain, was the harboring place and the breeding place, that we ought to broaden the authority and say that if a hunter found one of these animals just beyond the confines of the forest land he would have the right to kill him.

Mr. HAWLEY. There is another explanation, if the gentleman will yield. The first $125,000, at the bottom of page 55, can be spent anywhere in the national forests from the Canadian boundary south—all over that area. The second $125,000 in the proviso, at the top of page 56, is limited to that portion of the public land and forest and other lands where the animals are affected with rabies. It is intended to clean them out and then drop this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there any other part of the country than the Western and Northwestern States where this appropriation could be utilized?

Mr. HAWLEY. It applies to all the national forests in which there are predatory wild animals that prey on domestic animals.

Mr. STAFFORD. What other part of the United States except in the northwestern country could the appropriation be used for the purposes stated?

Mr. LEVER. There are large areas in the Northwest that are not in the public domain or the national forests. In the gentleman's State, I take it, there is much land which is neither public land or forest land. This proviso confines the operations used to public land and elsewhere in the West and Northwest.

Mr. STAFFORD. My point is whether or not you are appropriating $125,000 for the purpose of eradicating animals on private lands and not on the national domain.

Mr. LEVER. We are doing both. As far as possible, we are providing for the destruction of animals in the national forests and on the public domain, and at the same time to destroy them on private lands; and I think rightfully so, because the information of the committee is that the national forests and the public domain are constant breeding places and harboring places for these predatory animals; and if so, it seems to me that there is the duty on the part of the Federal Government to help eradicate the animals although they are now on private land.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let me ask this question: If the National Government appropriates funds for the eradication of these animals in the national forests and on the public domain, is it not doing its full duty, and why should we take upon ourselves the work of the States by eradicating these animals upon private lands?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman will note that in reference to the appropriation for the elimination of the ground squirrel, which carries the flea whose bite gives the bubonic plague, we provide for the eradication of the squirrel not only in the national forests and on the public domain, but on the territory surrounding, because we have felt that inasmuch as the national forests become the breeding place and the harboring place from which they go onto private property there was a duty incumbent on the Federal Government to help destroy them. The gentleman understands that the deficiency bill carries an item of $75,000 for that purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am aware of that.

Mr. LEVER. And the increase of $125,000 comes to the committee as a supplementary estimate in the regular way from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I would like to say that in the first place there are no predatory wild animals bred on private land. It is the forest reserves that are the breeding places, and that is where they come from. They swoop down on the lower valley in great herds.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why should not the Government eradicate them in the national forests, and in doing that would it not be doing its whole work?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; but they come down from the forest reserves onto the private lands. The farmer can exterminate all of the squirrels on his farm but not upon the surrounding public domain, and it is the squirrels that come from the public domain that go in and destroy the crop, and they feel the Government ought to join with them in helping exterminate them. In western Colorado they are paying as high as $100 apiece for scalps of gray wolves and $20 apiece for coyotes.

Mr. MANN. Would it not be better for us to kill the squirrels on the public domain first, if that is where they come from?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is true.

Mr. MANN. But that is not what they intend to do.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what I have in mind, whether it should not be our duty to exterminate them completely, provide ample funds for their extermination in the national forests and on the public domain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] has analyzed the situation very well, as is usual with him. The first proviso, containing the appropriation for the destruction of predatory animals, found on the bottom of page 55, applies to all of the forest regions, containing 167,000,000 acres of national forests, and probably as much or more of public lands. It is proposed to make a systematic warfare on the wild animals that are breeding in those forests and on the public lands and to destroy them. In order to meet an emergency situation and to do intensive work on that portion of the lands infested with mad animals, in addition to the other work, it is necessary to have this second appropriation if we are going to do it while it can be done. If the animals are allowed to roam at large and bite large numbers of other animals, the area infested by the animals subject to rabies will very largely increase and thousands and tens of thousands of dollars' worth of stock will be destroyed. And so the second proviso, on the top of page 56, for an appropriation for this kind of work was inserted. The work will be confined to these particular localities—southern Washington, eastern Oregon, Nevada, Idaho, and the border of Utah—with the idea that surrounding this area and working in toward the center and cleaning up all of the animals infected with rabies we will not only kill the predatory animals that destroy the flocks, but destroy the animals that spread the disease, endangering human life.

In eastern Oregon, as reported in the press, a mad coyote chased a man in an automobile for a considerable distance, and he was fortunate when it approached the automobile to have a gun or a revolver with which to kill the animal. A rough and steep road favored the approach of the animal. They are in constant danger in that section from these animals that come into the towns and attack domestic animals tied in the stalls. The mad animals are absolutely without fear, without the natural instincts of self-preservation. There are a great many of them. This second appropriation applies only to a very small portion of the entire domain and in order to clear it up. Since the animals make no distinction between private and public lands it was necessary to add the words "and elsewhere," so that the hunters and trappers can follow an animal when on the trail of one through a forest or public land or onto private land until they could kill him. They will be authorized to put their traps anywhere, otherwise it might have been construed that they would have to keep off the private lands, and their activities would thereby be diminished and curtailed.

Mr. MADDEN. How long have we been carrying an appropriation for this character of work?

Mr. HAWLEY. The appropriation for the destruction of predatory animals was put on the bill in the Senate last year. The second proviso is new in this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. If all of this that the gentleman has been describing is happening and has been happening for a number of years, why is it that it was never discovered until now? What makes it important now as compared with the years that have gone by?

Mr. HAWLEY. The rabies situation.

Mr. MADDEN. The whole situation?

Mr. HAWLEY. We have been endeavoring to cope with the situation ourselves, and we have appropriated in the West a great deal of money. This has been done by the individual growers of stock and the associations of growers of stock and by the States and counties, but the forests and the public lands, as has been stated, are the breeding places of these animals.

Mr. MADDEN. There were more wild animals years ago than there are now.

Mr. HAWLEY. No; there were more many years ago than there are now. Then they were largely destroyed, and then with the creation of the forests——

Mr. MADDEN. Who destroyed them?

Mr. HAWLEY. The hunters.

Mr. MADDEN. The Government did not?

Mr. HAWLEY. No.

Mr. MADDEN. Why is it the Government is called upon to do the very thing that the people in the States ought to do? In every conceivable activity in which the States ought to indulge, for the promotion of their own interest, wherever a way can be found to take money out of the Public Treasury for that purpose it is done, and new discoveries are made every year and every day.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. But when the people are paying as high as $100 for gray wolves and $20 for coyotes, does the gentleman not think that the State is doing very well, when these things are bred in the forest reserves?

Mr. MADDEN. The forest reserves have always been there, and they will continue to be there, and it is only another way of getting money out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. HAWLEY. The gentleman may be assured that if the national forests and the public lands can be rid of these wild animals we will be very glad to drop the appropriation from the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. But did the gentleman ever hear of a case where an appropriation was dropped after it was once started?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that debate——

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. RAKER. Will not the gentleman at least——

Mr. LEVER. There is no use in reserving the point of order if it is going to be made.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. I understand the gentleman from Illinois made the point of order against the entire paragraph.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that comes too late.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order. The point of order was reserved against the last proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was reserved against another proviso and then withdrawn, and the Chair's recollection is that the only point of order reserved is against the last proviso in the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. All this discussion that has been going on was with the understanding that the point of order was pending.

The CHAIRMAN. Against a certain proviso.

Mr. MADDEN. Then I make the point of order against the paragraph to which it was pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order against the last proviso.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. Would not the gentleman from Illinois permit us who are somewhat interested and have some personal knowledge of these conditions——

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RAKER. Before the Chair rules, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. When a point of order is made there is nothing else for the Chair to do except rule.

Mr. MADDEN. If those gentleman who are interested in this proviso wish to be heard upon it, I do not want to cut them off, so I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Just one minute. I know the gentleman from Illinois so well that when he makes up his mind he makes it up to stay and he is going to make this point of order, no matter what may be said, and he has heard the discussion——

Mr. MADDEN. I intend to make it.

Mr. LEVER. Then it is an utter waste of time for the committee to continue the discussion of it. Now, if the gentleman will permit us to proceed and let the Chair rule on this, I will offer an amendment here which may be in order, I am not sure.

Mr. RAKER. I understood the gentleman from Illinois to reserve the point of order.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is to pass on the point of order raised by the gentleman from Illinois. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment, the same language in the bill at the same point in the bill, if the Clerk can follow me.

After the word "forests," in line 2, page 56, strike out the words "and elsewhere," so that the language will read:

That of this sum not less than $125,000 shall be used on the lands—

And the word "and" ought to be in there—

and national forests in the Western and Northwestern States—

And so forth.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will first report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 55, at the end of line 25, insert the following:

"*And provided further also*, That of this sum not less than $125,000 shall be used on the public lands and national forests in the Western and Northwestern States for the protection of stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies by the destruction of wolves, coyotes, and other predatory wild animals."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. I would ask the Chair to rule. I do not care to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to know the reasons on which the gentleman from Illinois bases his point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Why, Mr. Chairman, there is no authority of law for any such provision in the bill, and the expenditure of this money is just another addition to the taxation upon an already overburdened people.

Mr. LEVER. That last statement is not in response to the Chair's request in reference to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, if he is going to offer another amendment I was going to ask him whether he would not be willing to increase the amount in one of the other items?

Mr. LEVER. I am going to do that. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 55, line 23, by striking out "$125,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$250,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 55, line 23, strike out "$125,000" and insert "$250,000."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall close——

Mr. MONDELL. I desire to offer an amendment——

Mr. LEVER. In 45 minutes. That is a long time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. I want to state earnestly and emphatically to this House that the people of the district I represent are very much interested in this subject. We do not care in what form you give us the money, whether in two separate items or in one. We want the appropriation because we need it. Up to date in my State 57 people have been treated at the State university for rabies occasioned primarily by coyote bites. That is to say nothing of thousands of live stock that have been bitten and have died. The counties and the State and the different live-stock associations have spent a vast amount of money, and they are continuing to spend it for the eradication of that dread disease. It is becoming alarming. From the Idaho line to the Colorado River it is dangerous for a man, woman, or child to go out in these desert wastes unprotected. In that State there are some 70,000,000 acres of land. They talk about private ownership. Fifty-six million acres of that 70,000,000 acres are in public ownership to-day, and, of course, that does not include the land that is in the forest reserves. Those reserves are the breeding places of the coyote.

I will admit the coyote is not very popular in the West. Even Mark Twain in his time said of him that he was so long, lean, lank, and hungry that even a flea would desert him for a velocipede. He got along very well though until the tame dogs listened to the call of the wild and became associated with him and gave him the rabies. And now he is spreading the rabies everywhere. Even the badgers, skunks, and wildcats have it. I received a paper just now while on the floor of this House giving an account of the death of a man who was bitten by a rabid coyote.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. Certainly.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Is the rabies sure death to the coyote?

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. It is, undoubtedly.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will not the disease itself result in the eradication of the coyote more rapidly than by the hunter himself?

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. No. It is resulting in the death of others than the coyote. It is a serious matter.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Do I understand you to inform us that these persons have died from rabies contracted from the coyote himself?

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. From the coyote himself. This paper was just brought to me in the House. It is the Elko Independent, which states that an Elko man had died from hydrophobia, caused by being bitten by a rabid coyote while sleeping in the sagebrush. Another paper tells of a child that died a short time ago from hydrophobia. Every paper records some new attack. In one of the school districts of my State they had to close the school. Congressman SINNOTT, of Oregon, whose district lies adjacent to mine, stated to me not long ago that some of the schools in his district were obliged to close. It has been going on for some time, perhaps a year. I have not exaggerated the condition at all.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. In reference to the condition the gentleman is describing about the spread of rabies, does the gentleman think this appropriation should be confined to the public reserves and the public domain? Would it not be better to apply it to all areas where these coyotes live?

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. That was one reason I wanted the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] not to make the point of order that he raised. I believe that these coyote hunters should be employed to destroy coyotes anywhere they are found, whether on the public domain or on private ranges or ranches.

Much of the privately owned land in the State of Nevada is unfenced. I trust the additional $125,000 will not be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nevada has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has already fixed the time for debate.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this disease has existed but a short time in the West. It commenced about a year and a half ago in Oregon, at which time people died, schools were closed, and thousands and tens of thousands of sheep died from being bitten by coyotes; also cattle and horses have died. It extended to Nevada and California, until last fall, from my own personal observation these animals infected with this disease entered my own town. Men from there were sent to the Berkeley Pasteur Institute for treatment. Tens of thousands of dollars' worth of property, not only on the forest reserves, on the public land, but in private ownership, have been destroyed by virtue of this disease. The towns have been hampered in dealing one with the other. Schools in California and Nevada have been closed by virtue of it. Nevada and California, where the disease is prevalent, and in Oregon they raised a fund of money for the purpose of offering a reward for these coyotes, and they were killed off by the thousands; and the disease is being eradicated as fast as it possibly can be by virtue of the assistance of the States and counties. The State of California, with its public-health service, has spent every dollar, practically, that has been appropriated for other health purposes to protect the health of its citizens. The stockmen and farmers, not only in the State of California but in Nevada, and in Utah and in Oregon, are spending money for this purpose. We have large areas of public land upon which these animals breed, and when they are grown they may go a hundred miles in a day, and there is no telling where you can find them. And it is such a menace that no man who has not been in the midst of it can tell what it means.

You can defend yourself against a robber; you can defend yourself against a bear; you can defend yourself against a roaring lion or a tiger; but you can not defend yourself against a rabid coyote, for whenever the slime from the teeth strikes any part of your body, death, worse than any other that can come upon a human being—death from hydrophobia—follows on the bite of these animals. Three men of my town—one a banker and one a merchant and another a stockman—were afflicted with this disease. One of them had a cow that was bitten by a coyote, and in removing the head of the cow to send away for examination, they got some of the saliva from the cow's mouth, and they had to go to Berkeley to take the Pasteur treatment or they would have been in their graves to-day.

This is not a matter affecting only one community. It sweeps over that entire region of territory. We appeal to you, gentlemen of the House, as the committee, listening to the experts from the department, have approved this amount in the bill, to retain the amount that is herein recommended. We trust and hope that in the interest of human life, in the interest of the protection of property of those people in the Western States, you may see your way clear, after you have allowed upon this appropriation bill these items for protection against all kinds of insects, many of which do not affect human life—we appeal to you to help us fight a disease that can be carried by one coyote to the dog, to the cat, and other animals. The life of the wife and the child are in danger. Even the schools, where the children are gathered, are and have been in great danger. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with considerable horror to the harrowing description of the terrible and frightful conditions that exist throughout some of the Western States as just related by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], the last speaker.

This appropriation of a quarter of a million of dollars is a considerable amount of money to be expended in the destruction of wild animals, and from reading the report of the hearing before the Committee on Agriculture, I have grave doubts whether it is being expended wisely or well. I notice they pay the hunters $75 a month, and if a hunter has an outfit he is allowed $10 a month for that, and if he has a couple of horses he is allowed $15 each per month for them, making in all $115 a month for one hunter with an outfit and two horses.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. And, of course, the more of these men there are to be appointed, the more patronage the gentlemen will have in their districts?

Mr. WALSH. I assume that may follow, possibly, and without civil-service examinations. One of these hunters, Mr. Chairman, killed one coyote while he was employed—quite an expensive animal. Another killed 37 coyotes and 13 bobcats in a month—50 animals for $115—and the carnage still continues.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Utah?

Mr. WALSH. I do not yield at this time. Furthermore, I find that one of the Members of this House related his experience to the committee in eradicating the coyote from a range of 20,000 acres in a manner which seemed to be not only perfectly satisfactory but economical as well, perhaps too economically for the western Members. That was by the use of hounds.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. STEELE] had a number of hounds on his ranch which killed several coyotes, 15 or 20, and he thereafter found out where their breeding place was, and hunted them out and dug them up and exterminated them, and he said there were no coyotes within 10 miles of that ranch afterwards. I find upon reading the hearings that some other members of the committee also recommended that hounds are successful in eradicating the coyote. It is but fair to say, however, that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. STEELE] was in favor of the appropriation of $125,000 to exterminate the animals afflicted with rabies.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for one question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Does the gentleman know that no man who has a pack of hounds that has cost him from $50 to $100 a head would ever think of turning them loose on a coyote because of the danger of infection?

Mr. WALSH. I know that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. STEELE] used hounds on the coyotes, and used them successfully on his range. I do not know whether they were worth $50 apiece or $100 or not, but they did the work. I would like to ask why it is that the western section of the country should be so alarmed about the coyote? When we in the eastern section of the country have animals that, while they do not chase an automobile for miles on the public highway, as related by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], do commit great depredations upon our live stock and poultry, and we are not asking the National Government for $250,000 to eradicate the woodchuck or the skunk or the polecat. [Laughter.]

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. MEEKER. Are you aware that where this coyote chased that automobile it was prohibition territory?

Mr. WALSH. I assumed when the statement was being made that it all occurred in a dry country. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman know that we are appropriating in this very bill $300,000 to kill insect pests up in Massachusetts? [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. I know that you are appropriating money to kill bugs, but I apprehend that very little of that $300,000 will find its way into Massachusetts or even New England, but our section will contribute in full proportion of the appropriation. There is one thing that I noticed, after reading the reports of the hearings and the report of the proposed work of the department, as outlined in pamphlet form, and that is that in some of these sections the coyotes have decreased in number, and as they decrease in number the number of hunters inrceases in, I suppose, corresponding ratio. They are going to have 140 hunters and 14 inspectors this coming year, and the number of coyotes has decreased, as a result of the brave and death-defying work of these brave hunters at $115 per.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I desire to follow the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], because most of the gentlemen or in fact all of the gentlemen who have spoken in favor of this proposition are from the far Western States, where these coyotes abound. In explanation of my reason for taking the time of the House this afternoon on this proposition I want to state that for four years I rode the range out in the State of Nevada, and I am familiar with the depredations committed by these animals and their danger to live stock, to say nothing of humans.

With all due respect to my friend from Massachusetts, he should learn how to pronounce the name of that animal before he comes in here and attempts to tell us about it.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I have only five minutes.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to ask the gentleman to give the correct pronunciation.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. These animals, according to the pronunciation in the country where they live and where they are best known, are called ki-otes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will not yield his pronunciation to classical New England?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. No; I can not yield to anyone. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this question seems to have developed into a joke on both sides—and it is no joke to the people of the West.

Mr. MADDEN. Is the gentleman serious about it?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. In the remaining few minutes I should like to be serious about it. With all due respect to my friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who has been in this House far longer than I will probably ever be here, I wish to say that gentlemen who are not familiar with this subject do not know how dangerous these animals are, not only to live stock, but to human life. You have heard that in the State of Nevada 57 people have had to be treated because of being bitten by these animals. I think the proponents of the measure made a mistake when they brought before us the illustration of a coyote following an automobile, or of a coyote biting a man behind a sagebrush—no doubt true, but rather incredible to those who are ignorant of these beasts.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. No; I can not yield.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not pronouncing the name of the animal correctly.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I am pronouncing the name of the animal according to the way it is pronounced in the country where it lives, and I do not care for any "dictionary" on the subject. [Applause and laughter.] My pronunciation was infected by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I was saying to the House that I did not think the proponents of this provision helped it any by bringing in the illustration of the man who was bitten behind the sagebrush. If he had taken enough alcohol before he lay down there to sleep he probably would have gotten over the effects of that bite. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Where did the gentleman say the man was bitten? [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. In answer to the gentleman's question with reference to the condition of the man behind the sagebrush, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the article from the newspaper describing the occurrence.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, is this being taken out of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I am trying to show the House that people who do not live in this coyote-infested country and who do not happen to be directly interested in this proposition can still see some good in this measure, for, coming from Delaware, it does not concern me directly. I think it is as good a provision as there is in the bill and is just as much called for as dozens of other items in the bill that concern particular localities where it happens that your own ox is gored and the other fellow's is not. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit me, I will say that I have been looking at the dictionary, and both pronunciations are correct.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, as to the pronunciation of the word coyote I am supposed to be an authority, because it is a Spanish word.

Mr. MANN. We do not speak Spanish, though.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. It is pronounced neither "kí-ote" nor "*ki-ó-te*," but it is pronounced "coy-ó-te." [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. How long has this appropriation been carried in this bill?

Mr. LEVER. This is the second year.

Mr. MADDEN. This is the first year, is it not?

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, the main point I want to make is this, that we ought to support this appropriation on the part of the Federal Government toward the destruction of these wolves, because they are wolves and nothing else. There are two classes of wolves out in that western country. One is called the gray wolf, which is larger than the coyote. The coyote is supposed to be a cross between the gray wolf and the fox, and therefore is more foxy than the regular wolf. [Laughter.]

The wolf in my part of the country was little known until recently. He came there from Texas, and we will charge him up to Texas.

Mr. BORLAND. He did not come from Wall Street, did he?

Mr. HERNANDEZ. No; he came from Texas. He is down there, and the Federal Government, in my opinion, should cooperate with the Western States in the destruction of these, the most destructive of predatory animals, since they have embraced within the national forests large areas of land and are keeping from one to four men all the year round. It is my opinion that they should be employed in killing wolves, if nothing else.

The appropriation provided for in the paragraph is simply to cooperate with the States in the destruction of these animals, and nothing more. The methods that shall be used in the destruction of the animals I do not know, but I suppose they will hire hunters for the purpose. They could offer a head bounty, as we do in my State, where we pay $15 for a wolf and $2 to $2.50 for a coyote.

Mr. OVERMYER. Will the gentleman describe to the committee the conduct of the coyote who is afflicted with rabies?

Mr. HERNANDEZ. In my State we are not bothered with rabies; we are simply bothered with the coyote.

Mr. RAKER. If the gentleman from New Mexico will yield, in answer to the gentleman's question, the coyote with the rabies loses all sense of danger and fear. He starts down the road, biting the tin cans, biting the fence, biting the horse, biting the automobile, biting the cow and the sheep, and he keeps on biting until he is dead. He may bite 20 dogs and he may bite other coyotes and cattle.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. I never saw a coyote with the rabies, but I have seen a dog with the rabies.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Mr. Chairman, surely there can be no objection to the retention of this clause in the bill. When American citizens will brave the dangers and hardships which they must encounter in order to establish a home upon some mountain side they should have all the encouragement that the Government can give to them. In order that you may have some proof that rabies exist among some of the wild animals of the Mountain States, I want to read from a letter which I have received from a constituent of mine, Mrs. Lula M. Gaddy, of Mountain Home, Idaho, who writes under date of February 1, 1916, as follows:

> One thing I think you can do for our locality in Idaho is to agitate the mad-coyote conditions which prevail there. I was one of those whom it was hard to convince that there were mad coyotes, but we learned to our sorrow that there were. Many animals have been bitten in our community during the last year, and several people. My brother's two children were bitten and by only a miracle and the goodness of God did one of them escape. They were playing in the yard close to the house when a mad coyote jumped the fence, attacked the baby, 2 years old, who was playing with his little shovel in the sand, and bit him in the top of the head, the fangs sinking deep into the skull; hearing his screams, the older brother rushed to the rescue of the baby only to be attacked by the creature and bitten in the leg. Their father, who was working in the field not far away, hearing the commotion, left his team and, seizing a club, killed the brute as it left the children and rushed at him. Upon examination it was found the coyote was mad, and the family spent three weeks right in the planting time in town having the treatment administered to the children. Fifty-five dollars apiece for the treatment, to say nothing of the local doctor's charges, board in town, loss of valuable time on the farm, etc., saying nothing of the anxiety. This added to an already immense doctor's bill caused by both parents having spotted fever the year before, made the father wonder why he had tried to hold a claim in Idaho. So talk up this thing. The ticks and consequent spotted fever are bad enough, but the mad coyotes are worse. All last summer and fall I never dared step out of doors to go to a neighbor's, or to the mail box, without a gun or club.
>
> Get the Government to put a big bounty on coyote heads or do something to kill off the pests.

I am willing to rest my case upon the appeal of this woman, who is only one among thousands of worthy citizens of the West who have braved the dangers of wild animals for many years past and who have paid into the Treasury of the United States millions of dollars for their homes. The sum should be increased to twice the amount provided for in this bill.

It seems a strange thing that so little has ever been done by this Government to aid the pioneer of the West. In the early days he fought the Indians in order that he might build a habitation for himself and his family. Now he is obliged to fight wild animals infected with a fearful disease, and although he has blazed the way for the generations which have followed and has done more than any other class in the country to increase our food supply, has given his sons to the Army and the Navy and done much else to make this country great, yet some gentlemen on the floor of this House doubt the wisdom of making a small appropriation to enable him to defend himself against attack of ferocious and infected wild beasts.

I therefore urge in all seriousness that the sum provided for in this bill, to wit, $125,000, be appropriated for the protection not only of our stock, but that which is still more important, the lives and health of our people in the Northwest by an early and vigorous fight on the part of the Agricultural Department to suppress rabies, which can only be done by the destruction of wolves, coyotes, and other predatory animals. I know that the Members of this House are in sympathy with the homestead entrymen in the far West, and let us show our appreciation of

him in a substantial way by retaining the provision of the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCRACKEN. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. How is your State spending money to eradicate the animals?

Mr. McCRACKEN. The legislature has made an appropriation for the payment of a bounty on the animals killed.

Mr. TILSON. They consider it the best way to offer a bounty of so much a head for those killed rather than to employ hunters by the month.

Mr. McCRACKEN. I will say that the stock associations and the State board of health have cooperated, and they have employed people to go out and kill coyotes. They also use poison and other means of destruction.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, for many years the Western States have paid bounties for the extermination of predatory wild animals. Those bounties have run all the way from two to five dollars for wolves and from 75 cents to about $2 for coyotes. In addition to that, the stock associations, particularly in former times, when the range stock industry flourished, gave bounties also. In some parts of my State the bounty on the gray wolf has been at times as high as $15—State and local bounty combined. Our people have expended a very great deal of money attempting to exterminate these animals. We have had some success. We have kept the numbers down to a point where the destruction of stock has been far less than it would have been without the great expenditure that has been made. Of late years, since the creation of the forest reservations and since conditions have changed in the live-stock industry, so that we no longer have the big concerns to pay the supplementary bounties, we have found it more and more difficult to cope with these animals. Last year an amendment was placed in this bill to aid these Western States in that regard, and I think it is a wise provision. A small sum is here appropriated for this purpose, compared with the sums the people of the Western States are expending annually for the same purpose. It was said in the matter of the brown-tail moth that Massachusetts and other States were spending quite as much as the Federal Government. I think it may safely be said that the States and communities and individuals in the West have expended $10 at the very least for this work of extermination to $1 proposed in this appropriation.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Has any good been discovered in any of these animals, either alive or dead, from their carcasses, their skins, or their fur? Are they good for anything whatsoever, so as to induce any private individual to kill them?

Mr. MONDELL. The skins are worth a little something. The coyote skin is worth from 50 cents to a dollar, depending upon its quality, but a wolfskin anywhere from 75 cents to a dollar and a half, but the animals in the main are of the character with which some people formerly invested the Indian. They are good under certain conditions—after they are dead.

Mr. HOWELL. I would like to state that in the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture a gentleman representing the Bureau of Biology made a statement that during the last two months there had been returned to the Treasury the sum of $1,300 for the pelts of animals that had been killed by the Government hunters.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to ask the gentleman a question on this matter of State cooperation. Are not the Western States somewhat hampered on the question of cooperation by the fact that they not only lose the taxable value of the national forests, but the national forests are themselves somewhat responsible for the conditions which they have to combat?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is correct. The national forests are the great breeding grounds for these predatory animals.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I will ask the gentleman whether we made an appropriation last year for this purpose?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Have we received any report of the work done under this appropriation?

Mr. MONDELL. I think there was something in the hearings about it. I have some information myself on the subject I will be glad to give the committee if I have the time.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, my information is that they have killed something like 3,000 of these predatory animals, excluding those infected with rabies.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] has raised a question as to the propriety and advisability of following the method of employing hunters rather than paying bounties. The officials of the Biological Survey, after very careful consideration of the situation and examination of the conditions, came to the conclusion that it would not be wise for the Government to join with the States and with individuals in the payment of bounties; that the best results would be obtained in the long run by the careful selection of hunters, paying them a salary and not allowing them to secure anything from the pelts or from bounties. With a part of this appropriation the bureau is doing very effective work in the destruction of prairie dogs. I have taken the trouble to keep informed in regard to this work, and I can say from personal knowledge that not only has the work done by the bureau been very effective, but it greatly stimulated the killing of prairie dogs by individuals. I am of the opinion that the increased yield of grass on account of the killing of prairie dogs by employees of the bureau and by individuals as a result of the influences of the bureau had a value in the single season far in excess of this entire appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time limit has already been fixed.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, it is an old saying that fat dogs will not hunt, and I fear that the man who is put on the pay roll to hunt these coyotes will get so fat that he will not do anything but lie around, the muzzle of his gun in the sagebrush, and draw his pay. If you need men to kill these coyotes, or whatever you want to call them, why not take the army that will soon be coming back from their hunt after Villa? They might as well be hunting these things as Villa.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point on the gentleman's pronunciation of "Villa."

Mr. MADDEN. We have had so much Spanish education here this afternoon——

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman asked the gentleman from California about wanting jobs for constituents. Knowing the gentleman to be liberal, would he not be willing for Democrats to be appointed as dog killers?

Mr. MADDEN. I would be willing if they worked at the dog-killing business, but the trouble is they will not.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I can not in two minutes. This appropriation is going to pass, there is no doubt about that, and perhaps it ought to, but the thing that alarms me is that next year you will have a million dollars in this appropriation, and the number of coyotes will grow and the necessity for employing more men will grow.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I want to inquire if they are rapid breeders?

Mr. MADDEN. They are. An appropriation once made by the Federal Government never ceases; it always increases. If you make it $10 to-day it will be $100,000 to-morrow; make it $100,000 to-morrow and it will be $1,000,000 the next day. It does not make any difference whether there is need for it or not, and I think it is wrong to load the taxpayers with unnecessary burdens of this sort and impose upon them as you do. These men from the Western States know very well that there is no more need for this appropriation to kill these wild animals than the man in the moon. They will still be there, as they have been since the beginning of time. Why, gentlemen, they have just discovered another way of putting a few more men on the pay roll. Now, we have to give them a shotgun and a horse and a saddle and a tent and all the other paraphernalia in order to make them eligible for the pay roll. Coyotes, oh, coyotes, what crimes are committed in their name! [Laughter and applause.] The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] weeps. You can see the tears running down his face lest the item will not pass and a few more men get on the pay roll to kill coyotes. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

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

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

On page 55, line 22, after the word "sum," strike out the words "not less than."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 55, line 22, after the word "sum," strike out the words "not less than."

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

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

Line 23, page 55, after the amount "$250,000," strike out the word "shall" and insert "may."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 55, line 23, after the amount "$250,000," strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

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

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, in one of the recent daily papers is the following article of news which clearly shows the upward trend of business and confidence displayed in the future by business men:

SEVEN MILLION DOLLAR RAIL ORDER IS PLACED—PENNSYLVANIA AND READING ROADS DISTRIBUTE HUGE STEEL CONTRACTS.

PHILADELPHIA, *April 15.*

Orders aggregating between $7,000,000 and $7,500,000 were placed with various steel concerns by the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Philadelphia & Reading Railway.

What is said to be the largest single order for steel rails in the history of the road was placed by the Pennsylvania Railroad. The order calls for 205,000 tons for 1917 delivery, and will cost approximately $6,000,000. The Reading's orders are for 26 locomotives for freight service. They will be built by the Baldwin Locomotive Works at a cost upward of $1,000,000.

The rail order will be distributed among the United States Corporation, Bethlehem, Lackawanna, Cambria, and the Pennsylvania companies.

It would, therefore, appear that the railroads giving this big order are not alarmed about the business distress over which some of the Republicans seem to exhibit so much worry. They do not see either in the present or future any occasion for alarm. If they did, they would not place such an enormous order for supplies for equipping their roads. The calamity, it appears, so frequently rehearsed on the floor of this House only exists in the worried and overtaxed imaginations of a few who refuse to realize the marvelous wave of prosperity sweeping over the land.

Our country is to-day enjoying the greatest era of prosperity it has ever known, and our business institutions are taxed to their limits to care for the business the requirements exact of them. Nearly every line of industry is taxed beyond its capacity to fill the unsolicited orders flowing in on it. This is a strong commendation of the present administration. It demonstrates beyond cavil or doubt that the business world has confidence in it and approves its policies.

Money is plentiful and can be had for legitimate purposes on reasonable terms; labor is employed at remunerative wages and industry was never more profitable. This strikes terror to the prophets of evil, who only a short time ago were crying calamity and distress, predicting idleness, shutdowns, lockouts, and every other business evil the ingenious mind could conceive. But lo and behold their disappointment! Instead of calamity and distress, we witness the most marvelous prosperity the country has ever known, our people are happy and contented, the country forging to the front by leaps and bounds, and reaping rich rewards as the result of the wise and economic business policies adopted by this administration.

Prosperity has come to stay, business is now on a safe foundation, panics are things of the past, and opportunities are equal for all. Special privilege no longer exists for a favored few, and the whole people are the beneficiaries of these beneficent policies. These conditions have been brought about under the administration of the Democratic Party, the only party in this country which could bring them about for the people.

The Republican Party could not do so because it was so obligated to the special interests, so absolutely dominated by them that it was powerless to enact remedial legislation for the best interests of the people. It had ample opportunity to do so, but failed. It has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. The Democratic Party was intrusted with power, fulfilled the expectations of the people, and will be continued in power for another four years.

Railroads are placing large orders for supplies, manufacturers are building additions to their plants, new lines of business are springing up, necessary to meet the demands made upon them by the ever-increasing public and private requirements. This is a great time, the greatest ever known in the history of our great Republic.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for enforcing the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. L., 847, 848), relating to the protection of migratory game and insectivorous birds, and for cooperation with local authorities in the protection of migratory birds, and for necessary investigations connected therewith, $50,000.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this is not subject to the point of order. There is a statute which covers this, and the gentleman from Kansas is going to move to strike it out.

Mr. COX. I want to get some information on this. I recall the statute very well. I know the Federal court has held it to be unconstitutional. I will make the point of order on it, because there is no law for it. The law has been held unconstitutional at least by one Federal court in the United States, if not two.

Mr. LEVER. It has been held constitutional.

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps one court has held it unconstitutional, but other courts have not.

Mr. COX. I do not know that any court has held it as constitutional.

Mr. LEVER. The court in Arkansas held it constitutional.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman permit the gentleman from Kansas to offer an amendment and have it pending?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 56, strike out the paragraph included in lines 11 to 18, inclusive.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12717, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING MONDAY.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, April 24, 1916, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting estimates of deficiencies in appropriations required by the Navy Department to complete the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for prior years (H. Doc. No. 1049); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Hempstead Harbor, N. Y. (H. Doc. No. 1050); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required for the service of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, for camps of instruction for civilians (H. Doc. No. 1051); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of urgent deficiency appropriation in the sum of $25,000 for operating force for public buildings, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1052); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, submitting information relative to time studies and premium payments in Government employment (H. Doc. No. 1053); to the Committee on Military Affairs 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. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11623) to permit the use of certain refined products of petroleum as stores on steam vessels carrying passengers, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 586), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 3132) providing for the homestead entry of certain lands in the State of Washington, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment accompanied by a report (No. 587), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2043) granting a pension to Seymour McDonough; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9203) granting an increase of pension to Homer E. Mills; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 14943) to amend the civil-service laws of the United States; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. DILLON: A bill (H. R. 14944) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to transfer on certain conditions the south half of lot 14, of the southeast quarter of section 21, township 107, range 47, Moody County, S. Dak., to the city of Flandreau, to be used as a public playground; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 14945) to fix the sizes of baskets or other open containers for small fruits or berries; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 14946) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 14947) providing for carrying in the mails reply letters and postal cards without prepayment of postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 14948) to repeal section 3 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the liens of judgments and decrees of the courts of the United States," approved August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. L., p. 357), and as amended in Twenty-eighth Statutes at Large, page 814, approved March 2, 1895; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 14949) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigation of lignite coals to determine the practicability of their utilization in producing benzol and other commercial products; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HULBERT: Resolution (H. Res. 209) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to report to Congress as to the advisability of establishing free ports, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LEVER: Resolution (H. Res. 213) providing for the consideration of H. R. 12717; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FERRIS: Resolution (H. Res. 214) providing for investigation of and relating to the high price of print paper and other products; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAY: Resolution (H. Res. 215) to provide for the discharge of the Committee on Military Affairs from the consideration of H. R. 12766, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 14950) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. Munson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14951) granting a pension to John Groth; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 14952) for the relief of Mrs. John A. Fox; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 14953) granting a pension to Mrs. Martha Ellen Sellers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 14954) granting a pension to R. L. Rhodes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14955) for the relief of R. L. Rhodes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 14956) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas Byrne; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 14957) granting a pension to Frank O. Stevens; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14958) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius McCafferty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14959) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph P. Brady; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 14960) granting a pension to Abbie Shanks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 14961) granting a pension to Sarah E. Crockett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 14962) granting a pension to William McCarthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 14963) granting an increase of pension to John Everets; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 14964) granting an increase of pension to James W. Gamble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 14965) granting an increase of pension to Lynn J. Heldreth; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 14966) to appropriate $10,000 to compensate Thomas H. Jeter for property taken by the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 14967) granting a pension to John Sawicki; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of women voters of Pueblo, Colo., favoring action by Congress on suffrage amendment at this session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of sundry citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of citizens of Atcheson, Horton, and Rossville, Kans., favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWNE: Petition signed by residents of Clintonville, Wis., protesting against House bill 13048; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of residents of the eighth congressional district of Wisconsin and residents of Marion, Wis., in favor of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition signed by residents of the cities of Embarrass, Shawano, and Clintonville, of the eighth congressional district of Wisconsin, against House bills 6468 and 491; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition signed by residents of Manawa, in the eighth congressional district of Wisconsin, against House bills 6468 and 491; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition signed by residents of Mosinee, in the eighth congressional district of Wisconsin, against House bill 652; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition signed by residents of Marathon County, in the eighth congressional district of Wisconsin, against House bills 6468 and 491; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CURRY: Resolution by the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, of Richmond, Cal., indorsing site offered by John H. Nicholl for the location of a naval academy on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of the Defiance (Ohio) Machine Works, relative to Government munitions plant in Defiance; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of envoys of nonsuffrage States and women voters of Colorado and citizens of Albuquerque, N. Mex., protesting against action of the Judiciary Committee relative to suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Texas: Petition of the Christian Endeavor Union of Honolulu, favoring prohibition in Hawaii; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of L. C. Nelson and other citizens of Alameda County, Cal., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of L. C. Nelson and other citizens of Alameda County, Cal., against bills to close barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of M. E. Cassity and 27 others, of Tomah, Wis., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Thorp, Wis., relative to Government developing water power; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of General Jacob H. Smith Post, No. 83, Veterans of Foreign Wars, favoring the Madden bill, House bill 13671; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Young Republican Club, of New York, protesting against the Clarke amendment to the Philippine bill; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of McNeil & Higgins Co., of Chicago, Ill., favoring 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Petition of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of Arizona, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of E. S. Beall and 11 other citizens of Phoenix and Buckeye, Ariz., opposing the passage of House bills 6468 and 491; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of citizens of San Jose, Santa Clara County, Cal., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Campbell, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Campbell, Cal., favoring prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petition of J. C. Wallace and 21 others of Denver, Colo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Frank C. Goudy, G. W. Brown, Caldwell Martin, Frazer Arnold, Kenaz Huffman, C. F. Heath, F. B. Richmond, H. S. Peregrine, Thomas F. Azpell, and J. H. Hillyard, of Denver, Colo., urging appropriations for national defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of sundry citizens and organizations of the United States, favoring House resolution 137, for Government inspection of dairies; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of Delaware: Evidence in support of House bill 14925, granting an increase of pension to Margaret Baylis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the Pittsburgh Builders' Exchange, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring reconsideration of bill granting permission to build proposed power plant in close proximity to Mall in the District of Columbia and selection of a site having the approval of the Fine Arts Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Building Construction Employers' Association of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring reconsideration of bill granting permission to build power plant in close proximity to the Mall in the District of Columbia and selection of a site having the approval of the Fine Arts Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Pittsburgh Builders' Exchange, of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against passage of House bill 11876; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Building Construction Employers' Association, of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against passage of House bill 11876; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition from Patriots' Day celebration mass meeting, San Francisco, Cal., requesting legislation to prohibit the President from severing diplomatic relations with any foreign power without the consent of Congress; also to prevent American citizens from traveling on ships of belligerent nations; also a request that the Committee on Foreign Affairs report a bill placing an embargo on arms and ammunition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NORTH: Petition of A. E. Longwill, of Indiana, Pa., asking for the assistance in the placing of a tax on all exportations of gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWE: Petition of sundry citizens of New York City, favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of New York, against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the board of trustees of the Cape May Yacht Club, against bills relative to numbers on motor boats; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of New York Young Republican Club, against the Clarke amendment to the Philippine bill; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SANFORD: Papers to accompany House bill 14455, granting a pension to Joseph P. Weis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Papers to accompany House bill 14896, granting an increase of pension to Gustavus Odor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Papers to accompany House bill 11523, for the relief of Harriet S. Upright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of Alf. Anderson and 9 other citizens of Kennedy, Minn., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of Mrs. E. M. Chase and other citizens of Manchester, N. H., favoring passage of House bill 2238, relative to ransom of Miss Ellen M. Stone; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas (by request): Petition of C. D. Curry and sundry other citizens of Hot Springs, Ark., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Harry B. Bezanson and 100 others, of New Haven, Conn., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WALSH: Petition of New England Conference of Evangelical Association, by Samuel P. Spreng and Charles W. Locke, its president and secretary, respectively, indorsing Sheppard-Gallinger resolutions, so-called; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *April 24, 1916.*

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

Almighty God, we thank Thee that with the returning springtime we have the token of Thy will and Thy purpose to supply all our needs. We thank Thee that we know that back of the rains, the fields, the flowers, and the sunshine is the Father's will, and we look to Thee with praises in our hearts for all the gifts of life. We come to Thee that the higher needs of our spiritual life may also be supplied. We pray that Thou wilt out of the unmeasured resources of Thy grace give to us all the nobler aspirations and ambitions of life, leading us to look at life from God's point of view, measuring its possibilities and its responsibilities by Thy revealed will. Guide us this day in the discharge of the duties that come to us. For Christ's sake. Amen.

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

LANDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, the Attorney General, the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the chairmen of the Committees on Public Buildings and Grounds of the United States Senate and of the House of Representatives, transmitting a map showing the title of the United States to lands in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.