Alphonse R. Eichman to be postmaster at Trempealeau, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

F. W. Mitchell to be postmaster at Ogema, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

John E. Nolan to be postmaster at Reedsville, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

George L. Reed to be postmaster at Darien, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 2, 1917.

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSY OR LEGATION.

CLASS 4.

Herbert S. Goold to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 4.

Livingston Phelps to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 4.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

William Hitz to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Ensign Justin McC. Miller to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
Boatswain James E. Quirk to be a chief boatswain.
The following-named machinists to be chief machinists:
Robert G. Greenleaf and
James MacIntyre.
The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Medical Reserve Corps.
Orlando H. Petty,
Charles D. Shannon,
Raymond W. McNealy,
Warren F. Pearce,
Rudolph D. Joldersma, and
Bertram L. Cunningham.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Francis D. Pryor to be a lieutenant.
Ensign Walter E. Doyle to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):
Frank Hindrelet and
August Schulze.

POSTMASTERS.

CONNECTICUT.

Frank O. Davis, Pomfret Center.

NEW MEXICO.

C. L. Loughridge, Gallup.

OKLAHOMA.

W. L. M. Burton, Shamrock.
Walter R. Franklin, McLoud.
Henry S. Howell, Mill Creek.
M. F. Landon, Lehigh.
Clifford P. Martin, McCurtain.
Cora M. Murdock, Oilton.
Lillian M. Newhouse, Prague.
J. P. Renfrew, Alva.
Charles H. Roosevelt, Verden.
C. C. Speakman, Wellston.
Robert H. Speck, Vici.
Millie D. Swift, Bigheart.
Sam Swinney, Durant.
J. W. Westbrook, Ada.
Vida E. Woolverton, Redrock.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Isaac H. Albright, Cochranville.
David H. Caldwell, Manor.
Mary A. Jefferis, Wynnewood.
Joseph C. McCormick, Marion Center.
John J. McCoy, Crum Lynne.
Chester A. Moore, Howard.
Harry F. Moyer, Robesonia.
Sylvester W. Smith, Center Hall.
J. Hayes Turner, Lincoln University.
Robert P. Whitman, Schwenkville.
Murray D. Zechman, Sinking Spring.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

William B. Blakeley, Andrews.
George A. Bessellieu, Meggett.
Lewis B. Freeman, Paris Island.
John A. Patjens, Mount Pleasant.
Hattie J. Peeples, Varnville.
Grover L. Smith, Springfield.

TENNESSEE.

S. H. Allen, Petersburg.
Charles R. Brumley, Mascot.
Leon Caraway, Big Sandy.
Willis H. Claxton, Stanton.
Thomas Lee Fowlkes, Ridgely.
J. B. Gilbert, Huntingdon.
Henry E. Hudson, Whitwell.
Mary Coker Parker, Mont Eagle.
York A. Quillen, Bullsgap.
Clyde E. Smith, Rutledge.
James B. Sugg, Adams.
Mary A. Varnell, Altonpark.
Perry B. West, Lafayette.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn January 2, 1917.

Capt. Edward M. Shinkle, Coast Artillery Corps (major, Ordnance Department), for appointment by transfer as captain of Field Artillery.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *January 2, 1917.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

We bless Thee, Infinite Spirit our Heavenly Father, that through the dispensation of Thy providence we have been brought to the beginning of a new year. The past with its experiences, its mistakes and achievements, its defeats and victories, its accumulated knowledge and wisdom is ours by inheritance, if we will. The future looms before us with its perplexing problems, great possibilities, and hidden issues.

Give us wisdom, strength, courage, and fortitude to go forward with renewed faith and with brave and manly hearts remembering that we are not bound to succeed, but we are bound to try and leave the results to Thine infinite wisdom, power, and goodness.

Grant, O we beseech Thee, that the nations now engaged in war may find a happy solution of all their differences, and that out of the turmoil, suffering, and sorrow a light may shine which shall guide us to a lasting peace; that the bonds of brotherhood may never again be broken under the spiritual guidance of our Lord and Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 22, 1916, was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. OAKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 10 days' leave of absence for my colleague, Mr. GLYNN, of Connecticut, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that his colleague, Mr. GLYNN, may be excused for 10 days on account of illness. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. LOBECK for one week on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the question of the international commerce commission.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of the international commerce commission. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. By inserting a lot of stuff, or the gentleman's own able remarks?

Mr. RAKER. There will be but a few of my able remarks, and the bulk of it will be the remarks of Mr. David Lubin, of Sacramento, Cal., whom we know, and who is a man of great learning upon this subject and who has spent many years upon it.

Mr. MANN. Is that the document which has just been received through the mail and has been printed by Senator FLETCHER?

Mr. RAKER. This has nothing to do with Senator FLETCHER. This is Mr. Lubin's own statement.

Mr. MANN. But Senator FLETCHER just printed a statement of David Lubin.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana objects.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of House bill 15852, a bill to lay an embargo upon print paper, pulp, and its products.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of an embargo upon print paper, wood pulp, and so forth. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a newspaper statement made by me upon the result of the recent congressional election in my district.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BRITT] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a newspaper article written by himself, touching the recent congressional election in his district. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection. A Member of the House ought to have the opportunity to make a statement in reference to an election in his district.

Mr. GARRETT. Let me understand clearly what it is.

Mr. MANN. It is a statement which the gentleman from North Carolina has written in reference to the election recently held in his district.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial from the Ocala (Fla.) Banner upon the subject of public buildings.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial upon the subject of public buildings. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the military highway bill, which I recently introduced, and also the remarks of others in relation to it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of the military highway bill. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

By direction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, Mr. MOON reported the bill (H. R. 19410) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report (No. 1249), ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota reserves all points of order.

RESIGNATION OF MR. QUEZON.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication, transmitting a letter of resignation of MANUEL L. QUEZON, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 28, 1916.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith an official copy of a letter addressed to the Governor General of the Philippine Islands by Hon. MANUEL L. QUEZON, under date of October 15, 1916, in which he tenders his resignation as Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands to the United States.

Sincerely, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER, *Secretary of War.*

—

MANILA, *October 15, 1916.*

Hon. FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON,
Governor General of the Philippines, Manila.

DEAR GOVERNOR GENERAL: I beg hereby to tender my resignation as Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands in the United States.

In this capacity I have served my country for seven years, and for the last three I have been fortunate enough to receive the whole-hearted cooperation of the administration of the Philippine Islands.

I am indebted to you for life. Without your cordial and decided support it would have been impossible for me to accomplish anything in the very difficult mission entrusted to me by my people. I want to leave to posterity this public testimony of my deep appreciation of what you have done for the people of the Philippines. They owe you something that they can never in this world repay. You have been in part their liberator. History will yet give you full credit for the unselfish and patriotic devotion to the noble task you have been called upon to perform in these islands. You were sent here as the representative of the Government of the United States, and as such it has been your paramount duty to show us in deeds the ideals of your country, how we are regarded by your people, and what they propose to do by us. You have done your duty. We are now convinced that your country stands for freedom for all; that we are regarded by your people with paternal care, and that they will go to any extent to secure for ourselves and for our children the blessings of democracy. As you have endeavored to relax and have succeeded in relaxing the political ties between your country and mine you have become the bond of everlasting friendly union between your people and my people. You have earned our love and admiration. You are entitled to the recognition of your own Government and of your own people.

Personally you have been very kind to me. You have proven to be my true friend. You know that I am yours for ever.

Very cordially,

MANUEL L. QUEZON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for six minutes upon the subject of public buildings.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to proceed for six minutes upon the subject of public buildings. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the article which I send to the Clerk's desk be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the newspaper clipping.

The Clerk read as follows:

[From the Ocala (Fla.) Banner, Dec. 30, 1916.]

FRANK CLARK, "THE GETTER."

The big newspapers of the country are hammering FRANK CLARK because he believes that the Public Treasury is a national affair and does not belong solely and exclusively to the big cities.

The Brooklyn Eagle, for example, says:

"Representative FRANK CLARK, of the second district of Florida, which has a population, exclusive of tourists, of approximately 200,000, is chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds."

Because his district is so small the Brooklyn Eagle seems to be possessed of the idea that FRANK CLARK has got no business being in Congress, and, in its opinion, it goes without saying that he has no business being chairman of so important a committee as the one on Public Buildings and Grounds.

In the opinion of the Eagle, the chairmanships of important committees should be the especial inheritance of the Members of Congress from our larger cities, which are supposed to be the depositaries of all intelligence and culture.

Then the Eagle goes out of its way to slander our State in the following fashion:

"But we must come back to Mr. CLARK, 'the getter.' He must not be too severely condemned. Environment has a lot to do with the spirit of getting. Florida is full of environment. In fact, it has more of it to the square mile than any State in the Union. Cynics have said that Florida's population is equally divided between those with the money and those after it. When there is a scarcity of the former, the latter seems to increase. It is an endless chain. What the east coast system takes from the rich it must defend against the onslaught of politicians, whose eagerness may account for the fact that the State legislature meets biennially and sessions are limited to 60 days. What is more natural than that Florida's Representatives in Congress should make most of a limitless opportunity?"

The editor of this paper has traveled just a little bit. He has visited Brooklyn, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Cincinnati, Chicago, and many of the larger cities of the country, and in all of which his heart thrilled and swelled with pride and patriotism as he beheld the splendor and adornments of their Federal buildings. He could well imagine that in grandeur and architectural beauty they put to the blush Solomon's temple and the palace of the Caesars.

They cost millions upon top of millions, but never a word has he heard uttered that it was a wasteful extravagance of the Nation's money. These magnificent structures, costing millions merely for their sculptural figures and other ornamentations, carry with them no taint of the "pork barrel."

It is only when a rural population of a few thousand souls secures a Federal appropriation amounting to a few thousand dollars that the "pork barrel" cry is heard.

On all occasions these big cities act the hog.

They reserve the right to themselves to loot the Public Treasury.

If rigid economy and simplicity is to prevail, why erect any Federal buildings costing five and ten and more millions of dollars?

The business of the country can be done in buildings without any architectural frills and furbelows just as satisfactorily as in one with marble columns, mural decorations, and golden domes that glitter in the sunlight.

Neither do those newspapers in the big cities across the line complain of the millions appropriated for the improvements of their harbors.

The "tainted" cry of "pork" is only heard when an appropriation is asked for for some building, river, or harbor in some rural localities, where the population is supposed to pay the toll and be content.

No wonder FRANK CLARK arose in his seat and in his wrath, in answer to one of his critics, said:

"That is an absolute, bald, unsupported, snaggle-toothed, and unqualified falsehood."

His language was not very parliamentary, but was no more than the occasion demanded.

The Government should not be niggardly or parsimonious. It should erect a Federal building in every incorporated city and town in the

United States, and in architectural design and finish it should set the pace. These buildings would cultivate the taste and accentuate the patriotism of the people. They would give them a broader vision of the grandeur and glory of our Republic.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

POSTAL RATES.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the zone system of postal rates for newspapers and magazines.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the zone system of postal rates for newspapers and magazines. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, are these the gentleman's own remarks?

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman's own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the vocational education bill (S. 703), and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 10 days be granted to the Members of the House for the purpose of printing their speeches in the RECORD upon this subject.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the latter part of the request, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] if it is his hope to complete the consideration of this bill to-day?

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the gentleman that all general debate on this bill has been concluded, and the bill is up now under the five-minute rule and we certainly expect to complete it to-day.

Mr. LEVER. In view of that statement, I will not make another motion. The Agricultural appropriation bill is ready for consideration, but I myself am in favor of this bill and will be glad for the gentleman to complete it to-day.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] intend to take up the Agricultural appropriation bill on Thursday after the conclusion of the Niagara bill?

Mr. LEVER. I do if I can get recognition.

Mr. MANN. Suppose that this bill should be completed early to-day?

Mr. LEVER. Then I shall hope to go on to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 703), and pending that motion he asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen have leave to print remarks on the bill for 10 legislative days.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I think I will object to the request for 10 days in which to print remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The question is on the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the vocational-education bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 703) to provide for the promotion of vocational education, etc., with Mr. PAGE of North Carolina in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 703, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 703) to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture, the trades, industries, and home economics; to provide for cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to authorize the appropriation of money and to regulate its expenditure.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. When we last adjourned the House bill had been offered as a substitute for the Senate bill, but had not been disposed of. Now the House bill, the substitute, as I understand, is open for amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The understanding of the Chair is that by unanimous consent the bill, S. 703, was stricken out and the text of the House bill (H. R. 11250) substituted therefor.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. My question is whether that substitute is now subject to amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Under the five-minute rule and under the ordinary rules of the House it is subject to amendment by section.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, under the unanimous-consent agreement that was made this substitute is to be treated as an original bill, read section by section, and each section open to amendment as read.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair and the Clerk will read the text of the House bill.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if my request is correct, the first section of the House bill has already been read?

The CHAIRMAN. The first section of the Senate bill was read.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. And we will now proceed to read the House bill?

The CHAIRMAN. We will now proceed to read the House bill, commencing with section 1.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I desire to offer an amendment to section 1 when it is read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be annually appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sums provided in sections 2, 3, and 4 of this act, to be paid to the respective States for the purpose of cooperating with the States in paying the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects, and teachers of trade, home economics, and industrial subjects, and in the preparation of teachers of agricultural, trade, industrial, and home economics subjects; and the sum provided for in section 7 for the use of the Federal Board for Vocational Education for the administration of this act and for the purpose of making studies, investigations, and reports to aid in the organization and conduct of vocational education, which sums shall be expended as hereinafter provided.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1 by inserting at the end of line 7, on page 2, the following:

"*Provided*, That all sums accepted by and paid to any State shall, by the State board controlling its expenditures, be equitably distributed in all parts or sections of the State, so far as it may be possible and practicable to do it under the provisions of this act."

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment as a friend of the bill, and its purpose is to try to make more specific and, if possible, more certain the fair distribution of the benefits of the measure that are intended by its author and friends.

Assuming that this bill becomes a law and that its provisions are accepted by all of the 48 States of the Union, and that the funds as herein provided are distributed among the States as proposed, the State of Missouri, from which I come, will, it is estimated, receive in 10 years $1,553,980. This sum when duplicated by the State will amount to $3,107,960.

According to the latest information I have been able to obtain we have in Missouri 923,963 children of school age and 9,873 public schools and 584 public high schools. Of course, it will not be possible for every pupil in the State to receive his or her share of the proposed appropriation, nor will it be possible for every public school in the State to receive its proportionate share of this fund, as the average annual amount to the average public school would be only about $31 per annum, which would be so reduced in amount as to be of little value if distributed in that way, but the average annual rate to the high schools of the State if equally distributed would amount to $532 per annum. So that it seems to me that it will probably be desirable to expend this fund in the normal schools, the high schools, and such of the other public schools as are prepared to give instructions in the branches provided for in the bill, but in any event it can and ought to be so distributed as to reach every section of the State and to be helpful to all the boys and girls of every quarter of the country who are striving for or desirous of obtaining vocational training along the lines proposed.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. What has the gentleman in his mind as to how they can distribute this money equitably throughout the State? For example, does the gentleman propose in the first place to distribute this money equitably throughout a State?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. My amendment provides that it shall be the duty of the boards in every State to distribute the money that goes to each State equitably over that State.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman would, then, try to instruct the boards to give this character of education in every school throughout the State?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Oh, no; but that the money should be distributed throughout the State equitably, so as to carry a part of its benefits to all parts of the State and avoid the possible danger of its being concentrated in a few places to the exclusion of other parts of the State.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman think that if the money expended is going to be of any use it must be concentrated to the extent of having an efficient organization wherever they are going to teach these vocational branches?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I think so; but if the gentleman will read my amendment he will find it provides that it shall be distributed by the States, so far as it can practically be done under the provisions of this bill, so that the purposes of the bill will in nowise be destroyed.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman suggest it shall be the duty of the board to administer it in a particular section of a State?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. The bill provides that it shall be distributed in proportion to population among the States. I take it that the same principle should be followed of distributing it equitably throughout the State. I know that there is some apprehension on that ground. Some fear that if the money is appropriated and paid to States it may go to a few sections of the several States and the other sections be neglected.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FESS. Who is to be the judge—the Federal board or the State board—as to the equitable distribution?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. The State board; but I understand their actions in all cases will be supervised by and subject to the approval of the Federal board, but it should be the duty of the State board to try at least to make a fair distribution of the funds.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I just wanted to make an observation upon what my colleague had stated.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. When I get through. The gentleman does not want to do so in my time, I hope.

Mr. FESS. No.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if the effect of his amendment would not be to take this appropriation out of the control of the Federal board?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Not at all; because the bill itself is not interfered with in the least, and the other provisions of this bill provide that the members of the Federal board shall supervise the entire matter.

Mr. WALSH. But this is in conflict with the other provisions of the bill, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I think not. This amendment says, "In so far as it is practicable under the provisions of this bill." It is not intended to interfere with its other provisions.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Yes; I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUGHES. We have attempted in this bill not to affect the economy of the States. We have guarded that in every possible feature. It is assumed that this board, which is to be constituted under the provisions of the bill in each State, shall best understand how to distribute this money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGHES. I ask the gentleman if the State board provided for in this bill would not have better information as to the plan of distribution of this money to the schools, and so forth, which must be submitted to this Federal board for their approval?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I think perhaps that is true. I think that what the gentleman from Georgia suggests is true, but at the same time I think that an amendment like this, incorporated in the bill, would have a good influence upon the State boards and possibly induce them to make greater efforts to secure the fair distribution of the funds throughout a State.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to my distinguished friend that the committee tried not to be captious at all in the drawing of this bill and tried to devote itself to the great principles promulgated in this bill. We felt that we could not go into the minor details. We felt that those should be left to the States, to these State boards, and we discussed this principle and this very question before the committee; and the committee was of the unanimous opinion that this bill carried just what the gentleman really expected and wanted.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. The gentleman from Georgia understands that I am heartily in favor of this bill.

Mr. HUGHES. I am very glad to know that that is true. Yes; I know it.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I am prepared to give it my hearty support, whether this amendment is adopted or not. But I do know that there is some apprehension in my State that when the money is sent there by the Federal Government it may be concentrated in a few sections or parts of the State. I can not see that the amendment I have offered can do any harm, because it provides that whatever is done shall be done in accordance with the provisions of the bill. It is simply an instruction to the boards of the State that they shall try, as far as practicable, under the provisions of the bill, to fairly distribute the money throughout the State, and would clearly show our intention and understanding when we vote to pass it.

Mr. HUGHES. Should not that be left to the board that is created under this bill? This is taking from them, I think, no rights that they ought to have. It is a suggestion by Congress, by passing this law, how Congress feels the money should be expended.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to his colleague?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Yes. I yield to my colleague with pleasure.

Mr. BORLAND. I observe that by the bill $500,000 is appropriated for agricultural education and $500,000 for industrial education.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. It is divided into three parts.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes. Now, $500,000 distributed among the States would be only $10,000 distributed throughout each State, and $10,000 more for industrial work, which is separate, however. Now, under a State such as ours, with 114 counties in it, it strikes me it would be hardly practicable to use $10,000, the first experimental appropriation, very widely over a State. It seems to me it would be necessary to concentrate that $10,000 somewhere where results would appear. If the appropriation were larger, it might be expanded. If we made it compulsory that the money should be distributed throughout the State, the money itself would not go very far among 114 counties.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. My amendment provides that—

So far as it may be possible and practicable to do under the provisions of this act.

If it is not practicable to divide it over all parts of the State, of course, under my amendment, they would not be required to do so.

Mr. WHEELER. Then this amendment is simply an expression of opinion on the part of Congress, and does not compel the board to distribute the money over the entire State?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Only so far as practicable under the provisions of this bill, expressing to the State boards the feeling of Congress upon that question.

Mr. WHEELER. As I understand, then, it is an expression from the Members of Congress. The State board can do as they please with the fund, anyway.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Why does the gentleman think the State educational organizations can not be trusted to make a fair and equitable distribution of this contribution?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I do not know. I guess they can be trusted, but I know that there is a controversy going on now in my State as to how the money appropriated under the road law we passed shall be divided. There are some people in that State who now favor expending it all on a few roads, and many people in other parts of the State are afraid they may not get their share. It seems to me that it will be entirely proper for this Congress to express its feeling as to how the money should be expended.

I congratulate the author of this bill for his good intentions that led him to prepare and to introduce it, and likewise I commend the several members of the Committee on Education who have participated in perfecting and reporting it to the House for its consideration. Its purposes are praiseworthy, and I hope and believe its practical operation will be very useful to a great many individuals, and of great benefit to the country at large.

After being called upon at the last session of this Congress to vote for more than $843,000,000 to sustain the military arm of the Government, including pensions for service in past wars, and since observing the invitation contained in the estimates now submitted, to vote at this session for more than $892,000,000 for military purposes, amounting together to more than $1,735,000,000 in the two sessions of the Sixty-fourth Congress, it is with a feeling of genuine pleasure and a delightful relief to be given the opportunity to-day to vote for an appropriation like this without associating with its expenditure the contemplation of bloodshed, misery, and death.

This bill proposes within the next 10 years to expend about $45,000,000 in training the boys and girls of our land for useful civil pursuits that will promote their own success and happiness in the world and at the same time benefit humanity.

In my opinion it is one of the most meritorious bills considered by this House in either session of this Congress. I hope my amendment will be agreed to, and that the bill will be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a letter from Prof. W. S. Dearmont, president of the State Normal School at Cape Girardeau, Mo., giving very convincing reasons why this bill should be passed, and urging me to give it my support.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to above is as follows:

MISSOURI STATE NORMAL SCHOOL,
Cape Girardeau, Mo., January 13, 1916.

Hon. J. J. RUSSELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RUSSELL: I have to ask another favor of you, in addition to the many that you have granted. I am informed indirectly through the Hon. HOKE SMITH, Senator from Georgia and chairman of the Commission for National Aid to Vocational Education, that the commission's bill will be reintroduced in the present Congress, in the Senate and House, and that strong efforts will be made to secure the passage of this measure offering national aid to vocational education.

I have read the commission's report very carefully and the bill as introduced in the last Congress. I feel sure that the measure of national aid proposed in this bill is very much needed. This is especially true in the Southern States, and the commission's own investigations and thoroughly reliable investigations made by other commissions and associations show that there are at the present time in the United States fully 2,000,000 boys and girls between 14 and 16 or 17 years old who are undertaking to earn a livelihood in various employments without having received an education that will make it possible for many of them ever to become self-supporting citizens. In other words, these 2,000,000 boys and girls for lack of a proper education are wholly unable to increase their earning capacity and to advance themselves in life to the position of self-supporting and self-respecting citizens. These 2,000,000 boys and girls must at best remain throughout life on the border line between self-supporting and self-respecting citizens and the great body of the submerged classes who are always more or less dependent upon society for their support. No doubt a very large proportion of them will fall into the ranks of helpless pauperism, and many of them will enter the ranks of the criminal classes.

Unless more adequate provisions can be made for the better education of the working classes in this country, this large body of our people, who are absolutely unable to become self-respecting and self-supporting citizens without better educational opportunities, must continue to grow still larger from year to year. Many of the communities in which there is this lack of educational facilities could no doubt supply the need for themselves. In many other communities it is well-nigh impossible for the local communities to meet this need fully. Under the circumstances it seems to me that it is only wise and proper that, knowing all the conditions so fully, the Congress of the United States should come to the aid of the States, for the present at least, and, through the bill recommended by the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, furnish part of the money needed in order that the several States and local communities may be brought to realize the importance of this work and may be moved to join with the United States Government in providing for the more adequate education of this large body of boys and girls whose needs at present are being neglected.

We hear very much just now of the need of "preparedness" on the part of the people of the United States to meet certain possible future contingencies. I think that if the great war in Europe has taught one lesson more strongly than another, it is the fact that the best possible preparation that a nation can make, for war even, is to develop its people to the highest possible degree in their industrial efficiency. Industrially, I think the most efficient people on earth to-day, perhaps, are the Germans and the French; and the industrial efficiency of these people has not only contributed to the national wealth, so necessary in war, but has contributed very largely to the ability of both the Germans and the French to manufacture the necessary war munitions and armaments, and no doubt the skilled mechanics of the Germans and the French, even without previous military training, can be very readily trained for duty as soldiers in time of need. Personally I feel that better industrial education and more specific preparation for industrial efficiency for all our people constitute the best possible preparation for the discharge of every social obligation of the citizen, including that of defending his nation, if need be, in time of war.

I hope that among the multitude of calls upon your time you may be able to give this important measure your consideration; and, if it meets with your approval after careful examination of its merits, I hope you will give the measure your hearty support. I feel sure myself that no more meritorious measure has been before Congress during the past two or three years.

Very respectfully, yours, W. S. DEARMONT.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] may be reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1 by inserting, at the end of line 7, on page 2, the following:

"*Provided*, That all sums accepted by and paid to any State shall, by the State board controlling its expenditure, be equitably distributed into all parts or sections of the State so far as it may be possible and practicable to do it under the provisions of this act."

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] is adopted, it will change the plan and purpose of this bill. It is the purpose of the bill as framed by the committee not to interfere with the autonomy of the State, but to let the State work out its own salvation, so far as plans for the expenditure of this money are concerned, except, of course, that they must be approved by the Federal board. Now, if this amendment is adopted, it will put it up to the Federal board to be the judge as to whether or not the State board is to expend this money in one section of the State or in another section of the State or still in another section of the State. That is one difficulty with the gentleman's proposed amendment. Another is that it provides that this State board shall, in so far as practicable, see that the money appropriated by the Federal Government is expended equally or proportionately in the various sections of the State. The plans of the States for the expenditure of this money have not as yet been worked out. We can not tell what those plans will be. Whether they will try to connect up with the public-school system and teach these various vocational subjects through that channel, or whether they will try to form independent schools and classes for this purpose, we do not know. The community in the State that is willing to take advantage of this Federal money will have to put up dollar for dollar to match the Federal moneys. Now, if every division of the State should be willing to put up dollar for dollar in order to get the Federal money, I can see the force of the gentleman's proposed amendment. But suppose that a certain section of the State makes a demand for two or three of these schools and the other sections of the State fail to make any demand. In my judgment, it ought to be left to the discretion of the State board to expend this Federal money when the State matches it, in whatever section of the State there is a demand for these vocational schools.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I dare say that under the terms of this bill the State which I have the honor partly and humbly to represent will get as good a percentage of the appropriation as any. Personally I would have preferred that the States should not shirk their obligation to provide an education for their children. I am not in favor of these schemes for relieving States of all their obligations, nor can I indorse the theory which seems to be held by some gentlemen that what we get out of the Federal Treasury is clear gain. The same people pay these appropriations when they come by this more expensive and circuitout route who pay them when they are collected directly from the taxpayers of the State. But that was not the purpose of my taking the floor. I do not see why there should be any distrust, any lack of faith, in the mind of any gentleman as to the proper distribution of such funds as may be contributed by the Federal Government when turned over to the State educational agencies, and I was much impressed by the point raised by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], who said that his State had 114 counties, and he intimated that if the allotment of butter under this bill is spread over the school necessities of 114 counties it will be so thin as to be of no value. Mr. Chairman, there are about 250 counties in the State of Texas, and that great enlargement of the area for the spreading of this butter makes it, to my way of thinking, still less effective.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I will ask the gentleman if he has read my amendment? If so he will see that it does not provide that the money shall be expended in all of the counties of any State.

Mr. SLAYDEN. It says "as far as practicable."

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. As far as practicable under the provisions of this bill, in all sections of the State.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Is it not the idea of the gentleman's amendment to meet the clamor which you hear from all parts of the

State of Missouri, that they shall get their share? Now, if they are to get so small a share that it will be of no practical benefit, why waste the money?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. The report says that there are $1,500,000 in 10 years that will go to the State of Missouri. That is a considerable sum of money. Now, it ought to be fairly distributed and not be concentrated in a few or a dozen schools to the exclusion of all the others.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I do not think a million and a half dollars is a large sum for a great Commonwealth like Missouri, when distributed over 10 years. But even if it is considered a great sum, and it were not granted, I can not believe that the State of Missouri should or would fail to do her duty in the education of her children.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think that it ought to be fairly and justly distributed over the whole State?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Frankly I think it ought to be kept in the Federal Treasury.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. But if it is going to be paid to the State, does not the gentleman think it should be fairly and justly distributed?

Mr. SLAYDEN. If it is going to be paid out of the Federal Treasury it is fair to the State to give it to the State superintendent and the board that supports him and rely on their honesty and judgment for its effective distribution.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will.

Mr. FESS. The bill was written on the principle that the control of education would be left entirely with the State board. I fear that this amendment injects an initiation of an opportunity for the Federal board to take control instead of the State board. As I say, the bill was written on the idea that the State board should make the arrangement and that it should be approved by the Federal board. It seems to me that this amendment will change the whole order of the bill.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I think the gentleman's fear is well grounded, but the idea seems to be that the injection of Federal control is not objectionable provided it is accompanied by an appropriation. [Laughter.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. From my standpoint I think there is no more important bill pending before Congress. It is very important to the agricultural States like Oklahoma. I want to say that I am in favor of this amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL]. If you read the report of the committee, it goes on to state that many children leave school in certain grades below certain ages, and that many are unable to complete the high-school course, and the report indicates that this bill and the appropriation made is really to help the poor boy and the poor girl. That is the class of children who need assistance.

I labored some time the other afternoon in asking a number of questions of those in charge of the bill, how it was contemplated that the appropriation should be distributed, but I am frank to say that I do not believe I got a satisfactory reply. Now, under the terms of this bill, out of the first appropriation for the first year my State of Oklahoma would get a minimum appropriation of $5,000. The State and local community, or both, has to supplement that appropriation by adding another $5,000. So that you have $10,000 appropriated. Now, there are 76 counties in the State of Oklahoma. Will anyone volunteer to advise me how this $10,000 can be expended in a State that has 76 counties so that it is going to help the poor boy and the poor girl out on the farm throughout the entire State?

The wealthy boy and the wealthy girl can, of course, pay their expenses in attending the State university, the normal schools, or the agricultural school or the district agricultural school, but how is this fund going to be expended through the State board of education so as to reach the poor boy and the poor girl out on the farm that it is intended to benefit?

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. The State of Oklahoma, when the maximum appropriation is reached, will get $81,000 for agricultural purposes and $22,500 for industrial purposes.

Mr. HASTINGS. But suppose the gentleman from Ohio was a member of the State board of education and there were 76 counties in the State, and you also had a State university, a State agricultural school, six district agricultural schools, six normal schools, and a number of other preparatory schools throughout the State, how would you distribute that fund so as to reach the poor boy and the poor girl on the farm who is unable to pay board or go away from home to some city? How are you going to help the rural school?

Mr. FESS. The committee believed that a Federal appropriation of $100,000 to Oklahoma, being supplemented by another $100,000 by the State—and that is the minimum, because it might be $400,000. That has been the rule as to the contribution by the State, where the Federal Government has contributed one dollar the State has contributed four. That is in accordance with our past history of appropriation, and it is supposed that that will be done later on by the State. It certainly would be unwise for us to undertake to say how it should be distributed in Oklahoma. It ought to be left to the State board of Oklahoma that is on the ground and who would not undertake to divide it up by a common multiple and give five or six dollars in one place, but leave it to the State board to put it in one place or a dozen places or 10 places or 100 places. In other words, it would not do at all for the Federal board located in Washington to undertake to say how this money should be distributed in Oklahoma. That must be left to the State board of Oklahoma and if you can not trust the board there, that is an argument against the bill entirely on principle, because we can not utilize the money. But I think we can if we leave it to the State board.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman from Ohio is a student not only of this bill but of educational matters in general. He is at the head of one of the principal colleges of the State of Ohio. I want to ask him this question: Suppose you were on the State board of education in Oklahoma, how would you suggest that the $82,000 supplemented by an additional fund of $82,000 could be expended in Oklahoma so as to reach the poor boy and the poor girl on the farm? That is the class that it is our purpose to reach.

Mr. FESS. It is the business of the State board to guard against the waste of it.

Mr. HASTINGS. I do not want to vote for a "pig in a poke." I would like to be a little more practicable. Is it contemplated that this money should be used in the State universities?

Mr. FESS. It certainly is not, because it is limited to students or pupils under college grade, and that prevents the State universities from getting it.

Mr. HASTINGS. In what schools could it be expended, say, in the State of Ohio?

Mr. FESS. In the first place, there are three funds. One is to pay the salaries——

Mr. HASTINGS. We will take the agricultural funds.

Mr. FESS. When you talk about State universities, I would suggest to the gentleman that none of this money would go to the State universities, unless it receives a portion for training teachers.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will it be used in the high schools?

Mr. FESS. Yes; if they meet the age between 14 to 18.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then, will any of it be used in rural schools?

Mr. FESS. Certainly; wherever the State board would apply it.

Mr. HASTINGS. But the State board could pick out any rural school in any county in the State of Ohio, or in any other State it saw fit.

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. To the exclusion of all other rural schools?

Mr. FESS. We should not interfere with that from this point. We have to trust the State board upon this matter. We ourselves can not dictate that. The gentleman's fear that it will go to the State universities or to a special college or to some favored institution is not well founded, because it does not go to any institution teaching pupils of college grade. They must be below college grade, except the small proportion that goes for the training of teachers. That, of course, will go to the special training schools, whether it be the State university or the State normal schools or whatever your State board will decide upon.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then, these funds will be distributed through the State boards of education, and they may or may not go to the rural schools?

Mr. FESS. It would certainly have to go to the rural schools for the payment of salaries of teachers in agriculture, for there is where the agricultural teachers and pupils are. The gentleman's fears are unwarranted.

Mr. HASTINGS. I am heartily in favor of the principles of the bill. I wanted to make sure about the distribution of the money, so as to guard against the concentration of it in a few schools. I favor the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri, because I would like to see each county and each community receive some of the benefits from this appropriation. Thousands of boys and girls are not able to pay board and other expenses of attending schools away from home. The object of this bill is to bring these advantages as near to the people as possible.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I am fearful that this bill when it goes into practical operation will prove a very distinct

disappointment. It is an effort to do that which has been tried heretofore concerning other matters, namely, to bring about a cooperation between the Federal Government and the various State governments touching a matter that should belong and does belong either to the one or to the other. If the entrance into vocational educational training is a proper Federal function then it ought to be done by the Federal Government without connecting it with or making it dependent upon State cooperation. If it is not a proper thing to be done by the Federal Government then the Congress should dismiss the subject and leave the matter to the States to work out. Somewhat on all fours with this proposition, Mr. Chairman, is the road bill that passed Congress last year. I believe that when that act goes into operation it will prove a very distinct disappointment to the people throughout the several States. Under the terms of this vocational educational bill, if I interpret the language correctly, States can not enjoy the benefits of it after a certain time unless those States make appropriations equal in amount to the Federal appropriations authorized in this measure. I do not believe that that is sound governmentally, and I feel quite sure that in its practical application a policy of that sort will create local jealousies, will create local contests that will eventually lead to the destruction of whatever good there is in this bill or else will lead away from that to the point where the Federal Government will take over the entire situation. I believe that the bill ought to be re-formed in its entirety, and, as I said a moment ago, if it is a proper functon upon which the Federal Government should enter, then the Federal Government should do it independently of asking State cooperation or aid.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that we have a precedent for everything incorporated in this bill, for since the foundation of the Goveernment Congress has passed more than 42 acts embodying these very principles.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I have very great respect, indeed, for the opinion and good judgment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. I am quite sure, however, that he will understand me when I say that I do not believe that he has given to this question the consideration that would warrant him in forming the conclusion that he states. This question is not a new question, let me say to the gentleman from Tennessee and to the committee. It has been discussed for more than 10 years in educational circles all over the United States. It has not only been discussed from its educational side, but it has been discussed as a constitutional question. The objections that the gentleman suggests have all been carefully considered. This bill is, of course, a novelty, as the good-roads bill was. The gentleman states that disappointment from the operation of this bill and the good-roads bill will occur. I, on the contrary, expect more of satisfactory returns than have ever been promised by the supporters of either bill. This bill is of stimulating quality, and it seeks to do that or to bring about the doing of that which everyone admits would be a great blessing to the country.

If the General Government can do this, as we have the constitutional right to do, if the General Government can bring to bear upon the educational interests of each State this stimulus and assistance that will lead them to extend their work in this direction, then certainly it will be of great benefit to the people of the United States. This fund is to be appropriated in only two ways, neither of which can possibly interfere with the operation of the States or their autonomy in the control of their methods of education. There are only two methods by which this fund is to be applied—first, to the training of teachers, and, second, to the payment of teachers. Everybody understands that this is specialized work. It requires the special training of teachers, and in order to encourage this special training a part of this fund is set apart for that particular purpose. Certainly no one could object to such a method of encouraging that form of education.

And the other method is for the payment of teachers. Gentlemen will understand that this specialized work must be to a great extent taught by expert teachers, especially in the inception of the work, and so the work is graded with a smaller appropriation at the first, to be increased yearly until a maximum is reached. For instance, a township in any of the counties where they may have a half dozen or more schools may not have any teachers that will be able to teach any of these economic subjects or agricultural subjects that we desire to have taught. They should have an expert teacher to go around to the country schools for a while in order to teach them the specialized subjects. There are many ways in which this fund can be particularly applied so that, as suggested by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS], it will not go to the benefit of any particular school or section, but will be applied, as he says, and as I agree with him, to the education of the children who will most need it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. TOWNER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if he can state in how many States of the Union vocational education has already been inaugurated? It says in the report that it has been inaugurated in many localities. In how many different States have they inaugurated this system of vocational education?

Mr. TOWNER. I think in practically nine States. In some other States, however, they have commenced in a desultory way the teaching of vocational education.

Mr. WALSH. And can the gentleman state about how much money has been expended by these nine States and is being expended annually?

Mr. TOWNER. I can not answer that question. I will say to the gentleman, however, it is comparatively an inconsiderable amount. It is not nearly large enough to obtain the practical results we hope to obtain under this bill.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] seems to fear that the participation of the Federal Government in this matter will interfere with the working out by the States of their own educational problems.

Mr. GARRETT. If the gentleman will permit me, I did not make that observation or anything from which, I think, that conclusion can be reasonably drawn. The gentleman, I am sure, misunderstood.

Mr. POWERS. I beg the gentleman's pardon if I did. At any rate, he was under the impression that this bill would work very unsatisfactorily and that it would be either abandoned by Congress or the Federal Government would have to take over the question altogether. I believe that is the substance of what the gentleman has stated. Is it not true that this bill is merely a proposition to the State to spend so much money under this section, provided we spend so much, and that any State in the Union can take advantage of it or reject it, just as it sees fit and proper?

Mr. TOWNER. That is true to a certain extent, but not wholly true. Certain conditions are prescribed that must be complied with.

Mr. GARRETT. What I wish to say is this: If any State wishes to take advantage of it, that State is paying its pro rata of the Federal taxes. If that State fails through its own entity to tax its citizens to raise a similar amount, it loses both, and, while it continues to pay its taxes which go to the Federal Government, it gets no benefit whatever.

Mr. TOWNER. That is very true, and I will say the same is true in regard to the appropriation for the improvement of the Mississippi River or any other particular appropriation. Not many people of the United States will receive any direct benefit from any particular appropriation. Nine-tenths of all the appropriations we make here in Congress are not so made or so arranged that the entire people of the United States can participate in the benefit, but we hope to make our appropriations, and it certainly should always be the object to make legislation so general as to reach the largest number that we possibly can. In other words, to secure the greatest good to the greatest number. And I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there can be no possible method by which so many of the people of the United States could receive a direct benefit as to bring to them this method of better education and preparation for the active pursuits they must follow when they go out into the world to act for themselves.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman from Iowa understand that the sums appropriated under this legislation by the Federal Government could be used in the payment of a part of the salary of a teacher who, teaching the subjects provided for, also teaches other subjects?

Mr. TOWNER. I think there is no doubt about it.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman thinks there is no question about that?

Mr. TOWNER. I think there is no doubt about it at all.

Mr. MONDELL. If that is not true, then the sums in a large agricultural State would be of little value in the ordinary common schools?

Mr. TOWNER. That is very true.

Mr. MONDELL. And the gentleman thinks there is no question about it?

Mr. TOWNER. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. MONDELL. What raised the question in my mind was that a moment ago the gentleman in his remarks referred to the fact that it might be necessary to have teachers especially trained that might go about teaching these various subjects in the school of a county or of a considerable agricultural community. The gentleman thinks, however, that that would not necessarily be required under the bill?

Mr. TOWNER. No.

Mr. MONDELL. But that in an ordinary district school the teacher qualified to teach agricultural subjects, we will say, or to teach industrial subjects, could have a part of his or her salary paid out of this appropriation?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. ROUSE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On December 22, 1916:

H. J. Res. 324. Joint resolution authorizing payment of the salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1916; and

H. R. 19178. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

On December 27, 1916:

H. J. Res. 282. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to provide the postmaster of Springfield, Ill., with a special canceling die for the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Illinois into the Federal Union;

S. 7095. An act extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River, authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved August 24, 1912; and

S. 6116. An act providing for the taxation of the lands of the Winnebago Indians and the Omaha Indians in the State of Nebraska.

On December 29, 1916:

H. R. 407. An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes.

On December 30, 1916:

H. R. 1788. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Jones.

VOCATIONAL-EDUCATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I think there has been and is now to a great degree a very unfortunate misapprehension as to the real purpose and object of this bill, at least as I understand its purpose and objects. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] raises the question that because Oklahoma will receive only $100,000 aid through this bill it is such a small amount that it could be of no particular value in educating the poor boy and the poor girl in Oklahoma.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I said that $5,000 the first year out of the fund would be of no particular value.

Mr. LENROOT. Well, whatever the sum is, the gentleman from Oklahoma and other gentlemen assume that the money that is to be expended in the education of the poor boy and poor girl will be the amount of Federal aid extended plus a like amount of State aid or contribution.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope and believe that that will not be the case at all; that the Federal aid extended will only be a very small percentage of the amount that will be expended within the States for these purposes. Take the case of a rural community, we will say, in the State of Oklahoma.

If they are spending now in one county $1,000 for agricultural education, and the State of Oklahoma shall receive $100,000 from the Federal Government to be expended for that purpose, that county will receive aid in proportion only to the number of counties in Oklahoma that will adopt the necessary standards and qualify themselves under this bill to receive aid. It may be 5 per cent of the amount that that county raises for these purposes; it may be 10 per cent, or 20 per cent, as the case may be. But if it is only 5 per cent or 10 per cent, if it is an inducement to that county to raise its standard of agricultural education so as to conform to the standard required by this bill in order to get that aid, great good will have been accomplished in the education of that poor boy and poor girl in Oklahoma.

Now, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] fears that the passage of this bill will result in local contests. Mr. Chairman, if the passage of this bill does not result in local contests, the bill in my judgment will very largely fail in the accomplishment of its purpose. I hope and expect it will result in local contests. There will be contests between the localities as to which will be the first to adopt the standard approved by these Federal boards, so that they can avail themselves of the portion they are entitled to of Federal aid; so that instead of this being considered as a proposition of Federal aid plus an equal amount of aid by the State, it should be considered as only a sufficient amount of Federal aid to stimulate the States and localities to give the boys and girls of their States such education as shall be a practical vocational education.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that this section was thoroughly discussed by the commission appointed by the President for three months. It was also adopted by the Senate. It was under discussion by the Committee on Education of the House for about 10 months. All three have agreed upon this amendment. I regret not to be able to agree with my distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL], a man of magnificent ability and judgment. But, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that that amendment will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Oklahoma that there is nothing pending.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I desire to ask the gentleman from Georgia a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee or some member thereof for information as to the meaning of the term "agricultural subjects." This bill provides, among other things, for the paying of teachers and the training of teachers to teach "agricultural subjects."

Now, then, does that include rural credit or cooperative business methods among farmers? That is what I desire to know.

Mr. HUGHES. The word "agricultural" means that which pertains to agriculture, to the soil.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I understand. That is what Webster says. Now, what is agriculture? My understanding is that the word "agriculture" refers entirely to the cultivation of the soil, the tillage of the soil, to the production of plants, and has nothing to do with the business end of farming.

Mr. HUGHES. If the gentleman will excuse me there, we have supervisors and directors out in the field to explain to the farmer and show him how to reduce theories to practice, so that he will study the scientific part of agriculture, and then it will be made operative in the field.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Yes. That is what I understand "agriculture" to mean, to go out and teach the farmer how to do better farming, scientific farming. I do not understand that that includes business affairs relating to farmers—relating to rural credits.

Mr. HUGHES. No.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I think the gentleman is hardly justified in his fears regarding that. The object of agriculture is not alone to produce, because if the farmer produces only he never gets anywhere. It is also the object of the farmer to dispose of his production as well as to produce it. I am quite sure the gentleman has in mind the question whether or not this would include assistants and help that would assist in the solution of questions that would teach the farmer how to dispose of his crop as well as how to produce it.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I have no hesitation in saying that the language would include that, in my judgment.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Well, let me ask the gentleman from Iowa, as well as the gentleman from Georgia, if they intended to include the teaching of the system or the principles of rural credits and better business in farming, such as cooperation in business, collective selling and collective buying, and so on?

Mr. TOWNER. I should certainly say collective selling would be within it. I do not know about collective buying. I am inclined to think that possibly might be outside the range. However, I would not venture an opinion on that question.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. What does the chairman of the committee or the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] think of it?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. FESS. There were four fields discussed by the commission. One was the agricultural, one was the commercial, one was the nautical, and one was the industrial. The commission decided that commercial education was well cared for in high schools, and therefore need not be treated in this bill. The nautical, which would go to the merchant marine, was a matter that was specialized, and this bill would not take care of that. But the agricultural and the industrial were the two great fields that called for help.

Now, in attempting to designate what would be included in the agricultural, they considered that it would be so attenuated that they chose the term "agricultural subjects," in order to avoid the necessity of undertaking to name certain things, because if you undertake to name anything and do not name everything the things not named would be excluded. Therefore my own opinion is that while the principle of rural credits would not be likely to be discussed to children of 14 to 16 years, it certainly is not excluded from the purview of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: Page 2, line 7, after the word "*Provided*," insert "That the words 'agricultural subjects' when used in this act shall include rural credits and cooperation in business among farmers."

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, in the remarks which I have already made I think I have explained the purpose of this amendment so that most of the members of the committee understand it. If this act is passed simply providing for the paying and preparation of teachers and directors and supervisors in "agricultural subjects," in my judgment, it may be construed that none of this money can be used to teach rural credits or cooperative business methods among farmers. I believe that would be an unfortunate result. Now, in order that there may be no question about the intention of Congress to include rural credits and better business methods among farmers I have offered this amendment.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT. Does the gentleman mean that there shall be provided teachers to go out and teach the farmers how to cooperate? I understand that this is to teach the children who are studying in school.

Mr. FESS. Children of 14 to 16 years.

Mr. GARRETT. Between the ages of 14 and 16. Does the gentleman contemplate the hiring of men to go out and teach the farmers how to form farmers' unions and fruit growers' associations and things of that sort?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I mean simply this, that the boy who is old enough to understand scientific methods of farming is old enough to understand the principles of business and of cooperation in business. More than this, we need to educate teachers to teach rural credit and cooperation in business among farmers.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation is perhaps abreast if not in the lead of any other nation in the world in providing instruction to farmers in the methods of farming. This is accomplished by our Agricultural Department, by our great agricultural colleges, by the work that is being done under the Smith-Lever bill, and through many other activities. We are spending many millions a year by these methods, but very largely this large expenditure is used to aid the farmer to produce more crops. Now, in the matter of business methods we are far in the rear of the most of the great nations of Europe. Our farmers are losing many millions of dollars every year because they have not been taught and trained to apply better business methods to farming. Some one has said that in agriculture we must have better farming, better business, and better living. So far as the farmers are concerned to-day the importance of having better business methods is greater than the necessity of having a better knowledge of the principles of scientific farming. We are behind in one matter; we are in the lead in the others; and under this bill it is proposed to leave us still in the rear on that one subject. The one great question for the farmers of the United States to solve in the future, and the one thing above all others that the Congress of the United States should aid the farmer to solve properly, is how to enable the farmer to conduct his business on better principles.

During the last session of Congress we passed a bill making a beginning in the providing of farmers with better credit facilities, but that applied only to land credits and to the question of getting credit upon better terms upon farm mortgages. We have done nothing yet in the matter of providing better personal credit. Our farmers know nothing about cooperating together in order to enable them to have better credit on personal accounts, so that they may transact their business better. The fact is that there is nothing that will do so much to enlarge the products of the farm as will the providing of better credit facilities for farmers and better business methods among farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. We have already made a start, but only a start, in the matter of providing farmers with better credit. When you go to Germany, to France, to Italy, and to many of the smaller European States, you find that the farmers not only have special institutions to provide them with farm-mortgage credit but they have thousands of institutions which aid the farmers in having a better system of personal credit and a better business system. In Germany there are over 20,000 cooperative business societies among farmers.

We have had up the subject of providing a better system of marketing. Our farmers do not cooperate in business. All the rest of the business interests of the country are united. In the last half century we have gone from individuals and partnerships in business to the great corporations which dominate and control the business interests of this country. When the farmer sells his product it goes at once into the hands of great corporations, great concentrated business concerns, and these corporations control and finally distribute it among the consumers. We have a very complex system of sale and distribution, so much so that it takes one-half of the value of the farm product in order to get it from the farmer to the consumer. This is not only a great loss to the farmer, but it is a great loss to the consumers of the country. There is too much going to the middle man, and I do not wish specially in that way to throw out any reflection upon the middle men, who constitute the business interests of this country, but still, when confronted with the high cost of living, we must know that the one way to obviate that, the one way to make living cheaper, is to lessen the cost of bringing the products from the farm to the consumer.

So the farmers should cooperate in business, follow the lead of the business interests. Here you are going to pass a bill through Congress providing for the expenditure of millions of dollars, which will go on increasing from year to year, and not any of it may be used to teach the farmers to cooperate in business, and thus be able to help the farmer to produce more products of the farm and to compete with the great business interests of the country and secure his proper share of the wealth that he produces. The way to do that is to teach them to unite in their business efforts and cooperate in their business, and so far as they can sell direct to the customer and thus cut out the cost of distribution.

That is just what I propose in my amendment—that we shall make it plain beyond peradventure and doubt that we may use a part of this money to educate the farmers in better business methods.

Take my own State, her agricultural products amount to $300,000,000 a year. Suppose by better business methods, by cooperation, by reducing the cost of transportation, the cost of manufacture, and the cost of distribution in the sale of farm products there would be 10 per cent saved; that would mean a saving of $3,000,000 annually to the farmers of Oklahoma. But when you talk about going back to the farm, leading the people of the cities back to the farm and having our boys and girls stay on the farm, after all there is one thing that is necessary, and that is to make the farm more profitable. On that point hinges the future of our agricultural interests. Make the farm profitable and the boys will not leave it. The farmers must make money or they can not live in suitable dwellings, they can not have proper educational facilities, they can not have suitable vehicles for transportation, they can not have their houses prop-

erly furnished, and can not have facilities and opportunities for self-improvement and recreation. It is not what farmers produce that determines the money they make; it is a question of profits. What do the farmers make? is the question. And what farmers make depends largely upon the use of credit and in cooperation in business.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] should be adopted. The gentleman is always eloquent in behalf of the farmers of the country. No man who knows him or who appreciates his long service in this House would say that he has not been a true friend of the farmers of Oklahoma. He has been eloquent in his fight for the interests of the farmers. He wants the farmers to make more profit. He is anxious that the farmers should succeed in business. He is willing to destroy the middle man who carries the product of the farm to the city. He is willing to utterly forget the consumer of his product after it comes into the city. He is for the farmer first, last, and all the time, though it means, in the last analysis, that without his customer the farmer shall stay upon his farm, raise his own product for himself, and get it nowhere.

My idea of the purpose of this bill is that it is to generalize the education of the farmer, to assist at the same time the farmer's best friend, the consumer in the city, by education. If I have read this bill wrongly, it is my misfortune; but my belief is that if the bill is passed at all it ought to be passed not because it specializes in the interest of the farmer or prejudices the farmer's mainstay and best friend, the man in the city——

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman think that if the farmers could sell directly to the consumers in the city that that would furnish these products to the consumers in the city at a less price?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Undoubtedly it would.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman see——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Wait a moment. I want more time if I am to be interrupted at length.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I will ask that the gentleman have more time. Does not the gentleman see that my amendment is as much in line for the benefit of the consumers in the city as it is for the benefit of the farmers? In fact, the gentleman, I think, hardly construes my purpose correctly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman is to go on and state his position over again, I shall have to object. The gentleman asked the question whether or not it would not be a good thing for the farmer or the producer of the product to sell directly to the city man and consumer of the farm product, and I unhesitatingly answer yes. But the gentleman fails to take into account the middleman, whom he has decried, who is not only the man who markets the product but is also the man who constructed the railroad and obtained employment for thousands of men and made it possible for the farmer to obtain the tremendous prices he is now receiving for everything he produces from the toilers in the city. The gentleman from Oklahoma would abolish railroads when he abolishes the middleman; the gentleman would abolish the steamships; the gentleman would abolish the stores; the gentleman would abolish every union of farmers who are brought together for the purpose of facilitating the distribution of farm products when the gentleman destroys the middleman.

Why, a great department-store proprietor declared in public recently that he wanted the middleman destroyed. In that event what is to become of the shop girl? What is to become of the man who goes out to buy of the farmer? What becomes of the man who handles his goods?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the population of this country is not solely upon the farm. One-half the population at least is engaged in industrial enterprises, and if there is a hiatus between the man who is the consumer and the man who is the producer, it is the middle man who is at the service of both. The individual farmer sometimes has a complaint against some commission merchant who may have done him a wrong, and he grieves about it, and he gets it published in the newspapers, and his Congressman comes here and makes frequent speeches about it; but God help the farmer of this country the moment he goes so far as to destroy the means of transportation, the means of communication, the means of distribution, every one of which gives employment to the middle man.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. As I understand it, then, the gentleman contends that the middle man renders a distinct service both to the farmer and the consumer?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of course, he does.

Mr. HASTINGS. If that be true, the more middle men the better.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How far is Oklahoma from New York City?

Mr. HASTINGS. About 2,000 miles.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the gentleman is a farmer and he is the farmers' friend. He is raising cotton or raising potatoes, I care not which. Let him put his cotton upon his back, or his potatoes and eggs and deliver them to me in New York City. I will pay a fair price for them. If the gentleman will have his farmer do that, he will help to bring about an intercommunication between the farm and the city. All the farmer has to do is to put his product on his back and deliver it. That will abolish the middle man, even if it brings stagnation in Oklahoma. If you are going to have communication, if you want to look at the question broadly, you have got to consider the means of transportation, the means of communication, and the means of distribution. Do not destroy the middle man right off the bat. Give the middle man a little chance for his white alley. Dear Mrs. Farmer in Iowa is not delivering her eggs to the consumers in Philadelphia at 60 cents a dozen—not much. She has not the opportunity to deliver them unless some one constructs a railroad, unless some poor thrifty fellow in my city puts enough money into the savings funds to be invested in the construction of a railroad to bring Iowa to the market, and that is all middle man.

I know people now who are denouncing the railroads, who want to have them regulated to death, and yet on picking up the reports of the savings funds in my city and in New York and in other great centers I find that it is the savings of the poor people, in whose behalf you are constantly pleading, that are maintaining, that are building, the railroads of the country and are bringing the East to the West and the West to the East.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. Would it not be possible to deliver some of these things by water transportation? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; and the sooner you all get that into your heads in the House of Representatives the better it will be for the welfare of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I think I want this bill passed, not because the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] wants it specialized, but because I believe that the one great crying need of this country to-day is the practical education of the children of the land. [Applause.] There are too many seeking a higher education that fits them only to make other men work, and too few who are willing to be educated to do the work themselves. My father ran a farm of 200 acres in extent, and he failed at it. If he had been scientifically trained, he probably could have made a good living on 40 acres.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. That is the point. The gentleman's father would not have failed if he had been taught the business of farming. And that is the object of this measure.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. My father was not able to give me a college education, and the more I get along in life the more grateful I am to my father for having let me go to work at an early age. [Applause.] If I have been useful at all, it has been because I was not afraid to work. I think we are training lots of young men through the colleges to a magnificent champagne appetite when they are not capable of acquiring a beer income. [Laughter.] If this bill proposes to give a practical education through teachers trained for the purpose to the boys who work upon the farms, well and good. If it gives a practical education to the man or the boy who is willing to work with his hands in the city in any of the great industries, so much the better.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this amendment will not be adopted. The committee feels that it could not possibly go into all of the numerous details that would surround this bill under such an amendment as that, and therefore I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves that all debate on the section and all amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the section.

Mr. HUGHES. Then I will withhold that motion.

Mr. MANN. Make it in 10 minutes.

Mr. HUGHES. Very well, I will make that motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma) there were—ayes 1, noes 21.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. PLATT: Page 1, line 9, after the word "trade," strike out the words "home economics," and also on page 2, line 1, strike out the words "and home economics."

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in appreciation of the importance of home economics, but home economics is an endless subject, more or less taught and generally pretty well taught in every school in the country, in almost every school in the country, even the district schools, and its inclusion in this bill offers an opportunity to dissipate this whole fund in trifles. It does not belong in this bill at all. This is a vocational education bill, and home economics is not, strictly speaking, vocational education. I think we would greatly improve the bill if we took the question of home economics out of it. I think if the bill is subject to any legitimate criticism it is that it goes too far, anyway, and tries to take in too many subjects. It would be better if agricultural training were taken out of it and that subject left to another bill. We are dividing this fund up in such a way and making the bill so broad that the encouragement will be distributed around so that it may not do any good at all.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I will say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has an amendment which we will offer subsequently, limiting the amount to 20 per cent. Will that be satisfactory?

Mr. PLATT. I should like to see it all go out. I should like to have a vote on that.

Mr. TOWNER. Would you like to submit it?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Have you excluded home economics for the training——

Mr. PLATT. On page 2, line 1, I take it out.

Mr. FESS. Was it the intention of the Member to exclude from it the teaching of teachers for home economics?

Mr. PLATT. Why, I think so. It seems to me it is dividing up the bill too much. The States are all teaching home economics now. They do not need any encouragement in this line. It is giving encouragement to something that does not need encouragement and taking away from the subjects that do need encouragement.

Mr. FESS. The very fact that we have so many schools teaching home economics would be an argument for training teachers for that subject, would it not?

Mr. PLATT. Certainly, but I know of no reason why the Federal Government should seek to encourage something which does not appear to need encouragement. An amendment to limit the amount would help some.

Mr. HUGHES. Will not the gentleman withdraw his amendment until we reach the point where an amendment will be in order along that line?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it the gentleman's understanding that home economics includes sewing?

Mr. PLATT. It includes everything under creation—sewing, cooking, and sweeping the floor, and so forth.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman think we should strike out of the bill that part providing for industrial education of children?

Mr. PLATT. It does not need encouragement. It is already being taught everywhere.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Evidently it is not, because there are ladies who grow up to be magnificent dancers, and who know nothing about this subject. Why could we not teach them?

Mr. PLATT. You could not teach those ladies home duties no matter how much you might spend.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a vote on the amendment.

Mr. HUGHES. Let us pass this now.

Mr. MANN. Oh, let us dispose of it now.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I think with the limitation that is suggested the gentleman would hardly be justified in asking that this amendment which he offers should carry. To do so, Mr. Chairman, would be to exclude one of the subjects of industrial education that has always been connected with the subject of vocational education. The gentleman is entirely mistaken in his views that this is outside of it. If you should adopt the gentleman's amendment you would teach the girls to become shop girls and factory workers and go into trades, and you would give them no instruction whatever regarding home making and motherhood. And that certainly is vastly more important than to become shop girls and milliners' assistants. The subject of home economics has been associated with industrial education from the very commencement of this great movement in the United States. It is certainly as important to teach the girls as it is the boys. The gentleman's view would limit practically the operation of this bill to the teaching of the boys of the United States and leave nothing whatever to the teaching of the girls. All over this country women of intelligence, with philanthropic minds, have become interested in this subject. They believe that the girls who are to become the home makers of the future, should be taught at least the fundamentals of these great subjects on which so much of the welfare and the happiness of the people depend. They are interested in helping to prepare the future mothers of American citizens how to make and keep an American home, how to insure sanitary surroundings, how to make the home attractive, how to care for the injured, how to treat the ordinary diseases and prevent infection and contagion.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will.

Mr. PLATT. Is not that very fact, that people all over the country are already interested in it, the reason why we should not include it in this bill?

Mr. TOWNER. Oh, the gentleman's idea, that because they are already interested is a sufficient reason why we should do anything, is entirely erroneous. It is to satisfy this growing demand that we should act. Men and women are becoming interested in this subject because they see the need of action, and it is to do something that will accomplish the desired results that this bill is framed and presented.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. BENNET. I doubt very much whether they teach domestic science in Port Jervis, in my colleague's district. I was born in that city. I think they ought to teach it there. We do teach it in New York City, and I think they ought to teach it in Orange and Dutchess Counties.

Mr. PLATT. They do teach it as well there as they do in New York City.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I really believe there is no one particular item contained in this bill that will bring so much good to the homes of this country and to the people of the generation that is to come as the assistance and stimulus it will give by teaching home economics. I think it will bring to us a better knowledge of the sanitation of the home, of the care of children, and in first aid for the injured in a dependency on good care and sensible treatment instead of a reliance upon patent medicines and quack nostrums. It will benefit the whole scheme of home-making and home-keeping if you elevate the home in the mind of a girl who thinks too much about becoming a shop girl, or a factory worker, rather than of going into the home and becoming a mother. In my estimation there is nothing that will so enlarge and ennoble the ideal of home-making and motherhood as to make them the subjects of research and scientific investigation. I hope that this amendment will be voted down.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did it come to the attention of the committee that the boys were constantly leaving the farm and drifting into the cities, and was the prevention of that a part of the scheme entered upon in this bill?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that the young women of the country are very much disposed to leave the farmhouse and respond to the allurements of the city also?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would it not therefore be judicious, so long as you are going to distribute money throughout the Union, that each State should induce its young women as well as its young men to stay on the farm?

Mr. TOWNER. I would say, "Yes, stay on the farm," rather than enter the factory or the shop. I would say to the girl, "Better stay in the home," until she becomes herself the mistress of a home than to go out into other fields of industry.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That for the purpose of cooperating with the States in paying the salaries of teachers, supervisors, or directors of agricultural subjects there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the use of the States, subject to the provisions of this act, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, the sum of $500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, the sum of $750,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of $1,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of $1,250,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, the sum of $1,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, the sum of $1,750,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, the sum of $2,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, the sum of $2,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and annually thereafter, the sum of $3,000,000. Said sums shall be allotted to the States in the proportion which their rural population bears to the total rural population in the United States, not including outlying possessions, according to the last preceding United States census: *Provided*, That the allotment of funds to any State shall be not less than a minimum of $5,000 for any fiscal year prior to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, nor less than $10,000 for any fiscal year thereafter, and of the sums herein authorized to be appropriated the following sums, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used for the purpose of providing the minimum allotment to the States provided for in this section: For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, the sum of $48,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, the sum of $34,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of $24,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of $18,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, the sum of $14,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, the sum of $11,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, the sum of $9,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, the sum of $34,000; and annually thereafter the sum of $27,000.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I make this motion purely to take the opportunity to call the attention of the House to the fact that notwithstanding the statement made by Mr. Thomas W. Lawson, of Boston, we had a quorum this morning to do business. If the newspaper reports that have been published are true, Mr. Lawson made the statement that if the truth concerning some stock manipulations on Wall Street were made public, it would empty the seats of Congress. There are a great many seats evidently that it did not empty.

I do not desire to usurp the functions of any committee that may have this subject under its control, but I feel that the accusations, if they really have been made by Mr. Lawson against the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, should be investigated, at least to clear our own skirts and to exonerate any Members of this House from any blame in connection with this transaction to which he refers, and make Mr. Lawson put up or shut up.

As I say, I do not wish to usurp the functions of any committee, but I have introduced a resolution into the House of Representatives asking for the appointment of a committee of three Members of the House of Representatives and three Members from the United States Senate to investigate the charges made by Mr. Lawson, giving that committee authority to subpœna witnesses and compel their attendance, asking that committee to subpœna Mr. Lawson to find out what he knows about these accusations that he has made, and appropriating the sum of $10,000 to cover whatever expenses may be needed.

Now, I do not know what you think about it, but the people of the country pay considerable amount of attention to accusations of this kind that are made against Members of Congress or persons who hold public offices, and I feel that here and now we should set an example in connection with accusations of this kind and, to use a slang expression, "put it up to Mr. Lawson's teeth." I have nothing to fear.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think he is taking these newspaper statements too seriously?

Mr. EMERSON. Well, the people are taking them seriously, and whether properly or not pay much attention to what Mr. Lawson says.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman know that the mails are filled every morning with the cranky notions of somebody from every State in the Union, and if Congress took time to investigate everything that was said about it, it would not adjourn on the 4th of March, or until the 1st of next January?

Mr. EMERSON. But Mr. Lawson and every man, woman, and child in this country knows that some attention is paid to what he says.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not much. Does not the gentleman know that Mr. Lawson has been scolding, scolding, scolding for some time?

Mr. EMERSON. That may be true, but it is up to us to do something to end these continued accusations and make Mr. Lawson either name the persons guilty or admit he is wrong.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. The gentleman is not discussing the bill.

Mr. EMERSON. I admit that, but I am taking advantage of this opportunity to urge this House to take some action on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the chairman of the committee with reference to the date in this bill as reported. It was reported to the House on February 12, 1916, nearly one year ago; and very properly the dates named in the bill at that time related to the fiscal year 1917. In view of the present situation and the condition of the Treasury I want to ask the gentleman whether he does not think all of these dates ought to be moved forward one year?

Mr. HUGHES. I will state to the gentleman that I had intended to offer that amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman make that motion?

Mr. HUGHES. I will offer that amendment, that all the dates be moved ahead one year, that 1916–17 be made 1917–18, and 1925 be made 1926.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that he ask unanimous consent that all the dates be corrected.

Mr. HUGHES. I ask unanimous consent that they be moved forward one year.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee). The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] asks unanimous consent that the bill be so amended as to move up one year the various dates set forth in section 2. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry. Was that request granted as to the dates all through the bill, or simply those in this section?

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair stated it, it applied only to section 2.

Mr. HUGHES. I think it ought to apply to all the dates in the bill.

Mr. MANN. The dates run all through the bill.

Mr. HUGHES. I intended to include all of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia makes a similar request as to the dates appearing in subsequent sections of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of making an observation that is very pertinent to this bill and all other bills of this character.

Of course, the Federal Government exercises its beneficient influence very largely through the expenditure of money. This bill calls for an appropriation, during a 10-year period, of $38,400,000. At the present time there is considerable question in the minds of Members of Congress as to just exactly how the expenses of the Federal Government should be met. Yet there is an increasing demand upon the part of the people that the Government engage in various activities helpful to the people, similar to the one under consideration.

Mr. FESS. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. BORLAND. In a few minutes. These subjects include not only this great work, which means the development of the industrial and agricultural population of the country to a higher producing value and a higher social life, but rural sanitation and good roads and countless other activities of the Federal Government which are exercised in that way.

Now, my theory is, and always has been, that the important question is not how much money the people spend, although that question is often thrown at us, but the important question is as to the way in which that money is spent. If we spend the money of the people wisely and in a way which reflects a better industrial and social life of the people we are justified in spending it and in raising the taxes for that purpose, and I am perfectly willing to do it. But the fact that we are engaged in these enlarged activities and these constantly increasing demands is, in my judgment, another reason why we should not waste the people's money, why we should not throw any of it away, and why every dollar that we make the people pay for the activities of the Government should be expended for the efficient operations of the Government.

At the beginning of the last Congress and of this Congress I called attention to the fact that we waste between $4,000,000 and $5,000,000 a year of the people's money by not requiring a standard day's work of eight hours of our employees in the District of Columbia. I have figured it up that this $38,000,000 expended during a period of nine years is just a fraction over $4,000,000 a year. In other words, for years we have been wasting in the District of Columbia enough money to carry on this kind of an activity all over the United States. I want to put that fact in the RECORD in connection with this bill, because I think that the people in the country who are interested in this subject and the people interested in rural sanitation, in good roads, and in other activities of the Government, are entitled to know whether there is or is not money available in the Federal Treasury to meet the demands of these activities. If we had an efficient operation of the departments in the city of Washington we would be in a position to spend this money to-day without a single dollar of additional drain upon the Public Treasury.

Now, that is not all. We are not only wasting four and a half million dollars of the people's money to-day in the present operation of the departments in the District of Columbia, but there is a propaganda going on for a Saturday half holiday all the year in the District of Columbia. They now get a Saturday half holiday 13 weeks in the year, and they want it for the other 39 weeks. That will mean 19½ more working-days taken off from their year, which is only 208 working-days long now. They work 208 days and they want 19½ days taken off that. That is practically a 10 per cent reduction in their working time. If these men give any service to the Federal Government at all in response to their employment that means that we would have to increase the force 10 per cent in order to do the same amount of work for the Government. That means an addition of $5,000,000 to the $50,000,000 pay roll now in the District of Columbia. In other words, that little demand, so innocent, so insidious, for a half holiday 39 more weeks in the year for this favored class of Government employees means the expenditure of $5,000,000 of the people's money, or more than enough to carry on the activities involved in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to ask my friend from Ohio, Dr. FESS, what his understanding is and his interpretation of the words "rural population" in the bill?

Mr. FESS. The commission made the figures of 2,500; that is, all cities that would have a population of over 2,500 would be urban and cities with 2,500 and less would be rural.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman does not think it necessary to embrace in the law a definition of those terms.

Mr. FESS. It was thought that it was not necessary.

Mr. MONDELL. Then, the understanding of the gentleman is that "rural population" has a definite meaning?

Mr. FESS. Yes; under the law for the taking of the census, as we understood it.

Mr. MONDELL. There is no legal definition even under the census law, is there?

Mr. FESS. There is in my State; I do not know about the Federal law.

Mr. MANN. Does not this bill provide that it shall be according to the census?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The language is—

Said sums shall be allotted to the States in the proportion which their rural population bears to the total rural population in the United States, not including outlying possessions, according to the last preceding United States census.

I suppose that would control it. Mr. Chairman, I want again to call attention to the language of the bill relative to the payment of salaries of teachers. I asked the gentleman from Iowa a short time ago whether he understood that a part of the salary of a teacher could be paid out of this fund and he said he thought there was no question about that. That is very important, but it seems to me that the language of the bill is such that we might have a comptroller who would decide that none of these sums could be paid except for the salaries of teachers whose time is wholly occupied in teaching these particular branches. That could all be made very clear and definite by slight amendments to the bill. I shall not offer such amendments, but I suggest them to the committee; instead of using the words in section 2 "the salaries of teachers, supervisors," and so forth, the word "the" be stricken out and the word "for" inserted in lieu of the word "of," so that it would read "in paying salaries for teachers, supervisors," and so forth. And then in section 3 a like amendment, so that the language would be "in paying salaries for teachers of trade," and so forth.

I am perfectly willing to leave the language of the bill as it is if it is clear beyond question that these sums can be used in payment of part of the salary of a teacher in a district school, that part of the salary which was proper and in proportion to the time that the teacher used in teaching these subjects. Unless that is clear and definite beyond question, the funds appropriated would be of little value in an ordinary country school.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I want to ask whether this would cover the gentleman's objection. Here is a school that teaches commerce but does not teach industrial vocation. The question of the gentleman is, Could that teacher, teaching now commerce, that is not provided for in this bill, be paid to add to his teaching field the teaching of vocational trades?

Mr. MONDELL. I think I can better explain what I mean.

I can explain what I mean by referring to the case of an ordinary district school or a small graded school in which there might be one, two, three, or four teachers, but the size of which would not be such as to justify the employment of teachers to teach agriculture or home economics or trade or to teach any one or all of these subjects—a school where the instruction must necessarily be given by teachers a considerable portion of whose time is occupied in teaching other subjects and other branches. If the appropriation is going to be of real value except in the city schools, it must be clear that the appropriations could be used to pay a part of the salary of a teacher teaching a variety of subjects in addition to those specified in the bill.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. POWERS. I want to say that there is no question about the proposition that the teacher can be paid a part of his salary out of this fund and at the same time teach other subjects.

Mr. MONDELL. I have had that assurance from several members of the committee; but at the same time the fact remains that the language of the bill is such that an auditing officer inclined to be a little technical could, with a considerable show of reason, hold that none of this appropriation could be used except to pay the salary of teachers whose time was exclusively occupied in teaching subjects provided for and appropriated for in the bill.

It would be very regrettable if that should be the interpretation, because that would deprive the small communities of the benefits of the appropriation, and it would include practically all of the agricultural communities. I shall not offer an amendment. I am offering these observations simply for the consideration of gentlemen who have studied the bill and are familiar with the provisions, so that, if there be any question at all in regard to that, amendments may be offered.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to the general provisions of the bill. I was much impressed by what the gentleman from Tennessee said a moment ago, and the fear expressed by him that there would be great disappointment relative to the benefits that might be derived from the legislation. It is true beyond a question that if the character of instruction and preparation for instruction provided for in this legislation were to be paid for wholly and exclusively in this country by these appropriations, or by these appropriations supplemented by an equal appropriation by the State, if that was to be all and the end of it, then our people would be greatly disappointed.

As I have said, they would be greatly disappointed, because neither the sums proposed to be ultimately appropriated, nor twice those sums, nor several times those sums, would be sufficient for the instruction of the youth of this great country in industrial lines in home economics and in agriculture.

The principal virtue that the bill has, according to my point of view, is the virtue of stimulation. If the bill shall stimulate instruction in these lines, if it shall have the effect of challenging the attention of the country and the communities of the country through these appropriations and these aids

to the necessity and the importance of these lines of study, then we shall have accomplished a great good, and it is only because I hope and believe it will so stimulate instruction along these lines that I vote for the bill. I have but little confidence in it as a mere Federal contribution to aid the communities and provide for this instruction. I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], or what I assume to be his attitude, that in the main the communities must provide for the education of their own children. I have had some doubts as to the wisdom of the Federal Government engaging in this sort of thing at all. It can not in my opinion be justified from the viewpoint that it is an aid coming from on high, from the Federal Government to the people of different districts, which they must have or otherwise their people will not be educated. It can only be justified upon the ground suggested by several members of the committee, that it will stimulate and encourage industrial education, the sort of education which we so very greatly need in this country. That it will lead to increased activity, increased expenditures, for these purposes for the excess of the sum that must be contributed to match the Federal appropriation. If it does not have this effect, it will, indeed, be disappointing.

Mr. MADDEN rose.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto conclude in 10 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. REAVIS. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. I suggest that the gentleman defer his motion a little bit.

Mr. MANN. I think we better make some agreement as to time.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto conclude in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments pending thereto conclude in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. MADDEN] may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have had some experience in the matter of educating boys along industrial lines, and my judgment is that this bill will not under its provisions accomplish the object sought. The distribution of the fund proposed to be appropriated in the bill, if apportioned throughout the States as the bill indicates, will result in nothing more than the expenditure of the money, in my judgment. If you want to accomplish industrial education or vocational education, whatever you may please to term it, you will have to establish educational plants along the lines that you propose to teach, where you will have a complete plant, where the boys and the girls may be educated from the ground up in the art of mechanics or whatever the line may be. You can not select a teacher here and there who can occasionally say to those under his jurisdiction, "You ought to train your minds along certain lines"; but, Mr. Chairman, you must teach the hand to work with the mind if you expect the coming generations to be proficient in the different callings in which they may be required to exercise their abilities and energies. I recall very well several years ago that boys learning different lines in the building trades learned only to use the tools of the trade. They were experts in the use of the tools, but they knew nothing whatever about what the material they were shaping with the tools was intended to be used for after they were through with it. So a few of us who were engaged in the building trades organized a trade school, and we maintained the trade school at our own expense in our State.

We compelled every apprentice boy indentured to a trade in the building line to attend this trade school for three months every year, and there we taught those boys mechanical drafting, we taught them all of the complicated questions connected with the building art. They were learning how to use the tools at their work, but they knew nothing whatever about the place the material they were making had in the building which was to be erected. They knew nothing whatever about how to measure tensile strength, they knew nothing about carrying loads or the weight of material and the character of construction that was required to make the building safe. We taught them that, and we compelled every man who employed an apprentice to send his apprentice boys to the school and to pay their full compensation during the period of their attendance at the school. Later on the State of Illinois took over this school, and the State of Illinois is to-day conducting this school. We are educating men in the building arts at the expense of the State of Illinois, and we are educating men and women in the art of agriculture at the expense of the State of Illinois. We are going to continue to do that. If the Government of the United States, through any appropriations that may be made by Congress, expects to accomplish any results, you are bound to consider the question of a complete plant in which every branch of the trade sought to be taught to the children who attend the schools can be displayed to their minds. You must teach them how to handle tools; you must teach them how to use their brains; you must teach them how the things they make are to be applied, and that is something you can not do in the ordinary school.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. COX. The gentleman's talk is very interesting. Did these boys who are taught the primary work in the building industry learn that in private establishments?

Mr. MADDEN. They learn the primary work in the private establishments, but they are compelled to attend school while learning it, and the man who employs them as apprentices is compelled to pay them their salaries while they are at the school.

Mr. COX. They get their practical work in the private establishments?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. COX. And while doing that work they are compelled to go to school?

Mr. MADDEN. They are required to go to school for three months in every year.

Mr. COX. How old were these pupils?

Mr. MADDEN. They can not begin to learn the trade until they are about 14 or 15 years of age, and they are required to serve four years before they can be graduated.

Mr. COX. And they must continue in that school for three months during all of the four years?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY. Some years ago in our State we determined to teach agriculture, and we were up to the question of whether we should establish separate schools such as the gentleman speaks of or whether we should conduct the work in conjunction with existing high schools. After canvassing the situation pretty thoroughly we decided upon the latter course and have established some 30 or 40 agricultural schools in Michigan in connection with high schools. And, if the gentleman's time is not too limited, I would like to tell him how that worked.

Mr. MADDEN. I would be very glad to hear it.

Mr. KELLEY. The State pays half the expense in conducting those schools in connection with high schools and the district pays the other half. The teacher is supplied from the agricultural college. Now, in the spring the classes in agriculture are taken out into the surrounding country and they study orchards; they study the crops during the various seasons, also animal industry, soil, and everything that pertains to farming. And the system has worked out most satisfactorily. And at the same expense we are educating in Michigan probably thirty or forty times as many young men as farmers as in Wisconsin, where they have adopted the other plan, that of having separate institutions.

Mr. MADDEN. They likely could do that with agriculture, because the farms are adjacent to the country schools, but you can not do it if you are going to educate a man as a machinist or a stonecutter or carpenter, or for any other trade, because you have not the plants.

Mr. KELLEY. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KELLEY. Not very far from your city of Chicago is the city of Gary, where they connect the public schools with the industries of the city, and as a part of the regular course of instruction in the high schools boys work a certain number of hours in the factories of the city. Why could not that plan be adopted everywhere?

Mr. MADDEN. They can work at a certain trade where they have a factory, but the thing is to realize before you take this money out of the Public Treasury that you are not going to accomplish the object for which you are making the appropriation unless you adopt some different method than the one proposed in the bill.

Now, I am for the bill, but I am largely for it as a matter of sentiment, and not because my judgment dictates that the plan is wise. The gentleman is an educator, a prominent one, distinguished in his State and in the Nation, and recognized as one of the leading educators of the country; but quite as distinguished men as he have appealed to me to vote for this bill and advocate its adoption, men from my own State, and when I asked them the reason why they were for the bill they said that it would bring $2,700,000 to the State of Illinois. I said, "If you want to get my vote for the bill and my assistance to enact it into law, you have got to appeal to my brain and not to my avarice, for, after all, Illinois is able to educate its own children, and for every dollar that Illinois gets out of the Treasury under this bill she will pay $20 in. We are paying the bills to maintain the Government of the United States, and there is not any inducement whatever to the State of Illinois and States like that to pay $20 in order to get $1 out; and we are able to do the work ourselves." However, if the bill will in the least particular advance the cause of education, or make for greater efficiency among our future citizens, or the better qualify them to successfully compete in the struggle for supremacy, or add to the prestige of the country, or prepare it to meet the competition of other nations in the race of life, I am in favor of its enactment into law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I doubted at one time whether I would be able to attend the session of the House to-day on account of my health, but I have always entertained a desire to do something to pass the pending bill. We have had it up frequently in the House and in the Senate, but owing to a disagreement on the part of the two Houses were compelled to delay final action by sending it to a commission. It is not what I would like to have. It is not all we need, but it is a beginning; it is an entering wedge on what I consider one of the greatest pieces of meritorious legislation ever submitted to the American Congress. It only carries an appropriation of thirty-odd millions of dollars over a term of years. It really ought to be at least $30,000,000 for the first year instead of $500,000.

The people of this country are going to demand of Congress and those who are elected to serve them that they shall go into the question of national aid in the construction of public roads thoroughly, and hand in hand with that they are going to demand that of the immense amount of money collected from the taxpayers and disbursed through appropriation bills that every boy and girl of this country shall have an opportunity to be educated not in a 5 or 6 months' school but in a 9 or 10 months' school, by competent teachers justly and adequately paid.

I have always regretted as a southern man that certain leaders of the South in Congress, when that great Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Blair, proposed national aid for education, did not pass his bill. They objected to it on the line of being a violation of the Constitution and in conflict with the rights of the States. Had that measure become a law thirty-odd years ago the South, where the great bulk of the illiteracy of the country existed, would have been educationally cleared up.

Now, Europe will be prepared at the end of the present war along vocational lines. I received a few days ago in the mail an illustrated book mailed in London, England, showing the pictures of the women, girls, and boys who have been trained industrially in the various manufacturing plants of England. If we are going to seriously enter upon the question of preparedness in this country, let us begin by educating our children [applause] not only in the public schools, but let us go far to equip them with a vocational or practical education in the right way. It would be the greatest blessing and good we could confer upon the American people, and would be of great and lasting benefit to the Republic. We would get more for the dollars we would spend in that way than if invested in any other way.

Now, I want to commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES], in charge of this bill. This measure, I am sure, is not all he would like to have it. He has had to contend with the Senate committee, and we have all been here long enough to know that in proposed legislation, where there is conflict of opinion, we must concede and compromise; but I want to commend him for his hard, efficient, and zealous work, and at the same time I want to say that the State of Georgia never committed a greater mistake than in not returning him to Congress. Had his reelection been submitted to a vote of this House, in my opinion there would not have been a dissenting voice. He would have been the choice of every Democratic and every Republican Member. [Applause.]

While I have served in this House eight years, I would rather go out of it with my name as the author of a vocational education bill than anything else to my credit.

I commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] for the splendid work he has done not only for his district and State and the South but for the entire country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not want anything that I may say regarding this bill to be construed as opposition on my part, for I shall be pleased to vote for the measure when the time comes. I am frank to say, however, that I shall vote for it with many misgivings. I have grave doubts as to the accomplishments of its practical operation and as to whether much that is promised will be performed.

I was greatly impressed with the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] to the effect that the duty of education belongs either to the General Government or to the State government, that it did not nor could not belong to both. I have frequently wondered during my service in this body as to where the demands for Federal aid will ultimately lead us. In the last year I have witnessed the appropriation of money for the relief of the flood sufferers in the Mississippi Valley, for combating the citrus-fruit canker, for the construction and maintenance of good roads, and now, at last, for education. The purpose in each instance was primarily a State duty, a State obligation. I have sometimes wondered, if the States are determined to shirk their obligations and their duties and are determined to depend upon the National Government for their performance, if in the evolution of the hurrying years the General Government will not say to the States, "If we must bear the burden of your obligations; if we must perform your duties; if you are determined that the General Government is to assume all of these, then to the extent of such assumption we will take of your sovereignty."

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. REAVIS. In just a moment. I find many Members talking loudly of State rights who are silent on State duties. These Members are breaking down State sovereignty. In all of these Federal-aid propositions the General Government is slowly, insidiously encroaching on the powers of the State. In the good-roads bill we have the provision relating to the Federal Government's supervision and maintenance of the road after construction.

The evil of that is not in the supervision of the road. The evil of it is the encroachment of the General Government upon the sovereignty of the States. In this bill we find in some measure a Federal board supervising the educational facilities within the States. Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. The Federal board initiates nothing in this bill, but simply approves of plans to be initiated by the various States, and, second, no State can get a dollar from the Federal Government without matching it with the dollar that the State furnishes. That is cooperation, and not gratuity.

Mr. REAVIS. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the object of this bill is for the General Government to offer a financial consideration to the States for performing a manifest duty. In only nine States, as we are informed, has vocational education been inaugurated. We are now offering not only to those States, but to the rest of the States of this Union as well, a financial consideration as an inducement to them to educate their children. We are by this bill saying to them, in effect, "If you will perform your duty you shall have this money, otherwise you shall not." It is true that the plan is to be formulated by the State boards, but the plan as formulated by the State boards can not be acted upon without the approval of the Federal board, so that in the last analysis you will have the General Government taking over the sovereignty of the States with respect to the education of the children within the States. I think I can see as a part of the philosophy of this movement for Federal aid—it may not come in your time or mine, but it will come sometime if the present tendency be continued—when the State will retain only that portion of its sovereignty which it demonstrates it can perform better than the National Government, and in the survival of the fittest, the National Government, if this process keeps on, will eventually take over those duties and obligations and sovereignties of the States which it can perform better than the States themselves.

I think it but wise that we consider which way we travel, that we may in some measure learn of our probable destination.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, am I encroaching upon the time that has been allotted?

Mr. CANNON. Go ahead.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Illinois has some time.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is entitled to five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. I understand that 10 minutes remain.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. There remain 10 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask unanimous consent for five minutes, not to interfere with the time allotted?

Mr. HUGHES. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, while we are philosophizing touching these matters, I should like to indulge in just a few moments more of discussion. I have been very much impressed with the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] and the way in which he points out the danger of the encroachment of Federal power. If I may be permitted to make this observation, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that all the encroachments of Federal power since the War of Secession have been made through the use of the taxing power of the Federal Government, and the reason for it is this: The citizen has not known when he paid his Federal taxes. The system of taxation has been indirect, rather than direct. The State taxation has been direct. The citizen has known when he paid his State taxes, because he went to the collector's office and he took the cash from his pocket, he paid it over, and he obtained only a tax receipt in return. He has not known when he paid his Federal taxes, because of the indirect system of taxation. The hand of the tax gatherer was hidden. The natural result has been—a perfectly natural result—that the State legislative bodies have hesitated to appropriate moneys for those things for which they probably should have appropriated money, and so there has come a demand upon the Congresses to make appropriations for things for which the States themselves should have appropriated. I believe gentlemen who have studied the history of taxation in this country and the development of the institutions of this country within the last 40 years will agree that that statement is correct.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I will; certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. How will my friend from Tennessee reconcile the fact that up until the last four or five years the States were increasing their taxation very much more, proportionately, than the National Government was?

Mr. GARRETT. Well, I do not agree with the fact stated by the gentleman.

Mr. TOWNER. I can not give the gentleman the exact figures, but I think the gentleman will find that within the last quarter of a century, up until the time these extraordinary expenditures for preparedness, and so forth, were imposed upon the Federal Government, the increase of State taxes was very much more, proportionately, than the increase of national taxation. I will say that in very many of the States of the Union now it is five or six times per capita greater than the amount of the national taxes.

Mr. GARRETT. To that State, or taking the country as a whole?

Mr. TOWNER. To that State. Not all the States have made a like increase, of course.

Mr. GARRETT. I shall not quarrel with the figures presented by the gentleman. He is doubtless more familiar with them than I am; but I do undertake to say that during the 12 years I have been in the House of Representatives there has been this constant pressure upon Congress continuously to take care of things that ought to have been taken care of in the States themselves. I think that will increase. I do not anticipate that we shall learn economy here until the Federal Government goes to a basic system of direct taxation. When it does reach that point, then there will be economy in the Federal expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PAGE of North Carolina). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to trespass upon the time of the House, but may I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for 5 minutes more, not to be taken from the 30 minutes agreed upon for debate upon this section. Is there objection?

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object to this request, but I wish to give notice that at the conclusion of the gentleman's five minutes I shall have to object to any further extensions.

Mr. GARRETT. The time for debate upon this section having been limited by motion, I withdraw my request.

Mr. CANNON. I think I am entitled to the other five minutes, and I will yield the remaining time, if I may, to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT. No; I will not take the time of the gentleman from Illinois. I withdraw my request.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. I agree with some of the things that they have said. Not having given much attention to this bill, I am trying to find out whether I am going to vote for it or not. As I have heard it discussed and have glanced over the report and over the bill I have wondered whether, if it be enacted, it will result in much good to the people whom we are trying to benefit, and that means all our people, the present and the coming generations. In many of our State governments we have too much machinery. We have too much machinery in Illinois. Think of it! As nearly as we can find out, 100 commissions, with separate jurisdictions, with secretaries and employees, and all kinds of expenditures. Our expenditures in Illinois are climbing and climbing. I hope and believe there will be a reform there in the way of lessening expenditures and giving better service. It is wonderful how we are progressing in the Federal Government, too, in the matter of personnel. I quite agree with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] and I sympathize with the fear expressed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. But what does this bill propose? It proposes cooperation with the States in the expenditure of a comparatively small amount of money, with the approval of the Federal Government. If this bill passes I apprehend that very little of the money that is provided to be appropriated from year to year will ever get to the 14 or 16 year old boys and girls. I apprehend that the Bureau of Education here will grow marvelously. I am not now speaking of any individual, but it is wonderful how machinery increases and what a grist it will grind when there is something paid for it. I say again, I doubt whether I shall vote for the bill. Oh, if you want me to express a desire that all people shall be educated practically, I have that desire; but there seems to be a great deal of sympathy for the farmer.

The farmer in Illinois does not need any sympathy. He has made his way. We have gone through much of effort and sometimes of suffering, but the farmer in Illinois—and I think generally, so far as I know in all the States, certainly in the Northern States—is better off than the other two-thirds of the population. The farmers constitute one-third. If you could put all of the other two-thirds of the people into a mixing machine and grind them all up together, including the magnates, the plutocrats, the college professors, the Socialists and the uplifters, the millionaires, and the business men of all kinds and thoroughly mix them so you could not distinguish one from another, you would find that the one-third of our population, the farmers, could give to either of the other two-thirds cards and spades from every standpoint, both in wealth and intelligence, and then win. So I resent somewhat this desire to be charitable to the farmer. He is able to take care of himself. That which costs nothing is not appreciated. We are getting much by direct taxation, when we could have gotten it just as well, without increasing the cost of living, by indirect taxation, the same as we have done in former years. [Applause on the Republican side.] But I do not intend to start an economic discussion or a discussion as to the proper method by which the money is to be raised at this time. I notice that we are getting great amounts of money from the income tax and the inheritance tax and other direct taxation, but we are keeping that taxation away from the multitude. When we took off the stamp tax in the last session of this Congress our honorable friend the majority leader [Mr. KITCHIN] said the stamp tax was not popular. I asked him why he did not refund it, and he said it would take too much bookkeeping to refund that which had already been paid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of cooperating with the States in paying the salaries of teachers of trade, home economics, and industrial subjects there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the use of the States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, the sum of $500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of $750,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of $1,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, the sum of $1,250,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, the sum of $1,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, the sum of $1,750,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, the sum of $2,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, the sum of $2,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, the sum of $3,000,000; and annually thereafter the sum of $3,000,000. Said sums shall be allotted to the States in the proportion which their urban population bears to the total urban population in the United

States, not including outlying possessions, according to the last preceding United States census: *Provided*, That the allotment of funds to any State shall be not less than a minimum of $5,000 for any fiscal year prior to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, nor less than $10,000 for any fiscal year thereafter, and of the sums herein authorized to be appropriated the following sums, or so much thereof as may be needed, shall be used for the purpose of providing the minimum allotment to the States provided for in this section: For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, the sum of $66,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of $46,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of $34,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, the sum of $28,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, the sum of $25,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, the sum of $22,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, the sum of $19,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, the sum of $56,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and annually thereafter the sum of $50,000.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Ohio a question which was suggested by the inquiry of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] some time ago as to whether this money could clearly be used for the payment of teachers who were engaged in teaching, for instance, home economics and other subjects. I call his attention to the language in section 9, which is:

That the appropriation for the salaries of teachers, supervisors, or directors of agricultural subjects and of teachers of trade, home economics, and industrial subjects shall be devoted exclusively to the payment of salaries of such teachers, supervisors, or directors having the minimum qualifications set up for the State by the State board, with the approval of the Federal board for vocational education.

Is not there really danger that a teacher who only gives a part of her time to these subjects would not come in under this provision, and would it not be made certain that she would by adopting the slight change of language which was suggested by the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. FESS. My own opinion is that section 9 does not exclude the right of a teacher who is teaching commerce, for example, to add to his teaching some such thing as provided for in this bill.

Mr. BENNET. I do not state dogmatically that it does. Of course, it does not affect the city that I have the honor in part to represent, because where we have a manual science teacher or any one of those teachers, he devotes his whole time and is supposed to be specialized, and in most cases he is. But it did seem to me that the bill ought not to keep the promise to the ear and break it to the hope of the rural community, but, of course, the gentleman is far more directly interested in that than I am.

Mr. FESS. Section 9 was written by the commission before the committee got hold of it, and it was to prevent the money from being expended for a purpose foreign to that of the bill, and that very point suggested by the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Wyoming was discussed, and it was thought that there was no embarrassment or confusion of any kind. If one school wanted to add a subject provided for in this bill that was not already in its course, if the State board would permit it, it would get the amount required. But that must be exclusively used for that teaching—the part they get from the Federal Government must be used for the exclusive purpose of teaching the additional subject.

Mr. BENNET. The gentleman may be right, but as I get older and more gray headed I realize the benefit of the maxim "safety first"; and, in view of the suggestion of the gentleman from Wyoming that the slight change of language would remove all doubt, it seems to me and I suggest to the gentleman whether it would not be worth while to return to the section and amend it.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. As to section 9, the only limitation is that the payment of the money must be to teachers who have the minimum qualifications set up by the State board.

Mr. BENNET. Yes; I read that.

Mr. MANN. That is what the gentleman read, and I do not see how he makes any application further.

Mr. BENNET. It seemed to me that the language, taken in connection with section 3, some State controller might raise a doubt. I am not offering an amendment. I am not dogmatic about it.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether they may get a crazy State controller somewhere, but I do not think any gentleman who reads this language would so construe it, and there is no better interpreter of the English language than the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BENNET. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the question raised by the gentleman from New York, and I am going to tell one or two things that I saw during the vacation which, I think, have some pertinence and application here, and I will ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] how under such circumstances these features would be affected by the proposed legislation?

During the vacation, not being very much engaged in active politics—my Republican opponent having been put to sleep early [laughter]—I was invited to visit some of the schools in my home town of San Antonio. First I visited a negro school, one of the most efficient and best conducted schools that I ever saw in my life, an immensely better school than I ever had the privilege of attending in my youth, which was during that period in the history of the South when we had comparatively few and usually inefficient schools. This particular school was a public school of the city of San Antonio. One of the most important features of its work, perhaps the most important, was the teaching of what is called domestic science—cookery, and so forth, and I was served with a wonderfully fine luncheon cooked by the pupils—including dressmaking and things of that kind, and carpentering and blacksmithing. My information was that these things were taught by teachers who also taught other things.

In another school, the great central high school, I saw immense shops for carpenters and smiths, and they were making all the school furniture. They were doing all kinds of work like that, and doing it admirably; and so efficiently and rapidly did they do it that the superintendent of schools of the city told me that he had some doubt of the wisdom of the policy, because, he said, the boys became efficient so soon, and so very efficient, that their services were sought for in the industries of San Antonio, and that they were tempted to abandon their ordinary scholastic pursuits by the high wages offered.

Now, I would like to know of the gentleman from Ohio or the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the committee, whether unless this fund, if it shall be appropriated, is turned over to the State educational authorities to be distributed in their judgment, the teachers engaged in teaching grammar, reading, writing, and things of that kind, who also are capable of teaching and engaging in the work of teaching other things provided for in this bill, will be cut off from any benefit from this fund? Will there be any doubt about the right to pay part of their salaries from this fund?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] that, in my judgment, there will be no doubt. The bill provides that in order for a State to receive the money the State must provide for the plant.

Mr. SLAYDEN. We have already provided these particular plants the gentleman apparently has in mind.

Mr. FESS. And the State board or other authority must provide for a minimum qualification of teachers.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I heard the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois upon that point, which were somewhat reassuring.

Mr. FESS. And third, they must provide also for expenditure that is to be fixed as a minimum, and all of this is to be submitted to the Federal board, and if the Federal board approves of it the money can go for that particular purpose. I see no reason at all why the case the gentleman speaks of is not covered by the bill.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does not the gentleman appreciate the fact that vocational training is being very generally adopted and rapidly made a more important part of the school curriculum everywhere?

Mr. FESS. I have just looked through the vocational commission report. There are nine States that by law provide for vocational training, but there are cities upon cities that have done it without reference to the State authorities, so that if the gentleman would ask me how many cities or localities have taken it on, I could answer that they are very numerous, though there are only nine States that have done it by law.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I know from personal observation that the country schools are doing it in Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, at the end of section 3, adding the following:

"That not more than 20 per cent of the money authorized to be appropriated under this act for the payment of salaries of teachers of trades, home economics, and industrial subjects for any year shall be expended for the salaries of teachers of home-economics subjects."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment be adopted, and I understand that it is acceptable to the members of the committee, not more than 20 per cent of the aid provided for in this section can be expended in the payment of salaries of teachers of home-economics subjects.

As the language in the bill now reads, without this limitation I am satisfied that a great many States would be able to receive all of the money provided for in this section without any new activities whatever upon the part of those States, and the whole purpose of the bill is to stimulate the States into doing those things which are not being done now, or, if done, not properly done, in order that they may provide a practical system of vocational education. This amendment will at least insure that 80 per cent of this fund will be used for subjects other than home economics subjects. I am a good deal in sympathy with the view of the gentleman from New York, Mr. PLATT, that home economics ought not to have been in the bill at all, so far as providing for the payment of the salaries of teachers is concerned.

Mr. FESS. It was not in the original bill.

Mr. LENROOT. It was not in the original bill, and it is not in the Senate bill for which this is a substitute. I say this not because I feel less interested in the subject of home economics than any other Member, but in my judgment the subject of home economics should be a part of the general educational system of the country. It ought to be a part of the curriculum of every school. Every girl, irrespective of what vocation she may ultimately follow, ought to be taught home economics, and the whole idea and object of this bill is to provide a vocational education. But it is in the bill, and I realize very well that many Members may not appreciate as I do or feel as I do concerning the incorporation of home economics in this bill. As I said a moment ago, this limitation of 20 per cent will at least insure 80 per cent of the fund to be used for new activities upon the part of the States, rather than merely an aid to the States in bearing the burdens they now bear and that they ought to bear.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a Congress met here at the beginning of the Civil War, a Congress that was confronted with some very difficult problems, which have probably not been equaled since then, and yet that Congress passed a law providing for the creation of agricultural and industrial colleges and making an appropriation amounting to $15,000 a year for each of the States for agricultural experiment stations. We carry now in the Agricultural appropriation bill every year, without opposition, an appropriation of more than $3,000,000 under the heading of States Relations Service, about half of which goes to the agricultural experiment stations to aid in education. I make profert of myself as evidence—not too proud of it—of what the agricultural colleges, the land-grant colleges, could do years ago. In the early days of those colleges I became a student at what is now called the University of Illinois, and went there partly because my father was interested in such subjects, and partly, I imagine, because there was little if any tuition fee. I believe they have done a great good. The appropriation in the course of these many years has been somewhat increased, and yet it is not exorbitant to-day. While the General Government makes some appropriation for this class of education, it has not assumed the entire burden. The great increase in the cost of the agricultural colleges, the land-grant colleges, has come from the people of the States through the State treasuries and not out of the General Treasury. We have reached that point where most of the States now prohibit children from doing anything but loafing or going to school. They are not permitted as we were, when we were young—not only permitted, but required—to work, and we can not go on without providing that the children shall have the opportunity of learning how to do things. It is not difficult in this country to learn how to think, but it is difficult to learn how to do. I sometimes think that if we had fewer thinkers and more doers we would be just as well off; but when we can add thinking and doing together, that is where we reach the summit of education. [Applause.] That is the theory of vocational education, and as the General Government in the sixties started with its land-grant college provisions the vocational idea of giving the farmer a training, so now through this bill it proposes to encourage the idea of giving the boy and the girl the right to learn how to do things while thinking as well.

I welcome the day when we shall engage upon this wonderful undertaking. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, the enactment of this bill is in keeping with the progressive spirit of the age. Vocational training began on an extensive scale in this country in the schools some 20 years ago. It was difficult at that time to find a teacher who could teach vocational training. We have a State normal school in Kansas, located in Pittsburg, my home town, that trains over 1,000 teachers. There are over 1,000 students there now from Texas, from Vermont, from Maine, from California, from every State, almost, in the Union, taking vocational training, and they are trained to teach in the schools of the country—how to think and how to do at the same time. One school teaches girls not only how to find out how much three pounds of coffee will come to at 28 cents a pound, but teaches them how to make the coffee, which is just as important as to know how much it costs. It also teaches them how to take care of a sick baby and how to clean up a sick room. It teaches girls how to repair a chair, a sewing machine, or any piece of furniture in the house. It teaches the young men how to do things that will be necessary for them to do on the farm, as merchants, or mechanics. It teaches young men how to use their hands and their brains, so that they can become experts in the industries of the country. And, as stated here a moment ago by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], the difficulty is in keeping young men in the school long enough. They become so expert that the industries want them and want them at once, and they are taken out of the school before they have finished the course and before they have fully equipped themselves to become instructors. They get an offer of better wages than school-teachers are ordinarily given to go into some of the industries of the country because of the learning they have acquired in this vocational school. As teachers they get better salaries than other teachers. So, whatever this bill may be able to do to advance vocational training throughout the country will be for the great betterment of the people of the country in every vocation in life—farming, manufacturing, housekeeping, and every phase of life and every activity that administers to the comforts and happiness and prosperity of the people.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Excuse me. I thought the gentleman had finished.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If I have any more time, I will yield it to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]——

Mr. HUGHES. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for just a moment?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, we are exceedingly anxious that this bill should be absolutely perfected, and it is of vital importance that we should do it this afternoon. I move now——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I will not yield to the gentleman to make his motion in the midst of my five minutes. I know the gentleman does not want to impose a cloture rule on the House?

Mr. HUGHES. I do not, sir.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is one of the most courteous gentlemen in the House and would not close anyone out from a fair time for debate. I understand that is the gentleman's position. No one has opposed the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I desire to discuss it, because if it is adopted it would appear, providing we were to deal only with the education of girls, that 20 per cent of the pupils would be taught home economics, which means the development and the preservation of the home, and 80 per cent would be left free to be given instruction as to how to work in the mills. Carried out literally, that is what it would mean.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. Does not the gentleman know that vocational education in commerce is as much for the benefit of the girls as for the boys, and is not the operation of mills to-day quite as much for commerce as manufacturing?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That may be; but I doubt if the gentleman wants to limit the education of girls to several branches of industry to the prejudice of their education in properly conducting a home. I have some feeling on this subject, because I come from a mill district. If I had my way, I would not permit a girl to work in a mill. [Applause.] If 80 per cent of the girls who are to be taught under this paragraph are to be taught industrial trades, I am certainly against the proposition of the gentleman from Wisconsin that only 20 per cent of them shall be taught the useful life and occupation of conducting a home.

Now, why this amendment is offered I do not know. The committee seems to have yielded upon this proposition for some reason or other. Many of the girls of this country are being weaned away from the home life, which they ought to learn to respect, and encouraged to go into the mills, factories, and foundries, if you please, for the purpose of competing with men.

The industrial schools in Philadelphia have an honorable history. One of the best of them was organized by private contributions, but was compelled to abandon its work largely

because the students of that school could not obtain employment in the trades in which they became competent, because of union-labor regulations. And if we are to train girls to be mill workers, train them to compete with the men, take them away from the homes, make home life humiliating to them, why, then, perhaps, we had better adopt an amendment limiting the amount of teaching there shall be for those of our daughters whom we hope will be kept out of the mills, and who, contracting honorable marriages, may be able to manage a home rather than to depend upon somebody else in an apartment house or hotel to manage a home for them. I want to see the youth of this country properly educated on vocational lines. I want to see the boy master his job. I would like to see the housewife able to conduct the affairs of the home, and I would not confine her to the mill. Neither would I limit this public benefaction we are conferring upon the States, so that only 20 per cent of the young women would be able to manage a home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day I stated that there was a most unfortunate misapprehension upon the part of some Members of this House as to the purposes and objects of this bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has now revealed himself as being one of those Members who are under a total misapprehension of the purposes and objects of this bill. He does not seem to have gathered any of the principles that lie behind this bill.

Why, he talks of this amendment that I have proposed as proposing to educate only 20 per cent of the girls in home economics and compel 80 per cent of them to be educated for the mills. Why, if the gentleman would read this bill before he undertook to get up on the floor and debate it, he would furnish more information to the Members of the House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Apart from home ecomonics, which the gentleman would limit to 20 per cent, what else are these teachers to teach except trade and industrial subjects?

Mr. LENROOT. Trade and industrial subjects.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is all. Eighty per cent trade and industrial subjects and 20 per cent for domestic economics.

Mr. LENROOT. The purpose of this bill, as has been stated time and time again by Members on both sides on this floor, and the purpose revealed in the bill itself, if the gentleman will take the trouble to read it, is not that this money is to be used to furnish the education of these boys and girls, but to stimulate the States into doing for themselves what they ought to do; and this limitation is for this purpose: That where a State furnishes the home economic education, as my State is doing, and as I hope the gentleman's State is doing, there is no occasion for invoking aid from the Federal Government where the State is doing it for itself.

But let us see what the gentleman's position would lead him to. He desires no limitation. That means that every dollar provided by this bill could be drawn from the Treasury and used in a State for home economics alone. That would mean that in the State of Pennsylvania they could draw all this money for the purpose of educating girls alone in home economics and deprive the girls and boys of the gentleman's district in Philadelphia of the privilege of receiving a vocational education in training and industry.

The purpose of this amendment is to make this bill do that which it is intended to do—to stimulate the States into doing those things which the States either are not doing now at all or are not doing in such a way as to provide practical vocational training for the boys and girls of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the question of home economics was fully considered by the President's commission in three months' study, and our information was that home economics was being very well cared for in almost every State and in almost every city of the country. The question immediately arose that if you were to appropriate for that particular subject, every school would get a portion of it and there would certainly not be money to go to any one school large enough in its sum to amount to anything. Consequently the commission's report omitted it entirely. The Senate bill omitted it. Our original bill omitted it. But in our committee the matter was taken up and the argument was pretty strongly pressed that we ought to recognize home-economics teaching as well as home-economic training. The committee had already recognized the latter; that is, money paid to institutions for the training of teachers, but not for the payment of salaries of teachers teaching these subjects. So that home economics was placed in the House bill, and is in the bill now.

The committee, I think, would agree to allowing it to be limited to 20 per cent along the line of what has been suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], not because there is any opposition to home economics; furthest from it. There are 12,000,000 boys and girls between the ages of 14 and 16 that are in the agricultural field to-day. There are 12,660,000, to be exact. There are 14,250,000 that are in urban life; in the rural population a little less than in the urban population. There was no provision for home economics in the agricultural appropriation of $3,000,000. There is a provision for home economics in the trade and industrial lines.

Now, if we devote all of the $3,000,000 to agriculture, that will go to one class of our population engaged in one thing. If we devote the $3,000,000 to urban population, it will be divided among home economics and trade schools and industrial schools which are not equivalent to trade schools. We ought to make a distinction between those, and in that way it would seem to me that probably, unless we limit the amount for home economics, there might be some misfortune that we do not want admitted into the bill. Personally—and I think I can speak for the members of the committee—we would be willing to vote for a limitation upon the amount to go to this particular fund, and I shall vote for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] a question.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the committee, I accept the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MADDEN. I was wondering whether, from the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio, he was endeavoring to impress the House with the fact that the expenditures under the authorization in this bill would be made in segregated institutions such as I described when I was talking on the bill.

Mr. FESS. That would have to be left entirely with your State board.

Mr. MADDEN. The only conclusion I could reach from what the gentleman said was that he believed in having special plants created for the teaching of special lines of instruction.

Mr. FESS. The bill provides that the State board must submit all plans, and must establish a plant by State expenditure, and that plan and plant must be approved by the Federal board.

Mr. HUGHES rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I move that all debate on this section and amendments thereto be closed.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. One moment. There has been no action taken upon the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I do not think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] can pass an amendment by merely accepting it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 60, noes 7.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: Page 6, line 2, after the words "$50,000," strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following:

"*Provided*, That the words 'industrial subjects' when used in this act shall include cooperative credit and business."

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate upon this amendment be limited to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment be limited to 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BENNET. Reserving the right to object, I have an amendment that I should like to offer, and to discuss for a few moments.

The CHAIRMAN. This request is as to the pending amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, judging from the fate which my amendment received this morning it is probable that this amendment will not carry, although I hope it will. This morning I was talking about the importance of cooperative credit among the farmers. Now, this section provides for the teaching of industrial subjects and the training of teachers to teach those subjects. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] seemed to think that my whole interest was in the farmers—that they should be provided with better credit—but that is not true. During the last few years we have been studying better credit facilities, especially for the farmers; and I wish to say that the European countries have also provided cooperative credit institutions for persons engaged in industrial pursuits, for small dealers, for small traders, for small merchants, while in this country we have made no progress in that direction. Now, take our banks as a whole, if I remember correctly they have invested and loaned out about $20,000,000,000. One-half of that entire amount is loaned to the corporations of this country. This does not mean that I am attacking the corporations, but it does mean that the advantages of credit in our banks are used to make money for the corporations. That fact has been recognized in Europe, and hence European countries have provided cooperative credit societies, not only for the corporations and for the owners of farms, but also for the persons of small means in the towns and cities. The history of those institutions shows that they have contributed immensely to the advantage and benefit of the poor. I call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] to this matter. In the last few years, when we have been trying to provide better credit facilities for the farmers and the men who largely represent agricultural districts, what has been done by the gentleman from Pennsylvania or any other man representing a great city constituency to provide better credit facilities for the poor men in the great cities of our country? In the great cities of Europe there are special institutions through which men can purchase homes on terms and at a rate of interest not duplicated here in the United States.

Mr. DALLINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DALLINGER. I should like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if he is at all familiar with the work of the cooperative banks in Massachusetts and with the fact that thousands and tens of thousands of workmen have been able to obtain homes through them?

Mr. BENNET. Is the gentleman also familiar with the system in operation in New York by which a street car conductor can borrow the money to buy his uniform when he gets a job on a street car, and anybody else in a similar situation can do the same thing?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I am somewhat familiar with what both these gentlemen call attention to, and yet I know that in our great cities as a whole the poor man is without credit facilities. Our banks are loaning their money to the great corporations and the great merchants, and the man of small means does not have access to credit facilities, as he does in Europe.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that while we were giving $15,000,000 out of the Public Treasury to start farm-loan associations for the benefit of the farmer, we in the cities had already provided ourselves, out of our own funds, with building associations by which the workmen were obtaining homes in the cities?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. The building and loan associations are doing a great work——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thought the gentleman would recognize that they were.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. But it is comparatively insignificant compared to the great field that is open.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman know that we in the cities are paying the farmer the highest prices he has ever received for all that he produces?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield. I should like to know what bill the gentleman from Pennsylvania has presented——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The farmer is receiving now the highest prices for everything that he produces, from eggs to potatoes.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I am not now discussing the problems of the farmer. This amendment applies to cooperative credit for the millions in our great cities. There is a great field for the activities of both Federal and State authorities. In this bill we are appropriating many millions of dollars. We are entering a new field for the National Government. We should see to it that these funds are utilized in a way that will not only make the farmer and mechanic a larger producer of products in his line but will give both the farmer and mechanic greater profit on his labors. This will be done by promoting cooperation in business and credit among our farmers and wage earners throughout every section of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The debate is open to anyone who desires to oppose the amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] is the best friend of the Oklahoma farmer on this floor, with apologies, of course, to the other Representatives from Oklahoma. Next to them he takes the rag off the bush. He is for the farmer who is now "bleeding" because he can not get anything (?) for his cotton down in Oklahoma. The poor farmer down in Oklahoma, getting $100 a bale, is impoverished just now, because we do not give him a little more rural credit.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Wait a minute. My heart bleeds for the downtrodden farmer of Oklahoma. I have heard so much from my friend from Oklahoma that I feel I can sympathize with him from the very depths of my heart; but I want to tell the gentleman that we have been buying eggs lately up our way, and they have cost us as high as a dollar a dozen, and the farmer has been getting it, except the very little slice that the gentleman thinks goes to the middleman who builds the railroad to get the eggs up from Oklahoma, or from somewhere out in Kansas, so we can get them at a dollar a dozen in Philadelphia and New York.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Surely.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I want to ask what the gentleman has done in this Congress, we will say, in an effort to provide better facilities for the laboring men and the small business men of his State with better credit?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have tried hard to have a few canals built to improve transportation [laughter] in order that the laboring man might have work and the farmer facilities for getting his crops to the market, but at such times the gentleman from Oklahoma could not see anything but the Oklahoma farmer, who seems to keep himself within the confines of his own State. I want communication with Texas and with Oklahoma, and if we can not get it by rail I want it by water. I know if we get it by water we will keep hundreds and thousands of people employed in the transportation business, which is a middleman's business, so that the farmer can get higher prices for his cotton and eggs. [Laughter.] Why, a little talk of this kind is educational. This is an educational vocation bill, and the farmers, those who support this bill, want to limit the right of the teachers who are to be paid out of the Public Treasury to educate their children in home economics; they want them taught a higher form of college art—to trip the light fantastic toe, and let the mothers and fathers do the work. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Certainly; any gentleman from Oklahoma is welcome now. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERRIS. I want to know if the gentleman in his generosity would bring his interoceanic canal to Oklahoma.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; if I could get in, but it takes all our money to help the gentleman from Oklahoma irrigate farms of 40 acres, at $7,500 per farm, whereas if we had a small proportion of the sum the gentleman gets for his semi-arid farms we could take care of most of his population in two counties in New Jersey.

Mr. FERRIS. I want to say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not get my support for his interoceanic canal.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have always supported the gentleman in his arid-land schemes, and I observe the gentleman always takes the public money for that purpose and always does it in the name of the farmer, without regard to the fact that he is making the farmer pay the taxes; but the farmer is making so much money now that by and by the income tax will reach him as it reaches Carnegie and Rockefeller. From the reports I have here the farmers of the West are making barrels of money, while in the East we are paying European-war prices for everything we eat. The "downtrodden farmer" is buying his fine limousines, with which he goes to church and the moving-picture shows just now. He is having a most delightful time in the gentleman's country and my people are paying the bill. Sometimes when I get up and call attention to these facts the gentleman from Oklahoma rises and wants to know what we

have done in the city to relieve the situation. We have at least tried to call attention to the fact that the farmer is getting it all. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out all of the section after the word "census," line 3, on page 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York proposes an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 5, by striking out the proviso beginning after the word "census" down to and including line 2, on page 6.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be closed in 10 minutes.

Mr. BENNET. I object. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the purpose of this proviso, it is to make it possible that States that do not earn the minimum under this bill by their own contribution, or who are not entitled to it by population, either rural or urban, shall nevertheless get the minimum sum. It strikes me that that is unfair. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] awhile ago started a very scholarly speech—and he was scholarly all the while he talked and some time he will conclude it—but he called attention to the change of situation that some day Congress must take into account. The wealthy States are now contributing all out of proportion to the population, and receiving from the National Treasury sometimes up to the proportion of their population but not always.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Does not the gentleman realize that the prosperity of New York, the great metropolis, is founded not alone upon the local business of New York but the general prosperity of the country?

Mr. BENNET. The gentleman from Missouri has made the next sentence in my speech. I think I might have made it just as well. I agree with him. We are all one country, and Oklahoma can not prosper unless New York does, and New York can not prosper unless Oklahoma does. I recognize the propriety of taxing wealth, even though that wealth happens to be in the State which I in part represent.

But I am certain of this fact, not in connection with this particular bill so much, that if taxation continues to be ingeniously added to the wealth and spread out as little as possible over population there will come a time when the old spirit of our forefathers that rebelled against taxation without representation will rebel again—this time against unequal taxation. I do not object because States which contribute less are under this bill getting just as much per person for rural and urban education as is New York. It would be grotesque to insist that because New York happens to contribute six or eight times as much per capita as some States to the National Treasury her children in the rural communities should receive six times the per capita for education that the children of the other States do; but it does seem to me that the large contributing States have a legitimate objection to the provision that States which do not either by population or by their own contributions make themselves eligible to receive the sums stipulated in this bill, shall receive them, nevertheless, as a minimum, simply because Congress wants to give them to them.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The principle upon which the minimum requirement is written is that if you do not make a contribution of a certain size it will be too small other than to be just frittered away. The rural population of Wyoming is two-tenths of 1 per cent of the rural population of the United States, and under the provision of allotment it would get about $1,050. The $1,050 appropriated to Wyoming for any purpose of education would be so small that it would be frittered away, and it ought to receive at least $5,000 or nothing. Its industrial population is only one-tenth of 1 per cent. There are 4 States which would be beneficiaries in industrial matters and 16 States in agricultural matters, and that is why that minimum provision was inserted.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, this bill, on the whole, is so fairly drawn that the particular amounts mentioned in it really amount to very little. It was not to them especially that I was addressing myself; but, if I may use the phrase, I was indulging in a little bit of a look into the future. As my days here are numbered, I wish to leave my contribution toward the problem that those of you who will succeed me in the Sixty-fifth and other Congresses will have to face. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] will have to face it, as will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], and so on, in the large contributing States on which are being piled yearly and on which in this Congress will be piled additional burdens of taxation—not according to the population, but according to their wealth. They will, sooner or later, have to face a feeling among the constituencies which elect them that if a certain proportion of the taxation comes from their States, then a certain proportion of the moneys put out in this way ought to go back to those States. I do not think that feeling is entirely fair, but I think it is the part of proper statesmanship to recognize now that the danger of that feeling does exist.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET. I think it is the part of proper statesmanship at the earliest moment when this new system of direct taxation is novel among us to be facing the problems that that system is going to bring about.

Right in connection with that I want to say a word or two about the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN], who asked those of us from the city what we have done to enlarge the credit facilities of the people in the cities. We have not done anything in the Sixty-fourth Congress, because there is no place on the face of the footstool where the credit facilities of the poor man are better than in the large cities. We do not believe in creating Government enterprises to do that which is already well done by private enterprise. I will tell you what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] and I could do to-morrow morning, and he and I are possibly about the same age—both of us over 40. We could land in New York City to-morrow morning, and with not 1 cent in the world we could go to the Bowery Young Men's Christian Association, where we could be trusted in the beginning with more credit than we would be entitled to according to our visible wealth if we had no money. We could be trusted from the beginning for our food and shelter, and in addition that institution would undertake the contract of finding employment for us suitable to what we could do. I speak now of the case of the very poorest man. Supposing we got what we could get, a job on the elevated railroad or the subway, we could go to the Morris Plan Bank in New York City, and we could get the money to buy the uniform that would be necessary, and then go right back there to that Young Men's Christian Association in the Bowery, and they would continue to trust us, at least for our board and shelter, until the first pay day. If we were mechanics and had tools, we could make arrangements by which we could retain our tools, and the Provident Loan Association would loan us money upon the apparent credit caused by the fact that we had tools. If we were merchants in a small way and needed as small a sum as $50, there are at least a half dozen State banks in the city of New York, which under our State law have local branches in the different sections of the city which would be glad to loan us seventy-five or fifty or one hundred dollars to carry on our little business.

In a big city a man who has character and willingness to work and ability to work never has to complain of the lack of proper means of credit up to the amount of credit that he ought to have. That is the reason why we have not done anything in this Congress, and why the Representatives from the city will not do anything in the Sixty-fifth or the Sixty-sixth or the Sixty-seventh Congress or thereafter. The large cities have facilities such as I have described. Take the smaller towns in the States like Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, and New York. Let us take the case of a brakeman on a railroad and let us suppose that he saves up $150. With that he can buy a lot in a city up to as large as 10,000 inhabitants, and with nothing in the world but that $150 lot and his job he can go to the building and loan association and borrow money at 5 per cent with which to build his entire house, and have 14 years in which to pay it back.

I have indicated only one place where the gentleman and I, if penniless, could nevertheless immediately obtain more credit than our financial condition really warranted.

There are many such. If we were Hebrews, we could go to the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society or the Young Men's Hebrew Association or the Hebrew Sheltering Home of Harlem.

Protestant Christians, as we are, we could nevertheless go to the Hebrew Free Loan Association and obtain a small loan, without interest, for the association makes loans to all creeds

and races among the poor, and always without interest, because the law of Moses says (Exodus xxii: 25):

If thou lend money to any of my people that is poor by thee, thou shalt not be to him as an usurer; neither shalt thou lay upon him usury.

"Usury" is used here in the ancient sense and is synonymous with "interest." There is no place where credit for those who have character, but no assets, is so easy to obtain as in a large city. The feelings of those in smaller communities are as kindly, but their impulses are unorganized. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] seems surprised that the banks loan large sums principally to rich people. They do this because rich people can repay large loans and give good security. No sound system of banking has yet been devised by which large sums of money can be safely and profitably loaned to irresponsible people. But the poor man in a large city can borrow far more money than his financial standing alone would permit and far more than any properly conducted Government enterprise ought ever to be permitted to loan him.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves that all debate on this section and amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET].

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the amendment, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That for the purpose of cooperating with the States in preparing teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects and teachers of trade and industrial and home economics subjects there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, for the use of the States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, the sum of $500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of $700,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of $900,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and annually thereafter, the sum of $1,000,000. Said sums shall be allotted to the States in the proportion which their population bears to the total population of the United States, not including outlying possessions, according to the last preceding United States census: *Provided*, That the allotment of funds to any State shall be not less than a minimum of $5,000 for any fiscal year prior to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, nor less than $10,000 for any fiscal year thereafter. And of the sums herein authorized to be appropriated the following sums, or so much thereof as may be needed, shall be used for the purpose of providing the minimum allotment provided for in this section: For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, the sum of $46,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of $32,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of $24,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and annually thereafter, the sum of $90,000.

Mr. POWERS and Mr. WALSH rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky, a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWERS: On page 6, line 4, strike out the word "preparing" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "paying the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors engaged in training."

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported last February. The committee intended to get together and run over any amendment which any member of the committee might want to offer, but we had no opportunity to do that. Since the report of the committee on this bill certain objections have reached me as to the word "preparing." Section 2 of the bill is predicated upon the theory of appropriating $3,000,000 a year after 1925 for the purpose of paying the salaries of teachers to teach agricultural subjects. Section 3 of the bill is predicated upon the theory of paying $3,000,000 annually after 1925 for the purpose of paying the salaries of teachers to teach trade and home economic subjects. Section 4 of the bill, the one to which I offer my amendment, is predicated upon a little bit different theory from either section 2 or section 3. Section 4 provides that the Federal Government shall expend $1,000,000 a year after the year 1920, I believe it is, for the purpose of paying the salaries of teachers to teach or to train people how to teach these various subjects—agriculture, home economics, and industrial subjects. The purpose of this bill is that the $1,000,000 shall be expended in paying the salaries of teachers to train other teachers to teach these subjects. The objection has been raised that if the word "preparing" is left in the bill the normal schools of the country will largely take over this entire fund. Now, there is no purpose on the part of the committee or any member of it to deprive the normal schools of their full share of this fund, but my amendment provides that this $1,000,000 a year shall go to paying the salaries of teachers in training these various folks to teach these various subjects. The word "prepare" means to equip, to fit out, to provide with whatever is appropriate and necessary; that covers more ground and includes many for which this money ought not to be expended. My amendment does not change the purposes of the bill as it has been framed by the committee, but it makes sure that this money shall be used for the purpose for which it was intended.

Mr. HUGHES and Mr. WALSH rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES], the chairman of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that the committee has carefully considered this bill line by line and section by section, and we have agreed that the word "preparing" is a proper one.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the section and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves that all debate on the section and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate upon this measure and am led to the conclusion that a Federal appropriation is a wonderfully efficacious thing to furnish stimulation to the States.

Now, the matter of education is a duty that either rests upon the State or it does not rest upon the State. If there is a demand that the youth of the land be educated along vocational lines that demand should be sufficient to force the States to take care of and provide that sort of education. If an appropriation such as this is justified, and if legislation of this sort is warranted, when coupled with an appropriation, then we here would be warranted in passing a bill saying to the States, "You shall furnish this education, although we make no appropriation therefor." And if there is need for this stimulation, I say, Congress ought to pass a law requiring every State within the Union to furnish this sort of legislation at their own expense, at least that is the way this scheme ought to be inaugurated.

Already nine States, we have been told, have embarked upon this program, and if nine States can do that, paying the expense out of their own treasury, why can not all States in the Union adopt that same program?

The proper way, I submit, for a project of this sort to be handled would be for the Nation to create and establish a national university or a series of universities which would be under distinct Federal control. But, it is said, we have embarked upon this policy in the road appropriation. Yes; we have, and I am credibly informed that one of the great enterprising States of the Middle West, through agitation in the newspapers, by the leading newspapers of that State, and by citizens interested in the subject within that State, will not probably undertake to cooperate with the Federal Government in the improvement of roads. And a spirit of resentment is going forth throughout that State because they realize it is an encroachment upon the powers and duties that belong distinctively to the Commonwealth, and such stimulation is not looked on with favor. And so I feel that I probably can not support this measure in this form. I believe that if nine States can do this without the wonderful stimulant of a Federal appropriation, the other States can see to it that they will do it. They say, "Oh, $1,500 will accomplish nothing for Wyoming; therefore we will make a minimum appropriation of $5,000." Yes; they sought to do that in the road bill by giving them a gratuity of $6,500, but after that bill came back to this body it was found that a change had been wrought in it. It was agreed to in the form in which it came here. There should at least be some equitable scheme devised whereby each State should receive its share, if it be justified, and that instead of stimulation with Federal funds we might well enact a compulsory statute minus the appropriation, which will in no certain terms bring the States to a realization of their duty in this respect. What a spectacle is presented when States will brazenly admit they neglect their duty in regard to educational matters, but are willing to fulfill them if Uncle Sam will help bear the expense.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That in order to secure the benefits of the appropriations provided for in sections 2, 3, and 4 of this act, any State shall, through the legislative authority thereof, accept the provisions of this act and designate or create a State board, consisting of not less than three members, and having all necessary power to cooperate, as herein provided, with the Federal Board for Vocational Education in the ad-

ministration of the provisions of this act. The State board of education, or other board having charge of the administration of public education in the State, or any State board having charge of the administration of any kind of vocational education in the State may, if the State so elect, be designated as the State board, for the purposes of this act.

Any State may accept the benefits of any one or more of the respective funds herein authorized to be appropriated, and it may defer the acceptance of the benefits of any one or more of such funds, and shall be required to meet only the conditions relative to the fund or funds the benefits of which it has accepted: *Provided*, That after June 30, 1918, no State shall receive any appropriation for salaries of teachers, supervisors, or directors of agricultural subjects until it shall have taken advantage of at least the minimum amount appropriated for the training of teachers, supervisors, or directors of agricultural subjects, as provided for in this act, and that after said date no State shall receive any appropriation for the salaries of teachers of trade, home economics, and industrial subjects until it shall have taken advantage of at least the minimum amount appropriated for the training of teachers of trade, home economics, and industrial subjects, as provided for in this act.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 8, line 5, after the word "and," strike out the word "eighteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I wish to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. POWERS. I offered an amendment myself. I am a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is also a member of the committee. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky later.

Mr. POWERS. I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the Chair was not aware of the fact that I offered my amendment awhile ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances I will withdraw my amendment for the time being.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama withdraws his amendment temporarily, and the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. POWERS: Page 8, line 7, strike out the word "until" and substitute the word "unless," and on line 13 strike out the word "until" and substitute the word "unless."

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides that after June 30, 1920—I believe it has been so amended—"no State shall receive any appropriations for salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects until it shall have taken advantage at least of the minimum amount appropriated for the training of teachers." Now, that word "until" evidently ought to be "unless," and the same thing is true in the subsequent line 13.

If there is no opposition to it, I will say no more at this time and will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I see no objection whatever to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. POWERS. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky demands a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 22, noes 34.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] offers an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERCROMBIE: Page 7, line 12, after the word "designate" insert the words "the State department of education."

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, section 5 of the bill provides—

That in order to secure the benefits of the appropriations provided for in sections 2, 3, and 4 of this act, any State shall, through the legislative authority thereof, accept the provisions of this act and designate or create a State board, consisting of not less than three members, and having all necessary power to cooperate, as herein provided, with the Federal board of vocational education in the administration of the provisions of this act.

In the State of Alabama and some other States there is no State board of education. The public-school system is under the direction and supervision of a State officer, designated as the "superintendent of education." There is some doubt as to whether the Legislature of Alabama under its constitution would have the power to comply with this requirement.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. With pleasure.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask my colleague whether the extension of the time from 1918 to 1920 would not overcome the very obstacle or trouble of which he complains?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, the extension of the time from 1918 to 1920 would remove this obstacle if it were certain that our legislature has the power under its constitution to create a State board of education. We had a State board of education at one time, provided for in the constitution of the State. As a substitute for that board our constitutional conventions of 1875 and 1901 created a State department of education, to be under the direction of a State officer, known as the "superintent of education."

I offer this amendment, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in order that there may be no doubt that my State will be able to meet this requirement, and I trust that the committee will adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I got the full force of the amendment to line 12.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. The amendment which I offer, Mr. Chairman, provides that after the word "designate," in line 12, page 7, section 5, the words "the State department of education" be inserted. If this amendment should be adopted, the section would read as follows: "Any State shall, through the legislative authority thereof, accept the provisions of this act and designate the State department of education, or create a State board consisting of not less than three members and having all necessary power," and so forth.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I would like very much to meet the requirements of my friend from Alabama, but I think that changes entirely what the bill wants to do. We want to do this work through a State board. Now, in my own State we have not a State board of education, but we ought to have, and I feel that if Ohio will not meet the requirements by creating a State board of education, she will be honestly and worthily punished for not doing it, and I am speaking advisedly, because I know of the constitution in my State. I would like to keep the requirement that all of this fund must be apportioned and applied through the State board of education, and not through any particular individual who might be called the head of the State board.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Is it possible under your State constitution for your legislature to create a State board of education?

Mr. FESS. Without a doubt.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I am not certain that it is possible under our State constitution, in view of the fact that we at one time had a constitutional provision establishing a State board of education, for which we substituted a provision establishing a State department of education under the direction of a superintendent of education.

Mr. BORLAND. I should like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] a question.

Mr. FESS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BORLAND. What virtue is there in administration by a board greater than in administration by a State educational department or superintendent?

Mr. FESS. The work of education in a State is sufficiently important that there ought to be an organization with complete control of the educational work, and every State in the United States, with a very few exceptions, has a State board. Some of our States, however, have neglected to take on that particular phase of educational organization.

Mr. BORLAND. Is not a board a rather clumsy method of doing business?

Mr. FESS. No; not if it is a small board.

Mr. BORLAND. There is a tendency to create more boards than we really need. In fact, I very gravely doubt—and it is my one doubt about this bill—whether we need this Federal education board, and whether it would not be entirely better and

more efficient and appropriate to have it managed by the Federal superintendent of education or Commissioner of Education.

Mr. FESS. I think the work is so very comprehensive that it ought to have a board of managers well equipped for this particular work.

Mr. BORLAND. It sounds very well to speak of a board of high-class men, but in my State we have found that we have more boards than we need, and that it results in a great deal of lost motion and lost efficiency; and I heard the governor elect of my State announce that he proposed to consolidate a large number of our State boards into fewer organizations and fewer hands, which struck me as being a very good reform.

Mr. FESS. That is all right, to centralize these duties.

Mr. KELLEY. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] or the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], if the amendment is inserted as stated after the word "designate," whether that would not preclude the designation of the State board where one already exists?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. No; because the following sentence states specifically that the State board, where it exists, may be designated.

Mr. KELLEY. Your amendment being put in after the word "designate," then how would it read? Please read that once more.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Beginning in line 11—

Any State shall, through the legislative authority thereof, accept the provisions of this act and designate the State department of education, or create a State board——

Mr. KELLEY. Or create a State board?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Yes. Further on it is provided that the State board of education or other board having charge of the administration of public education in the State, or any State board having charge of the administration of any kind of vocational education in the State, may, if the State so elects, be designated as the State board for the purposes of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLATT. I should like to ask one or two questions with regard to this matter. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] asked the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] whether under his constitution the State legislature had the right to create a board of education. Now, of course, it is a fact that boards of education and State educational departments are created in the constitutions of some States, and it would be impossible to change the department without changing the constitution.

Mr. FESS. It is not intended to change the department. It just adds one thing.

Mr. PLATT. If the State constitution creates an educational department, there would be no opportunity to create a board of education without changing the constitution.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. That is exactly the trouble in Alabama, and in that connection I desire to read a telegram which I received a few days ago from Hon. William F. Feagin, the State superintendent of education for Alabama. It reads as follows:

Before passing vocational bill see that proper amendment makes it possible for Alabama to get benefit immediately, as you know our legislature does not meet until 1919, and the constitution of the State does not allow a State board of education.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will accept the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. If the gentleman will withdraw his request for a moment, after this section is perfected I propose to make a motion to strike out the section, and I want five minutes on the motion to strike out.

Mr. HUGHES. Then make it 10 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. My motion would not be in order until the others are disposed of.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I have one or two other amendments that I desire to offer to this section.

Mr. HUGHES. Then I withdraw my request.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I desire to offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Amend section 5 as follows: Add to the conclusion of line 16, on page 8, the following:

"*Provided*, That until the final adjournment of the first regular session of the legislature held after the passage of this act, the assent of the governor of the State shall be sufficient, and until that time the governor of such State may designate the agency to cooperate with the Federal board of vocational education under the provisions of this act."

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, in a number of the States, my own being among them, the legislatures will not meet again in regular session until 1919. This amendment is offered for the purpose of making it possible for such States to participate in the distribution of these funds prior to that time without the necessity for special sessions of their legislatures. I might say that the first part of the proposed amendment is expressed in the exact language used in a similar amendment to the Federal roads bill. As Members will recall, that bill provided for acceptance through the State legislatures, but in order to render it possible for States to share in that fund prior to the regular meetings of their legislatures the bill was amended after this fashion.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. Does not the change of dates in the bill as we have amended it meet the requirements of the gentleman's State?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Only in part. Under the terms of the bill there is no way for a State to participate in the use of any of the funds until its legislature has accepted and designated the agency to cooperate with the Federal board for vocational education.

Mr. FESS. Does my friend believe that it is wise legislation to make a provision that this must be accepted by the legislative action and then make an exception to it?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. The proposed exception is temporary. It is to continue only until the legislature has had an opportunity to act. I submit that it would be unfair to compel a State to call a special session of its legislature, which would probably cost more than the State's first annual allotment, or forego for a period of two years the benefits to be derived by acceptance.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Of course, Congress can not grant authority to the governor of any State to accept the provisions of any act.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I am not sure about that. Congress granted such authority to governors in the act providing Federal aid to the States for improving and constructing public roads.

Mr. LENROOT. Whether it did or not, Congress has no authority to grant authority to the governor of a State to bind the State. Is not that true?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, there is precedent for such action by Congress, and it occurs to me that the need, in this instance, is as great as it was in the good-roads legislation. Is haste in the construction of public highways of greater importance than promptness in the vocational training of our boys and girls who are growing into manhood and womanhood by the thousands day by day?

Mr. LENROOT. It must be granted, of course, that Congress can not authorize the governor of a State to bind the State, and then I want to ask by what authority the governor, in the absence of legislative authority, can bind the State?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. That raises a constitutional question that I am not prepared to answer. If the granting temporarily of such authority is unconstitutional, it is a matter that has been overlooked heretofore in other legislation, notably the act providing Federal aid to roads.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I hardly think my friend from Alabama will insist on that amendment. Of course the very object of the bill is to submit to the people of a State through its legislature the question of whether they will accept the provisions of the act and give power to the governor to accept the various provisions of the act. To give the power to the governor would be an utter subversion of the purposes of the bill. I do not know whether he would have the constitutional right to act upon it, but I am very sure that he would not have the authority to bind the State. The legislature could repudiate his action if it desired. I think it would involve the bill in very grave embarrassment, and I hope the gentleman will not insist.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section. Mr. Chairman, this is the section which provides that before the States can obtain the benefits of this act they shall severally appropriate an amount equal to the amount to be allotted under the rules and regulations to be laid down. I do not believe in that character of legislation. I recognize the Federal Government as one sovereign entity, and I recognize the several State governments as sovereign entities.

I do not believe that the Federal Government ought to make an appropriation from the Federal Treasury to be expended in a State for any purpose and place upon it a limitation that it shall not be expended in that State unless the State itself responds in an equal amount.

Gentlemen say that this bill is not designed to destroy the autonomy of the States. It is not upon its face. And yet, what is the situation? The Federal Government, under the terms of this bill, will say to a State—well, say the State of Illinois, for example—"Here is $10,000, provided you tax yourselves in an equal amount. I have already taxed you to obtain this $10,000, which we now come and offer to you provided you tax yourselves again to raise an equal amount."

Mr. FESS. The gentleman is on the wrong section. Section 8 is what he talks about, but we are on section 5.

Mr. GARRETT. Well, I will let my remarks apply to section 8 when we get to it, and I will complete my speech. If the State of Illinois says, "No; we do not choose to tax ourselves $10,000," then the Federal Government will say, "Very well; give us $1,000 and we will take that and distribute it among other States." The State of Illinois will obtain nothing under the provisions of this act unless it taxes itself in an equal amount, and yet gentlemen say that it does not propose to coerce the State. It is proposed, just as was in the roads bill, to coerce the State through the most powerful instrumentality of coercion that now exists in this country, and that is through the use of the taxing power.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that that principle ought to apply in legislation. I repeat what I said earlier in the day if the Federal vocational bill is essential, let it be a Federal vocational education bill, and let us not undertake——

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the gentleman think that the Federal Government would have the right to impose a vocational education bill on the people of a State?

Mr. GARRETT. I doubt that very much; but the State might be willing to submit to that imposition. As a legal proposition it might not have the right. But I do undertake to say that it is bad policy to enter into this arrangement whereby you practically coerce a State to send one dollar after another, or are you proceeding on the principle, "For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath"? Mr. Chairman——

Mr. TOWNER. Will not the gentleman withdraw his amendment to section 5?

Mr. GARRETT. I think in the proviso, if I interpret the language correctly——

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is entirely mistaken. It is in section 8 that the requisite for State action is made.

Mr. GARRETT. It would be absolutely necessary if section 8 goes out that this section shall go out also, would it not be?

Mr. TOWNER. I think not. Of course, if the gentleman desires to insist upon his amendment, well and good.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That a Federal board for vocational education is hereby created, to consist of the United States Commissioner of Education, who shall be chairman of the said board, and four associate members, no more than two of whom shall be of any one political party, to be appointed by the President. In the first instance two members shall be appointed for two years and two for four years, and all subsequent appointments shall be for four years. The associate members of the board shall each receive a salary of $5,000 per annum. The board shall have power to cooperate with State boards in carrying out the provisions of this act. It shall be the duty of the Federal board for vocational education to make or cause to have made studies, investigations, and reports, with particular reference to their use in aiding the States in the establishment of vocational schools and classes and in giving instruction in agriculture, trades and industries, commerce and commercial pursuits, and home economics. Such studies, investigations, and reports shall include agriculture and agricultural processes and requirements upon agricultural workers, trades, industries, and apprenticeships, trade and industrial requirements upon industrial workers, and classification of industrial processes and pursuits, commerce and commercial pursuits and requirements upon commercial workers, home management, domestic science, and the study of related facts and principles, and problems of administration of vocational schools and of courses of study and instruction in vocational subjects.

Such studies, investigations, and reports concerning agriculture, for the purposes of agricultural education, shall, so far as practicable, be made in cooperation with or through the Department of Agriculture; such studies, investigations, and reports concerning trades and industries, for the purposes of trade and industrial education, shall, so far as practicable, be made in cooperation with or through the Department of Labor; such studies, investigations, and reports concerning commerce and commercial pursuits, for the purposes of commercial education, shall, so far as practicable, be made in cooperation with or through the Department of Commerce; such studies, investigations, and reports concerning the administration of vocational schools, courses of study and instruction in vocational subjects, shall, so far as practicable, be made in cooperation with or through the Bureau of Education.

The Commissioner of Education may make such recommendations to the board relative to the administration of this act as he may from time to time deem advisable. It shall be the duty of the Commissioner of Education to carry out the rules, regulations, and decisions which the board may adopt. The Federal board for vocational education shall have power to employ such assistants as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. POWERS rose.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if we can not agree on some time in which to discuss this section? It is growing late, and we are very anxious indeed to complete this bill this afternoon.

Mr. POWERS. I shall only consume a very little time myself.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to agree upon some time in order that we may expedite the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to the gentleman that this is really the only controverted section in the bill. I would not like to see the time limited at this time. I have several amendments that I desire to offer.

Mr. MANN. I do not think that it is possible to complete the bill to-night, much as I would like to do so.

Mr. LENROOT. I suggest that we go on and take an amendment at a time.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. POWERS: Amend section 6, page 8, by striking out all of lines 17 to 25, inclusive, on page 8, and the words "per annum," on page 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. That a Federal board for vocational education is hereby created to consist of the United States Commissioner of Education and four citizens of the United States, to be appointed by the President; one of said four citizens shall be a representative of manufacturing interest, one a representative of commercial interest other than manufacturing, one a representative of labor, and one a representative of agriculture. The board shall elect annually one of its members as chairman. In the first instance two members shall be appointed for two years, and two for four years, and all subsequent appointments shall be for four years. The members of the board, other than the United States Commissioner of Education, shall receive a salary of $5,000 per annum."

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, the pending Smith-Hughes bill, providing for national aid to vocational education, has been heralded far and wide as a Democratic measure. Vocational education as defined in the bill means that kind of practical education which is designed to prepare girls and boys for useful employment or occupation. Its purpose is to prepare workers for the more common occupations in which the great mass of our people find useful employment. The bill will soon become a law, and in the next political campaign it will be proudly spoken of by Democratic orators as one of the great achievements of the Democratic Party, and especially of this administration.

One not conversant with the facts would be led to believe that the Democratic Party is the grandfather of vocational education and the great-grandfather of national aid to same, and but for its wise statesmanship the world would never have had the slightest conception of what vocational education really means to the individual or to the Nation, whether procured through national aid or otherwise. No Republican will be given any credit for having had anything to do in helping to bring vocational education about, and especially national aid therefor; for was it not President Wilson who said in his Indianapolis speech that the Republican Party had not had a new idea in the last 30 years? Under the circumstances a brief review of the efforts to secure national aid for vocational education in this country will not be amiss. Let me say now that the real worth of vocational education to the individual and to the Nation, and especially national aid therefor, so far as this country is concerned, was largely conceived in Republican brains and pushed forward by Republican hands. In 1862 Justin S. Morrill, then a Representative from the State of Vermont and later a Republican United States Senator from the same Commonwealth, introduced and secured the passage of what has since become known as the Morrill Agricultural College Act. He believed that the welfare of the country demanded special education along the lines of agriculture and

the mechanic arts. The original Morrill bill was vetoed by a Democratic President, James Buchanan, on the ground that education in all its forms was purely a State and local problem. He feared Federal aid would "cause the States to lean upon the National Government for the support of their own educational systems," as he expressed it in his veto. Abraham Lincoln, however, in 1862 signed the Morrill Agricultural College Act, which granted to the various States tracts of land on which to erect great agricultural and mechanical colleges for the purpose of training young men of college grade to become leaders in the great fields of agriculture and industry; and thus was established the policy of Federal aid to vocational education in this country.

OTHER LAWS FOLLOWED.

In the wake of this measure, which founded the agricultural and mechanical colleges, have come a series of congressional acts appropriating large sums of money and giving grants in furthering its purposes. Among these acts was one, in 1890, by Mr. Morrill himself. In 1887 Representative Hatch succeeded in passing through Congress a bill, since known as the Hatch Act, which provided an annual appropriation of $15,000 to each State for the maintenance of an agricultural experiment station. Subsequently this was increased to $30,000 per year. Other acts followed. Now an annual Federal appropriation of $80,000 goes to each of the 48 States in the Union for the support of their agricultural and mechanical colleges and experiment stations. The Smith-Lever Act of 1913 commences with an annual appropriation of $10,000 to each State for agricultural extension work, and this sum is increased from year to year until it finally reaches the average sum of $95,000 to each State. Effective farm extension work is now carried on in not more than one-third of the counties in the United States, and probably less than one-fifth of the farmers have been reached at all. Only a few thousand of the farm women have been reached by extension work in household arts. Including the agricultural college in Porto Rico and the one in Honolulu, Hawaii, both of which this Government helps to support, there are now 52 white and 17 colored in all. They receive an annual cash appropriation of over $4,000,000. The entire appropriation for their support has now reached the enormous sum of $46,000,000, and this does not include the 15,000,000 acres of land which have been given for the benefit of our State universities and agricultural and mechanical colleges. I am speaking, of course, of Federal appropriations.

The several States have appropriated about fourteen times this amount; some put these figures less. Each of the 48 States in the Union has a great agricultural and mechanical college or university. Many of them owe their existence and all of them the great good they have done in large measure to the grants they have received from the Federal Government. The official reports of the 50 white agricultural and mechanical colleges and universities to the Bureau of Education for the year ending June 30, 1910, show that they had enrolled in that year 56,834 students. The Morrill Act and those following it have given to this country these high-grade colleges, whose thousands of highly skilled and essentially specialized graduates have added untold value not only to the so-called cultural side of education but also to our agricultural and industrial development. Nobody questions the great good that has been done. But great as has been the results flowing from the Morrill Act, still the good confidently hoped for by its author has not been realized. He believed that his bill would furnish to the country a great army of trained farmers; that the college student would return to the farm to invigorate farm life by greatly improved farm methods. This was his hope and his dream. Instead of its fruition, the colleges have turned out technicians in agriculture and the mechanic arts, and but few of these in comparison with the number of students attending these colleges and universities. Of the 56,834 students enrolled in these agricultural colleges and universities for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, only 6,587 were agricultural students. The others were taking courses in English, history, mathematics, physics, and other sciences. Great as has been the results of the Morrill Act, it has failed to carry vocational education to the great masses of our people.

As I say, nobody denies its great achievements, but it has failed to send the farmer college boy back to the farm imbued with an enthusiasm for either agriculture or the industries or even their great possibilities.

OTHER REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TOOK A HAND.

Other Republican Members of Congress took up the task of extending national aid for vocational education so as to reach and better prepare for their labors, the man on the farm, the laborer in the mine, the housewife with her arduous household duties, the girl in the factory giving her young life to labors most uncongenial to her. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], now a distinguished Republican Member of this body, introduced a number of bills along these lines and devoted years of his life in pushing the cause along. The brilliant Senator Dolliver from Iowa, the sturdy and gifted Senators from Nebraska, Burkett and Pollard, Republicans all, introduced bills and furthered the cause for national aid to vocational education along useful and practical lines. The struggle went on. Other champions appeared upon the scene. Realizing that supplemental legislation was needed to the Morrill and allied acts, if the great mass of our people were to be reached and prepared for useful occupation in agriculture, industry, and home economics, Senator CARROLL S. PAGE, also a Republican United States Senator from the State of Vermont, began and for years has been giving the best efforts of his life to the solution of this great question. He fought hard to pass through the United States Senate a measure for Federal aid, which has since become known as the Page vocational education bill.

The proverbial uncertainty of American politics swept into the United States Senate a Democratic majority on March 4, 1913; and Senator HOKE SMITH of Georgia, became chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. Senator PAGE took his place in the ranks.

The substance of the Page bill was introduced by Senator SMITH, as the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, following the report of a commission to investigate the question, and the measure then became the Smith bill. But let it ever be said to the credit of Senator SMITH that he has not tried to deprive Senator PAGE and other Republicans of the honor of fathering this great legislation. In a speech in the United States Senate on the 31st day of July, 1916, Senator SMITH, in speaking of the services of Senator PAGE, said:

> The responsibility for the measure would have continued with him rather than to have fallen to me but for the change which took place in the organization of the Senate three years ago. With the Republican majority he was leading in the work and I was helping him. Since that time, as I am chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the situation is reversed just a little, but I am always glad to stop at any time the opportunity is presented to give to the Senator from Vermont every possible credit for his splendid work upon this subject and almost to regret that we have a Democratic majority and that he has not charge of the bill instead of myself.

The present distinguished chairman of the Educational Committee of the House, Mr. HUGHES, introduced a bill for vocational aid along the lines of the Smith bill, and the joint measure is now referred to as the Smith-Hughes bill. Every Republican on the Committee on Education, of which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] is chairman, is giving this bill his enthusiastic support. Just a few moments ago the brilliant and able Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], made a masterly speech favoring this bill. The Republicans, in the main, are friends and champions of the cause. This, then, in brief, is the history of this soon-to-be legislation, and like other legislation conceived in Republican brains, has been taken over by this Democratic administration and heralded to the country as its very own.

WHAT THE PURPOSES OF THE BILL ARE.

What then in substance is the legislation for which Senator PAGE and other Republicans stood? What is the legislation proposed in the Smith-Hughes bill? What is vocational education as herein advocated and for which national aid is now proposed? What need is it intended to fit and fill that other education fails to reach? Why can we not depend and why do we not depend upon our great colleges, universities, and our splendid system of public schools for all the education of every character that we need? It should be remembered that we have more than 600 colleges and universities in the United States. The running expenses of our public schools now cost in round numbers $600,000,000 every year. There are now, in round numbers, 30,000,000 children in this country between the ages of 6 and 20 years inclusive. About 50 per cent of these are urban or city children, 50 per cent live in the country. The history of education in this country shows that 40 per cent of these 30,000,000 children, or 12,000,000 of them, will have left school at the age of 14 years; 70 per cent, or 21,000,000 of them, will have left school by the time they are 15 years of age; and 85 per cent, or 25,5000,000 of them, will have left school by the time they are 16 years of age, although every State in the Union, with the exception of six, have laws compelling parents to send their children to school. Less than 10 per cent of the 30,000,000 children will ever go through high school, and of those that do go through high school less than 2 per cent will graduate from a college or university. Only half the children who enter the city elementary schools of the country remain to the final elementary grade. One million of

them go out every year to join the great army of workers. They fill the vacant places caused by old age and death. At a pitifully young and inexperienced period of life they go out to face the cold, hard, sordid business world. They struggle through painful years of small wage and poor product.

If it should be said that these figures and these results are a pretty severe arraignment of the efficiency of our public-school system to reach the mass of our people, I shall have to admit that it is. If it should be said that 93 per cent—some put the figures as high as that—of our children should not stop school before they are 16 years of age, I readily agree that that is true. But the fact remains that they do stop. The fact remains that they leave school with inadequate general education and with no special education to fit them for life's work. The problems, then, confronting us are, What can we do to keep the children in school longer than they have been accustomed to go? What can we do for them while yet in school to better prepare them to meet the actual problems of life when they do go out? What can we do for those that have already gone and those that will go without that character of training that fits them to face without too great a disadvantage the real work of life before them? What can we do for our older and more mature people, male and female, now actually engaged in the real battle of life and many of them hard pressed by its stern necessities? That our present system of education is not measuring up to the real needs of the hour, nobody doubts or denies. That the courses of study in our present school system, collegiate, secondary, and common, are not sufficiently attractive and practical to keep the children and youths of our land, at ages frightfully young, from either going into idleness or the work of the world is proven by the painful truth that 85 per cent of the children leave school before they are 16 years of age and less than 2 per cent graduate from a college or university.

That the courses of study in our present school system are not practical enough and fail to connect, as they should, education with life, is abundantly proven by the all-to-many educated good-for-nothings and misfits in life. Our system of education ought to prepare people for the practical affairs of life and make them self-sustaining. Our theory of education and courses of study are predicated too largely upon the idea of preparing people for the professions.

WHERE THE BULK OF OUR PEOPLE WORK.

According to the census of 1910 there were 12,659,203 persons in the United States, both male and female, engaged in farming. There were 14,261,376 persons engaged in manufacturing, mechanical pursuits, and allied industries. Probably less than 1 per cent of those engaged in agriculture have had adequate preparation for so doing. This means, then, that there are over 12,000,000 people engaged in farming in the United States who have not been trained to deal with the soil through scientific methods in such a way as to make it yield what it should to the support of the present and future life of this Nation. It is equally correct to say that there is not 1 in 100 of the workers engaged in industrial pursuits that have had adequate training for the work in which they are engaged. A remedy ought to be found for this condition. Since less than 2 per cent of our children—largely the future citizens of our country—go through a college or university, and therefore less than 2 per cent of them are directly benefited by Federal grants to our agricultural and mechanical colleges, some way ought to be devised to reach and aid the other 98 per cent. That is partly the purpose of the bill before us. We must not be too sorely disappointed, though, if it fails to accomplish the object intended. It is a big problem we are tackling, and many there are who believe that we are not ready for Federal aid as provided for in this bill. Others believe that it is essentially a State and local problem and that the Government ought not to interfere. Others say that the courses of study in our schools should be modified so as to more adequately prepare people for the ordinary affairs of life, and that the reformation of our school system should come from within rather than from without.

I agree that there is much force of reasoning in the statement that the needed reform in our school system should come from within; and but for the conditions confronting us, as well as the imperative necessity for more practical training of the 25,000,000 workers now engaged in farming, mining, manufacturing, and the other occupations, as well as the other 1,000,000 workers that join the ranks of labor every year, I would be willing to let the States and local communities work out their own educational problems. But when we realize the great waste there is going on along agricultural lines—for example, the misdirected effort, the lack of proper yields from the soil, the high prices of all we consume, at least partly due to these things—we are bound to come to the conclusion that something ought to be done.

THE BILL PROVIDES FOR AGRICULTURAL TRAINING.

Among other things, the bill before us offers Federal aid to each State, first, in the teaching and preparing teachers to teach agricultural subjects; second, in the teaching and preparing teachers to teach home economics, trade, and industrial subjects. I shall speak first of the proposed Federal grant to aid the States along agricultural lines.

Section 2 of the bill provides "that for the purpose of cooperating with the States in paying the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects" there is hereby authorized to be appropriated certain sums of money to the States each year till June 30, 1925, when it reaches the sum of $3,000,000. Each year thereafter it is to be that sum. The sum allotted to each State will be in the proportion that its rural population bears to the entire rural population of the United States. Kentucky would be entitled, under this arrangement, to $105,300 each year from the Federal Government. But before Kentucky or any other State would be permitted to share in these funds the State would have to match dollar for dollar with the Federal Government under the plans and arrangements provided for in the bill.

The instruction to be given must be under public supervision and control and "the controlling purpose of such education shall be to fit for useful employment; that such education shall be of less than college grade and be designed to meet the needs of persons over 14 years of age who have entered upon the work of the farm or the farm home." The bill provides that the schools in which any of the Federal money is to be expended "shall provide for directed or supervised practice in agriculture, either on a farm provided for by the school or other farm for at least six months per year." The bill also provides for the expenditure on the part of the Federal Government of $1,000,000 each year (the State putting up dollar for dollar) for the purpose of paying the salaries of teachers to train teachers to teach agricultural, trade, and home economic subjects.

THE IMPERATIVE NEED OF INTENSIVE AND SCIENTIFIC FARMING.

In order to support the present and future life of this Nation and make farming pay as it should, our farmers need to know more about the soils, orcharding, dairying, poultry raising, truck gardening, horticulture, bee culture, stock raising, stock breeding, rotation of crops, the testing of seeds, drainage, the chemical properties and value of fertilizers, and divers other things. I was reared on a farm and have at least a limited knowledge of the needs of the farmer. The demands upon our country for food products are such as to make more intensive and more progressive farming an absolute necessity.

For years the drift of our population has been from the country to the city. According to the United States census of 1880, 70.5 per cent of our people lived in the country, while 29.5 per cent lived in the cities and towns. The 1890 census showed that 63.9 per cent lived in the country while 36.1 per cent lived in the cities and towns. The 1900 census shows that 59.5 per cent lived in the country and 40.5 per cent lived in the cities and towns. The 1910 census shows that 53.7 per cent, or about 49,000,000, of our people are rural, while 46.3 per cent, or about 42,000,000, are urban or city.

In other words, we have just about as many people living in the cities and towns over 2,500 population as we do living in the country. By counting those who live in towns and villages under 2,500 in number we now have a greater urban than we have a rural population. The statistics I have cited show that people are constantly leaving the country and going to the cities and towns to live. Those who live in the cities, those who live in the mines, shops, and factories, and those who do not produce foods must be fed by those who do. In some sections of our country there is a good deal less land under cultivation today than there were 50 years ago. For example, the New England States had 72 per cent less land in cultivation in 1910 than they had in 1850. In certain agricultural sections, too, our rural population is decreasing. Iowa, the greatest agricultural State in the Union, 98 per cent of her land being capable of cultivation, has 4 per cent less population now than she had 10 years ago. In one-sixth of the total land area of the United States our population decreased during the years 1900 to 1910. In that decade our population decreased in 769 counties out of the 2,841 counties in the United States. The decrease covered an area of 472,462 square miles, 42,937 square miles of which were in the State of Missouri. The decrease in the State of Ohio amounted to 43.5 per cent. During the decade from 1900 to 1910 our urban population increased by 11,013,738, or 34.8 per cent; the total increase in our rural population was only 4,963,953, or 11.2 per cent. Our population is increasing at an enormous

rate, but that increase is in the cities and towns, not the country. In the past there has been too much drudgery in farm life. Its profits have been comparatively small, its inconveniences many. The tendency has been—and naturally so—for too many of our industrious, progressive, and enterprising young men and women to leave the farm and seek more profitable and sometimes more congenial employment in the cities and towns.

Farm life will have to be made as pleasant and profitable as that found elsewhere in order to attract to it the young men and women of to-day. There is a big temptation for far too many to seek the bright lights of the city. The United States has been blessed with an immense acreage of virgin soil. That condition no longer obtains. Unscientific agriculture can not be profitably carried on except on a virgin soil and under conditions which permit of extensive culture. It is therefore indispensable that our farming be more intensive, more scientific, and more profitable, if we are to sustain our ever-increasing population, which to-day exceeds 100,000,000. One of the scientific staff of our Federal Bureau of Soils recently made this statement:

If the possibilities of increased profit are not a sufficient inducement to undertake the training of our farmers, certainly in the immediate future the exigencies of the increasing population will force upon our public authorities the responsibility for making our agriculture adequate.

It is estimated by the Bureau of the Census, as well as by the Department of Agriculture, that "within the lifetime of children now entering our public schools the population of the United States will be no less than 450,000,000." We know this is not an extravagant prediction when we stop to realize that our population increased from a little over 7,000,000 in 1810 to over 91,000,000 in 1910.

It is the part of wisdom and statesmanship to look out for the future. Aside from conserving our human resources, the conservation of our natural resources, "of which the fertility of the soil is the most important," is our most important social duty. Our soil must be made to yield more each year without impairment. This can not be done with our present careless method of agriculture, nor can we continue our present method of agriculture without the food supply becoming relatively less from year to year.

The pressure of population upon our food resources will increase not merely for a few years but for all time to come. It will be constant and more insistent as the years go by. It is vitally essential that there be established in general practice a restorative and permanent system of soil culture. This agricultural education should not only reach the mature farmer of to-day through agriculture extension work and otherwise, but it is even more essential that the youths of our land be prepared and thoroughly instructed in the right theory and practice of farm work. This practice and training must not be merely State; it must be Nation wide in its scope. Our agriculture must be highly productive. It must be permanent. Science has taught other countries how to restore and maintain the fertility of their soil and increase its productivity. Germany, for example, has within the last 30 years increased her production of rye from 15 to 29 bushels per acre. Within the same period the United States increased her production of rye from only 14 to 16 bushels per acre. Germany increased her production of barley from 24 to 29 bushels per acre; the United States from 24 to 24.3. Germany increased her production of wheat from 19 to 30 bushels per acre; the United States from 13 to 15 bushels. Germany increased her production of oats from 31 to 59 bushels per acre; the United States from 28 to 30. Germany increased her production of potatoes from 115 to 208 bushels per acre; the United States from 98 to 100 bushels.

Senator PAGE, in a great speech before the Senate in July of last year, said:

Mr. President, Germany has an area equal only to the three States of Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri, but she produced three-fifths as much oats, four-fifths as much barley, three times as much sugar, six times as many potatoes, and nine times as much rye as we produced in the whole United States.

Germany had, in 1907, 43,000,000 acres sowed in wheat, barley, oats, and potatoes. She harvested 3,000,000,000 bushels. We had in the United States the same year 88,500,000 acres in the same crops and harvested only 1,875,000,000 bushels. Germany had less than half the acreage and harvested nearly double the same number of bushels. Kansas, Minnesota, and North Dakota are our three greatest wheat-producing States. France is about the same size as these three States. France sowed, in 1907, 16,000,000 acres in wheat. The States of Kansas, Minnesota, and North Dakota did the same. In that year France harvested from her 16,000,000 acres 325,000,000 bushels of wheat. Kansas, Minnesota, and North Dakota harvested from the same number of acres only 188,000,000 bushels. They have 45,000 agricultural schools in France. France is the greatest producing nation in the world to-day. Germany, France, England, and some other countries produce from two to three times more of all sorts of products per acre than we do, and yet they have no better soil and no better climate. Science must do for us what it has done for these other countries. We have got to have better soil doctors in this country. We are compelled to give more attention to rotation of crops, fertilization, better seeds, and better breeds of stock. An expert in agricultural matters has recently said:

The nineteenth century farmer was no farmer at all; he was a miner, mining the fertility of the soil and selling it for the bare cost of mining.

He might have truthfully added that in too many cases the farmer does not raise anything to sell at all, but merely produces enough on which to live. I know that there are no better people than the ones I have the honor to represent.

I know that with our present methods of agriculture the problem of producing enough on which to live and laying a little something aside for a rainy day is a serious one. My district, too, has some 8,000 people engaged in mining. These people must be fed. The people living in the cities and towns must be fed. It would be infinitely better for all concerned if we could produce in our own district enough to support our own people.

In order to do this we will be compelled to make a study of our soil. We have got to find out whether it lacks in potash, phosphate, nitrogen, or other things, and then apply the remedy. We have got to quit putting the same piece of land in the same crop so often. We have got to find out what a certain piece of land is best adapted to produce and the best way in which to produce it.

Dr. Hopkins, of Illinois, one of the greatest soil chemists in America, was once lecturing down in the southern part of Illinois, near Egypt, where the land is poor. He explained to the farmers in that section how, by the application of $1.50 worth of phosphate to the acre, the normal yield of corn would be increased from 12 to 13 bushels per acre to 50 or 60. At the conclusion of his lecture a gray-haired old farmer, with tears in his eyes, stepped up to him and said:

Mr. Hopkins, I want to thank you for what I have seen to-day, but, God help me, if I only knew that thing 40 years ago. I have got six boys in my family, and I have labored night and day to keep body and breeches together and to keep the family together, and what have I got on my farm? Twelve to fifteen and sixteen bushels of corn to the acre is all that I could make. Now, I would like to have sent my boys to college; I would like to have given those children an education; but I could not raise enough crops on that piece of land that I have owned, and so I have tilled all my lifetime and have earned barely enough to support my family. Now, if a man had only come to me when I was a comparatively young man and told me the thing that you have told me to-day—that $1.50 of rock phosphate would have given me the 50 bushels of corn crop, the crop which was raised right over the fence from where I am—I could have sent my children to the high school and to a university, and—

He said, with tears running down his face—

I am at the end, and nobody told me that.

Too many good men have grown gray and worn their lives out as the old man in Illinois has done without knowing what to do to the soil to make it productive. This knowledge ought to be carried to them and their children. We have it already in the laboratories of our experiment stations and agricultural colleges. It is the purpose of the bill before us to help carry, especially to the children of these farmers, such knowledge as will make them practical and highly productive farmers. It will take years to solve the problem. The knowledge, I say, has in great measure already been obtained.

The men in charge of our agricultural colleges, experiment stations, and other institutions have for many years been giving the best efforts of their lives along these lines. The problem facing us is to carry the results of their experimentation and research into the homes of the people we represent and make it a part of the lives, especially "of persons over 14 years of age who have entered upon or who are preparing to enter upon the work of the farm or the farm home," as the bill expresses it. In each State this important work will be placed in the hands of a board of three or more persons, to be designated or created by the State legislature. Whether in Kentucky, for example, this State board will try to establish independent schools or classes for the purpose of imparting the valuable information of which I have been speaking, or whether they will try to do it largely through our public schools, I do not know. My own judgment is that the only effective way to reach the masses of our people, and especially the ones this bill is largely designed to reach and help, will be through our public schools. There is no other agency so powerfully effective in carrying this knowledge into the homes and into the lives of our farmers, actual and to be, as our public-school system, when its courses of study are vocationalized and made to respond to the actual needs and necessities of life. It is vitally essential that a restorative and permanent system of soil cul-

ture be established in general practice throughout our country, else the people will soon be in dire distress for the bare necessities of life.

Mr. Davenport has said:

The world has not yet learned to feed such a population as is just ahead of us, and before the present century is ended the largest single public issue will be that of bread.

We do not have to wait for the century to end, for bread, the high cost of living, the actual necessities of life to be the biggest public question for solution before our country to-day. It is the most vital question now before our people. It was so vital in 1912 that the Democratic Party in its platform adopted at Baltimore declared:

The high cost of living is a serious problem in every American home. The Republican Party in its platform attempts to escape from responsibility for present conditions, by denying that they are due to a protective tariff. We take issue with them on that subject.

That was two years before the war in Europe began. Upon that, more than any other one issue, the Democrats won the Presidency. But for that issue, hopelessly divided though the Republicans were, the Democrats would not have won. The Democrats declared in their platform and on the stump that the high robber protective tariff that the Republicans had foisted upon the people was the cause of the high cost of living. They said they would reduce the tariff and bring down the cost of living, so that the poor man would always have enough money in his purse to purchase a decent meal. On that issue largely the Democrats came into power. They did reduce the tariff. On October 3, 1913, they did erase from the statute books of our country a Republican protective tariff law and in its stead placed a so-called free-trade tariff law of their own. The high cost of living, however, did not come down. It is higher to-day than it has ever been. At no time since the Democrats came into power, now nearly four years ago, has anyone been able to buy a single thing that men or women either eat, drink, or wear at less cost than when the Republicans were in power.

Upon the contrary, the average cost of the necessities of life are higher to-day by more than 25 per cent than they were when the Democratic Party came into power on March 4, 1913. As a matter of fact, the price of foodstuffs have been going up for years.

The following table shows the average retail price of food in the United States and the amount that could be bought for $1 in each year from 1890 to November, 1916; sirloin steak excepted:

Year.	Articles.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for $1.
			Pounds.
1907	Sirloin steak, per pound	$0.181	5.5
1916	do	.268	3.7
1890	Round steak, per pound	.123	8.1
1916	do	.239	4.2
1907	Rib roast, per pound	.150	6.7
1916	do	.210	4.8
1890	Pork chops, per pound	.107	9.3
1916	do	.228	4.4
1890	Bacon, smoked, per pound	.125	8.0
1916	do	.303	3.3
1890	Ham, smoked, per pound	.152	6.6
1916	do	.302	3.3
1890	Pure lard, per pound	.093	10.8
1916	do	.213	4.7
1890	Hens, per pound	.135	7.4
1916	do	.241	4.1
			Dozen.
1890	Eggs, per dozen	.208	4.8
1916	do	.506	2.0
			Pounds.
1890	Butter, per pound	.255	3.9
1916	do	.439	2.3
			Quarts.
1890	Fresh milk, per quart	.068	14.7
1916	do	.099	10.1
			Bags.
1890	Wheat flour, per bag	.711	1.41
1916	do	1.89½	.72
			Pounds.
1890	Corn meal, per pound	.019	52.6
1916	do	.036	27.8
			Pecks.
1890	Irish potatoes, per peck	.247	4.0
1916	do	.511	2.0
			Pounds.
1890	Sugar, per pound	.069	14.5
1916	do	.086	11.6

The same thing is true of other foodstuffs. The same thing is true of clothing. The high cost of living is the most serious problem confronting us.

Never in the history of the world have taxes been so high or have visited us in so many of their obnoxious forms. The estimated deficit in the United States Treasury on June 30 next is $300,000,000. The Democratic Members of Congress are now racking their brains to find out how they can still further tax the people in order to meet this deficit. How many of our people can live under existing conditions is a problem. The people have again intrusted the Democratic Party with the task and duty of solving their problems and remedying their wrongs. It is up to the Democrats, not to us. It is not certain at all that we will even control the House of Representatives after March 4. Democratic statesmen and near statesmen are now coming forth with this nostrum and that as the sure cure for the high cost of living, but among all the panaceas proposed no one of them charges that the high cost of living is due to a high protective tariff or that a free-trade tariff will bring it down. A food embargo, among other things, is proposed. After all is said and done, and after these remedies are tried out, if they are, it will doubtless be discovered that the high cost of living will still continue, and that the surest way to bring permanent relief is through more extensive, intensive, and scientific agriculture. The farmer is not now getting any more for his products than he ought to get. The consumer, though, pays twice as much for the farmer's products as the farmer sells them for. The price is raised by the middlemen, the commission merchants, the great cold-storage concerns, food trusts, and others after it leaves the farmer's hands on its way to the table of the ultimate consumer. Laws already on the statute books are probably ample to protect the people if they are vigorously and fearlessly enforced. This would help reduce the high cost of living. Those criminals who for the sake of paltry gain are cornering the food supply of the country and holding it from the mouths of hungry men and the stomachs of starving children, should be prosecuted to the limit of the law. Taxing these cold-storage concerns and others for holding foods longer than a certain period of time would help; but let me repeat that after all is said and done the fact will be found to still remain that we have got to have a greater production to meet the ever-increasing demand for foodstuffs. If we fail in this, prices will still remain distressingly high.

HOME ECONOMICS.

Home economics is the science of home making. It includes a knowledge of ventilation, cooking, hygiene, household sanitation, preparation of foods for the sick, care of children, motherhood, food values, what foods constitute a well-balanced meal, what foods are compatable and what are incompatable, and many other things of immense practical value. It is not the purpose of this bill to make provision for the farmer's boy and leave the farmer's girl and the farmer's wife to look out for themselves. It is not the purpose of this bill to make provision for the practical instruction of the miner's son and leave the miner's wife and daughter unaided in these things that are so essential to the welfare and well-being of the family. It is in the home where the chief happiness of mankind is found. All must eat some sort of food; all must live in some sort of a home. It is there where character is formed and the principles of good conduct and good citizenship instilled. It is a trite old saying that the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world. Good home makers—good mothers are the greatest asset any nation can have. The foundation of all good government is laid in the home. And since every girl is a potential mother and mistress of a home it is just as essential that she be educated along practical and useful lines as it is that her brothers be. So this bill provides that the Federal Government shall not only aid the States in paying the salaries of teachers to teach home-economic subjects but shall also aid the States in paying the salaries of teachers to train other teachers to teach these subjects. Home-economic subjects ought to be a part of the curriculum in all our public schools and their teaching made compulsory. Statistics show that 5,000,000 people in this country become ill every year from preventable diseases and 600,000 infants under 2 years of age terminate their little span of life, most of them from a lack of proper care. The young women of to-day are the home makers of to-morrow. They should be fitted and trained for their important tasks. This training should reach down to the average girl who goes to neither high school nor to college, but who one of these days will have the care of a home and a family.

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRIES.

The acquiring of a commercial education is now pretty well provided throughout the country, and, while this bill makes provision for Federal aid to such education, I shall not now take time to discuss it. The feature to which I want to call your special attention is that provision of the bill which seeks to promote the welfare of the boy and girl whose parents are engaged in the industries—whose parents, and especially whose fathers, are every-day laborers. Whether they be blacksmiths, carpenters, masons, machinists, plumbers, barbers, engineers, miners, or otherwise engaged in manual labor, it matters not.

This bill is designed to reach those who are not able to send their sons and daughters to college or the university; those who need the labor of their offspring to help support the family. We are all laborers. Some work more with their heads than they do with their hands, and some work more with their hands than they do with their heads. One is just as honorable as the other. The farmer longs for the so-called leisure of the lawyer's office. The overtaxed lawyer and public servant longs for the health-giving freedom of the farm. This bill is designed to help fit for useful employment the boys and girls who can not go through high school or college but who must go to to work to help support themselves and the family. And, as I have said, there are less than 2 out of every 100 of our American boys and girls who ever reach the college or university, and 9 out of every 10 never even pass from the elementary grade to the high school or academy. This bill is designed to reach and benefit that great army of our boys and girls who never reach high school, college, or academy. The purpose of this bill is to help fit for useful employment in some trade or industry this great and ever-increasing army of American youths.

The Federal Government proposes to pay $3,000,000 annually in cooperation with the States toward the payment of salaries of teachers to teach trade, home economics, and industrial subjects, and in addition to that, $1,000,000 annually toward the payment of salaries of teachers to train teachers to teach these and agricultural subjects. All these teachers should have had actual experience in the trade or subject they undertake to teach. In the language of the bill the controlling purpose of such education shall be to "fit for useful employment" and "shall be designed to meet the needs of persons over 14 years of age who are preparing for a trade or industrial pursuit or who have entered upon the work of a trade or industrial pursuit."

There are to be three kinds of schools established—all day, part time, and evening. In the all-day schools the instruction is to be given for at least nine months out of the year to persons over 14 years of age who have not entered upon employment. The instruction for "at least half of the time" shall "be given to practical work on a useful or productive basis." The part-time schools are designed to aid workers over 14 years of age "who have entered upon employment." The evening schools are designed to aid workers over 16 years of age. The instruction to be given is to be "supplemental to the daily employment." One, if not the controlling, reason why so many children leave school at such an early age is that neither they nor their parents can see any practical benefits growing out of such education. They fail to see, and they are not alone in that, how the study of algebra, higher arithmetic, Latin, or Greek is going to aid them very materially in knowing how to feed the cow, bake the beans, or break the horse, or how to plant and till the corn or mine and load the coal, or how to paint the house or dig the ditch. It is a great sacrifice on the part of many parents not to put their children over 14 years of age into the ranks of the breadwinners.

In the great majority of cases the only way to induce the child or its parents to continue the child's education after the age of 14 is to show, at least the parents, that what the child is to learn in school will enable it to command a better wage, fit it to do something really useful, and enable it to solve life's greatest problem—the bread-and-butter one. It is essential, not only to the child but to the country of which he is an important part, that he be trained and taught in useful employment and made to know that it is just as honorable to work with the hands as it is with the head. The minds of the laboring man's children are as acute, their perceptions as keen, as those of any other class. The laboring man himself, the man who works with his hands, should hold up his head in any company and feel, what he has a got a right to feel, that he is just as honorable as any man in it.

CONCLUSION.

I am for this bill because it is designed to help develop and conserve both our natural and human resources. I am for it because it will help to promote a productive and prosperous agriculture. I am for it because it will help to increase the wage-earning power of our productive workers and greatly enhance the price of the output. It will help both employer and employee. It will greatly increase our wealth. The distinguished chairman of our committee, Mr. HUGHES, recently said in a speech:

> If we assume that a system of vocational education pursued through years of the past would have increased the wage-earning capacity of each of these 25,000,000 workers to the extent of 10 cents a day, this would have made an increase of wages for the group $2,500,000 a day, or $750,000,000 a year, with all that this would mean to the wealth and life of the Nation. This is a very moderate estimate, and the facts would probably show a difference between the earning power of the vocationally trained and the vocationally untrained of 25 cents a day. This would indicate a waste of wages through lack of training amounting to $6,250,000 every day, or $1,875,000,000 for the year. That is difficult for us to conceive and believe, but these figures are true.

The money expended for vocational education is a wise business investment. The practical training of men in any pursuit brings lasting economic returns in increased production and wage-earning power.

Miss O'Reilly, in her statement before the committee, said:

> The nation of the future which will hold the industrial supremacy of the world will be the nation which makes the things best for the markets of the world. That can only be done through the scientific organization of industry; that scientific organization of industry can only come through the training of the workers.

Miss O'Reilly is undoubtedly right in what she says.

American agriculture has prospered in the past because we have the richest soil in the world. Our people have treated it as though it were inexhaustible and as though its fertility would last forever. We know better now. To conserve our soil and feed the increasing population every farmer must be an expert.

Our American manufacturers have prospered in the past, first, because our raw materials have both been cheap and abundant; second, because of the abundance of poorly paid foreign labor that has been admitted to our shores; third, because of the executive and inventive genius of our people; and fourth, because of our production on a large scale. All these conditions can not always prevail. All of them do not prevail now. We have been selling too much raw material and not enough finished products. We ought to "sell more brains and less material." While the United States in volume of output leads the four other great manufacturing nations of the world, still our exports consist largely of "crude materials." As a matter of fact, less than one-third of the volume of our foreign commerce consists of manufactures ready for consumption. We have exploited the soil beneath our feet. We have slain the forest and robbed the hills, and in our national anthem still continue to sing that we "love" them.

The maintenance and development of our foreign trade will, as the years roll by, depend more and more upon our ability to compete with foreign nations in the products of skilled labor.

The vocationally trained artisans of England, France, and Germany excel our own in skill and efficiency. If the future battles of nations are largely to be fought in the markets of the world, as many see it; if the victory is to depend largely upon the skill and efficiency of our workers; if there is now scarcely an untrained man in all of Germany; if the workers in still other countries are better trained than in our own; if there is to be added yearly 1,000,000 untrained workers to our already 25,000,000, not 2 per cent of whom have been adequately trained for their work, then it does not take a prophet to foresee the results of the contest.

We need national aid to vocational education, because the question is a national one in its scope and because the States are unable to properly handle it. In only nine States has the work by the State as such been undertaken, and not even 1 per cent of the workers who need training have been reached.

We need national aid to vocational education because the National Government ought to introduce into our educational system, since the States have not, the needed elements to make it purposeful and useful. The Federal Government ought to stand for the principle that the aim of utility in education is just as important as the aim of culture, and is entitled to take its place in dignity by the side of it. This will do more than any other one thing to bring about a reform in our public-school system and cause the courses of study to be planned to fit the student for the practical and the useful.

It is not the purpose of this bill to take away from the State either their power or responsibility in educational matters. It is rather to stimulate and encourage them into right action along educational lines.

Its purpose is to put a practical training in the reach of the 92 per cent of our children who leave school before they ever complete a high-school grade. Its purpose is to reach out a helping hand to the poor man's son and the poor man's daughter.

I do not want to be understood as predicting that the bill before us, when enacted into law, will work any immediate revolution in our public-school system or in the lives of those now in being. It will take time for even a semblance of its influence to be seen, at least in some parts of our country. Nobody assumes that this bill has reached a solution of this great problem. Time and experience will change and modify the provisions in this bill and add to them many important features that in our ignorance, inexperience, and shortsightedness we have omitted. The future historian of our country, however, will vindicate the position of those who have sponsored and

voted for this measure. The country will be indebted to them for having inaugurated a movement that will be, at least, in years to come, of far-reaching effect in determining the standing and prestige of our Nation and the usefulness of its citizenship. I am glad that the House saw fit to adopt my amendment which provided that the members of the Federal board shall be practical men and be selected from the various interests to be affected.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, this section is the controverted section. It was discussed at length before the committee not only for weeks but for months. We thought that the wording of that section as presented by the committee was simple, and allowed the board to be appointed by the President and gave him full power to appoint the board, but after consultation I think that I can say that on behalf of the committee we are willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Education, is somewhat in error in the statement that the committee is unanimously in favor of accepting the proposed amendment.

Mr. HUGHES. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I discussed it with him a few minutes ago, and I understood that he agreed to it.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. When my friend spoke to me about the matter, I understood him to refer to another amendment—an amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. I regret sincerely that there should have been any misunderstanding.

I prefer to let section 6 stand as it is written, but since the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS] has offered an important amendment, which seems to be favored by a majority of the committee, I shall at the proper time offer a substitute for the entire section, and I ask that I be permitted now to submit my proposed substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The section has not yet been perfected, and, as the gentleman's amendment is in the nature of a substitute, it would not be in order until the section is perfected.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Then, I desire to have my substitute read at this time for the information of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the substitute will be read at this time for information.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERCROMBIE: Amend the bill by striking out all of section 6 and substituting the following:

"SEC. 6. That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, there is hereby created an executive department of the Government to be known as the department of education, which shall be under the supervision of a secretary of education, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive a salary of $12,000 per annum, and whose term of office shall be the same as that of the heads of the other executive departments. The said secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for said department of such device as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal.

"There shall be in said department an assistant secretary of education, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive a salary of $6,000 a year, and who shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the secretary or required by law. There shall also be such clerical assistants as may be authorized by Congress.

"The department of education shall have power to cooperate with State boards in carrying out the provisions of this act, and it shall be the duty of said department to make or cause to have made studies, investigations, and reports with particular reference to their use in aiding the States in the establishment of vocational schools and classes and in giving instruction in agriculture, trades and industries, commerce and commercial pursuits, and home economics."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HUGHES. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 45, noes 8.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the comma after the word "workers," on page 9, line 11; also, in line 14, after the word "pursuits"; also, in line 15, after the word "workers"; also, in line 17, after the word "principles." All of those commas should be changed to semicolons.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 11, after the word "workers," strike out the comma and insert a semicolon; same page, line 14, after the word "pursuit," strike out the comma and insert a semicolon; same page, line 15, after the word "workers," strike out the comma and insert a semicolon; and in line 17, after the word "principles," strike out the comma and insert a semicolon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chariman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 10, after line 11, add the following:

"Said board may from time to time appoint advisory committees made up of persons representing industries, commerce, labor, agriculture, home making, or general or vocational education, to assist them by advice in the administration of this act, and may fix the compensation of such advisory committee, but not more than $50,000 shall be expended by the board for this purpose."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that has just been adopted, proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS], providing for a representative board, was one of the amendments that I stated in general debate upon the Indian bill I would offer. Another amendment that I stated at that time I would offer is the amendment that is now pending, providing that this vocational board may appoint from time to time advisory committees, with a limitation upon the expenditures that it may make of $50,000 per year. Now, Mr. Chairman, upon this section 6, in many respects the most important in this bill, two great bodies have given it great consideration and have united in their conclusions upon it—the United States Chamber of Commerce and the American Federation of Labor. Both of those bodies, usually more or less antagonistic to each other, urged the adoption of this amendment that is now pending. The United States Chamber of Commerce in a pamphlet, which no doubt all Members have received, in digesting the House and Senate bills, have this to say concerning this proposition:

The change asked by the national chamber's committee is that the Federal board should be required to appoint advisory committees of five each, representing industry, commerce, labor, agriculture, home-making, and general or vocational education. Each committee should be appointed only for such a time as the Federal board determines, and the members should receive for the time of their actual service both compensation and their traveling expenses. The members of each committee should be chosen to represent as many different parts of the country as the geographical distribution of the industry being studied will permit.

That is the attitude of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Now, in reference to the attitude of the American Federation of Labor, I read from the report of the executive council made to the last annual convention of the federation, as follows:

It is our opinion that this new board should be composed of representative men but not partisan representatives of the administration in power. Its personnel should represent the great fundamental activities of life, namely, agriculture, labor, commerce, industry, and education, and the local advisory boards should be equally representative, so that the human activities of the Republic could feel assured that experienced, tested men from their own vocations, such as labor, commerce, agriculture, industry, and education should be fairly and efficiently represented.

That, Mr. Chairman, expresses the views of these two great bodies that are primarily interested in this great subject, the employer of labor and the labor employees themselves.

Now, I am anxious to expedite the consideration of this bill, and I shall not take the time to go into the reasons for these advisory committees as I would under other circumstances, but it can all be summed up in the proposition that this bill should be perfected to the greatest extent possible, so as to insure practical vocational education to the youth of our land, and that means that practical standards should be adopted by this board, composed of practical men, and in so far as they need advice they should have it from practical men. As the bill now stands, Mr. Chairman, it is made mandatory upon this vocational board to get their information through the various departments, the Department of Labor, the Department of Agriculture, and other departments, and that means that this bill—with all due respect to the committee, and I do respect it most highly—in its operation, although that was not the intent of the committee, would make the administration of this bill based upon theory rather than upon practical knowledge.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to interrupt the gentleman just a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, and refer him to lines 17 to 19, page 10 of the bill, where this language occurs:

The Federal board for vocational education shall have the power to employ such assistants as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Would not that give them the right kind?

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, that is the phraseology that we always use in bills contemplating permanent employees or officials. It does not contemplate this kind of a board at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, we need the practical men in order to get these uniform standards, in order that they shall be standards that will not merely make an avenue to drain the money from the Federal Treasury to the States for the purpose of paying it over to them upon some theoretical system of education, but in order to make every dollar that goes out of the State treasury mean something of value to the boys and girls of the land; and if that is to be done we need practical advice, instead of compelling this board to get their information through college graduates, specialists if you please, and trained people if you please. After all, in the performance of this great work there is no graduate in economics, there is no professor of economics anywhere in the United States that can give the effective advice required for the making of these standards, the practical standards that we would have by actual advice of men who know what they are talking about because they have lived in their trade or business and have been brought up in it. I sincerely hope that the amendment may be adopted.

Mr. CANNON and Mr. TOWNER rose.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I understand what the bill carries, and I think I understand the amendment that has been agreed to by the House. But if I understand this present amendment, it proposes to create boards, at an expense of $50,000 a year, not exceeding $50,000 a year. Am I correct in that?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; coming out of the $200,000 already provided for.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely; coming out of the $200,000. That is the whole amount provided for?

Mr. LENROOT. For the administration of the board.

Mr. CANNON. Yes. Now, the amendment, if we must have a board, provides for the appointment by the President, to be confirmed by the Senate, of a board of five. That other provision cares for all this appropriation to be cared for, not by a board of several or by several boards but at a total expense of $20,000. This is a proposition to make an additional expense at least of $30,000. It may be $130,000, as the case may be. The only limit is the $200,000, as I understand it. Am I correct in that?

Mr. LENROOT. If the gentleman means the expense of these advisory committees, that is $50,000.

Mr. CANNON. Then this is an increase of $30,000. It is $50,000 for the advisory committees that the gentleman's amendment covers. Is that right?

Mr. LENROOT. A limit of $50,000.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; a limit of $50,000. Now, I have listened and have gained my knowledge of this bill not by prior investigation but as the debate has proceeded and from reading the bill and report. I apprehend that it is going to pass. Perhaps it ought to pass. I may get into a condition where I will vote for it [laughter], if I keep on learning, before the final vote comes.

But we have been urged to pass this bill. What for? To encourage the States. That is it; not to take possession. It is a donation from Uncle Sam for the education of the people, to encourage the States to participate. How are they to participate? They are to participate through the State boards. Well, I suppose those State boards ought to know what they want. I presume they will know what they want, with the approval now of the Federal board that is provided for by the amendment that is agreed to.

Great Heavens! It looks to me more and more as if this is a proposition to create unnecessary offices, and God knows if there is a government in the world that has now so many unnecessary offices, multiplied and multiplied, and a disposition to multiply further, and with a notice now to make a Cabinet officer out of the head of the Bureau of Education, which is to be offered in an amendment later. Let us give something to the States, to encourage the States, and if they do not select boards that are skilled, then the whole thing fails, because they must cooperate if they get a part of this fund.

Maybe I have grown old; maybe I am not practical. But with the amazing amount of legislation that we have had for the last decade, some of it under us God-blessed Republicans [laughter], saints, as I call them [laughter]—but you have "seen us" and "raised the limit" [laughter]—do you not think you had better take an account of stock for a little while? Let us be practical. Let us have something out of all this legislation to go to the children, for whose betterment we are trying to legislate. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Lenroot amendment, for the reason that I think it will make this bill more practical. I believe the amendment just adopted, proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS], has made this bill more practical and I am heartily in favor of it. When we consider that an army of a million of young people of school age finish their education each year before they are 15 years of age, before completing the eighth grade, we must come to the conclusion that this measure is the most important measure that we have considered, not only at this session but the most important measure that has been considered for many sessions of Congress. It is the greatest conservation movement before the people—the conservation of the efficiency of the industrial workers.

In Wisconsin we have had some experience with vocational education. We passed a law in 1911, and while it contained a board like the one proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky, we did not have these advisory committees, and we did not administer the law in a practical way. The educators on the board administered the law, and not the practical men on the board. But in the last two years we have had advisory committees similar to the one proposed in the Lenroot amendment, and we have accomplished more in the last two years in making vocational educaction practical than we did in the several years before. The Wisconsin Board of Industrial Education is composed of three employers of labor, three skilled employees, the State superintendent of public instruction, the dean of the College of Engineering, and the dean of the extension department of the University of Wisconsin. This board is well balanced, very efficient, and is doing a wonderful work.

We went through the motions of vocational education for several years before. Our young men who were studying manual training and vocational training spent their time making bootjacks and birch-bark bird houses and coat hangers, but did not get down to the real, practical work of vocational education.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. If Wisconsin has done so admirably upon her own motion, can not the other States, under this law that we propose to pass, be trusted to be as wise as Wisconsin through their various boards, providing one-half of the amount from their State treasuries? Oh, we have got some wisdom in the other States. [Applause.]

Mr. BROWNE. I think the other States can be trusted, but if we can hurry this matter up it is important to do so. Every year there are a million young people going out of school before finishing the eighth grade, with no education that will help them to make a living, and if we can hurry up their training a few years we shall be doing a great service to them and the entire country, and really making more advancement in conservation than by any of these other conservation movements. It will simply get us along quicker if the Government gives some aid, as it is giving aid in all these other activities. Now, this amendment is simply the adoption of the German system. About 30 years ago Bismarck said to his educators that the education system of Germany was not practical enough, and he practically took the vocational education or industrial education of Germany out of the hands of the schoolmasters and placed it in the hands of practical men and created boards composed of employers of labor and skilled laborers, and as a result of that practical education we have the great efficiency of the German people to-day. There are practically no able-bodied people in Germany who are not self-supporting. She sets an example for the world in this respect.

The city of Munich probably has greater efficiency in its industrial workers than any other city in the world, due to its board of vocational education which is composed of 23 representatives of local occupations, and Dr. Kirchen Steiner, its superintendent, says of his advisory board:

> I could not have gotten along in any other way. The personnel of my board causes each local occupation, 50 in all, to be taught with a particularity and an intensiveness that make the city lead in its industries in all the markets of the world.

Munich has an advisory board of some 20 members who are conversant with all the different industries taught, of which there are about 50. Now, as I say, we can not make this bill too practical. We have made it practical in one way by the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS], and I believe we will make it still more practical by adopt-

ing the amendment of my colleague [Mr. LENROOT]. The great weakness of industrial education in the different States to-day is that it does not give a practical education that will enable a boy to be proficient enough in his trade to earn a good living. The great fault in many of our law schools to-day is that we have theoretical lawyers, law professors who have never appeared in court and never tried a case, who are teaching law; while the law schools that have practical men, who are in active practice and who come to the lecture room from the courts, are the ones that are turning out young men who are practical and efficient lawyers, and I believe we should proceed in this way in vocational education, along practical lines, by having a representative board and giving them the opportunity offered by this amendment to consult with practical and experienced men from all the various industries.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. The provision of the amendment is that there shall be five advisory boards appointed by the Federal board.

Mr. LENROOT. The number is not limited.

Mr. TOWNER. The number is not limited. There may be more than that. I accepted the statement that was submitted to the United States Chamber of Commerce. These boards shall consist of five or more members. These gentlemen are to have $50,000 appropriated among themselves each year for the purpose of enabling them to advise the central board here in Washington regarding the performance of its duties. I was very much amused with the suggestion of my friend from Wisconsin that these advisory boards, that are to come here from all over the United States to tell the commission how to perform their duties, are a practical institution. I imagine them coming here from all over the country to advise the commission in a practical way about how to perform the duties of their office.

I thought the President ought to have a free hand in the appointment of the commission. I yielded in my judgment to the limitation that has been placed upon the President in the appointment of the commission. I have done this against my judgment, but for the purpose of securing a speedy conclusion of the consideration of this bill. But when it comes to taking $50,000 out of the $200,000 fund for the purpose of making a holiday excursion for men from California and Colorado and all over the United States to come here and advise this general board how to perform its duties, it seems to me that the proposition is nothing else than ridiculous. The provision of the bill is—

Such studies, investigations, and reports concerning agriculture, for the purposes of agricultural education, shall, so far as practicable, be made in cooperation with or through the Department of Agriculture.

I wonder if my friend from Wisconsin considers that the work of the Department of Agriculture is merely theoretical? Yet this work is to be done in conjunction with the Agricultural Department of the Government, so as to save this additional expense and make the work of the commission more effective. The bill says that—

Such studies, investigations, and reports concerning trades and industries, for the purposes of trade and industrial education, shall, so far as practicable, be made in cooperation with or through the Department of Labor.

I wonder if my friend thinks that the Secretary of Labor is a purely theoretical man, and that those who are associated with him would give the board merely theoretical advice? And so on with regard to the other departments.

This bill is framed on the idea that there shall be cooperation with these various departments named in the bill, and that the various specialists shall aid in advising and assisting the commission in the conduct of its work. I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be voted down, because I believe it will be a useless and a needless expenditure of $50,000 of money that could be better applied for the practical work of the board.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] has built up a man of straw and then has proceeded to demolish it. The gentleman says that we propose to throw away $50,000 in furnishing junketing trips for the members of this committee. The gentleman from Iowa knows that in the language of the bill as it now stands, and which he approves of, it appropriates any sum up to $200,000 for the purpose of making this very study and investigation. The difference between my amendment and his proposition is that I want some practical knowledge brought through these studies and investigations and he does not care whether there is any practical knowledge or not.

The gentleman talks about the Department of Agriculture. I frankly admit that these studies can be made through the Department of Agriculture, because their experts are made up to-day of efficient, practical men, as a rule. But when he comes to the other departments, when he speaks of the Department of Labor he furnishes no argument when he says that the Secretary of Labor is a competent man. He is, but Secretary of Labor Wilson is not going to make these studies and investigations. The Department of Labor is a splendid bureau through which to get information and statistics, but it is valueless, practically speaking, so far as furnishing this board with information concerning the one great question of making uniform standards for vocational education.

The gentleman talks as if my amendment was mandatory. It is discretionary with this board whether they call upon these men or not, and if this board desires the views and experience of practical men in fixing these standards, will anyone say why the board should not have the authority to call upon practical men to furnish it? They are not required to call upon them, they are not required to appoint a single committee unless they choose to do it, but my amendment gives them the right to do it. Mr. Chairman, I insist that if this bill is to be something more than a drainage tube from the Federal Treasury to the State treasury, that we ought to adopt every safeguard possible, and this amendment furnishes one of the safeguards.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to ask the gentleman if it would not be very much better to call men in who have practical information to convey to the board than it would be for the board to hold hearings in order to obtain the information or facts that practical men might have?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; very much better for this board to meet men face to face and get its information from them than to get it from specialists from some bureau second hand.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, just one minute. Lines 17, 18, and 19 of this section gives the power to the Federal board that this amendment proposes to give.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman read it?

Mr. FESS (reading)—

It shall be the duty of the Commissioner of Education to carry out the rules, regulations, and decisions which the board may adopt. The Federal board for vocational education shall have power to employ such assistants as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask the gentleman—who is familiar with the phraseology used in legislative acts—whether he thinks for one moment that the word "assistants" in that section contemplates anything of this kind?

Mr. FESS. That is the way it is written.

Mr. LENROOT. Then it differs from all other bills that we have had.

Mr. FESS. The purpose of this provision is to link up the Federal board with the Government agencies and to get through these special organizations now already created what is needed without creating a separate organization with increased expenditure.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman from Ohio think that the language he has just read authorizes the Federal board to employ clerks, and nothing else?

Mr. FESS. It authorizes the board to employ anyone without limit of salary that it sees fit to make the investigation and to make the board effective. We state that this investigation shall be made as far as possible in matters of labor through the Labor Department, and in matters of commerce through the Commerce Department, and in matters of agriculture through the Agricultural Department, and our purpose is not to create a separate commission with increased salaries—a thing we are all tired of—but to get this work done by experts in departments already created. There is no place in the world where we have as many investigators, such a group of scholars, such a group of practical men as we have in the various executive departments now under control of the President of the United States, and we do not want needlessly to create a special commission to do this work, but we wish to do it through already created boards under the jurisdiction of our cabinet officers. This was the purpose of omitting this special advisory board, and it seems to me unwise to create a new commission with an additional expense. The amendment providing for representation of the various fields which we just adopted insures against impractical methods.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman stated a moment ago that the language of the bill permitted the very thing that my amendment proposes, and then at the conclusion of his argument he says that that is not the intention. What is the gentleman's view of it?

Mr. FESS. The gentleman's view of the matter is that the Federal board can make the investigation that it thinks is necessary to make it effective, to make the bill practicable through all the existing departments here instead of creating a separate commission to do it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would not the effect of the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] be to create a number of new place holders and supernumeraries, who would be simply in addition to the officers already created by us?

Mr. FESS. That is one reason I am objecting to it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is the most important feature of the bill and that it ought to be adopted. The language read by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], contained on lines 17, 18, 19, of page 10, if it does anything, authorizes the board which the bill creates to employ a permanent staff of investigators who will be on the pay roll for all time, whereas the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] proposes to authorize the appointment of an advisory board or boards of practical men in their various lines. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] says that the bill proposes to make the investigations through the Agricultural Department, through the Department of Labor, and through the Department of Commerce, and I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio what the Department of Labor knows about the various trades of the United States, or what the Department of Commerce knows about the various activities in the commerce of the United States, excepting in so far as they are able to compile a lot of statistics in connection with the movement of commodities. If you want to get information about the activities of the commerce of the United States and of the practical things in connection with the movements of men engaged in commerce, you want to talk to the men who are engaged in the industries of the United States. If you want to get the practical information about the trades of the United States, you must talk to the men who are in the trades of the United States, and not to the Department of Labor, whose offices are filled with a lot of politicians who know nothing about trades.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman asks why you would go to the Department of Agriculture to find information pertaining to agriculture.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, let the gentleman talk about the other things. I have not criticized that part of it.

Mr. FESS. I think I would go to the Department of Agriculture because I would find a group of people there who probably know more about the science of agriculture than any other group that probably could be found anywhere.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, my friend does not do me justice. He does not state what I stated. I said you provided in this bill that you should. I did not say that you ought not to go. What I say is that you ought not to go to the Department of Labor or to the Department of Commerce, because neither of these departments knows anything about the practical side of the things with which they deal.

Mr. CANNON. Then they ought to be abolished.

Mr. MADDEN. They do not treat of the practical side of the life of the country. They are compiling statistics; they are making records of things done by people who have practical knowledge; and if you want to get practical knowledge, you must go to the man who has it. It is not in the possession of any man in either of these departments, for he is not working at his trade, and most of the men in the departments have no trade and have no knowledge of trades.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What is this Federal board of vocational education, consisting of the United States Commissioner of Education and four members appointed by the President of the United States, to do?

Mr. MADDEN. They are to regulate the conduct of the education which is provided for in the bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think that the President will appoint five men competent to do this work?

Mr. MADDEN. I have no knowledge of what the President will do. Judging from what he has done in the past, I would rather doubt it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman think we ought to appoint an advisory board for the Interstate Commerce Commission to tell it what to do?

Mr. MADDEN. We have already provided for the appointment of an advisory board for a more important board than the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Federal Reserve Bank Board is being advised by men of intelligence, men of practical experience.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If we create these Federal boards and then create advisory boards to wet-nurse them, why do not we create the United States Chamber of Commerce on one side and the American Federation of Labor on the other to wet-nurse the Congress of the United States and tell it what to do?

Mr. MADDEN. We are only providing that the appointments shall be made, and any provision for appointments that may be made ought to be on practical lines, and that is suggested in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LENROOT) there were—ayes 27, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 12, after the word "education," add the following: "or any member thereof."

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] for just a moment. This amendment that I have offered is for the purpose of perfecting the section in accordance with the amendment of mine which was adopted a little while ago. The bill provides that the Commissioner of Education may make such recommendations to the board relative to the administration of this act as he may from time to time deem advisable. That was upon the theory that he was to be the chairman of the board. My amendment, which was adopted a while ago, provides that this chairman shall be annually elected by the members of the board, and so I have added, after the word "education," the words "or any member thereof" may make these recommendations to the board. That is the gist of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POWERS) there were—ayes 16, noes 39.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Page 10, line 15, strike out the words "Commissioner of Education" and insert in lieu thereof the words "chairman of the board."

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, this is another amendment, offered for the purpose of perfecting the bill as amended. The original bill provides it shall be the duty of the Commissioner of Education to carry out the rules and regulations and decisions which the board may adopt. That was under the theory that the Commissioner of Education was going to be the chairman of the board, and that has been changed. He may be the chairman and he may not be the chairman. Therefore I move to strike out the words "Commissioner of Education" and say "the chairman of the board."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that I sincerely hope the committee will accept the amendment, since the amendment has been adopted providing the board shall elect its own chairman. The duty of carrying out the regulations should devolve upon the chairman and not upon the Commissioner of Education, who now merely becomes a member ex officio of the board.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me in view of the amendment that has been adopted that we should strike out of the bill, beginning at line 12, down to the word "adopt" in line 17, for the reason that the Commissioner of Education is now a member of this board and acts with the board at all times.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. And this provision which is made with the view that the Commissioner of Education should be chairman of the board is now unnecessary, and this part of the bill should be stricken out.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. DOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. BORLAND. It strikes me that the provision there that the Commissioner of Education should make recommendation to the board is not based solely on the fact that he is chairman of the board, or based on the fact that he is an officer of the Government. It is presumed that he has the same policy in regard to education that is common to the other members of the board. His investigation as an expert educator should be useful to the board. On no other theory would he make any recommendation at all. The board meets in order to make their own recommendation.

Mr. DOWELL. In answer to the gentleman I merely desire to say that the Commissioner of Education under the amendment is now one of the commissioners. He is present and acts with this commission and is a part of it. He may submit at any time any suggestions or recommendations he desires, the same as any other commissioner. Why should we give one commissioner a certain right to recommend that we do not give to all, when they now stand upon an equal footing? It seems to me that these lines should be stricken out, and when it is in order I desire to make the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

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

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I send an amendment to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 17, strike out section 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The administration of this act shall be under the control of the Commissioner of Education."

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield? I have one or two amendments to offer in order to perfect the section. If I do not waive the right, I have no objection to his going on.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Missouri will allow, there has been read prior to this time an amendment by way of substitute to the entire section, offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], and until the section is perfected the Chair would hold that the gentleman's amendment is not now in order.

Mr. BORLAND. I think the Chair is right about that, and I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws the amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 21, strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is an agreeing to the amendment .

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I make the same amendment on line 1, page 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 1, strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

Mr. LENROOT. And the same amendment, Mr. Chairman, in line 5, page 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 5, strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

Mr. LENROOT. And on line 9 strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 9, strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not, in view of the fact that the Commissioner of Education is no longer chairman of the board, lines 14, 15, and 16 should not come out on page 10.

Mr. HUGHES. It has been amended to cover that part.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment by way of substitute——

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment which in view of the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. POWERS) should now be offered, inasmuch as the language has been changed. I move to strike out lines 12, 13, and 14 to the period.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOWELL. Page 10, lines 12, 13, and 14, strike out the following language:

"The Commissioner of Education may make such recommendations to the board relative to the administration of this act as he may from time to time deem advisable."

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT. Was that amendment not voted on a few moments ago?

The CHAIRMAN. That amendment was not voted upon. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. DOWELL. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 21, noes 37.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment, by way of substitute for the entire section, offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the committee I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be permitted to read the whole substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment by way of substitute will again be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERCROMBIE: Amend the bill by striking out all of section 6 and substituting the following:

"SEC. 6. That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, there is hereby created an executive department of the Government to be known as the department of education, which shall be under the supervision of a secretary of education, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive a salary of $12,000 per annum, and whose term of office shall be the same as that of the heads of the other executive departments. The said secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for said department of such device as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal.

"There shall be in said department an assistant secretary of education, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive a salary of $6,000 a year, and who shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the secretary or required by law. There shall also be such clerical assistants as may be authorized by Congress.

"The department of education shall have power to cooperate with State boards in carrying out the provisions of this act, and it shall be the duty of said department to make, or cause to have made, studies, investigations, and reports, with particular reference to their use in aiding the States in the establishment of vocational schools and classes and in giving instruction in agriculture, trades and industries, commerce and commercial pursuits, and home economics."

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order, and the gentleman from Tennessee reserves it. But the gentleman from Illinois makes it. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. It clearly is not germane to the bill. It creates an executive department of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear from the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the gentleman from Illinois is a universally recognized authority in the matter of the interpretation and application of the rules of this House. In fact, I have never known his superior as a parliamentarian. I submit, however, that the proposed substitute seems to be germane. Section 6 provides an agency for carrying into effect the provisions of this act, and the substitute which I offer for section 6 provides an agency for carrying into effect the provisions of this act. Their purposes are the same; their duties the same.

Section 6 as originally drawn created a board, to be composed of five Cabinet officers and the Commissioner of Education. Section 6 as reported by the Committee on Education creates a similar board, to be composed of the Commissioner of Educa-

tion as ex-officio chairman and four members to be appointed by the President. The substitute which I offer creates an agency for a similar purpose. Instead of creating a board it establishes a department and charges it with the duty of administering the provisions of this act. The proposed substitute confers upon the proposed department no power, no duty, that is not directly connected with the purposes and provisions of this act and that is not conferred upon the proposed board.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that the proposed amendment is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. The proposed amendment, a substitute, is not germane to the bill under consideration.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BORLAND: Page 8, line 17, strike out section 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The administration of this act shall be under the control of the Commissioner of Education."

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment should be adopted it would, of course, necessitate unanimous consent or subsequent amendment to change the other portions of the bill. It seems to me that there is no magic in the word "board." In fact, we may sometimes attribute to a board virtues that it really does not possess.

The first bill passed by Congress providing for cooperation with the States in an activity which was formerly considered to be entirely within the State's jurisdiction was the road bill. The road bill, I think, furnished the model for this bill. But in the road bill, in order to get it passed and approved by the people and their Representatives, it was provided that as much of the money as possible should go directly to the object to be accomplished, namely, the construction of roads. Care was taken that an undue amount of the money should not be absorbed in the creation of salaried positions. It seems that that reasoning is just as cogent in this matter as it was in the case of the road bill. In other words, it seems that what we want to do is to stimulate education and provide as much of the Federal activities in that direction as possible and to spend as little as we can on the machinery of the administration.

Now, I say that is what we want to do. I take it that that is what the House wants to do. I would not want to assume that the House wants to create unnecessary offices. But if we did not find it necessary in administering the great road fund—more than twice the size of this fund—to provide for a board, but considered that the whole result could be accomplished by having the States submit their plans to the Department of Agriculture and having the proper officials there approve that plan and have it carried out under the direct supervision of the States, it seems to me that method can be followed here. And if the real plan is to stimulate the States and encourage them to submit a plan of vocational education to the approval of the Federal Government, that approval can be rendered by one official much more expeditiously and effectively than it could be done by a board. We did not find it necessary to create a board to administer the road law, and yet it apparently seems to be desired here to create a board to administer this law. With all due respect to the committee, it does seem to create unnecessary offices.

Nor can I understand why a bipartisan board should be necessary in this particular matter when it was not necessary in the case of the road law. Here is each State presumably with its own political policy and aspiration; it has to submit certain plans of education, and then those plans of education are to be passed upon and approved and cooperated in by the Federal Government. There does not seem to be in that anything requiring a bipartisan board.

But I can very easily understand—and this, I think, is the real evil to be avoided—that, if we create such a bipartisan board, in a few years it will not be limited in its total expenditures to $200,000, but we will be the recipients of telegrams and letters and newspaper articles and other inspired literature demanding that we increase the amount available for that tremendous and important board of the Federal Government. Every board runs its tentacles—its roots—down into the social, industrial, and commercial bodies of the country, and the first thing you know we have got support from some source for that board. That does not always occur with a strictly administrative officer. It does seem to me that we can strengthen this bill very materially and add to its efficiency in many respects if we will dispense with the board. The board, after all, can agree upon only one plan of action. If they disagree we certainly have a source of weakness instead of a source of strength. All the board can accomplish is to unite, to agree, upon a policy. It seems to me that policy can be carried out much more efficiently by one executive officer than by a board. I think the total result of section 6 as now drawn, and especially as amended by the amendment, which I voted against, to create classes out of which this board shall be selected—the total result is to weaken the section, and we will still more weaken it if we leave the board in existence at all. I think the board ought to be stricken out and the commissioner of education left in charge.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment by way of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BORLAND) there were—ayes 10, noes 39.

Accordingly the amendment was disagreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on section 6 be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUGHES. 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. PAGE of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 703) to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture, the trades, industries, and home economics; to provide for cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to authorize the appropriation of money and to regulate its expenditure, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request:

FLORENCE, S. C., *January 2, 1917.*

Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN,
Washington, D. C.:

Please secure five days' leave of absence and arrange pairs. I am in favor of probe.

J. W. RAGSDALE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, this request will be granted.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KITCHIN, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the vocational educational bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the vocational educational bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I make a similar request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes a similar request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting some remarks made on yesterday in Philadelphia by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] on Thirty Months of War.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made yesterday by Dr. FESS at Philadelphia on Thirty Months of War. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the vocational education bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks on the pending bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MINORITY VIEWS ON POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed two days in which to file minority views on the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 19410).

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for two days in which to file minority views on the Post Office appropriation bill (H. Rept. No. 1249, pt. 2). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 3, 1917, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting statement showing in detail what officers or employees of the Navy Department who were paid out of appropriations contained in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, traveled on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1809); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Ashley River, N. C. (H. Doc. No. 1810); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of expenditures on account of appropriation "Contingencies of the Army" during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1811); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of the publications received and distributed by the War Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1812); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of the Merrimack River, Mass., from Lowell to the sea, and on preliminary examination of Merrimack River, from Lowell, Mass., to Manchester, N. H. (H. Doc. No. 1813); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a petition from a number of employees in the War Department occupying low-salaried positions asking for an increase in their compensation because of the high cost of living; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a petition from the employees in the office of the local inspectors at Evansville, Ind., requesting an increase in salaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

8. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a petition from the employees in the office of the local inspectors at Dubuque, Iowa, Steamboat-Inspection Service requesting an increase in salaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a petition from the employees in the office of the local inspectors at Apalachicola, Fla., Steamboat-Inspection Service, requesting an increase in salaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a petition from the employees in the office of the local inspectors at Galveston, Tex., Steamboat-Inspection Service, requesting an increase in salaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

11. A letter from the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, transmitting lists of documents and files of papers which are not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 1814); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of the commanding officer of Watertown Arsenal of "tests of iron and steel and other materials for industrial purposes" made at that arsenal during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

13. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William Boughan, son and one of the heirs of William M. Boughan, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1815); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Emma R. Burlingame, widow of Andrew J. Burlingame, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1816); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

15. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Sidney E. Harrison, widow of Samuel H. Harrison, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1817); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

16. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Alonzo D. Hosmer *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1818); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

17. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary E. McDowell, widow of Cyrus D. McDowell, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1819); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

18. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of John W. Yelton *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1820); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

19. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary E. Martin, widow (remarried) of Samson M. Archer, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1821); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

20. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Belle W. Morris, niece of John H. Benham, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1822); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

21. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary J. Camp, widow of Samuel C. Camp, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1823); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

22. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Kate C. Carey and Fannie C. Eldridge, daughters and sole heirs of Milton Carpenter, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1824); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

23. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William C. Cotton, son of Joseph Cotton, deceased, *v.* The United States; (H. Doc. No. 1825); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

24. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Cornelia Cress, widow of Edwin Cress, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1826); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

25. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Nancy P. Crosson, widow of Francis M. Crosson, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1827); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

26. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Ella C. Daniels, widow of Charles Daniels, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1828); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

27. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Lillian J. Hines and Frances D. Clark, nieces of Thomas Dean, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1829); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

28. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Matilda D. Edgerton, widow of William H. Edgerton, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1830); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

29. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary St. C. Ferguson, widow of William G. Ferguson, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1831); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

30. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Minerva Groom, widow of John C. Groom, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1832); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

31. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Maggie M. Deisch, formerly Maggie M. Guild, widow of George H. Guild, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1833); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

32. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary C. Griffin, widow of Daniel F. Griffin, deceased, *v.* The

United States (H. Doc. No. 1834); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

33. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of David Isaacs, Jane Davis, Phoebe Isaacs, and Julia Einstein, children and sole heirs of Lyon Isaacs, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1835); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

34. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Frances J. Van Tuyle, widow (remarried) of Henry W. Jacobs, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1836); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

35. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Joseph B. Presdee *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1837); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

36. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Orville T. Perkins *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1838); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

37. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Robert H. M. Donnelly *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1839); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

38. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of George H. Devol *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1840); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

39. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Hattie Reaver and Ola Baird, daughters and sole heirs of Jacob E. Taylor, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1841); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

40. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Elizabeth A. Smith, widow of Thomas J. Smith, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1842); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

41. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary F. Silsbee, widow of Eri Silsbee, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1843); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

42. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Annie E. Perigo, widow of Ephraim Y. Perigo, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1844); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

43. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary E. Sweisfort, widow (remarried) of Benjamin M. Frank, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1845); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

44. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Albert Reynolds *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1846); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

45. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Joseph Brinton *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1847); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

46. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of John C. Bayless *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1848); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

47. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William H. Whitney *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1849); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

48. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Hannah C. Wainwright, widow of William A. Wainwright, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1850); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

49. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Cleveland Robinson, son of John C. Robinson, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1851); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

50. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Lucius H. Ives *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1852); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

51. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Emma G. Harris, daughter of Henry Gephart, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1853); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

52. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Frank Erdlemeyer *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1854); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

53. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Rowland J. Beatty *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1855); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

54. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Margaret G. Augustine, administratrix of Henry Augustine, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1856); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

55. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary A. Wiley, widow of Thomas C. Wiley, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1857); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

56. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Eliza J. Van Doren, widow of Archibald Van Doren, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1858); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

57. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Frances D. Tenney, widow of Luman H. Tenney, deceased *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1859); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

58. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Joseph H. Bigley, administrator of Charles C. Suydam, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1860); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

59. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Isora S. Cottrell, widow (remarried) of Gideon J. Stivers, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1861); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

60. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary S. Sheffield, widow of Eugene S. Sheffield, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1862); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

61. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Dwight L. Bathurst, administrator of Horace A. Russell, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1863); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

62. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Arthur C. Page, son of Francis M. Page, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1864); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

63. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of George D. Millett, brother of John Millett, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1865); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

64. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary L. Martin, widow of Jeremiah C. Martin, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1866); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

65. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary L. Jennings, daughter of Benjamin F. Lee, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1867); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

66. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of C. T. Wathen, administrator of William H. Lawrence, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1868); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13311) granting a pension to Mrs. Dicie J. Sullivan, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 19410) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 19411) providing for construction of bridges and culverts on public highways out of the reclamation fund when rendered necessary or appropriate by the construction of canals or laterals under the reclamation law; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 19412) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Pomona, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MONDELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 19413) for the inclusion of certain lands in the Wyoming National Forest, Wyo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 19414) for the erection of a public building at the city of Auburn, State of California, and appropriating moneys therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 19415) to remove restrictions against alienation and taxation on all lands in the Five Civilized Tribes immediately upon the death of the allottee; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 19416) to provide for an auxiliary reclamation project in connection with the Minidoka project, Idaho; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 19417) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat., pp. 539–560, chap. 389), relating to publications admitted to the second class of mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PARK: A bill (H. R. 19418) to promote the reclamation of arid and swamp lands of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19419) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19420) to authorize the President of the United States to advance officers on the retired list who were wounded in battle in the service of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 19421) to authorize entry of the public lands by school districts for schoolhouse site and ground; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HENRY: A bill (H. R. 19422) to prevent the use of the mails and of the telegraph and telephone in furtherance of fraudulent and harmful transactions on stock exchanges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 19423) granting to the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, a right of way for a storm-water relief sewer through a portion of the Presidio of San Francisco Military Reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 19424) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition and sale of lands known as the Klamath River Indian Reservation," approved June 17, 1892 (27 Stat. L., pp. 52–53); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 19425) to raise revenue by taxing certain articles of food held in cold storage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 19426) to amend an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 19427) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the trustees of the Onawa Public Library, Onawa, Iowa, two condemned bronze or brass cannon, with their carriages and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 19428) to authorize the granting of a town-site patent to the town site of Petersburg, Alaska, and contiguous land; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 19429) fixing interstate passenger rates in certain circumstances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 19430) to amend section 6 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, by providing for the filing with the Interstate Commerce Commission by telephone and telegraph companies of their rates, fares, and charges for the transmission of messages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 19431) to provide standard time for the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 19432) for the relief of the Wichita and affiliated bands of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 19433) changing the designation, fixing the status of, and granting an increase of pay to clerks of the Quartermaster Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A resolution (H. Res. 423) directing the Attorney General of the United States to transmit to the House certain information relating to the shipment of arms and munitions of war into Mexico in violation of the provisions of the joint resolution of Congress, approved March 14, 1912, and the proclamation of the President issued in compliance therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 424) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the House certain information relating to the shipment of arms and munitions of war into Mexico in violation of the provisions of the joint resolution of Congress, approved March 14, 1912, and the proclamation of the President issued in compliance therewith; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 425) directing the Secretary of War to transmit to the House certain information relating to the shipment of arms and munitions of war into Mexico, in violation of the provisions of the joint resolution of Congress, approved March 14, 1912, and the proclamation of the President issued in compliance therewith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A resolution (H. Res. 426) indorsing President's peace policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LENROOT: A resolution (H. Res. 427) amending the rules of the House by the creation of a committee on salaries of officers and employees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 328) to investigate the charges made by Thomas W. Lawson against Members of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 329) authorizing and directing the Department of Labor to make an inquiry into the cost of living in the United States, and to report thereon to Congress as early as practicable; to the Committee on Apprpriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 19434) granting an increase of pension to Samuel V. Templin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19435) granting an increase of pension to John B. Mendenhall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 19436) granting an increase of pension to William C. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 19437) granting a pension to Susannah Ditterline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 19438) granting an increase of pension to Zaphnath Stephens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 19439) granting an increase of pension to Clark L. Stilwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19440) granting an increase of pension to Hiram C. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 19441) granting a pension to J. H. Kissinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELLY: A bill (H. R. 19442) granting a pension to Mary A. Baker, widow of Fletcher D. Baker, Company B, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Infantry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 19443) granting an increase of pension to David Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19444) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. F. B. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19445) to waive the age limit and the disqualification of being married in the appointment of Edgar N. Caldwell as a second lieutenant in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROSSER: A bill (H. R. 19446) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Smolen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 19447) for the relief of Ferdinand A. Roy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19448) granting an increase of pension to Philip P. Keller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 19449) granting an increase of pension to Garrett W. Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19450) granting an increase of pension to John Norfleet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19451) granting an increase of pension to John Barker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILLON: A bill (H. R. 19452) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Cross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 19453) granting an increase of pension to Amanda J. Yockey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19454) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth York; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 19455) granting a pension to Lilla J. Darling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 19456) granting an increase of pension to William W. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 19457) for the relief of T. M. Francis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 19458) granting an increase of pension to Frank S. Trickey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 19459) granting an increase of pension to Robert N. Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 19460) granting an increase of pension to Belle W. Dexter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19461) granting an increase of pension to Herman Brumley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 19462) granting an increase of pension to Morris Lincoln; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 19463) granting an increase of pension to Eli Sherman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19464) granting an increase of pension to William Winters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19465) granting an increase of pension to Theodore M. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19466) granting a pension to David Leroy Reed; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 19467) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Cross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 19468) for the relief of Messrs. Palmer and McBryde; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 19469) granting a pension to Alvin Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 19470) granting an increase of pension to George H. Bostwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19471) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19472) granting a pension to Francis G. Babcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 19473) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 19474) granting a pension to Joseph Ray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19475) granting a pension to William M. Helvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19476) for the relief of James Clay Colson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 19477) granting an increase of pension to Adolph van Reuth, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 19478) granting an increase of pension to Lou West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19479) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Brosius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19480) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Hulett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19481) granting a pension to Lewis Spriggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 19482) to provide a suitable medal for Charles P. Bragg; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 19483) granting an increase of pension to John A. Quick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19484) granting a pension to James R. Hays; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 19485) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Gleason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19486) granting a pension to Nellie Plew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 19487) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Bunyan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 19488) granting an increase of pension to George Edward Blackmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 19489) for the relief of Thomas Ford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 19490) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Crews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 19491) granting an increase of pension to Josiah James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 19492) granting an increase of pension to Hobart Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 19493) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. McCoy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 19494) granting a pension to Catherine R. Reader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 19495) granting an increase of pension to James W. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19496) granting an increase of pension to William D. Bunch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19497) granting an increase of pension to William B. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19498) granting a pension to T. McElvaney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19499) granting a pension to Grant Gooch; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 19500) granting a pension to Fred G. Brooks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 19501) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Lingle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19502) granting an increase of pension to James H. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 19503) granting a pension to George W. Sanford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS: A bill (H. R. 19504) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Kester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 19505) granting an increase of pension to Louisa N. Tobey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 19506) granting a pension to Mary Glover; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 19507) granting an increase of pension to De Foris Thayer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 19508) granting an increase of pension to John U. Whitford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 19509) granting an increase of pension to George M. Loring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 19510) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Boyce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19511) granting an increase of pension to Jacob J. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19512) granting an increase of pension to Luke P. Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 19513) granting an increase of pension to Frederick C. Schriefer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19514) granting a pension to Luda Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19515) granting a pension to Earl P. Ridgman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 19516) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Konicka; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19517) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Utter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19518) granting an increase of pension to George W. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19519) granting a pension to Henry S. Gooch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19520) granting a pension to Thomas S. Garen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19521) granting a pension to Jennie Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19522) for the relief of S. Reamey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19523) for the relief of the legal representatives of Archer Hays, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19524) for the relief of the heirs of Abraham Elrod; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19525) for the relief of the heirs of Lot Quinn; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19526) for the relief of heirs of Nathan Pumphrey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19527) for the relief of the legal representatives of Jennie Hunter, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19528) for the relief of Jennie Belle Cox, Robert Isaac Clegg, and Thomas Neel Clegg, children and only heirs of Thomas Watts Clegg, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19529) granting an honorable discharge to Phillip Totten; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19530) to correct the military record of Andrew J. Flanders; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 19531) granting a pension to Americus Watt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19532) granting a pension to Angeline E. Nourse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 19533) to correct the military record of William J. Kerrigan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 19534) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton L. Karr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19535) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Ambrosier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19536) granting an increase of pension to William Henry Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19537) granting a pension to Lucia L. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 19538) granting an increase of pension to Marvin J. Boughton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Red Polled Cattle Club of America, Gotham, Wis., protesting against proposed embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Kings County, N. Y., for a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 18089 for the special relief of Louisa Casy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Licking Lodge, No. 499, Loyal Order of Moose, of Newark, Ohio, against the increase of postage for periodicals, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BROWNE: Petition of Fred Dethloff, W. H. Slatter, and many other residents of Marathon County, Wis., in favor of the Lindbergh resolution, No. 264; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of National Child Labor Committee, New York City, favoring passage of the Smith-Hughes vocational education bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Board of Aldermen, New York City, protesting abolishment of pneumatic-tube mail system now in operation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Paragon Plaster Co., Syracuse, N. Y., favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of International Union of the United Brewery Workmen of America, Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against passage of national prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Lincoln Society, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring compulsory universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of G. O. Manley, New York City, favoring passage of House bill 15312; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

Also, petition of Woman's Benefit Association of the Maccabees, Port Huron, Mich., protesting against increase of pound rate on periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Memorial of Board of Aldermen of the city of New York, against autotruck service for mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of sundry citizens, favoring increase for railway mail clerks and others; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of International Union of Brewery Workmen, of Schenectady, N. Y., against prohibition of any character; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Electric Workers, of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring embargo on exportation of foodstuffs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Loyal Order of Moose, of Gloverville, Amsterdam, and Johnstown, N. Y., against increase of postage on certain periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Christian Herald, New York City, protesting against proposed increase on second-class postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of New York Photo Engravers' Union, No. 1; New York State Federation of Labor; International Typographical Union; Hardware Age; Central Federated Union; Christian Work; New York Freeman's Journal; Curtis Publishing Co.; Woman's Benefit Association of the Maccabees; and W. D. Boyce Co., protesting against proposed increase of the rate on periodicals, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Cigarmakers' International Union of America, Local Union No. 132, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against passage of national prohibition law, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Child Labor Committee, New York City, favoring the passage of the Smith-Hughes vocational education bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of International Union of United Brewery Workmen of America and Central Federated Union, favoring increase of pay for Federal employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Boufort's Wine & Spirit Circular (Inc.), Louisville, Ky., favoring certain changes in the Randall bill prohibiting sending of periodicals with liquor advertisements through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Ridgewood Board of Trade, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring an increase in number of ways for Brooklyn Navy Yard in order that two ships may be built simultaneously; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Rotary Club of New York and the New York Board of Aldermen, against curtailment of pneumatic mail-tube service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of National Model License League, Louisville, Ky., protesting against passage of prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. K. Gleason, of New York City, and Lincoln Society, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of compulsory universal military training law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of American Bar Association, in favor of the passage of Senate bill 4551, vesting certain power in the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of Middlesex-Essex Pomona Grange, No. 28, Everett, Mass., favoring embargo on wheat and

foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Texas: Petition of sundry firms and citizens of Dallas, Tex., in favor of bill for relief of Niagara Falls power situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Cuero Commercial Club, of Cuero, Tex., and Texas Industrial Traffic League and sundry citizens and firms of Cuero, Tex., favoring passage of bill increasing the membership of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENISON: Petition of certain letter carriers of Marion, Ill., for increased compensation for railway mail clerks and others; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of sundry citizens against embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Wisconsin Dairymen's Association favoring the passage of laws for reasonable national standards for all dairy products, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FESS: Papers to accompany House bill 19016, granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Gibson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7059, granting an increase of pension to Philip H. Lind; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Rockford (Ill.) Merchants and Business Men's Association, for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Joseph Elsone, of Northville, S. Dak., favoring House bill 18531, concerning proofs of widowhood in claim for pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of East St. Louis (Ill.) Commercial Club, favoring the continuation and extension of the pneumatic-tube mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Winnebago National Bank, of Rockford, Ill., favoring House bill 17606, amending Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Curtis Publishing Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., opposing the zone system and increase of postage rates for second-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of L. W. Brewer, of Ottawa, Ill., favoring House bill 13275, relative to military-bounty land warrants; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Evidence to accompany House bill 19020, for the relief of Mort Bradshaw; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of H. S. Speer, of Tinsman, and W. T. McKimon, of Wesson, Ark., for increase in pay of rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 18941, granting increase of pension to Lydia Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial of Sanitary and Reclamation Commission of Astoria, Oreg., asking for erection of modern post-office building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of Greenfield (Cal.) Grange, No. 357, indorsing Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of John W. Hays, president of Union Label Trades Department of American Federation of Labor, representing 720,000 workmen, protesting against all prohibition measures now pending before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Joseph Fessner, of St. Louis, Mo., secretary of the International Union of United Brewery Workmen of America, protesting, on behalf of 60,000 employees of the breweries of St. Louis, Mo., against the enactment of pending prohibition measures now before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Local No. 43, St. Louis, Mo., consisting of 650 members of the International Union of Brewery Workmen, filed by William Frech, secretary, urging the defeat of all prohibition measures now before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: Memorial of San Francisco (Cal.) Labor Council, against high cost of living; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of California Bean Dealers' Association, San Francisco, Cal., relative to the standardization of all food products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHER: Memorial of Board of Aldermen of the city of New York, against autotruck service for mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of employees of the United States arsenal at Benicia, Cal., urging Congress to give consideration to the enactment of legislation for increasing the pay of civil-service employees generally and providing for the retirement of the aged and disabled employees in line with the trend of times; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Redding, Cal., urging embargo on wheat; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of San Francisco (Cal.) Labor Council, favoring a national building in the San Francisco civic center; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of Los Angeles (Cal.) Wholesalers' Board of Trade, opposing repeal of national-bankruptcy act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of California Bean Dealers' Association, favoring standardization of all food products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of employees of the post offices in Los Angeles and Pasadena, Cal., for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Memorial of Board of Aldermen of the city of New York, against autotruck service for mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of New York State Federation of Labor against increasing rates of postage on certain periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Pasco, Fla., favoring passage of immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of W. F. Davis and other railway mail clerks of Amarillo, Tex., asking for increase of pay, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of employees of Laconia, N. H., post office, asking increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of J. F. Kelly, president Massachusetts Council, Friends of Irish Freedom, urging Congress to see that delegates of the United States to the proposed peace conference act as the champions of Irish freedom, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of C. O. Chadwich and other coal dealers of Newton, Mass., for the regulation of the price of coal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Union Label Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, protesting against proposed prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 3, 1917.*

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

Almighty God, we come before Thee in prayer because our confidence and hope is in Thy steadfastness. Thou dost not change. Thou dost not wait upon our willingness to follow. Thou hast led us by Thy hand in paths that we have not known, paths that lie beyond the reach of our thoughts and plans. Thou hast led us; Thou hast increased us in prosperity; Thou hast lavished upon us the blessings of the divine mind. We come before Thee to pray that Thou wouldst guide us this day in the discharge of our duties and lead us forward true to the great principles that we have committed ourselves to as a Nation, and loyal to the name of the God of our fathers. For Christ's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the Journal of the proceedings of the preceding day.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Bryan	Culberson	Gronna
Bankhead	Chamberlain	Cummins	Harding
Beckham	Chilton	Curtis	Hardwick
Brady	Clapp	Fletcher	Hitchcock
Brandegee	Clark	Gallinger	Hollis