

Also, petition of Arthur H. Marston, the Marston Co., San Diego, Cal., favoring 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of A. Morris Carey, of Baltimore, opposing universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Maryland, opposing prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Julius Gutman & Co., of Baltimore, Md., opposing prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of 48 citizens of Greenville, Pa., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens, opposing prohibitory measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OAKLEY: Petition of citizens of Hartford County, Conn., opposing mail-exclusion and prohibition bills pending before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHELAN: Petition of sundry citizens, in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Charles E. Turnbull, of Addison, N. Y.; Clarence A. Ketcham, of Lounsbury, N. Y.; and sundry other rural mail carriers of Addison, Lounsbury, Bolivar, Nichols, Prattsburg, Hornell, Arkport, Alpine, and Westfield, all in the State of New York, favoring a reasonable allowance for equipment maintenance and the placing of rural carriers' compensation upon an equitable and specific basis; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Rev. John R. Adams, Henry O. Dorman, Frank P. White, Hon. Warren J. Cheney, and 86 other citizens and voters of Corning, N. Y., favoring legislation for national prohibition and other prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of Church Federation of Los Angeles, indorsing the Randall bill excluding liquor advertising from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petitions of sundry citizens, in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARD: Petition of Rev. W. J. Clarke Agnew and other residents of High Falls, N. Y., in favor of the passage of several prohibition measures now before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WASON: Petition of Mrs. Lilly C. Howes, Mrs. Eleanor Hall, Mrs. Gady M. Wilkins, Mrs. Julia B. Robbins, Mrs. Alicia C. Newton, Mrs. Juliet M. Lawrence, Mrs. Helen M. Fisher, Mrs. Lillie E. Plummer, Mrs. Obed M. Gordon, Mrs. John S. Blair, Bertha K. Whipple, Grace G. Blodgett, Mary Caroline Blair, Harriet Carpenter, Mrs. Bernice L. Brennan, Mrs. Jennie L. Holman, Mrs. Maud Marshall, Mrs. Carrie L. Bliss, Mrs. Elizabeth U. Fletcher, Mrs. Lillian E. Winters, Mrs. Isabella M. White, Mrs. Mary L. Towns, Mrs. Myra A. Fairbanks, Mrs. Lolie R. Pierce, Mrs. Effie E. Hayden, Ethel Farnsworth, and Mrs. Elise C. Schaff, all residents of Fitzwilliam, N. H., favoring equal political privileges for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Rev. Calvin Delony and 6 other citizens of East Greenville, Pa.; Henry S. Hunsbeyer and 10 other members of the Montgomery County Christian Endeavor Union; and William S. Clapp and 6 other citizens of Skippack, Pa., requesting the passage of House joint resolutions 84 and 85; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petitions of citizens of Worcester, Mass., protesting against antiliquor legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 18, 1917.

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

Almighty God, a thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when they are past, and our years, how swift they fly! We are swept into the great current of Thine own vast eternity. Yet our years are related to Thy eternity. We come to Thee in the midst of the sorrow of the Nation on the death of one of the national heroes. We bless Thee to-day that Thou hast laid Thy hand from time to time upon men who in the crises of our national history have served us well, that Thou hast prepared them before for the coming crisis, and that Thy hand is seen in every turn of the affairs of our national life. We bless Thee that Thou hast led us on. We see to-day how dependent we are upon Thy guidance, and Thy providence, and Thy care to prepare mighty men for the issues of our national life. We

pray that we may put ourselves under Thy command and in Thy control, and that we may be guided by the Divine counsel to accomplish God's great purpose in us as a Nation. For Christ's sake. Amen.

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

### WHITE-PINE BLISTER RUST (S. DOC. NO. 683).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for inclusion in the Agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1918, under the Bureau of Plant Industry, for the eradication or control of the white-pine blister rust, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

### FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

Alice O. Munn, widow of Daniel W. Munn, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 680);

Julia F. Haskell, widow of Edward P. Haskell, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 681); and

Laura Long, widow of Silas Long, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 682).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

### SENATOR FROM INDIANA.

Mr. WATSON. I take pleasure in presenting the credentials of Senator elect HARRY S. NEW, of Indiana, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and placed on the files of the Senate.

The credentials are as follows:

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1916, HARRY STEWART NEW was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Indiana a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1917.

Witness his excellency our governor, James P. Goodrich, and our seal hereto affixed at Indianapolis, Ind., this 15th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1917.

[SEAL.]

By the governor:

JAMES P. GOODRICH, Governor.

E. O. JACKSON,  
Secretary of State.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 186) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue temporary permits for additional diversions of water from the Niagara River.

The message also transmitted resolutions of the House on the death of Admiral Dewey, and announced that the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. PADGETT, Mr. TALBOTT, Mr. ESTOPINAL, Mr. RIORDAN, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts, and Mr. BROWNING a committee on the part of the House to attend the funeral of the late Admiral Dewey.

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 1093) to permit the Denison Coal Co. to relinquish certain lands embraced in its Choctaw and Chickasaw coal lease and to include within said lease other lands within the segregated coal area, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES. I have a letter in the nature of a petition from Dr. Aline Bradley, legislative superintendent of the Fourth Division Drys, of Fairbanks, Alaska, setting out the conditions there and the result of the vote at the last election. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD without reading.

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

THE FOURTH DIVISION DRYS,  
Fairbanks, Alaska, December 29, 1916.

HON. WESLEY L. JONES,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: You are aware that Alaska voted dry on November 7 by a majority of more than 2 to 1 in her four judicial divisions.

You will admit that when the Alaska of dance-hall, gambling, and saloon fame thus registers her protest against the liquor traffic—when more than 8,000 voters out of approximately 12,000 sign their names to such a gigantic petition against alcohol, the petitioners are entitled to their demand.

Make no mistake—liquor has had the ruling hand in Alaska, as well as the robbing hand, hence the vote against it, which vote was not simply



a protest against alcohol, but even more a protest against Alaska's rule by alcohol in all channels—local, Territorial, and judicial.

The plebiscite asked that Alaska be made dry after January 1, 1918. There is no good reason, however, why Alaska should await the memorial of her legislature before securing the passage of an act by Congress prohibiting the sale, manufacture, and importation of alcoholic beverages into Alaska.

We therefore beg to ask your earnest consideration of the reasons why Alaska's prohibition bill should be passed during the present session of Congress:

1. Section 410, Compiled Laws of Alaska, creating a legislative assembly for the Territory, provides that "The authority herein granted shall not extend to \* \* \* the establishment and maintenance of schools."

Before its 1917 spring term the authority of the Alaska Territorial Legislature as regards the "establishment and maintenance" of her schools must be fixed with absolute certainty. Otherwise the school revenue which will begin to fall as licenses expire in 1917 could not be replaced in time; district schools (Nelson) would be closed for lack of funds, while those in incorporated towns would be crippled for the same reason. Our helpless Territorial legislature could not remedy the condition until its next session, in the spring of 1919.

Alaska's children simply can not face two years without proper school revenues.

2. Barring the beers of domestic manufacture, all liquors consumed in Alaska come into the southeastern portion through its ports of entry, and into the interior by one of three routes—St. Michael, White Pass Railroad via Skagway, and via Valdez and Cordova over the trail into Fairbanks and other points. Hence Alaska can be made as dry as a bone if Congress so elects.

3. Having no fear that Alaska would go dry on her first vote, the liquor interests shipped into interior Alaska last summer only the usual annual tonnage of liquors, which supply must last the vast interior territory until the spring of 1917, unless shipped in over the trail at a prohibitive cost.

Should the importation of liquor go unchecked next summer the quantities shipped in will be beyond computation. The liquor interests, through their three wholesale dealers in Alaska, can afford to place as large a stock as they may wish—no limits. The liquors remaining on hand after licenses expire and after January, 1918, will supply material for a profitable bootlegging business for several years to come.

After reading the foregoing we believe you will admit that Alaska needs three things:

1. A prohibitory measure, which shall prohibit the sale and manufacture of liquors in Alaska after January 1, 1918.

2. A clause in the above prohibition measure prohibiting the importation of liquors into Alaska after May 31, 1917. This last and most important clause in order to cut off the bootleggers' supply and settle the bootlegging problem.

3. A sister measure giving Alaska the right to control her schools, bearing in mind that from the Territorial revenues must come the substitute for the liquor-license revenues. These two measures must be enacted concurrently by this session of Congress.

In conclusion, will you introduce and support, or secure and work for the introduction and passage, of the above measures for Alaska? Telegraph rates from Alaska are prohibitive—Alaska too far away for the usual methods of influencing Congress. We are therefore appealing to your sense of fairness and justice in the only manner open to us.

Will you aid us and work for us?

Respectfully, yours,

ALINE BRADLEY,  
Legislative Superintendent.

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of Federal Employees' Union No. 15332, of Davenport, Iowa, praying for the passage of the so-called Nolan minimum-wage bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Iowa State Federation of Labor, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the use of all surplus moneys received from naturalization sources for the education of immigrants, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Worth County Union of the American Society of Equity, of Iowa, praying for an investigation of the charges now being made for sisal fiber, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Austin, Minn., praying for national prohibition, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TILLMAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Aynor, S. C., praying for national prohibition, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Worcester, Fitchburg, Sharon, Northampton, Bolton, and Holliston, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for national prohibition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Women's Auxiliary of the Railway Mail Association of Boston, Mass., praying for an increase of the salaries of employees in the Railway Mail Service, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Order of Railway Conductors, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the proposed legislation for compulsory arbitration of disputes between the railroads and their employees, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Washington, D. C., praying that teachers in the public schools whose combined salaries would exceed \$2,000 be eligible for

both day and night school service, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kalamazoo County, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to found the Government on Christianity, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KERN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Portland, Ind., remonstrating against an increase of postage on second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. WEEKS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Worcester, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor advertisements from the mail, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Fitchburg, Mass., praying for national prohibition, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Real Estate Exchange of Boston, Mass., praying for an investigation into the subject of old-age pensions, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented a petition of Local Branch, Farmers' Education and Cooperative Union of America, of Ione, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to amend section 4 of the interstate-commerce law relating to long and short hauls, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry electricians employed in the Puget Sound Navy Yard, Bremerton, Wash., remonstrating against the proposed schedule of wages for electricians for the year 1917, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. WATSON presented a petition of Meredith Nicholson, Booth Tarkington, Charles A. Bookwalter, and John C. Ruckelshaus and sundry other prominent citizens of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### WHITE-PINE BLISTER RUST.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have a petition signed by very influential parties in the State of New Hampshire in favor of an added appropriation to care for the white-pine blister rust, a matter that is engaging the attention of the people of New England as well as of other parts of the country. I ask that it be printed in the Record with the few names which are attached to it.

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

WARNING—WHITE-PINE TREES BEING DESTROYED—THEY ARE VALUED AT \$261,000,000, AND THE WHITE-PINE BLISTER RUST IS KILLING THEM.

A disease known as the white-pine blister rust threatens the destruction of all the white pine and other five-leaved pine trees in the United States.

It has already appeared in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and in Quebec and Ontario.

There is no known cure for it. It kills the white pines infected and it spreads steadily. The spores or seeds are blown from diseased pines to currant and gooseberry bushes. They germinate on the leaves of these bushes. The leaves then produce millions of spores or seeds of the disease which are blown by the wind from the bushes to the pines, and these, even those several miles distant from the nearest bushes, are infected, become diseased, and die.

The white pines in New England are worth \$75,000,000; in the Lake States, \$96,000,000; in Western States, \$60,000,000; and in the national forests, \$30,000,000, or a total of \$261,000,000.

Unless the ravages of the white-pine blister rust are stopped these pines will be destroyed.

The American Forestry Association urges people in all the regions where the disease has been discovered to destroy at once all currant and gooseberry bushes, diseased pines, and others exposed to infection.

This will help to stop the spread of the disease.

AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, D. C.

HON. J. H. GALLINGER,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The undersigned, being especially interested in the preservation of millions of dollars worth of white pine in southern New Hampshire, and realizing the danger to this tree from the white-pine blister rust, and that the destruction of the white pine would seriously affect the industries of southern New Hampshire, herewith respectfully beg to call your attention to the necessity of obtaining sufficient funds from the Government to carry on an effective campaign against this most serious disease, and beg to urge you to lend your assistance toward obtaining such appropriation as may be sufficient to combat in an effective manner this disease, which is threatening the business interests of southern New Hampshire.

Keene Forestry Association; Charles Gail Shedd; the Keene Natl. Bank, by W. L. Mason, cashier; Ashuelot Natl. Bank, Keene, N. H., by J. E. Weightless; Jerome E. Wright; Keene Woodenware Co.; Cheshire County Savings Bank, C. L. Sturtevant, treasurer; Elgin A. Jones, 10,000 to 12,000 acres in charge, representing William A.



Yaston, Robert M. Burnett, and Robert F. Ruhms, owners; Horatio Colby; Frank Huntress; L. M. Norwood; Sentinel Printing Co.; C. J. Woodward; Bertram Ellis; H. J. Fowler; Jonas Fred Whitcomb; Keene Commercial Club, by W. C. Coughlin, president; Philip H. Fassedin; the New England Box Co.; La Fell Dickinson; Cheshire National Bank, W. R. Porter, cashier; C. C. Abbott; Faulkner & Colony Mfg. Co., R. E. Faulkner; Impervious Package Co., N. H. Batchelder, treasurer; Geo. W. Holmes; A. L. Wright; Geo. H. Eames, Jr.; C. L. Russell Sons; W. H. Prentiss; the Beaver Mills, R. P. Hayward, general manager; Burdett Chain Mfg. Co., William Parson, treasurer; Geo. H. Eames.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HARDWICK, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendments and submitted reports thereon: H. R. 13788. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Prat (Rept. No. 947); and

H. R. 14826. An act for the relief of F. M. Barfield (Rept. No. 948).

Mr. CLAPP, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 7758) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, consider, and determine certain claims of the Cherokee Nation against the United States, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 949) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 7759) to amend the general deficiency appropriation act of June 30, 1906, and the act of Congress of March 4, 1909, regarding payment of judgment of Court of Claims in favor of Cherokee Nation, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, which was agreed to.

Mr. HARDING, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 6430) directing the reexamination of the accounts of the late Peter G. S. Ten Broeck, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 950) thereon.

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 7583) to amend the Federal farm-loan act by providing for the establishment of the thirteenth Federal farm land bank district, to be composed of the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico, and to establish a Federal land bank therein at Denver, Colo., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 951) thereon.

#### WILLIAM LOWELL HILL.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on Naval Affairs, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 7288) providing for the appointment of Chief Boatswain William Lowell Hill as a commander in the United States Navy, and I submit a report (No. 946) thereon. I ask that the letter of the Secretary of the Navy and the memorandum accompanying it may be printed as a part of the committee report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

#### SELECTION OF INDEMNITY LAND.

Mr. STERLING. From the Committee on Public Lands, I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 198) providing for the confirmation of the agreements between the States of South Dakota, Montana, and Idaho and the United States relating to the selection of lieu or indemnity lands, and I submit a report (No. 945) thereon.

In view of the emergency which exists in my State now in regard to this agreement relating to indemnity lands, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

#### Senate joint resolution 198.

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the agreements between the States of South Dakota, Idaho, and Montana and the United States relating to the selection of lieu or indemnity lands, dated January 4, 1910, October 4, 1911, and August 23, 1912, respectively, so far as heretofore consummated in accordance with the proclamations of the President, dated February 15 and June 4, 1912, and March 3, 1913 (37 Stats. L., pp. 1729, 1743, and 1777), are hereby ratified and confirmed.

Mr. STERLING. I offer a formal amendment to come in at the end of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the joint resolution insert a comma and the following words:

And that the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to approve all selections made in pursuance of said agreements as so consummated.

Mr. CLARK. It seems to me that that is a direction affecting the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. It occurs to me the Secretary will act according to his discretion without the direction of Congress.

Mr. STERLING. So far as that is concerned, I will agree to strike out the words "and directed."

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, may we have order, or will Senators speak louder? We are interested in this measure and would like to hear what is going on.

Mr. STERLING. I will modify the amendment by striking out the words "and directed."

Mr. MYERS. May I ask what is to be stricken out?

Mr. STERLING. I have agreed to modify the amendment by striking out the words "and directed."

Mr. CLARK. There was an amendment directing the Secretary of the Interior to approve the agreements that had been made between the Forestry Service and the States named. I interposed the query as to whether Congress should direct the Secretary in the exercise of his discretion. The Senator from South Dakota says it is perfectly agreeable to have the words "and directed" stricken out.

Mr. MYERS. It is merely proposed to strike out the words "and directed" and to leave the amendment otherwise stand?

Mr. STERLING. Yes; to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to approve the selections.

Mr. MYERS. I should like to have the amendment read as modified.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the joint resolution:

And that the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to approve all selections made in pursuance of said agreements as so consummated.

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

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 7909) to amend section 1 of the act approved July 1, 1916, making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 7910) authorizing the city of Bemidji, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near that place; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 7911) for the relief of the immigrant Cherokees or heirs thereof who were moved under Chief Ross's advisement under treaties of 1835, 1836, and 1846, and who were parties to said treaties; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 7912) granting an increase of pension to Ada M. Kennedy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 7913) granting an increase of pension to Nelson W. Adams; and

A bill (S. 7914) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Lindsay; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 7915) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Col. William B. Gordon to the rank of brigadier general on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 7916) granting an increase of pension to David F. Rudd; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7917) granting a pension to Everett L. Stokes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 7918) granting an increase of pension to John M. Lenhart;

A bill (S. 7919) granting an increase of pension to James M. Gwinn;

A bill (S. 7920) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Grounds;

A bill (S. 7921) granting an increase of pension to Jeremy Walker;



A bill (S. 7922) granting an increase of pension to James H. Knight (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7923) granting a pension to Hester A. Doyle (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

#### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted an amendment authorizing the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, to grant permission to the Women's Titanic Memorial Association for the erection on the public lands in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate memorial as a lasting tribute to the heroes who sacrificed their lives in the sinking of the steamship *Titanic*, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill (H. R. 19119), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the investigation and improvement of cereals and methods of cereal production, etc., from \$176,505 to \$179,005, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 19359), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the number of clerks of class 3 in the General Land Office to 57, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 18542), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. CLAPP (for Mr. OWEN) submitted an amendment providing that the surface of any segregated coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in the State of Oklahoma which have been or may be condemned under the laws of the State of Oklahoma or State penal institutions, etc., shall be construed to include the entire estate except the asphalt reserved lands, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill (H. R. 18453), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SAULSBURY submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in animal industry from \$250,300 to \$252,800, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 19359), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment relative to the salaries of clerks and messengers to committees of the Senate, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 18542), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SHAFROTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 20079), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

#### WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### DECISION ON WEBB-KENYON LAW.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have received—and I presume all other Senators have received—a great many requests for copies of the opinion of the Supreme Court on the so-called Webb-Kenyon law. All the copies are exhausted, and it is impossible to get any more. I have here one copy, and I ask unanimous consent that the opinion be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator consent to its reference, as all such matters are referred, to the Committee on Printing?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, it is utterly impossible to hear what is going on.

Mr. NORRIS. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that I have asked that a copy of the opinion of the Supreme Court in passing on the Webb-Kenyon law be printed as a Senate document. The Senator from Utah asks that it may go to the Committee on Printing, and I have no objection to that course. I will say, Mr. President, that I think the committee ought to act upon it without any delay, because requests are coming in by every mail. If the opinion is to be printed at all, it ought to be done immediately.

Mr. SMOOT. I agree with the Senator absolutely.

Mr. NORRIS. Let the matter be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so referred.

#### NOMINATION OF WINTHROP M. DANIELS.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I offer a Senate resolution which I ask may be read and go over under the rule until to-morrow.

The resolution (S. Res. 322) was read, as follows:

Whereas in secret executive sessions of the Senate on January 3 and 6, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] delivered an address in opposition to the confirmation of the Hon. Winthrop M. Daniels to become a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission; and Whereas said address was printed in confidence for the information of Senators; and

Whereas after said address had been thus printed and before the intimation of secrecy was removed therefrom the said Winthrop M. Daniels prepared in writing a reply thereto, which reply was afterwards printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and

Whereas said reply shows on its face that at the time of its preparation the said Winthrop M. Daniels had in his possession a copy of the said address delivered by the said Senator from Iowa; and

Whereas the said Winthrop M. Daniels could not at said time have procured a copy of said address without a violation of the rules of the Senate by some Member or officer thereof; and

Whereas the rules of the Senate provide that any Senator who discloses the secret or confidential business or proceedings of the Senate shall be liable to expulsion, and that any officer of the Senate who is guilty of such violation shall be dismissed from the service of the Senate; and

Whereas the furnishing to the said Winthrop M. Daniels of a copy of said address was a flagrant violation of the rules and ancient and time-honored landmarks of the Senate: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That a committee of three Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to make an investigation for the purpose of ascertaining the Senator, or officer of the Senate, who has been thus guilty. Said committee is hereby directed to take the testimony of said Winthrop M. Daniels and such other persons as may be necessary to ascertain the means by which, and the persons through whom, he obtained a copy of said address. The said committee is authorized to issue subpoenas, compel the attendance of witnesses, administer oaths, and do all things necessary to fully carry out the purposes of this resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska whether there will be any expense attached to the proposed investigation?

Mr. NORRIS. I think not. I have not included any expense.

Mr. SMOOT. The only reason why I spoke of it is because the resolution provides that subpoenas shall be issued and papers sent for, and I thought there would be expense attached to it. If so, under the law the resolution should go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I presume if it should be found, for instance, that Mr. Daniels could not appear without a subpoena or something of that kind the committee would have to get authority. I assumed that there would not be any difficulty of that kind.

Mr. HUGHES. There is no provision for counsel?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not think the Senate will care to have counsel.

Mr. HUGHES. I think the committee ought to be represented by counsel. But, of course, it is not my resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

#### COMPLAINTS OF AMERICAN SHIPPERS.

Mr. PHELAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 324), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed:

*Resolved*, That the Senate hereby requests the Interstate Commerce Commission to supply it with a list of complaints made by American shippers against discriminations practiced by belligerent carriers.

#### COMMUNITY FORUMS.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, I have received a communication from the Commissioner of Education, transmitting a copy of a bill to provide for and regulate the use of public schools as community forums. I desire to have the matter printed as a public document, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing for action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that will be done.

#### POWER AT NIAGARA FALLS.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 186) entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to issue temporary permits for additional diversions of water from the Niagara River" having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1 and agree to the same.



That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert the following:

"Any such permittee who without further authority of Congress diverts after the time herein named for the expiration of such permit any part of the additional amount of water authorized by Congress to be diverted for the first time under this resolution shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine not exceeding \$2,000 nor less than \$500, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year nor less than 30 days, or both, in the discretion of the court; and each and every day on which such violation occurs or is committed shall be deemed a separate offense: *Provided*, That where such violation is charged against the company or corporate body, the offense shall be taken and deemed to be that of any director, officer, agent, or employee of such company or corporate body ordering, directing, or permitting the same."

And the House agree to the same.

MARK A. SMITH,  
JOHN K. SHIELDS,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*  
H. D. FLOOD,  
CYRUS CLINE,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*

The report was agreed to.

#### EMBARGO ON FOOD PRODUCTS.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, a few days ago I gave notice that I would ask permission to address the Senate to-day at the conclusion of routine morning business on Senate resolution 316. I now ask that that resolution be read by the Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and lays before the Senate the resolution referred to by the Senator from North Dakota, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 316) which had been submitted by Mr. McCUMBER on the 13th instant, as follows:

*Resolved*, That an embargo against the exportation of any food products, or any legislation which would narrow or destroy the markets for such products, or in any other way interfere with the operation of the law of supply and demand in establishing their prices, in the face of the great increase in the price of land, labor, and every article which the food producer must purchase would be an act of the grossest injustice to a most important portion of our population.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, one of the most frequent subjects of journalistic discussions, of magazine contributions, of fiction writers, Chautauqua lecturers, college and high-school essayists, commencement orators, and embryo presidents is the infidelity of public officials to the interests of the people whom they represent; that the Member of Congress as soon as elected is either afflicted with a loss of memory touching prelection promises or metamorphosed from a Dr. Jekyll to a Mr. Hyde. So persistently has this falsehood been poured into the public mind that the whole body politic has become saturated with it and poisoned with its virus.

No greater error ever rooted itself in the public mind. Every day's record of the proceedings of Congress writes the word "lie" across these insinuations; every day's record discloses a deluge of bills to meet every wave of public sentiment and answer every complaint, great and small, real and imaginary.

If Congress is subject to any criticism concerning its responsiveness to public thought or sentiment, it is that in the alertness of individual Members of that body to respond to public desires in their eagerness to initiate the first measure designed to meet any complaint they fill the Record with bills and oftentimes press with patriotic zeal measures detrimental to the people as a whole. The result of this proneness to curry favor from every society, class, or organization seeking legislation for its special benefit has shown itself in class legislation that is rapidly undermining our whole economic structure and threatening the very life principle of our Government—the equality of all under the law.

An analysis of this ardent responsiveness will disclose in very many instances a strong admixture of political consideration and interest, the desire to earn the approbation of the greatest number of the constituency of any Member with the hope that such approbation may return as bread upon the waters at the next election.

Now, all this would be most commendable and beneficial to the country were all our interests homogenous, and that which is demanded by one constituency never inimical to the interests of any or all of the others. But, Mr. President, it so happens that we are a country of vast and diverse interests which, if

allowed to adjust themselves under the great law of supply and demand, will yield the greatest possible blessing; but which, if disjointed and antagonized by special legislation conceived to benefit one class or one constituency at the expense of the other, will not only diminish or destroy their natural beneficence but will engender a discord and social upheaval that can end only in paternalism with all its degenerating influences.

Were all these bills responsive to public demand enacted into laws, the great commercial and industrial structure builded by the architect of adaptation, through centuries, would, through discordant and antagonistic legislation, collapse and come tumbling to the earth. Happily the same spirit which seeks to promote the interests of one class or the majority of one constituency also operates as a potent force to guard the interests of some other class or constituency against the demands of the first, and thereby acts as a check against most of this proposed legislation.

With 48 States and about 430 congressional districts, each one of which has special industries to be promoted or safeguarded, we may confidently look for such an equilibrium in legislation as will be beneficial to the whole without injury to the parts. It is only when the interests of a class, permeating all these States and districts, are sought to be advanced at the expense of the other classes throughout the country—when the contest is purely a class conflict rather than a sectional one—that the danger and injustice become acute and imminent.

If, to promote the interests of a national political party, we bribe one class of voters who may hold the balance of power by legislation which will advance their interests at the expense of some other class; or if, actuated by political expediency, we legislate for the interests of the majority at the expense of an important minority, we are nearing the end of true popular government. There is no autocracy so dangerous, so tyrannical, as the autocracy of mere numbers. The only true government is that which, capable of comprehending the interests of the whole, never loses sight of the interests of the smallest part, and which so legislates as to afford the individuals engaged in all the diverse industries of the Nation equal opportunity. And, Mr. President, as we must purchase our comforts and pleasures in this world, equal opportunity must mean equal compensation for labor expended, measured by its character and the preparation and intelligence necessary for its performance. Toward this great end should all legislation, so far as legislation can promote it, be directed.

In this very Congress we have been tempted by the demon of political expediency to depart from this purpose. And, Mr. President, we have fallen. That glaring evidence of our weakness prompts me at this time to raise my voice against a repetition of an error of the same character, a crime against one class of our citizens at the behest of another. I refer, Mr. President, to the many bills introduced at the beginning of this session for an embargo against the export of food products from this country. I refer to the purpose of one class of our citizens to deprive another class of its just compensation for its labors; to overcome the law of supply and demand by destroying the market of our farming population; to drive one class to penury that the other may continue to revel in extravagance.

Most of the dangers from these bills, responding to the demands of special interests, would be mitigated were we not misled by the persistence or violence of any complaint as to its relative importance. If the cry for relief or for special legislative favor increased in volume in proportion to the numbers affected or the justice of the demand, we might be able to measure out a relief which would approximate a standard of fairness to all. But a very casual observation will convince any thoughtful person that the volume of noise is no indication whatever of the severity of the ailment. One man of stoical character will endure any amount of pain without a murmur. Another will groan at the scratch of a pin. One class, accustomed to self-denial and a life of rigid economy, adapts itself to any financial stringency that may overtake it. Another class, pampered with luxury and spoiled by extravagance, regards any condition which would diminish those luxuries or check those extravagances as a national injustice which can only be remedied by a heavier toll on the frugal and industrious. One section cries loud and reaches long into the Federal Treasury to compensate it for every loss by bursting dike or torrential flood; another, with grim and manly resolution, sees its whole year's crop annihilated by storms or drouths with never a thought that the Government should stand as an underwriter against the blighting visitations of Providence. And as the honest, the industrious, the frugal of human society must always in the end pay for the debts of the dishonest, the sluggard, the prodigal, or the beggar, the rights of that portion of the public entitled to the most considerate attention of the Govern-



ment are generally sacrificed that the clamorous may be satisfied.

I might give a little illustration, which is very apt in this connection, by citing the fact that almost every year Congress appropriates vast sums of money to relieve those whose homes and crops have been destroyed by floods occasioned by the overflow of the Mississippi River near its southern end, and yet in a single year in the Red River Valley, in my State, we have lost more by floods than has been lost in all the years of the history of the section to which I refer; but we have not asked, and are not asking, that the Government should make good our losses.

And so to-day, Mr. President, the self-indulgent, leisure-loving, pleasure-chasing portion of our population, sensitive to every condition that will check their extravagances or diminish their pleasures, observing in the rise of the price of bread and other food products a possible necessity for the practice of some little economy in their other expenses, and without the slightest consideration for the welfare of those they would injure or the justice of their demands, cry out for an embargo on food products. And Congressmen, responding to that cry, and with the same lack of consideration, proceed immediately to press measures for an embargo against the exportation of food products.

That these bills spring from the desire of one class to acquire special benefits at the expense of the other is clearly shown in a recent article in the *Modern Miller*. The writer of that article sent out inquiries to all classes of our people to ascertain their attitude on the question of an embargo on food products, and he summarized the responses as follows:

Consumers are for it; producers are against it!  
Town people are for it; country people are against it!  
Laborers are for it; farmers are against it!  
Common people are for it; agriculturists are against it!  
The "shorts" are for it; the "longs" are against it!

It is true, Mr. President, that notwithstanding our vastly increased wheat acreage, the world crop this year was exceptionally short, and the United States crop somewhat below the average. These causes, combined with a great world war, has increased the demand and enhanced the price of wheat and flour, and hence the cry for an embargo. The fact that the price of every other commodity (that which the wheat producer must purchase) has advanced as much as or more than those commodities, seems in no wise to enter into the equation in the mind of those who favor this destruction of farm prices by legislation.

Are the prices of farm products exorbitant to-day? This is the first question which presents itself for consideration. On the answer to this must rest the whole of proponent's case. That the producer of food cereals is entitled to a just reward for his labor expended in producing them and a reasonable return upon the capital employed in their production, every one will admit, at least in debate. The difficulty arises in determining what is a just reward. Here, I regret to say, I find the sentiment everywhere prevalent in our great cities—a sentiment hoary with age and hardened by time—that the vocation of the tiller of the soil is of such a menial character that he ought not to aspire to the standard of ordinary urban living; that if he receives such prices for his products as will enable him to have sufficient food and clothing for his physical comfort during his working years and enable his children to supply his few necessities in his declining age, it ought to satisfy him; that he ought not to expect any degree of affluence in his chosen vocation beyond this.

Numerous, Mr. President, as are those holding this view, it is a waste of time to attempt to convince them of its wrong and injustice. Their ailment, atrophy of conscience, complicated by chronic selfishness, can only be reached by a change or reversal of environment. I speak only to those whose sense of justice enables them to accept as axiomatic that all labor should reap a reward proportionate to its arduous character and the preparation and intelligence required in its performance; that like labor, whether performed in the field or in the factory, whether rural or urban, ought to assure like comforts to the toiler; and that capital invested in one legitimate enterprise has the same right to reasonable return as when employed in any other enterprise.

From this viewpoint and measured by this standard, are the grain and cattle producers of this country receiving more than a just compensation for their products? I maintain, Mr. President, that not only are they not receiving more than they ought, but measured by the earnings in other vocations and trades and other lines of business their compensation to-day is far below their just deserts.

Mr. President, in all other lines of production in which advancing cost requires a doubled or quadrupled capital to conduct it, we naturally look for higher-priced products and ac-

cept the result with equanimity. Do you realize that the price of land throughout the wheat-raising sections of the United States during the last 20 years has increased from fivefold to tenfold? Do you realize that labor has doubled in price during the last 20 years? With such increase in required capital and labor, what right have you to expect the maintenance of the old price for farm products?

Mr. President, I have had some experience in farming and have given the subject no little consideration, and I know that if farming were carried on the same as other lines of business, if all the work employed was paid for on the basis of like labor employed in other vocations, no farm would ever pay a dividend upon the capital invested under ordinary market conditions. It is only because the labor of the farmer and his entire family is employed without any standard of compensation that the business has not collapsed. With the present prices of land, present prices of labor, and the price the farmer must pay for his necessities, he should receive for his several products in normal times as much as he is now receiving during a great world war and a short world crop, and a greater sum for many of the products of his farm than he is now receiving.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I am very much interested in the speech which the Senator is delivering; and I want to ask him whether the low price of farm products has not been the cause of that drift of the people from the farms to the cities which has been such a curse, or supposed curse, to the welfare of the Republic; and if stable and fair values are given for farm products, whether that will not remedy the very evil that is supposed to exist by reason of this drift and make the people of the overcrowded cities come back to the free life of the farm?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, population will always drift to the point of greatest compensation for a given amount of expended energy. That applies the world over. Whenever you make farming produce such a return upon its labor and upon its investment that those who follow the vocation can reap the same comforts and luxuries and live upon the same standard as the average life in the city, the population will drift again from the city to the farm.

If I were to enumerate what I should consider a minimum farm price for the products of my State, in order to make farming reasonably profitable, I should give about the following:

Wheat	per bushel	\$1.50
Oats	do	.65
Barley	do	.85
Flax	do	2.00
Corn	do	.70
Potatoes	do	.70
Rye	do	1.25
Beans	do	2.50
Beef on hoof	per pound	.07
Pork on hoof	do	.08
Butter	do	.35
Eggs	per dozen	.45

I am dealing now only with farm prices, and not retail prices.

With such prices assured for a period of 10 years, making allowance for the average losses, partial or total, farming could be conducted on a fair basis.

I read from a recent report in the *Nation's Business* the following:

Wheat is dear in 1916. For 34 years, however, during which generation of time boys became men, with homes and cares of their own, the farm price of wheat was less than a dollar a bushel, except in case of corner. The farm price of wheat on December 1, 1881, was \$1.19 a bushel. On the same day during every year that followed down to 1915 the farm price was less than a dollar a bushel. On October 1, 1916, the farm price was \$1.36.

And, of course, that means only the highest quality or grade.

Let me ask those who are now wishing to strike down the market price of wheat with a legislative bludgeon if they really think that a raise in price above the dollar mark once in 34 years, and which price to-day is not sufficiently high to enable the farmer to pay going wages for labor employed, is so excessive as to merit the assault which they are making against the wheat producer?

Do you not know that the moment that this war ceases and the moment we reap a normal world's crop there will come upon the farmer such a diminution in the value of his products, due to stagnation, that will be nothing less than a calamity? And are you not willing that he should have this little ephemeral prosperity, which has come to him after 34 years, if prosperity it can be called, to compensate him for the long years of underpay in the past and the other years of stagnation in the future?



Those who propose this measure attempt to deceive the public, if not to deceive themselves, by comparing the 1916 crop of the United States with the 1915 crop. They make this comparison for the purpose of pointing out the danger of a catastrophe in the food supply of the country. They are careful to compare this year's shortage with the most phenomenal crop ever raised in the United States. As a matter of fact and truth, it ought to be known that the 1916 crop of 639,886,000 bushels is but little below the average crop of this country. During the last decade the average crop of this country, including the nearly double crop of 1915, has been 732,839,000 bushels.

During the past decade we have had five crops, each of which fell below 700,000,000 bushels. The 1915 crop of wheat in the United States was 1,011,500,000 bushels, or about 400,000,000 bushels above the normal. And this phenomenal yield is being put forth as a basis of comparison for the purpose of frightening the American people into the idea that there has been an enormous shortage in our wheat supply. If we should simply tell the truth, that an average yield is about 700,000,000 bushels, and our consumption for seed and bread about 530,000,000 bushels, and our crop this year is nearly 640,000,000 bushels, the phantom of starvation would immediately vanish. No, Mr. President, the whole trouble is that these people do not want to pay the price fixed by the law of supply and demand.

Has it ever occurred to you that the farmer can not eat this unground wheat or corn, but must buy his flour and many manufactured products of which he furnishes the raw material and pay as much for it as you do? Can you not understand that the farmer pays higher prices for his labor, higher prices for his machinery, higher prices for his shoes, higher prices for his clothing, higher prices for his drugs, higher doctors' bills, and that all of these have increased in the last few years far beyond the increase in the price of his products, even in war times? And do you expect that you alone shall be the elect of Providence and go right on with ever-increasing charges for the things you sell him and he should sell you for the same old prices?

A friend of mine in Washington who keeps an account of the prices paid at retail for all items entering into household expenses gave me the following table of comparisons between what he paid for certain articles in December, 1915, and December, 1916, as follows:

Articles.	1915	1916	Per cent increase.
Women's shoes.....	\$5.00	\$6.50	33
Men's shoes.....	7.00	8.00	15
Matches, per box.....	(1)	(1)	33
Boy's suit.....	10.00	14.00	40
Coal.....	7.00	8.25	18
Ice per 100 pounds.....	.30	.40	33

<sup>1</sup> 3 for 5 cents.

<sup>2</sup> 2 for 5 cents.

Of course, the cost of ice was caused by the war!

Do you stop in your everlasting arrogance, your extreme selfishness, to contemplate that while you, and I mean every man of you, from the lowest-paid laborer on the streets to the moneyed magnate of the country, insist on taking advantage of the law of supply and demand wherever it affects your products, you deny that right to the farmer?

Mr. President, wheat and barley have advanced greatly in price since 1914. But their advance is due entirely to scarcity. Can you not therefore understand that if the farmer in my State harvested only one-fourth of a crop of wheat, that one-fourth of a crop would have to advance 300 per cent in value to yield him the same returns, and that an increase in value of 60 per cent will still leave him far below an average return? On the other hand, you know that the enormous advance in the price of everything the grain raiser must purchase is not due to shortage. There is no shortage whatever in clothing, shoes, matches, and coal. There is no shortage whatever in gingham, and prints, and shirtings, and sheetings, and drills, and hickories, and piquets. The manufacturers and dealers in these articles have got both the goods and the higher prices. The farmer has the higher prices, but he has not got the goods. And in the face of this natural hardship to the grain producer we find men either so ignorant of the real situation or so deaf to the voice of justice that they are aiming their blows at the only real sufferer.

Comparing the fall of 1914 with that of 1916, I find that beef cattle increased just 7 per cent. I find that in one year, from 1915 to 1916, round steak increased at retail in this city 40 per cent. I find that hogs increased in price during those two years 20 per cent, but the retail price of pork has increased more than 40 per cent. I find that calves increased in price 10

per cent, and that sirloin steak increased in one year 40 per cent. I find that from December 1, 1914, to December 1, 1916, corn increased in price 36 per cent, but I find also that a boy's suit increased in the last year 40 per cent. I find that oats increased in two years 15 per cent, but brown sheetings increased from 90 to 100 per cent. I find that rye increased 37 per cent, but prints increased from 75 to 80 per cent. I find that butter increased in two years 22 per cent, but that coffee increased 80 per cent. I find that eggs increased per dozen 21 per cent, but that gingham increased from 50 to 75 per cent.

To bear out these statements I ask to have inserted at this point a table taken from the Monthly Crop Reporter, showing the farm prices of farm products in November and December of 1914 and November and December of 1916, together with the percentage of increase.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if that table gives the prices in the local markets and then the prices in the cities?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; this gives the farmer's price—an estimate of what the farmer receives at the elevator, direct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Does the Senator ask unanimous consent to insert the table in the RECORD?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request will be granted. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

*Farm prices of farm products.*

[Monthly Crop Report.]

Articles.	Nov. 15, 1914.	Nov. 15, 1916.	Per cent increase.
Hogs, per 100 pounds.....	\$7.00	\$8.74	20
Beef cattle, per 100 pounds.....	6.02	6.44	7
Veal calves, per 100 pounds.....	7.78	8.60	10
Sheep, per 100 pounds.....	4.68	6.41	36
	Dec. 1, 1914.	Dec. 1, 1916.	
Wheat, cents per bushel.....	98.6	160.3	60
Corn, cents per bushel.....	64.4	88.9	36
Oats, cents per bushel.....	43.8	52.4	15
Barley, cents per bushel.....	54.8	88.2	62
Rye, cents per bushel.....	86.5	122.1	37
Butter, cents per pound.....	28.4	34.4	22
Eggs, cents per dozen.....	29.7	38.1	21

Mr. McCUMBER. I desire to have this followed by a table showing the increase in the price of canned goods, on which many of the people in the cities depend, for the same period, taken from the American Grocer, and for the purpose of showing this enormous increase in the price of canned goods as compared with the increase which the farmer receives for his product which goes into the canned goods.

For instance, I find that asparagus increased 90 per cent; that canned beets increased 65 per cent; that standard corn increased 100 per cent; that even sauerkraut, when canned, increased from 80 cents to \$1.55, or 95 per cent. I find that granulated sugar increased 50 per cent; that corn increased 50 per cent; that coffee increased 80 per cent, and so on. I ask to insert this table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave will be granted. The Chair hears no objection.

The table referred to is as follows:

*Canned goods.*

[From Price Current in American Grocer for December, 1914 and 1916.]

Vegetables.	1914	1916	Per cent increase.
Asparagus, 1 bottles glass, dozen.....	\$2.40	\$4.25	90
Asparagus tips, No. 1.....	2.00	2.30	12
Beans, lima, No. 2, dozen.....	1.10	1.35	12
Beets, Maryland, No. 3, dozen.....	.90	1.40	65
Corn, standard, No. 2, dozen.....	.65	1.30	100
Peas, No. 2, standard, dozen.....	.65	.85	30
Sauerkraut, dozen.....	.80	1.55	95
Flour:			
Patents, spring, earload lots, barrel.....	6.25	8.75	35
Patents, winter, earload lots, barrel.....	6.00	8.15	35
Oatmeal, barrel.....	5.60	6.80	20
Sugar:			
66 per cent, 100 pounds.....	4.01	5.14	25
Granulated, 5-pound bags, 100 pounds.....	5.15	7.55	50
Molasses, common, gallon.....	.22	.31	50
Coffee, Central America, common, pound.....	.061	.11	80
Ten, India.....	.21	.30	50
Cheese, whole milk, pound.....	.15	.23	50
Skim, choice.....	.13	.19	50



Mr. McCUMBER. I wish now to insert a table taken from the American Wool and Cotton Reporter, showing the wholesale price list of fabrics of general consumption by the agriculturists of the country on December 24, 1914, and on December 24, 1916, and the percentage of increase. This table ought to be very interesting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave will be granted. The Chair hears none.

The table referred to is as follows:

Wholesale price list.

[From American Wool and Cotton Reporter.]

Articles.	Dec. 24, 1914.	Dec. 24, 1916.	Per cent increase.
Ginghams, cotton:			
Amoskeag, staple ginghams, per yard.....	\$0.06½	\$0.09	45
Everett classics, per yard.....	.07	.09½	33
Everett shirtings, per yard.....	.08	.14	75
York dress.....	.07½	.11	50
Silver book seersucker, per yard.....	.07½	.11	50
Amoskeag XX seersucker, per yard.....	.07½	.11	50
Eastworth seersucker, per yard.....	.08	.13½	50
Pilgrim prints:			
Indigoes, yard.....	.04½	.08	80
Black and whites, yard.....	.04½	.07½	75
Shirtings:			
Massachusetts, P. N., yard.....	.05½	.08½	50
Massachusetts, W. J., yard.....	.06½	.10½	55
Brown drills, 30 inches, yard.....	.06½	.11½	80
Piedmont, 30 inches, yard.....	.07	.13	80
Brown sheetings:			
Father George, L. L., yard.....	.05	.09½	90
Midland, L. L., yard.....	.05	.09½	90
White Star, yard.....	.04½	.09½	100
Bleached sheetings:			
Fruit of the Loom, yard.....	.07½	.11½	50
Lonsdale, yard.....	.07	.11	55
Forget Me Not, yard.....	.06	.10	66
Dwight Anchor, yard.....	.12½	.18	50
Pillowcases, Piquet:			
42 by 36, bleached, dozen.....	1.74	2.38	50
50 by 36, bleached, dozen.....	2.16	2.86	30
54 by 36, bleached, dozen.....	2.35	3.34	45
Sheets, Piquet:			
54 by 90, bleached.....	5.80	8.10	50
63 by 90, bleached.....	6.10	9.00	50
Hickories: Iron Mountain, yard.....	.06½	.09½	50

Mr. McCUMBER. I find, for instance, that staple gingham increased 45 per cent; that Everett shirtings increased 75 per cent; that seersuckers increased 50 per cent; that prints increased 80 per cent; shirtings, from 50 to 80 per cent; brown sheetings increased from 90 to 100 per cent; bleached shirtings increased from 50 to 66 per cent; pillow cases, Piquet, increased from 30 to 50 per cent; hickories increased 50 per cent. All these are things which the farmer must purchase with the articles which he sells, most of which have increased from 7 to 20 per cent.

Another table taken from the American Wool and Cotton Reporter shows the price of woolen yarn, December, 1914, and December, 1916, with the percentage of increase. I am assuming that the farm wife, to a considerable extent at least, still knits these yarns into socks and stockings for the family. It will be interesting for those who purchase the manufactured product to comprehend the increase in prices to her and her family. I will simply state generally that worsted yarns increased from 65 to 90 per cent and ordinary woolen yarns from 60 to 75 per cent.

Woolen yarns.

[Wholesale prices from American Wool and Cotton Reporter of December, 1914, and December, 1916.]

Articles.	1914.	1916.	Increase.
Worsted yarns, Bradford system:			Per cent.
2-12s to 2-16s, carpet stock.....	\$0.57½	\$1.05	90
2-40, fine Australian.....	1.10	1.80	65
Braid yarns:			
1-24s, Canadian braid.....	.90	1.02	11
2-36, Canadian braid.....	1.05	1.22	20
Woolen yarns:			
18 to 20 cut.....	.50	.80	60
22 to 24 cut.....	.51	.90	75

These tables are all instructive, and ought to be read and understood by the American people, and especially would I submit them to the thoughtful consideration of the Association of Bakers who are asking for an embargo on food products.

Now, you people right here in the cities fix your own prices for what you sell. Think, then, a moment of the injustice, ay, the criminal injustice, of the people who themselves fix the prices of everything they sell, proposing to boycott the only class of American people who are compelled to take just what the other people see fit to give them for their products! The farmer never fixes the prices of his products. Of course, he

wants to get all he can; but when he brings his products to the market he does not say, "This is what I am charging for my wheat, my corn, and my potatoes." He simply asks, "What are you paying to-day?"

Here is a question I wish to ask the boycotter:

Are you willing to give the farmer in my State 6 per cent interest on his investment in land and equipment and allow him to pay his wife and adult daughters what you pay for a colored cook and housemaid, to pay himself and his adult sons what you pay a carpenter? If you are, then drop your embargo nonsense and prepare to vote him a bonus, for, even at the present high prices, he is not receiving a quarter of that.

Mr. President, there is probably considerably less profit made by the middleman on flour and grain than on other farm products. And yet on these articles the spread between the farm price and the consumer's price is far greater than it should be. Prof. Ladd, of the agricultural college of my State, made a report a very short time ago showing clearly that the grain raiser of the State of North Dakota and, of course, of every other State, is euchred out of his legitimate compensation for his product when compared with the price charged by those who purchase from him.

The experiments made at the agricultural college of North Dakota by Prof. Ladd showed that the milling value of grain purchased from our State under the term "D feed" was far greater than the price allowed would indicate. I will give an example of one carload of "D feed": Price to the farmer who raised it, \$653.01.

It is probably proper to explain here that on account of the blight of the wheat crop of the Dakotas and western Minnesota the vast majority of the bushels of wheat taken in are taken in as rejected or under these new terms.

It will be seen, therefore, that this carload of wheat brought the farmer only about \$635. There are probably not less than 1,200 bushels in that carload; from that up to 1,500 bushels. So you can see that he really received probably for this grain from 40 to 65 cents per bushel.

Minneapolis price on track, \$992.06; the mill product as wholesaled, \$1,660.15; the mill product as retailed, \$2,107.03. It will be observed, therefore, that this grade increased in value at wholesale two and a half times and at retail about three and a half times what the farmer received. Allowing for all freight and labor charges, the profit would still be exorbitant.

Mr. President, the Society of Bakers of New York and vicinity have sent to each Member of Congress a petition for an embargo on wheat. While they are asking the Members of Congress if they are aware of the deficit in the American wheat crop, it might not be amiss to ask them a few questions.

Mr. Baker, are you aware of the fact that the wheat farmers in my State raised only about one-quarter of a crop in actual weight? Are you aware of the fact that with that little one-quarter of a crop they must pay the same taxes as they paid with a full crop; that they must buy coal at a vastly increased price; that they must pay higher prices than ever before for clothing to keep them from freezing? Are you aware of the fact that everything they must purchase has advanced in price even more than the farm prices of the things which they produce, and that while there is the excuse of shortage and war demand to explain the considerable increase in the price of wheat, there is no excuse on earth for the advance in the price of most of the other articles of common use in this country, but that such prices represent imposition of the highest degree? Are you aware of the fact that most of them have mortgages on their farms, and that the mortgages will grow just the same whether there is any crop or not? Are you aware of the fact that with one-quarter of a crop they must still pay for a full crop of interest? Are you aware that while you fix the price of the bread which you make and never sell it at a loss, the farmer does not fix the price of his product and is often compelled to sell at a loss? Are you aware of the fact that if the farmer charged for his own labor in producing wheat what you pay for your labor who produce the bread for you, there is not one of them in the whole Northwest that would not run behind, and that he is only able to keep his head above water by putting in his own labor and that of his wife and children for their board and cheap clothing? Are you aware that the American farmer, his wife, and adult children, earn in this country with normal crop only an average of 20 cents net per day? Are you aware that in the face of that meager earning under normal conditions, and in the face of nearly a crop failure in my State, when most farmers have lost heavily, that the present administration, to purchase four more years of control, added 25 per cent to the wages of railroad employees who are now receiving from \$5 to \$8 per day; and that the farmer in my State, who this year has not earned one penny, and who has on the average only a net earning capacity of 20 cents per day, will in the end



pay, in higher freight charges, this added sum to his brother who already receives from \$5 to \$8 a day? If you are aware of that fact, have you no consideration then for them and for their necessities? When you are crying "Feed the American first," has he not just as much right to cry to you, "Clothe the American first, shoe the American first, doctor the American first?"

If the American consumers of food products could once get thoroughly impregnated with the conviction that the food producer is not a class designed by Providence solely to produce food for them and in turn to be exploited by the balance of humanity, but that not only their interests but their right to enjoy the average standard of living is mutual, we would hear less complaining about farmers' prices and make a greater effort to increase the farm value of their products. I admit that he himself is partly responsible for your rather low estimate of his vocation. I admit that he does not give the same thought to his business interest that you give to yours. I admit that his acts are often inconsistent and unexplainable. I admit that he is often misled by demagogic and pretended leaders who seem to create prejudices which they capitalize for their own purpose. I have known him, forgetting his own true interest, to vote to destroy one President because he was willing to put some of his products on the free list, as between this country and a single other country, and then turn around and vote for another for President who would put everything he produces on the free list as against the whole world. Of course, I can not always understand his reasoning, but I do understand his interest and his rights, whether he sometimes makes a mistake or not. And one of his sacred rights is to market his products at a reasonable profit.

Now, Mr. American Baker, as you are the complaining witness against the American wheat producer, will you please submit yourselves to a little sidelight inquiry. Why is it that while the English miller pays about 20 per cent more for his American wheat than the American miller he nevertheless sells his bread at least 33 per cent lower than you charge for yours? Why is it that even in these stringent war times the English baker purchases in America the same flour which you purchase, transports it across the ocean at now enormous expense, makes it into bread, and sells at a less price than you receive for your bread?

My colleague in the House, Mr. HELGESEN, presented the other day a statement from the Agricultural Department, quoting the Bureau of Chemistry, that 325 pound loaves could be made from a barrel of hard wheat flour and 320 pound loaves from a barrel of soft wheat flour. He also asserted—and I assume after inquiry—that the best grade of flour costs the baker in the District of Columbia \$8.50 per barrel. We then have cost of flour to the baker, \$8.50; 325 loaves of bread, at 6 cents per loaf, \$19.50; leaving a margin of \$11. A pretty large margin to be easily explained. But this is only about two-thirds of the whole truth. As a matter of additional truth, your loaves of bread, retailing at 6 cents, weigh only about 11 ounces, moisture and all. To be accurate on this I had a friend purchase and weigh 13 different classes of bread sold in the District on December 11, 1916. Here is the result. I will give the kind and the price and the weight in ounces. Of course, a pound loaf of bread ought to weigh 16 ounces, but here is what it does weigh. First, here is the Corby 10-cent loaf. That is supposed to be what we call a 2-pound loaf. It sells for 10 cents and it weighs 21 ounces instead of 32 ounces.

I will ask to insert this table at this time and then comment on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). Without objection, it will be inserted.

The table referred to is as follows:

On December 11, 1916, on weighing different loaves of bread, he found the weights as follows:

Kind.	Price.	Weight in ounces.
	Cents.	
Corby's.....	10	21
Corby's rye bread.....	6	10½
Corby's lunch bread.....	12	26
Havenner's.....	12	24
Corby's Mother's.....	6	11
Corby's table cream.....	6	11½
Butter Krust.....	6	11½
Schneider's.....	6	12
Havenner's Vienna.....	6	10½
Corby's Vienna.....	6	11
General Baking Co.'s Grandma's.....	6	11
Corby's.....	5	9½
Rolls.....	6	7

Mr. McCUMBER. Now, quoting again from the Department of Agriculture, referred to by Mr. HELGESEN, we find this declaration: "We get about 1½ pounds of bread from a pound of flour, household methods." In other words, a barrel of flour of 196 pounds weight will make 294 pounds of bread, or 4,704 ounces. Dividing this by 11 ounces, the average weight of a loaf in the District, we have 427 loaves. Now, making the computation, 427 loaves at 6 cents per loaf amounts to \$25.62.

Cost of flour to the baker.....	\$8.50
Cost of bread to the consumer.....	25.62

Gross profits..... 17.12

Mr. President, it will require considerable explaining to satisfy either the producer or the consumer of the justice of this increase from flour to bread of 300 per cent. May not the public justly ask you, Mr. Baker, are you aware of the fact that the increase in price of wheat ought not to add more than 1 cent to the cost of a 16-ounce loaf of bread, not an 11-ounce loaf of bread? Are you aware of the fact that, taking advantage of this comparatively slight increase in the price of wheat, the bakers of the city of Washington, and undoubtedly yourselves as well, sell 11 ounces for a pound loaf of bread? Are you aware of the fact that in doing this, you are actually defrauding the consuming public out of nearly one-third of a pound of bread in every loaf you sell, and yet in addition adding 1 cent to the price of every loaf?

So much for you, Mr. Baker.

Now, a word about the cause of the high cost of living. It is true that a dollar does not purchase as much as it did a few years ago, and the dollar as a purchasing agency is getting cheaper every day. Why? First, because the quantity of dollars is rapidly increasing. I shall not now discuss that feature. Second, we ourselves by making ourselves "easy marks" have contributed to the increase, and, third, because of our senseless extravagances.

Mr. President, the tramp who begged for 30 cents with the explanation that he wanted 5 cents for a sandwich and 25 cents to tip the waiter is but a fair illustration of the attitude of the American people toward the question of the high cost of living, and of the reasoning, I may be permitted to say, of those who introduce bills in Congress to strike a blow at the producer of food products to offset general public extravagances.

What elements enter into the cost of any commodity in this country?

A little retrospection would be most valuable to the American public along this line. For the most part prices are fixed by the gullibility of the purchasing public. And I wish that they would put that sentence into their notebooks. Prices are only partly governed by the law of supply and demand. At least another factor must be taken into consideration, namely, the ability and willingness of people to pay whatever is demanded. People who have the power to fix prices charge what the public are willing to pay and never what the thing is worth. The average American purchaser simply goes into a store and orders this and that, or more often orders by phone. If he is running a bill, he seldom even asks what the price of the article is. How often do you hear one of them say, "This is too expensive; I won't take it"? In the old country the idea of bargain and sale is still extant. The merchant may ask an exorbitant price to start with. The purchaser may offer half what the article is worth, and they finally arrive at a figure which gives a fair profit to the one and a reasonable charge to the other. I do not, of course, commend that system in the least, and especially I would not commend it to Americans who go over there to make purchases; but if this country were inhabited by French people you would purchase your products for at least 35 per cent less than you do to-day.

Again, Madam Boycatter, yesterday you went into a millinery store and you selected a hat. The wire frame in that hat can be sold at a profit for 8 cents. Add to that a nickel buckle worth about 5 cents, velvet covering worth 30 cents, ribbon worth 30 cents, total 73 cents. The girl who sewed on the velvet, the buckle, and ribbon may have received 75 cents. That makes about a dollar and a half. That hat ought to have retailed for \$3. What did you pay for it? You paid \$18, or more than five times what you ought to have paid. That \$15 of excess would have bought you 300 eggs, at 60 cents per dozen, and no self-respecting hen ought to be required to lay an egg for less than a nickel—enough to have lasted you and your family three months. Now, honestly, did it ever occur to you that you might boycott those criminally extravagant prices? You purchase a flimsy dress that will not wear you three evenings for \$75. You ought to have been able to have purchased it for \$20, and you could have purchased it for \$20 if you just would not pay the extravagant prices.



I read the other day an article concerning the price of refrigerated eggs. A Chicago food speculator admitted that he had 72,000,000 eggs in cold storage, and, asked why the excessively high price of eggs, he merely stated that the people were willing to pay it, and that it was his duty to get all he could for his product. So long as the people are willing to be imposed upon, then the imposition will be dishd out to them with ever-increasing prodigality.

Why is it that everything is cheaper in Windsor, Ontario, than in Detroit, Mich.? One reason is that the Canadian woman has not lost her sense of prudence and frugality; the American woman has.

There are two things, Mr. President, that stand out clear and distinct in this investigation of the cost of living. First, that the labor expended upon our farms is the poorest paid labor in the United States; second, that there is practically no proper relation between the meager price the farmer ordinarily receives for his products and the excessive price charged the ultimate consumer for the same product, either in its original or manufactured state. The proponents of the embargo seem to be perfectly oblivious to these facts.

But here again, Mr. President, the consumer has the remedy in his own hands as against the last vendor. That weapon is substitution. There are so many substantial foods in the country that he need not confine himself to the most expensive kinds.

How many people give the slightest consideration to the subject of substitutes in the daily necessities of life? We do this in the larger concerns. When lumber becomes too expensive the builder begins to compute the cost of a cement or brick building. And this demand for the more economical will decrease the demand for the more expensive and operate as a lever to bring down its price. You say that wheat flour at \$8.50 per barrel is too expensive. All right, then, substitute. Are you aware of the fact that in this country we raised in 1916 nearly 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn, selling for about 80 cents per bushel, and that corn meal makes the finest hot Johnny cake and corn bread imaginable, and that if the consumer could get it served good and hot he would usually take it in preference to the wheat bread? Are you aware of the fact that this country raised in 1916 about 1,230,000,000 bushels of oats, selling for about 40 cents a bushel, and that no cereal on earth makes such nourishing breakfast food as oat meal? Are you aware of the fact that we raised in this country in 1916 about 184,000,000 bushels of barley, selling for about 75 cents per bushel, and that barley meal is a most nourishing diet? So if wheat flour is too high, just diminish your consumption in that direction and make a corresponding increase in one or more of these other directions, and down will come the price of wheat flour.

Of course, I do not expect any one of you to do this. Why? Because you know and I know that what you pay out for your flour and, in fact, what you pay out for your food materials generally, is such a mere bagatelle as compared with your other living expenses that you will not stop to give it serious thought. Just look at this rise in the price of bread proposition squarely in the face and see how insignificant it is after all. An average family in the United States, according to Government figures, is composed of five members. Those five persons will eat two loaves of bread per day. On account of the increased price of wheat, bread has advanced from 5 cents per loaf, the price for half a century, to 6 cents per loaf, entailing upon that family the awful increase of 2 cents per day; if the family purchases the bread already baked, \$7.30 a year, and if the family does its own baking, probably less than half of that. Just think of it, to save those 2 cents per day to a city family you would club to death the farmers who have dared to breathe for one little year the fragrant air of American prosperity.

Mr. President, our real ills to-day are not because of the cost of the things we put into our stomachs to sustain life, but because of our vast expenditures for ever-increasing extravagances, which do not leave us sufficient means to meet just food prices. The whole trouble with us is that while we measure with critical eye what we pay for the necessities of life, we fail wholly to take into consideration what we expend for pure extravagances.

What we need most in this country is some form of education that will bring home to us our criminal extravagances. There is not a paper in the whole country that will attempt to educate the people along this line, and very naturally we can hope for little sentiment for reform from this source when we realize that our great dailies are themselves denuding our forests and making a wilderness of vast tracts of what might be a matter of pride and wealth to the country in order that they may feed the public with their Sunday stuff, 60 per cent of which is worse

than useless. You have a paper famine. Well, cut down the size of your paper to real legitimate business. One-half of the country is crying for condensed information, and the other half is becoming mental dyspeptics because of the character of the literary conglomeration devoured by them.

From the lowest paid laborer to the highest salaried official, there is not one that does not expend from ten to one hundred times as much for unnecessary as he pays for the reasonable necessities of life. I have before me a table which indicates what four beers a day for a year will buy for the support of a family. It is but just to say that I took this table from some prohibition literature, but the items which are enumerated are:

One man's overcoat, 1 man's suit, 1 man's sweater, 1 man's hat, 2 suits men's underwear, 1 woman's suit, 1 woman's separate skirt, 1 silk blouse, 1 petticoat, 1 woman's hat, 1 pair woman's shoes, 2 suits underwear, 2 boy's suits, 2 boy's overcoats, 6 blouses, 2 hats, 2 sweaters, 6 pairs hose, 2 little girl's coats, 4 little wash dresses, 4 suits of underwear, 2 girl's hats, 12 children's handkerchiefs.

These prices were advertised in a Washington paper of January 28, 1916. I think they are a little below the prices one would have to pay for those articles to-day, as I have previously shown in the tables which I have presented.

It is estimated that we pay for—

Confectionery annually.....	\$178,000,000
Furniture.....	245,000,000
Public education.....	325,000,000
Boots and shoes.....	450,000,000
Flour.....	455,000,000
Soda-fountain products.....	500,000,000
Potatoes.....	225,000,000
Cotton goods.....	675,000,000
Meats.....	1,500,000,000
Tobacco.....	840,000,000
Beers and liquors.....	2,500,000,000
Auto repairs and gasoline.....	5,000,000,000
Other amusements.....	5,000,000,000

Now, Mr. Tobacco User, you spend 40 cents a day for the weed, or \$146 a year, on yourself alone. You spend for flour \$8.50 a year. Do you not really think that before you crack your throat with your shrieks about an \$8.50 barrel of flour a year you had better consider the \$146 you pay for tobacco? Madam Housekeeper, a loaf of bread advanced from 5 cents to 6 cents, and you are weeping your eyes out about the extra penny. Have you given any consideration to what you pay out for theaters in a year? Have you for a single moment thought that what you pay for yourself alone for a box in an ordinary theater or a seat at a grand opera for just one evening's entertainment will equal the increase on 500 loaves of bread? You say you are paying 5 cents apiece for eggs. Have you stopped to think that you are also paying 5 cents apiece for apples, and that there is more food in one egg than there is in half a barrel of apples? Do you stop to consider that you are paying 10 cents for 1 grapefruit, and that there is more nutriment in 1 egg than there is in 40 grapefruits? Do you realize that while you are paying 30 cents a pound for good ham you are paying 30 cents for food for half a dozen persons, and that there is more nutriment in a pound of ham than there is in a hundred of these fruits? And before you get so hysterical that you can't reason at all, hadn't you better just cut out your morning grapefruit or your evening apple and invest the savings in eggs and butter and meat?

Among the extravagances that might well be mentioned is the enormous amount paid out in gasoline and auto expenses for pleasure rides only; and yet I think they are the most excusable of all. The automobile has come to stay. We are glad it has come. It has given the people of the country the fresh air, the exhilarating sunshine, the rest, the ability to see their own country—an enjoyment that no other instrumentality of human progress has given to them. And were it not for the worries and vexations and exasperations due to inefficient workmanship and exorbitant prices for repairs, it ought to reduce the doctor bills. Some time ago I read a statement of just what the American people pay out yearly for gasoline, tires, and automobile upkeep. The amount was more than \$5,000,000,000 annually, far more than the cost of the entire Civil War. That was a couple of years ago, before gasoline had reached its present price, or before so many people owned autos.

I have no data to determine the amount paid out annually for jewelry; I simply know that it is vast. The vast number of multimillionaires, with their wildest extravagances, their palatial mansions, their retinue of servants, speak the enormous sums paid out by the American people for patent medicines, the greater proportion of which is far more dangerous than the ailments they are advertised to cure. I would not deny them their right to indulge in such extravagances, but I would ask them to cease their cry against what the farmer receives for his wheat until they have reduced their expenses along other lines.



Mr. President, I am not concerned alone in the fact that the increased leisure and vastly increased extravagances of city life have blinded the eyes of those people to a fair sense of justice toward our rural population. There is a far deeper significance, a real peril, to the Nation. This revelry in extravagant habits, this unquenchable demand for amusements, for continuous mental intoxicants, is undermining the sturdiness of our younger generation, filling the country with boys who can not bring themselves down to the stern realities of life, filling the country with I. W. W.'s, who, though well educated in our public schools, despairing of making their own way in the world, fall back on the only alternative that the country owes them a living.

There are few boys of 18 years and over in the United States who to-day could not tell you the relative standing of all the baseball teams in the United States and discourse intelligently on the qualities and characteristics of every actress in the United States; but the number who would be able to tell you how many Senators each State has would be amazingly small. The bulletins of your city dailies may describe an event that will change the whole current of thought, of life, of geography in the world, and you may observe a dozen people reading them. If you would go a few blocks farther, where the returns from a national game are being thrown upon the board, you would find the streets for two blocks closed with a dense mass of humanity. The man who fails to note this almost total surrender to the intoxication of amusement and its effect upon the younger generation has but little patriotism in his make-up. Fabulous prices are paid to footlight favorites. The American people are spending not only enormous sums of money to make this possible, but seem to be obsessed with the idea that the main thing in life is amusement, play, entertainment. This undermining of our American and world character, destroying the ability for sober, philosophic thought, is vastly increasing the number of people who can not make a living and yearly adding hundreds of thousands to the ranks of socialism.

The aimless cigarette victim who spends his money and his time to satisfy this insatiable, abnormal propensity throws down his \$2 for a theater ticket for a play that is not worth 15 cents, waits at the door to supply the chorus girl with flowers, is then compelled to go to a cheap restaurant where he expects to be supplied with ham sandwiches at a penny apiece, and, failing, joins in the cry to boycott the farmer, who would pinch a 50-cent piece an hour before he could wrestle down his conscience to spend it for a like seat. It is not the price we pay for our food products that we need think so much about, it is our everlasting extravagance, our failure to bring about a proper adjustment between the prices of necessities and what we are paying out for excesses. The best thing that could ever happen the American people would be the closing of every theater and place of amusement in the United States for 10 years. There should be a closed season that would allow the people to regain some of their old stability, some of their old composure, that would allow them time to accustom their minds to the consideration of the real things in life rather than the artificial things.

Nor is this the only evil flowing from the extreme prodigality of urban life as compared with the extreme economy enforced upon rural vocations. Extravagant earnings lead to extravagant spendings; extravagant spendings to an increase of prices; increase of prices adds to the cost of lots and buildings. Higher cost of buildings means higher rents, and higher rents lead to higher charges for commodities sold within such buildings. And so every turn of this jackscrew of prodigality pushes prices higher and higher in our cities without producing corresponding advances in the price of farm products.

There is just one remedy against this urban increase. With the handle of frugality let the public begin to turn the jackscrew the other direction and prices will go down. Then make up your mind that you will not be robbed, and your high-priced articles will go down to meet your just demands, and all of these inflated city prices will go down to a normal and healthful state.

We hear of no attempt to boycott the enormous prices paid for real estate in our great cities and consequent fabulous sums paid for rents. We have a vacant lot down on the corner of Vermont Avenue and H Street where once stood the Arlington Hotel—a splendid hotel, fit for kings—but it was torn down to meet the more extravagant demands of the American public. That little piece of earth to-day is valued at \$1,250,000. The owners are now trying to figure out what use they can make of that corner that will pay the enormous interest upon that investment—what business for whose necessarily excessive charges the American people will stand. They will find a way; they must find it or lose the capital invested. If a hotel is erected, I assume the gentleman who will pay \$4 for a pound

of sirloin steak will charge that high cost of living to the farmer who receives 8 cents for it, and will be demanding an embargo.

Mr. President, I have presented these facts and these sentiments not with the expectation that they will have a hearing, much less an influence in checking prodigal habits that can not continue without disastrous results sooner or later, but rather with the hope of showing to these people who are seeking to compel the food producer, by a reduction of his income, to relieve them from extravagant habits, the injustice of an attempted embargo upon those food products, and to make them realize, if possible, their own duty to begin their economy in the field of prodigality. By so doing they can pay the increased value of flour and food products which this war and scarcity have produced and still have left a reasonable abundance for these unnecessary of life, and thereby confer a blessing upon themselves as well as upon all their countrymen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). What disposition does the Senator desire made of his resolution?

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask that it may be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so referred.

#### CALLING OF THE ROLL.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will please call the roll.

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

Beckham	Hollis	Norris	Sterling
Brady	Hughes	Oliver	Stone
Brandeggee	Husting	Overman	Sutherland
Bryan	James	Page	Thomas
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Pittman	Thompson
Chilton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Poindestex	Tillman
Clapp	Jones	Pomerene	Townsend
Curtis	Kenyon	Ransdell	Wadsworth
du Pont	La Follette	Saulsbury	Walsh
Fall	Lee, Md.	Shaforth	Warren
Fernald	Lippitt	Sheppard	Watson
Fletcher	Lodge	Sherman	Weeks
Gallinger	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	Works
Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	
Harding	Myers	Smoot	

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair begs to announce that the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] is detained at his home through illness. This announcement may stand for the day. Fifty-eight Senators have responded to their names. A quorum is present.

#### WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 408.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask unanimous consent to offer a substitute for the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. MYERS. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily for the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] put in the RECORD a few days ago an article in regard to the development of water power in Italy, and it was very interesting. I have a similar article in regard to water power now being developed in the Republic of France along the same line that I desire to have printed in the RECORD.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

#### FRENCH WATER POWER.

In sharp contrast to the nonaction of the United States Government, France is now spending millions of dollars to develop the water power of the Alps, the Pyrenees, and the central mountainous regions.

It was the war that acted as an incentive to France in developing water power for the operation of mills manufacturing shells, chemicals, and other necessities for the army.

In the valley of Durance new plants, aggregating 74,000 horsepower, for the electrochemical industry are under way, while above Modane one of the biggest chemical works in France has acquired rights to about 120,000 horsepower of waterfall that will be utilized speedily. Electric



energy for Paris brought from the Alps is the most ambitious project for the future. A dam 75 yards high in the Rhone at Genissiat, backing the water up 14 miles to the Swiss frontier, will furnish a fall sufficient to operate a power station of 325,000 horsepower and 240,000 kilowatts. The line of transmission will be 312 miles long. It is estimated that this enterprise alone will economize 1,800,000 tons of the 20,000,000 tons of coal France imported annually before the war.

President Wilson once remarked that the "we-will-and-we-won't" policy had been delaying progress in the United States. That this delay is apt to become a serious handicap is shown by the manner in which European nations are encouraging the development of their water power. The fear that some one will make some money out of development in the United States should no longer retard progress. The coal bill and the farmers' fertilizer bill can not be cut down except by the extensive development of the vast water power that is now going to waste in this country.

Mr. SHIELDS. I have an editorial from the Washington Post, which I also ask to be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be done.

The editorial is as follows:

#### A WATER-POWER PLAN.

Legislative progress is made by compromise. Where there are so many Members of Congress coming from different sections of the country, having different constituencies to satisfy, it is inevitable that there should be much conflict of opinion as to what is best for the country, and it is only by general concessions that any progress at all can be made.

For many years there has been general recognition of the need for water-power development. The House has passed a water-power bill, known as the Adamson measure, and the Senate has passed a conflicting bill, known as the Shields measure. The two bills have been in conference for many months, and apparently the effort to reconcile the two measures has been abandoned.

The point upon which the two branches of Congress have failed to agree concerns the right of the Government to collect a tax upon each horsepower developed. It is urged that if such a tax were fixed as a principle of the general water-power bill all new development projects would be taxed, while well-established successful plants would go untaxed.

As a feasible compromise it has been suggested in the Senate that instead of this tax there should be included in the new revenue-raising bill an excise tax on all water-power development in the United States. This would apply to established plants as well as to new projects.

In view of the present revenue needs, and especially because of the need for development of the power now going to waste, the two Houses might do worse than agree upon this compromise.

Secretary Lane, of the Interior Department, sums up the arguments in favor of immediate action by Congress in this statement:

"It is generally conceded that the water-power resources upon the public domain can not be developed under existing laws, because of the uncertain tenure involved by revocable permits: (a) Because the engineer and the promoter fear to embark upon an enterprise under such conditions; (b) because the capitalist will not loan money upon such security; (c) because the consumers can have no positive assurance that they will be supplied for a fixed and definite period. It is an established fact that numerous responsible persons who have obtained permits to develop water-power sites under the existing law have been unable to construct because of the foregoing."

Any group of business men would have been able to compromise their differences of opinion in a matter of this kind after several conferences. The failure of Congress to take action is an unnecessary handicap to the national prosperity.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, the article I have presented in regard to the development of water power in the Republic of France, notwithstanding that country is engaged in a war that almost involves the existence of the nation, challenges attention to what we are doing in this country along the same line. We have, as shown by official reports, about 61,000,000 horsepower of water power. About 27,000,000 of it is in navigable rivers, the remainder upon the public domain. According to official reports, only about one-tenth of this vast natural energy has been developed and the remainder is going to waste. The cause of that is our present impractical and prohibitory laws.

Mr. Secretary Garrison, in a statement made before the Interstate Commerce Commission while a water-power development bill was pending in the House, said that under those laws only about 140,000 horsepower of water power had been developed since their enactment in the navigable rivers, and that those laws were the direct cause of stagnation in water-power development.

Mr. Secretary Lane, while the bill which has lately been occupying the time of the Senate, the Myers bill, was before the House committee, said:

WATER POWER OF THE WEST CAN NOT BE DEVELOPED UNDER THE PRESENT LAW.

It is generally conceded that the water-power resources upon the public domain can not be developed under existing laws because of the uncertain tenure involved by revocable permits—(a) because the engineer and the promoter fear to embark on an enterprise under such conditions; (b) because the capitalist will not loan money upon such security; (c) because the consumers can have no positive assurance that they will be supplied for a fixed and definite period.

It is an established fact that numerous responsible persons who have obtained permits to develop power sites under the existing law have been unable to construct because of the foregoing.

Mr. President, a few days ago in an address in the Senate I called attention to the provision of the present restrictive laws which are causing stagnation in the development of water power in the United States, authorizing the imposition of royalties to

go into the Federal Treasury upon all water-power developed, and I suggested that if there must be Federal charges upon such development it should be in the form of a general tax, which is the only constitutional charge that Congress can impose upon the water powers of the several States, and at the proper time I will offer an amendment to the revenue bill for that purpose, in these words:

That all persons, associations, and corporations engaged in the business of operating plants for the production of water power shall pay an excise tax of 10 cents per horsepower year of energy produced and used or sold or otherwise disposed of.

All persons, associations, and corporations subject to this tax shall annually file with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, on January 1 of each year, a detailed statement of the horsepower produced, sold, used, or otherwise disposed of by them for the previous year, duly verified by a person having knowledge of the facts: *Provided*, That this tax shall not apply to any person, association, or corporation during the five years next after having begun the business of producing, using, selling, or disposing of water power, nor to persons, associations, or corporations producing, using, or selling less than 100 horsepower: *Provided further*, That no person or company required by the terms of the permit granted to them by Congress, or any authorized agent of the United States, to construct a dam or dams in navigable streams for the development of water power to pay any rent, royalty, or charge of any nature, or of any amount, shall be subject to the said tax, and no such royalty or charge shall exceed the tax hereby levied.

The rate is tentative and may be increased if deemed advisable.

Not only have these laws caused stagnation in the development of the water power of the United States but they have driven millions of dollars of American capital into Canada and Norway, there to be invested. Further, I am reliably informed that not only have they driven this capital out of this country but France in the great movement it now has to develop the water power of the Republic is negotiating with the greatest hydraulic and electrical engineer in this country, Mr. Hugh L. Cooper, the engineer who built the Keokuk Dam in the Mississippi River, with a view of getting him to leave this country and take charge of the development of water power in that country.

I think these facts ought to have some bearing upon those who are now attempting to maintain the present proscriptive legislation upon the statute books and thus defeating all water-power development in the United States.

#### FUNERAL OF ADMIRAL DEWEY.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (No. 68) providing that appropriate funeral services over the remains of the late Admiral George Dewey be held in the Rotunda of the Capitol on Saturday, January 20, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m., and that the Houses of Congress attend the services, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (No. 68) of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in recognition of the long and distinguished service rendered the Nation by Admiral George Dewey appropriate funeral services be held in the rotunda of the Capitol on Saturday, January 20, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m., and that the two Houses of Congress attend said services.*

That as a further mark of respect his remains be removed from the Capitol to Arlington Cemetery for burial in charge of the Navy Department, attended by the Sergeants at Arms and the committees of the two Houses.

That invitations be extended to the President of the United States and the members of the Cabinet, the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Diplomatic Corps (through the Secretary of State), such officers of the Navy as may be designated by the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chief of Staff of the Army to attend the exercises in the rotunda of the Capitol.

Mr. TILLMAN. I move that the Senate concur in the resolution of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TILLMAN. I offer the following resolution, and ask that it be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 323) was read, as follows:

*Resolved, That the President of the Senate appoint a committee of 12 Members of the Senate, to join the committee to be appointed by the House, to attend the funeral services of Admiral George Dewey at Arlington, Va.*

*Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this resolution, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith on the part of the committee of the Senate be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. SHAFROTH subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses, to which was referred the



foregoing resolution, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT, under the first clause of the resolution, appointed as the committee on the part of the Senate Mr. TILLMAN, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. CLAPP, Mr. LODGE, Mr. PAGE, Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. KERN, Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. SAULSEURY, and Mr. SMOOT.

#### LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment will be found on pages 41 and 42, Federal Farm Loan Bureau.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, on page 42, line 6 of the pending bill, I move to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$6,000." This refers to the salary of the secretary of the Farm Loan Board.

The gentleman who is occupying this position, Mr. Flannagan, prepared a digest of the Federal farm-loan act which, I think, was printed as Senate Document No. 500. He testified and was examined as an expert before the joint committee upon the general subject of Federal farm loans. In other words, he is not the ordinary clerk; he is an expert who has made a study of this subject, and because of his knowledge his advice is sought by those who want to understand generally the subject. Therefore he is not to be treated as being in the class of an ordinary clerk.

Mr. President, the secretary of the Farm Loan Board corresponds to the secretary of the Federal Reserve Board, and that official gets \$9,000 a year. I think the Senate would be making a mistake to take a backward step. If the four gentlemen who constitute the Federal Farm Loan Board fixed this salary at \$6,000 it means that they think they ought to have a \$6,000 man, and they picked an experienced, cultivated, educated man to fill the position. He is discharging the duties satisfactorily, and he is doing a great work there in organizing the board.

I, in a way, resent an attempt to do anything that might affect the policy of the Federal Farm Loan Board. It is something that the farmers are interested in; they feel that they have been kept out of it for many years. This Congress has taken the forward step. The right kind of men have been appointed. We yesterday set a precedent by retaining the salary at \$10,000 as fixed by the original act. I do not think we ought to give the secretary of the board the same salary that we give the chief of the bond division who is under that secretary. I think the committee has made a mistake. No doubt it did it honestly, but I think the Senate ought to correct it promptly.

I therefore offer the amendment to increase the salary to \$6,000.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, this man was not appointed as an expert. The act allows the board to appoint such experts as they may think necessary. This man was not appointed as an expert; he was appointed as secretary to the board, and his salary, as I said yesterday, is more than that of an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. The committee fixed his salary about on a par with that of other secretaries who perform similar service done by secretaries of boards. I wish to hasten this bill as far as possible. There has been a great deal of discussion over this matter. I hope the Senate will vote down the amendment.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, the Senator might have gone further and said if we adopt the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia we would pay the secretary of the bureau a higher salary than the secretary of a department.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, when the Farm Loan Board was established originally it was established as an independent board, as I said yesterday, and then later it seemed wise, in order to bring it closer to the Treasury Department, to make it a bureau in the Treasury Department, and to make the Secretary of the Treasury a member ex officio of the board; and that was done.

It is stated that Mr. Flannagan was not appointed as an expert, but was appointed as secretary. In appointing Mr. Flannagan as secretary and getting the services of an expert the board has acted economically. If this salary is put at \$3,000, the board will have to hire a \$3,000 man and then employ Mr. Flannagan, or some one else who knows the subject, as an advisor.

In the Federal Reserve Board the secretary not only receives \$9,000 a year but he has an assistant who receives \$7,500 a year. The secretary of the Federal Reserve Board occupies the same relation to the Federal reserve act that Mr. Flannagan occupies toward the farm-loan act.

I was personally introduced to Mr. Flannagan by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN]. The Senator from Virginia has known Mr. Flannagan all his life, and he vouched for him to me. Mr. Flannagan worked with me on the farm-loan act without compensation of any sort, and paid his own expenses in Washington for a year. Then, when the joint committee was established by statute and was given an appropriation of \$10,000, Mr. Flannagan was made its secretary.

There is no man in the United States who knows the farm-loan act as intimately as Mr. Flannagan does. Mr. Flannagan is an expert on financial matters. When the Federal reserve act was under consideration he was invited to testify as an expert before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and also before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] recommended Mr. Flannagan as a member of the Federal Reserve Board. He later asked me to go with him to see the President and recommend Mr. Flannagan as a member of the Farm Loan Board, and later I think he recommended Mr. Flannagan as secretary of the Farm Loan Board. I read an extract from a confidential letter written by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] regarding Mr. Flannagan. He said:

I have known Mr. Flannagan for many years, and not only hold him in high esteem as a friend, but I entertain a very high opinion of his ability and capacity. When he left Virginia many years ago I considered him the best equipped bank officer in the State. I do not know a man who in my judgment is better equipped, or even so well equipped, as Mr. Flannagan is for a position on this Federal Farm Loan Board. He was born and raised in my home county. He and his father before him have been my warm friends from boyhood. I have had the fullest opportunity to know all about his character, habits, attainments, and ability. If the rural-credit system is to be made a success, it must be through just such men as Mr. Flannagan. I have no hesitation in recommending him in the most unreserved manner.

It was said on the floor yesterday—I do not know whether it got in the Record or not—that Mr. Flannagan is just an ordinary secretary. He is decidedly not an ordinary secretary. He is a man who knows banking and currency and finance intimately. He is a real expert. He has worked over the farm-loan act as no other man has. He knows every part of it. He knows the relation of one part to another.

The idea of the Appropriations Committee acting on their information, if they really had it, that he is just an ordinary secretary points to the vice of this whole system. Here is a Farm Loan Board and a farm-loan system set up by the Senate and the House and the President. It is provided that there shall be a board to run it, and that that board shall select such assistants as it needs, and when the board has been in operation only a few months the Committee on Appropriations, the members of which do not pretend to be particularly skilled in banking and currency or with the farm-loan act, on their meager information, information so meager that it is not even reported in the report of their proceedings, say that the salary of the secretary should be cut from \$6,000 to \$3,000. That merely shows that this is not the proper way to treat the board or the act.

Expert knowledge of banking and economics and law and general office management are required. The four members of a Farm Loan Board tour the country, as they are required to do by the act; and from the time they were appointed up to a month ago the entire direction of the office was under Mr. Flannagan. He has from 1,200 to 2,000 letters to handle every day. He attends to the office management. He is the one who had to provide the technical system and to get out the circulars of information that were required by the act, and he has done it.

If the Senate, following the lead of the Appropriations Committee, reduces this salary it will simply mean under the act that they will have to hire a stenographer to act as secretary and pay him \$3,000, it may be more than he is worth, and get the benefit of Mr. Flannagan's services or that of some other expert by paying him a higher salary.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to ask the Senator if the board has by any rule or resolution assigned an annual salary to the secretary?

Mr. HOLLIS. It has not. The board is simply employing men temporarily. No man is hired by the board except by the month.

Mr. THOMAS. What is Mr. Flannagan's age?

Mr. HOLLIS. I do not know. I know that he worked with me for two years on the farm-loan act, nights and at all times, and he had all the activities of an able-bodied man. I never asked him how old he was.

Mr. THOMAS. I asked the question because it has been said that he is a man of advanced years.

Mr. HOLLIS. He is not a young man, but I do not know how old he is.



Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the amendment of the committee does not reflect on Mr. Flannagan in the least. It proposes to fix the salary of the secretary of the board, and that is all it does. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] has been referred to. The truth of what he said about this man no one can doubt; but if the Senator from Virginia were here, I know him so well that I have no idea he would agree to any such salary as is proposed in the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I made a few remarks yesterday in answer to a question by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] as to what salary Mr. Flannagan had been receiving before. I know Mr. Flannagan. While he is a Virginian, he has been for a number of years a resident of Montclair, N. J., very close to my home town. I know him very well. I know that his reputation stands very high among banking men and in many banking circles.

I can state this fact, and I know it to be a fact, that when president of a bank—I can not just recall the name of the bank—in the city of New York he was receiving a salary of \$12,000. I mention this to show his standing in the city of New York among banking men and in New Jersey. At the same time he was employed as president of another organization or corporation, and receiving a salary from it as well. He was considered an exceptionally efficient gentleman in that direction. Matters of health involved a cessation of obligations at that time.

Whether the salary proposed is too much or not is left for the judgment of the Senate to determine, but I do feel that I would be far short of my duty, knowing him as I do and knowing his general reputation and the estimation in which he is held in the State of New Jersey, did I not mention this fact.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that there is no Senator who will take the time to examine this appropriation bill and compare the salaries paid to employees in the other departments of the Government who can justify the payment of \$6,000 to the secretary of the board. If the members of the board do not understand the intent of the law and can not manage its affairs and are dependent upon the wisdom of Mr. Flannagan, the secretary, then we did wrong yesterday in providing a salary of \$10,000 to each member of the board, and we ought to reconsider our action and pay the salary provided for the board to Mr. Flannagan and reduce the salary of the members of the board.

Mr. President, we pay the Assistant Treasurer of the United States \$3,600 a year. The highest-paid chief clerk in any of the departments of the Government is \$3,600. The salary of the chief clerks runs from \$2,000 to \$3,600, according to the amount and importance of the work they do. The committee, in considering the salary to be paid to the secretary of this board, took into consideration what we were paying to employees in other departments, men who are doing work at least as important as that in which he is engaged.

I wish to say now that there are chief clerks of divisions in the departments who are receiving \$2,500 who have just as much work and just as much responsibility as the secretary of this board will have. You can not justify a salary of \$6,000, Mr. President.

Another thing, if the members of the board had in the first place been required to submit to the Committee on Appropriations an estimate of the amount to be paid to the secretary of the board, I know the Appropriation Committee of the House of Representatives would not have allowed \$6,000 for the place. I also know the Senate committee would have objected. As long as it remains at \$6,000, how are we going to refuse to increase the salaries of the chief clerks in the other departments of our Government?

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRONNA in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. CHILTON. What does the Senator say to the proposition that the secretary of the Federal Reserve Board gets \$9,000? Does not the Senator recognize that there is a distinction? Does he think there ought to be less ability and experience on the part of the secretary of the Federal Farm Loan Board than there is in administering the Federal reserve act?

Mr. SMOOT. There is a great deal of difference and never will be as much responsibility. The work of the two boards are not to be compared.

Mr. CHILTON. The Senator, of course, can say there is; but I think even with his ability he would have a great deal of difficulty in convincing me that there is. I should like to hear him try it.

Mr. SMOOT. I would not undertake to convince the Senator, but I want to say to the Senate that there is a great deal of difference in the responsibility and work of the two boards. The members of the Federal Reserve Board receive \$12,000, and there is a reason for this large salary. The fact that that board has the whole financial system of the Government under its control was considered in fixing the salary. Not only does it have the finances of the Government to direct but their action in directing the same may affect the finances of the world.

There is just as much difference between the two boards, Mr. President, in the responsibilities and the duties of the board as there is between some of the bureaus of our departments and the departments themselves.

I could not be justified in voting for more than \$3,000 for the salary of the secretary of the board, and the Committee on Appropriations decided it could not justify any greater amount, if we intend in the future not to pay greater salaries to employees of one department of the Government than to another.

It is entirely with the Senate as to what they shall do. If they want to single out one man in one bureau and pay him twice as much as is done for work of a similar nature by men in other bureaus of the Government, then vote for the salary of \$6,000. But if the Senate wants to have justice done between the employees of the Government it will vote for the salary of \$3,000 provided for in the bill, as reported by the committee.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah is a very distinguished and a very experienced member of the Committee on Appropriations. His inability to distinguish between the duties of the secretary of the Farm Loan Board and the chief clerk of some bureau in a department indicates the very reason why Congress should not leave the salaries to be fixed at the outset by the Committee on Appropriations. The act treats the whole matter from an entirely different standpoint and for the very reason that the Committee on Appropriations is one that has practical hard sense but is not supposed to be gifted with very much imagination.

In inaugurating an important system of this kind it is possible that in some cases high salaries may be paid. My fear is that the salaries paid will be too low and the system will not have a fair chance. My criticism of the Farm Loan Board up to the present is that they have not hired enough men or good enough men to do the work; that they have been somewhat cramped. They have tried to go very carefully, and I think they have gone carefully.

The secretary of the Federal Reserve Board does not begin to occupy so important a position relative to the country as does the secretary of the Farm Loan Board. In the first place, the Federal Reserve Board do not run any banks; they do not issue any bonds; they do not have to perform any one of the manifold duties which the Farm Loan Board have to perform. The Federal Reserve Board found the national banks—75,000 of them—all in existence, all running, with their officers, but the Farm Loan Board have to create a system; they have got to pick out officers and establish 12 Federal land banks. They therefore need the very best help and the very best advice they can get. The idea of comparing the secretary of a board like that with a chief clerk of some bureau of the Government is entirely outside of the field of argument.

I feel that the Appropriations Committee has undertaken to administer the farm-loan act itself, and that, too, without information, as was shown by their reference yesterday to Mr. Flannagan as just an ordinary secretary. One would think, therefore, that he is merely a stenographer, who has shown a little executive ability. That shows the lack of ability on the part of the Appropriations Committee to appreciate the situation.

I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] will be adopted.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, what are the special duties of the secretary of the Farm Loan Board?

Mr. HOLLIS. The secretary of the Farm Loan Board, in the first place, while the members were investigating the farm-loan needs of the country, had to establish the office curriculum; he had to send out the circulars and forms to farmers' associations throughout the country telling what the farm-loan act was. He has had to answer the correspondence, which is voluminous in amount, some 1,200 to 2,000 letters a day. He has had to formulate a plan for issuing farm-loan bonds and to do the thousand other things in an executive capacity that the board have to pass on in their official capacity. He is the right-hand man of the members of the Farm Loan Board.

The members of the Farm Loan Board, so far as I am informed, had not made a study of the farm-loan act. They were men who had been selected because of their experience and



ability as shown in other directions, but they were not any of them men who had had to do intimately with the farm-loan act. I know that they would have been at a great loss if they had not had the services of a man who was intimately acquainted with the act to guide them.

Mr. OLIVER obtained the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I desire to interrupt the Senator for just a moment to say, in order to see whether he agrees with the statement—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] has the floor.

Mr. OLIVER. I will postpone taking the floor until the Senator from Florida shall have concluded.

Mr. FLETCHER. What I desired to say was merely in line with the answer of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] to the question propounded to him by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] as to the duties and work of the secretary of the Farm Loan Board. I would remind the Senator from New Hampshire, also, that the correspondence in the office is enormous. I have been told that they have received as many as a million inquiries with regard to this act; how it can be put into operation; the methods whereby the farm-loan associations may be organized; the steps to be taken in order that the people of the country may avail themselves of the credit facilities afforded by the act, and so forth. There are questions embodied in inquiries coming to the secretary, which go to the very gist and meaning of the operation of the act. People will inquire from one part of the country as to the steps necessary to be taken there to form local associations, as to the details of their organization, and the requirements generally of the board respecting the steps to be taken in order that the benefits of the act may be enjoyed. Those questions are answered by the secretary of the board. I know that, because every day I get letters from various parts of the country asking questions of me as to what effect this will have, as to whether this can be done, whether that can be done, and various other things under the act. I have frequently referred those letters to the secretary of the board, and he is called upon to answer those inquiries, and also to send out and distribute the literature on the subject. In addition to that, he prepared Senate Document No. 500, which is the farm-loan act annotated by him, and carefully prepared, so as to be in the most useful form.

I merely wanted to suggest that to the Senator from New Hampshire as somewhat enlarging upon his answer to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Florida know that all those questions which are asked are incorporated in the pamphlet the board is sending out to everybody. They have been sending that pamphlet out to my constituents—just one pamphlet.

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely; but there are questions asked regarding that pamphlet.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the secretary is doing all that, what is the board doing?

Mr. FLETCHER. The board have a great deal to do with organizing this whole system. In the first place, they had to divide the country into 12 districts; that has been done. They then had to locate those banks, and that has been done. They have to select the officers and the five directors for those banks. They have also to select appraisers throughout the country, so many for each State. They have a thousand and one things to do to establish the system and to put it into operation.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, when the subcommittee which had charge of this bill entered upon its duties the members of that committee were confronted by requests from every department of the Government for increases of salaries, and particularly for increases of salaries of men holding positions corresponding exactly to this one, very few of whom are in receipt of as high salaries as that fixed by the committee for this secretary. The subcommittee was unanimous in recommending the reduction of this salary from \$6,000 to \$3,000; and, if I am not mistaken, I think the committee was unanimous in sustaining that action of the subcommittee. There was some division in the subcommittee, as well as in the full committee, with regard to the salaries of the members of the board because of those salaries having been fixed by statute, but there was no difference of opinion as to the salary of the secretary. The committee decided that, although the increases of salaries demanded were in many instances justified, on account of the condition of the Treasury they would grant no increases.

I tell you, Mr. President, that the Senate, if it fixes this salary at above \$3,000, will be making a mere pretense of any attempt at economy in the consideration of this bill, because there are thousands of employees covered by this bill who are much more deserving of higher salaries than is the secretary of the Farm

Loan Board. I hope the committee will be sustained in this one attempt at economy.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in relation to this matter. I know the gentleman who is occupying the position of secretary to the Farm Loan Board; he is a very able man; but it seems to me we have reached that period in the affairs of our Government when it has become absolutely necessary that we should economize. As a usual rule, when a business is running behindhand, instead of even keeping salaries at the rate which employees have previously been receiving, there is a tendency to reduce the salaries. That is true in all business transactions; and I do not see any reason why it should not obtain as to Government transactions.

In committee I favored the payment of \$10,000 for the salaries of the members of the board, although originally I was opposed to it. I voted for that rate of salary yesterday only upon the ground that these gentlemen had, under the law which provided for \$10,000 salaries, left their homes and left their business for long periods of time, expecting to occupy these places, and that consequently they should receive the salaries which they really entered into a contract with the Government to receive. When, however, it comes to fixing the salaries of men in the first instance, at least in view of the present condition of the Treasury, I feel that it is our duty to be as economical as we reasonably can be. I believe, in view of the present condition of the Treasury, a fair compensation for this officer is \$3,000. For that reason, it seems to me, if we are going to economize at all, that we must begin at some place. It may be that it is disagreeable for one to do it; it is certainly disagreeable for me to do it, but, nevertheless, we have got a duty to perform here, and, so far as I am concerned, I feel that we ought to perform that duty and support the proposition of the Committee on Appropriations to fix this salary at \$3,000 per annum.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, when this bill was under consideration by the committee we were told that we must be economical in view of the condition of the Treasury, and the committee endeavored to follow out that injunction on the part of the majority members of the committee, who have a more direct interest perhaps in this matter than have the minority.

It will be recalled, Mr. President, that two or three days ago I called attention to the salary of the superintendent of the Botanic Garden, a man with great responsibilities, a man of great experience and fitness for the place, who is getting the meager salary of \$2,000 a year. The salary was estimated by the Treasury Department at a higher rate, but I was deterred from pressing that matter in committee upon the plea that we must not increase salaries this year, or must not agree to large salaries this year. I called attention to it in the Senate, and Senators on both sides of the Chamber agreed with me that the increase should be made, but contended that, unfortunately, this was not a good time to do it. I therefore did not press the amendment which I had offered and submitted to the committee.

Now, Mr. President, if the secretary to a commission is to receive more than \$3,000 a year, I shall offer the amendment to which I have referred when the bill gets to the Senate, and shall do everything in my power to see that an adequate salary—at least a decent salary—is given to that man, who is deserving certainly of as much pay as a secretary to a commission can possibly be entitled to.

What is true of that item of the bill will be equally true as to other items of the bill. There is no reason why one man should be singled out and given an exorbitant salary while the claims of other men who are underpaid should be ignored on the ground of the necessity for practicing economy because of the condition of the Public Treasury.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia 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	Gallinger	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Harding	Norris	Smith, Md.
Brandeggee	Hardwick	Oliver	Smoot
Bryan	Hollis	Overman	Sterling
Chamberlain	Hughes	Page	Stone
Chilton	Husting	Pittman	Sutherland
Clapp	James	Poland	Swanson
Clark	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pomerene	Thomas
Culberson	Kenyon	Ransdell	Tilman
Curtis	La Follette	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Fall	Lane	Shafroth	Warren
Fletcher	McCumber	Sheppard	Williams

Mr. HOLLIS. The Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] is unavoidably absent on public business.



Mr. CHILTON. I desire to announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] is absent on account of illness and that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent for the same reason. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], who is detained from the Senate on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] on which the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, after consulting with several of my colleagues on this side of the Chamber, I have decided to ask leave to modify my amendment by changing the amount from "\$6,000" to "\$5,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia modifies his amendment as indicated by him. The question is on the amendment as modified.

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

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

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. I am advised, however, that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I feel at liberty to vote and vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] and vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (when Mr. GRONNA's name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON]. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HARDING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). In the absence of my pair, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], I withhold my vote.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and vote "nay."

Mr. VARDAMAN. I inquire if the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I have a pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], but I understand that if he were present he would vote "nay" on the pending question. So I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BECKHAM. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

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

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

Mr. CHILTON. I have a general pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. OLIVER (after having voted in the negative). I inquire if the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has voted?

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

Mr. OLIVER. I transfer my pair with that Senator to my colleague [Mr. PENROSE] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of sickness.

Mr. SHERMAN (after having voted in the negative). I inquire if the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] has voted?

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

Mr. SHERMAN. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and will allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 31, as follows:

#### YEAS—19.

Ashurst	Husting	McLean	Pomerene
Chilton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard
Culberson	La Follette	Myers	Swanson
Fletcher	Lane	Pittman	Walsh
Hollis	Lee, Md.	Poindexter	

#### NAYS—31.

Beckham	Hardwick	Ransdell	Thomas
Borah	James	Shafroth	Tillman
Brandeggee	Kenyon	Sherman	Vardaman
Bryan	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
Clapp	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	Watson
Clark	Oliver	Smoot	Weeks
Curtis	Overman	Stone	Williams
Gallinger	Page	Sutherland	

#### NOT VOTING—46.

Bankhead	Gore	Martin, Va.	Simmons
Brady	Gronna	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Broussard	Harding	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Catron	Hitchcock	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Hughes	O'Gorman	Sterling
Colt	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Thompson
Cummins	Jones	Penrose	Townsend
Dillingham	Kern	Phelan	Underwood
du Pont	Kirby	Reed	Wadsworth
Fall	Lea, Tenn.	Robinson	Works
Fernald	Lewis	Saulsbury	
Goff	Lippitt	Shields	

So Mr. CHILTON's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, the action of the Senate on the salary of the secretary of the board indicates their desire not to have large salaries paid, and no doubt the Farm Loan Board will take notice of the vote and govern themselves accordingly. I am afraid, however, that if the action of the Senate stands as the Appropriations Committee has recommended, that action will be misunderstood. There is no movement that I know of to attack the Federal Reserve Board or the Federal reserve act in any such way, to interfere with the authority of the Federal Reserve Board to employ their assistants and experts as they think wise, and to pay them such salaries as they think are deserved. I know that some of the Members on this side were governed in their votes on the last motion by their desire to economize, and some of them were governed by other considerations.

The Farm Loan Board came before Congress and asked for \$400,000 in this bill to carry on their necessary work. They said frankly that they did not know how much of that it would take, and nobody can tell how much it will take, because it is a new business; it is an untried country; and they have asked for what they thought they should have. The House of Representatives cut that request from \$400,000 to \$300,000, but otherwise left the farm-loan act as it was originally, without undertaking to dictate to the Farm Loan Board as to the officers they should have and the officers they should not have, or the salaries they should pay.

If this amendment is agreed to as it has been perfected, it will result in saddling on the Farm Loan Board a publicity agent for one year from the 1st of next July whether they want a publicity agent or not. It will saddle on them the chief of a bond division at \$3,000 a year, whether they want him or not, and a certain number of clerks and stenographers that may be needed or may not be needed.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

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

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER. Does the Senator mean to say that the Farm Loan Board will be compelled to employ these officials simply because their salaries are appropriated for in the appropriation bill? I rather think not.



Mr. HOLLIS. I think if they have any heed to their future appropriations they will follow very strictly the rule that the Appropriations Committee has laid down for them here. I certainly should if I were on the board.

Mr. OLIVER. If it is good policy for them to spend this money, no doubt it will be spent; but there is certainly nothing to compel them to employ a publicity agent unless that publicity is necessary for the transaction of the business. I think, however, they will find that these officials are necessary, and they will spend the money.

Mr. HOLLIS. The Senator, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, thinks so, or he undoubtedly would not have favored it. The point is that the Appropriations Committee ought not to assume, four months after the establishment of this board, to run their business for them. It was not intended by Congress that they should.

Mr. OLIVER. If the Senator will allow me again to interrupt him—

Mr. HOLLIS. I will.

Mr. OLIVER. I will state, for the information of the Senator, that all of these positions were inserted by the committee at the suggestion and upon the request of the Farm Loan Board.

Mr. HOLLIS. There is nothing in the record to show that. My information is that that is not the way it came up; that the Farm Loan Board were asked to produce a list of the officials and assistants and salaries, and they did so.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. HOLLIS. They stated that this was a temporary list; that none of them were hired by the year; that they were all hired by the month, and that there would likely be changes. That is what I understand to be this case.

Mr. OLIVER. I was present at the meeting when they appeared, and, of course, they submitted this list in response to a request from the committee. They stated that these officials or employees were the ones for whom they had arranged; and in accordance with that the committee provided for these positions, but reduced some of the salaries.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I do not desire to prolong this discussion. We went through it all yesterday. I want the Senate to understand just the effect of the committee amendment, however. The effect of it is that after the Farm Loan Board has been in office four months the Appropriations Committee undertakes not only to cut down the appropriation asked for, and the appropriation made by the House, but to legislate on certain offices and certain salaries, before the Farm Loan Board has had a fair trial. The members of the board were inexperienced. They had not been before Congress before, and they very likely did not give to the committee full information. I ask that the amendment may be rejected, so that the provision of the House may stand, and that the board may be left for one year to work out the provisions and objects and purposes of the farm-loan act as Congress originally intended.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I was very much surprised to hear the Senator from New Hampshire say that this was a veiled attack on the Farm Loan Board, when nothing was further from the truth.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I did not say it was. I said I thought it might be so construed; but I made no charge of the kind.

Mr. OVERMAN. I beg the Senator's pardon, then.

I want to say, Mr. President, that we went into this matter fully. We took no action until we had these gentlemen before us, talked to them in confidence, and conferred with them; and we took this action for what purpose? They told us they had appointed their office force. That was about as far as they had gone. Then we asked them for a list of the officers and their salaries; and when we found that their salaries were all out of proportion to the salaries of the Assistant Secretary of State, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and the Assistant Secretaries of the great departments of this Government, we made the salaries of the officers of the Farm Loan Board conform to the salaries of other officers of the great departments of this Government, and it was our duty to do so.

The idea that any man on the committee wants to cripple the Farm Loan Board is preposterous. There are as good friends of the Farm Loan Board on the Committee on Appropriations as the Senator from New Hampshire himself; and we desired to do nothing whatever to cripple that board.

Why, Mr. President, we knew that those gentlemen—excellent gentlemen, splendid men—were strangers to Washington, and to appropriations, and to the salaries that other officers here were getting. They came before us fairly and honestly and spoke to us like fair men, expressing their ignorance of these matters. I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that if the board knew, as we knew, the salaries that were given—they so expressed them-

selves—they would not have fixed these salaries at the figures they did. Why, sir, if they had known that the Chief of the Bond Division of the Treasury Department was getting only \$2,000, do you tell me that those four men would have appointed a man at \$3,900?

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, the trouble is that the committee made exactly the mistake that I indicated a little while ago. The clerk in charge of the Bond Division in the Treasury Department has no such duties as the man who will look after issuing the farm-loan bonds, billions of them. He has nothing of the kind to do. His duties are entirely technical and administrative, and are not at all in the line of constructive work of this kind.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I know that it is the same name—the same office.

Mr. HOLLIS. That is it exactly.

Mr. OVERMAN. I suppose that when there are any bonds for sale in the Treasury, he will have the same thing to do. In fact, this man will not have much to do. I believe these bonds will sell themselves. I do not believe this man will have to go up and down the country hawking bonds. I think all he will have to do will be simply to sit in his office there and do an administrative act, because I believe these will be the best bonds on the market, and they will sell like hot cakes.

Mr. President, I resent the idea that this committee were in any way trying to cripple the Farm Loan Board. We were sitting there trying to legislate in behalf of the taxpayers of the country who will have to pay this money; and we did not believe that at this time, with \$300,000,000 deficit staring us in the face, we ought to be extravagant. We were perfectly satisfied that this board, if they knew what other officers were getting in the different departments, would have fixed the salaries of their employees on the same standard; and it was practically admitted, in talking to us, that they did not know about these things.

So far as the appropriation of \$250,000 is concerned, we asked them about that. We wanted to give them everything they needed. They do not know—it is impossible for them to tell—how much money they need; so we made it \$250,000. If they need more, all they will have to do is to come here with a request for a deficiency appropriation, and they will get it. If they need \$150,000 or \$200,000 more in the deficiency bill, the Committee on Appropriations will be glad to give it to them. We want to give them such amount of money as they need; but nobody knows; they could not tell themselves within \$50,000 or \$100,000 of how much they will need. So we concluded that we would give them a lump sum of \$250,000 to spend in their discretion as they thought best. Then, if there is a deficiency, they can come back, and they will get it without any trouble.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just one word.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] intimates that we are dealing with this board differently than we have with other boards, or differently than we have with other bureaus of this Government; but we are not. Whenever there has been a bureau created in the Government service, it has always been created in exactly the same way that this board was created. The first appropriation bill passed after the creation of a bureau with a lump-sum appropriation to begin operation has provided for specific salaries, just the same as we have done for the Federal Farm Loan Bureau in this bill.

We have not dictated to the board. We have not interfered with any rights of the board. We have no idea of crippling the board in any way. As I stated yesterday, when the question of reducing the appropriation from \$300,000 to \$250,000 was being considered, one of the subcommittee asked one of the members of the board, "Is it possible for you to get along with \$250,000 for the coming year?" He frankly admitted that perhaps it would be, and no doubt it will be possible for them to do it; and it was upon that statement that we reduced the amount. Not only that, but in considering the matter after the members of the board left the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee decided that upon the answer of the member we would make the amount \$250,000, but that if there was a deficiency Congress would be in session again before the time expired for expending the whole of the money, and it would take care of whatever deficiency there was in a deficiency appropriation bill.

That is the case as it really happened, Mr. President, and I sincerely trust that the amendment of the committee will be agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not desire to prolong the discussion at all; but I really believe that the House provision is preferable to the Senate provision, everything considered, in connection with this item covering the Federal Farm Loan Bureau. That leaves it open, as the Senator from New Hamp-



shire has said, for the board to arrange their affairs and adjust their work and engage such employees as they need, as the circumstances and conditions may warrant. They need not pay \$3,000 if they can get a good, capable man to do the work for less, and so on. But just as an instance, it seems to me the committee is short-sighted in providing in this amendment that three clerks must be employed at \$720 each—that is to say, clerks in this important bureau, attending to duties which must require first-class ability, at \$60 a month—and then one at \$600. What sort of a clerk do you suppose is going to be of any help to any board anywhere that you can get for \$50 a month? Then there are these stenographers, three of them, at \$720 a year.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, they fixed those salaries themselves at \$720.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the committee's recommendation in this amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am talking about what the board furnished us. They furnished us a list of their clerks—one of them at \$600. We did not disturb that.

Mr. FLETCHER. They can not get very good clerks very long at that figure.

Mr. OVERMAN. Well, that is the figure at which they fixed the salary.

Mr. FLETCHER. But those are all temporary employees.

Mr. OVERMAN. We did not touch that.

Mr. FLETCHER. You put it in the law. You have fixed it. You have limited it by this act for the next year so that they must employ three clerks at \$720 each and one at \$600.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator to be in error about this matter. If the Senator will read the section, he will see this language:

For salaries and expenses under the Federal Farm Loan Board, created by the act approved July 17, 1916, including the actual necessary traveling expenses of the members of the board and such salaries, fees, and expenses as are authorized by said act—

That is in the second paragraph.

Mr. FLETCHER. I know; but I am talking about the first paragraph.

Mr. OVERMAN. The first paragraph only fixes the office force that they have now. It does not attempt to interfere with the salaries of any other offices of any kind.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand that perfectly well. It fixes the office force that they now have. They have said that it is a temporary force. They have said that they do not know when they may need changes. The employees at present are only employed by the month; but you are putting it in the law so that they will be obliged in the next year to employ such clerks as they need; three of them, say, at \$720 each, and one at \$600; and then you provide for one stenographer at \$1,200, seven at \$1,000—I do not complain of that; that seems to me to be fair—but four at \$900 each. I doubt if you can get proper stenographers, stenographers capable of doing this work, for that compensation.

Mr. OVERMAN. Why, let me interrupt the Senator again. Here is what they furnished us. The Senator complains of the clerks being paid \$720:

Mr. Francis W. Weeks, Miss Caroline Collins, Mr. Albert W. Finch, \$720.

They fixed it themselves. We did not change these lower salaries.

Mr. FLETCHER. I know they fixed them at that figure to begin with.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is the way they fixed the salaries themselves.

Mr. FLETCHER. To begin with, yes; but you are putting in the law a provision requiring them to employ these people for the next year at this figure, and that is too low; that is not enough. Any stenographer who is thoroughly capable ought to get more than \$60 a month.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I assume that my friend the Senator from Florida knows that there are thousands of stenographers in the departments who do not get more than that. I say "thousands"; I think I am within bounds when I say that.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is within bounds.

Mr. FLETCHER. If so, they are not doing the work that the stenographers in this bureau will be required to do. This is technical work of a very important character and requiring skill and ability.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I think if the Senator will look at this list of salaries that they sent us he will find that we have not changed those at all.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is possible that at the start they have been able to employ people temporarily at low salaries.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FLETCHER (continuing). But I do say that to limit this board to those figures for the next year for the employees they need is not fair to the board. I do not believe they can get capable work, such as they ought to have, for that figure.

Mr. CLARK and Mr. OLIVER addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, these salaries are exactly the same as the salaries that are fixed for clerks of the same class in all departments of the Government; and why the Farm Loan Board should be authorized to pay more than other branches of the Government I can not understand.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator will not say that all stenographers in the other departments of the Government get only \$60 a month.

Mr. OVERMAN. All the stenographers here do not get \$60 a month.

Mr. FLETCHER. You have one stenographer at \$1,200 a year and seven at \$1,000 a year, which I say is fair.

Mr. OLIVER. There are stenographers in this list that get more than that. The stenographers to the members of the board, for instance, get more, and I do not see why the Farm Loan Board should be allowed more. Besides, Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. You have here four at \$900.

Mr. OLIVER. We are giving them in this bill exactly what they asked.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If they could take this chorus, they would be worth more than \$60 a month. [Laughter.] One at a time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FLETCHER. I have said all that I care to say on the subject.

Mr. CLARK. I wanted to ask the Senator a question, in view of one of his statements. I understood the Senator to say that if we agreed to this amendment as reported by the committee it would compel the employment of these clerks and stenographers, and so forth, at the salaries herein fixed.

Mr. FLETCHER. No; I do not say you compel the employment of them; but if they need these stenographers, then you limit them to this pay.

Mr. CLARK. Then my question will not be asked, because it would be of no use. I understood the Senator to say that we were compelling them to employ these clerks and stenographers at this salary.

Mr. FLETCHER. No; I say you are compelling them to pay only \$60 a month for three stenographers, if they need those, and \$50 dollars a month for one of the clerks.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator mean that under this bill they could not pay more than \$60 for a stenographer? What is the purpose of the second paragraph of the section?

Mr. FLETCHER. I say that they are limited to the employment of four stenographers at \$900 each and three at \$720.

Mr. OVERMAN. Not at all. There is no limit at all.

Mr. CLARK. I can not agree with the Senator about that.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the language of the amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish the Senator would show me where they are limited.

Mr. FLETCHER. Why put it in the bill, then?

Mr. OVERMAN. Why, we fix the salaries of those that are already employed, giving them the power hereafter to employ as many as they think necessary.

Mr. FLETCHER. Why put in this amendment then, that this board are allowed—for that is what it means—one clerk of class 4 at \$900, three at \$720, and one at \$600? Why put that in there, if they can employ clerks without regard to that provision? And then why put in there a provision that they are allowed to employ one clerk and stenographer at \$1,200, seven at \$1,000 each, four at \$900 each, and three at \$720 each? If they can go on and employ stenographers at salaries to suit themselves without regard to that provision in the law, why put it in there?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. OLIVER. I will say to the Senator that if he will turn to page 37 he will find, in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury, that it is specified that he shall have "three assistant secretaries at \$5,000 each, clerk to the Secretary \$3,000, executive clerk \$2,400, stenographer \$1,800, three private secretaries, one to each Assistant Secretary, at \$1,800 each," and so on.



In all the departments of the Government we specify, as far as possible, the number of clerks that shall be employed by each department and in each bureau, and specify the salary that shall be paid to each. We are only doing the same thing in reference to the Farm Loan Board. Why should they be placed upon a different plane from all the other departments or bureaus of the Government?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is precisely what I have been contending for—that you have specified and expressed these figures and these items and these clerks, and that means they are limited thereby.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no.

Mr. FLETCHER. But the Senator sees fit to cite the other provision, the second paragraph of the amendment, and to present the thought that the board is not confined at all to these provisions with reference to these stenographers and clerks.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that if the board had all their employees engaged that it intends to have for the next year, and all had been specified, there would have been no lump-sum appropriation provided for in this bill; but in paragraph 2 the amendment provides for a lump sum, and out of that lump sum the board can employ whatever experts, stenographers, and clerks they may desire for the coming year within the appropriation. If they had the force completed, the same as the other departments of the Government are, there would have been no lump sum, but every clerk and every employee of the board would have been specifically provided for, as the clerks in other bureaus or departments of the Government are legislated for.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I wish to say only a word on the action of the committee in reducing the lump-sum appropriation from \$300,000 to \$250,000. In the House hearing Mr. Norris, of the board, estimated that their annual expenses in the office would be from \$125,000 to \$150,000. It will be observed that the office expenses, which include the office force, are only \$67,000, and that is somewhere between \$60,000 and \$70,000 more than they need.

I think it would be a great mistake to leave any board with a lump-sum appropriation after the board is established. This is nothing different from what has always been done upon the establishment of every board. We have in the nature of things to make a lump-sum appropriation until they get started, and after they get in operation they are required, and ought to be required, to furnish an estimate, not leaving them do as they please but requiring them to submit an estimate and let Congress fix the salaries. That has been the uniform practice of Congress, and the Farm Loan Board is not of such dignity rising above all the others as that an exception should be made in this case.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

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

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

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and vote "yea."

Mr. CHILTON (when Mr. KERN's name was called). The Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as before and withhold my vote.

Mr. VARDAMAN (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Arizona was called). I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] is absent from the Senate in the performance of official duty.

Mr. VARDAMAN (when his name was called). I desire to ask if the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I have a pair with that Senator. I transfer the pair to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], but I understand from his colleague that if he were present he would vote "yea" upon the pending proposition. I therefore consider myself at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and vote "yea."

Mr. REED. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "yea."

Mr. SHERMAN. I have a pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] and vote "yea."

Mr. GRONNA. I am paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON]. He is not present and I withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 20, as follows:

#### YEAS—33.

Bankhead	Jones	Ransdell	Tillman
Borah	Kenyon	Reed	Wadsworth
Bandeggee	Lane	Shafroth	Warren
Bryan	Lodge	Sherman	Weeks
Clapp	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Clark	Norris	Smoot	Works
Culberson	Oliver	Sterling	
Gallinger	Overman	Stone	
Hughes	Page	Thomas	

#### NAYS—20.

Brady	Hollis	McLean	Pomerene
Chamberlain	Husting	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard
Chilton	James	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Vardaman
Fletcher	Lee, Md.	Polindexter	Watson

#### NOT VOTING—43.

Ashurst	Gore	Lippitt	Simmons
Beckham	Gronna	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.
Broussard	Harding	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Catron	Hardwick	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Colt	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Curtis	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Swanson
Dillingham	Kern	Penrose	Thompson
du Pont	Kirby	Phelan	Townsend
Fall	La Follette	Robinson	Underwood
Fernald	Lea, Tenn.	Saulsbury	Walsh
Goff	Lewis	Shields	

So the amendment of the committee as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment of the committee passed over is on page 109, under the heading "Post Office Department," where the committee proposes to strike out the House text down to and including line 19, on page 115, and to insert the matter in italics from line 20, on page 115, to line 4, on page 119.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest that the amendment ought to be read. I do not think we are in such haste that we ought not to have the amendment read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. BRYAN. On an examination of the Record I find that the amendment has already been read, and unless some Senator particularly desires it the reading might be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire asked that it be read.

Mr. GALLINGER. If it has been read, I withdraw the request. I was not aware that the amendment had been read before.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, when this matter came up in the committee I inquired with reference to the paragraph on page 117 providing for a readjustment of the salaries of clerks under this provision. The matter came up in the committee several times and the committee considered it. It was stated that it made no change in existing law except to authorize the Postmaster General to make the adjustments within the limits of \$100, as herein provided, instead of \$200, as now provided by law. I have looked the matter up as carefully as I could within the time that I have had, and I do not believe that the paragraph ought to remain in the bill.

The paragraph proposes to make a change in the law with reference to the Post Office Department in its conduct. We have a Post Office Committee that is thoroughly familiar with matters of this kind, and that, I think, has now before it the Post Office appropriation bill which is to be passed at this session of Congress. That bill will go into effect just as soon as this bill will go into effect, and, if this change ought to be made, it can be taken care of in that committee, by a committee that is thoroughly familiar with the matter and which can give it all the consideration that is desired.

So I feel constrained to make a point of order against it.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator withhold the point of order?

Mr. JONES. I will withhold the point of order if the Senator from Utah desires.



Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, perhaps it would be just as well at this time for me to explain in as few words as possible what changes from the House bill the Senate amendment makes.

In the past the clerks in the office of the Postmaster General, the First Assistant, the Second Assistant, the Third Assistant, and the Fourth Assistant have been appropriated for separately. Under the Senate amendment all the clerks appropriated for in the Post Office Department come under the head of the Postmaster General; or, in other words, the Postmaster General in the future will assign clerks to the offices of the First Assistant, the Second Assistant, the Third Assistant, and the Fourth Assistant Postmasters General in numbers as he thinks proper, or as the exigencies require. In giving the Postmaster General this power there is no question but that he can get more efficient work and better results and at the same time save money to the Government.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the Senator state that, in making those reductions and increases, the Postmaster General must now either reduce or increase at the rate of \$200?

Mr. SMOOT. I am not discussing that question right now, but I will say that under the present law that is the only way he can make them.

Mr. CURTIS. In classes.

Mr. SMOOT. In classes—fourth class, third class, second class, and first class. A fourth-class clerk gets \$1,800, a third-class clerk gets \$1,600, a second-class clerk gets \$1,400, and a first-class clerk gets \$1,200.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator just a moment?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. I do not know whether the Senator understands my position or not. I make no question about anything in the amendment except that one paragraph.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood the Senator to complain only of the one paragraph in the amendment.

Mr. President, the effect of the amendment will be a saving under the current law of \$23,280 and a reduction of 31 in the number of employees in the department. That result comes about, Mr. President, by the recognition that has been given to efficient workers by the Postmaster General in the past. Whenever better work has been demonstrated on the part of an employee he has been given a promotion and paid a higher salary. For the last three years there has been a steady decline in the number of employees in the department here at Washington, and every year there has been a decline in the amount appropriated to run the Post Office Department, notwithstanding the increased amount of business that has come to the department by the increase of business in the country.

As to the necessity of the paragraph referred to by the Senator from Washington, I wish to say that the Postmaster General under existing law in making promotions can only make a promotion by granting an increase of salary of \$200 in a clerkship of the fourth, third, second, or first class. The proposed provision allows him in case of a demotion to make it with a reduction of salary of the clerk demoted of \$100, and in case of a promotion he can increase the salary \$100 instead of \$200.

I would have no objection to that provision; in fact, I think it a splendid provision to enact into law. Then, wherever an efficient clerk is found and is worthy of an advance of \$100 he can receive it without having to wait for a chance to obtain an increase of \$200. In case of a demotion it can be \$100 instead of \$200.

I have here a diagram showing the steady decline of the appropriations made for the Post Office Department in Washington. I have nothing to say in relation to the work of the Post Office Department outside of what we are now appropriating for.

This shows, beginning with July, 1915, a steady decline in not only the number of employees but in the amount of appropriations, notwithstanding, as I said before, the amount of increased work that has come to the department.

Mr. President, I recognize that the paragraph objected to by the Senator from Washington is general legislation upon an appropriation bill and subject to a point of order. The Senator expressed the opinion that the subject could be attended to by the Post Office Appropriation Committee. I do not know whether the Post Office Committee would consider the question or whether it should be considered by that committee, as it affects only the clerks of the Post Office Department here in Washington, and the salary of those clerks is provided for in the legislative appropriation bill. I recognize of course the Post Office Committee could handle the question, but I believe that the Appropriations Committee in handling the legislative appropriation bill is the proper one to legislate upon this subject.

If the Senator from Washington desires that that paragraph shall be stricken from the bill by way of an amendment, I will say now to the Senator rather than to have a point of order made against the amendment entirely I will agree, as far as I can agree as a member of the committee, to strike out from the bill the paragraph on page 117, beginning with line 6 down to and including line 18, but I do hope the Senator will not insist upon his point of order.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand the Senator from Washington has made a point of order against that part of the amendment.

Mr. JONES. To one paragraph; but it is all one amendment. Then the chairman of the committee can reoffer the other as a separate proposition, and doubtless it will be adopted.

Mr. BRYAN. The point of order of the Senator from Washington has not been withdrawn?

Mr. JONES. No; it has not been withdrawn.

Mr. BRYAN. Let me supplement what the Senator from Utah has said and see if the Senator from Washington will not withdraw his point of order. In the first place, it is doubtful if the point of order is good; but passing that by for the present here is the situation in the post office in Washington: A clerk may be half the time placed on work assigned to a clerk of class 3 and is thereby entitled to receive \$1,600 per annum. The other half of the time may be spent on work assigned to a clerk of class 2 at \$1,400 per annum. The Postmaster General under the present law has to leave him at \$1,400 or advance him to \$1,600. This plan only allows him, considering the work balanced through the year as a whole, to fix the salary at \$1,500 when it ought to be on an average that amount. It is represented to us that that would mean a saving of a great deal of money to the Government. I can very easily see how the present system would prevent a man entitled to increase of pay from receiving it. Under the plan outlined and under the illustrations given that particular clerk ought to be paid \$1,500 a year; but the Postmaster General must keep him underpaid at \$1,400 or advance him to the \$1,600 rate. It means a great deal to the department.

Furthermore, I will say to the Senator from Washington that the Postmaster General more conspicuously than any other head of a department in Washington has been endeavoring to economize and to so adjust the treatment of the employees of that department as to keep them satisfied, to pay them larger salaries than they have been receiving when they deserved an increase, so that when the new post-office building was opened up here it was done without an increase of the clerical force in Washington. With a big building opened up, with the co-operation of the Post Office Department with the Bureau of Efficiency, they so worked out the matter that it did not cost any more money.

Now, the Postmaster General feels that when men are loyal to him in that way he ought to be allowed to treat them with more consideration than he can do because of limitation of the increase to \$200 or nothing. I do not see what possible harm it can do. If I understand the Senator from Washington, that is the only objection he has to the whole amendment.

Mr. JONES. It is the objection I have to that paragraph.

Mr. BRYAN. If we do not do that, we then go back to the text of the House bill, and the saving which is proposed to be made here will be lost. I am sure the Senator from Washington does not desire to bring that about.

The Postmaster General can to-day promote or demote. The only difference is he would have to do it in steps of \$200, and here he would be allowed to do it in steps of \$100. The whole amendment is in the interest of efficiency in the department; it is in the interest of proper pay for the work done. I am sure if the Senator from Washington had had time to consider it he would not be making the point of order against it. Not only the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations considered this matter, but it was referred by that subcommittee to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] and myself to thoroughly consider it, and we did so. We examined the House hearings, where the matter was gone into at considerable length.

I will say, first, that the House committee was favorable to the plan, but did not have time to adopt it. It was there shown that a saving would be made, but pending the time when the bill was considered in the House committee and when the representatives of the department were before the Senate committee the plan had been worked out, and a further saving had been effected. It is poor encouragement to the Post Office Department, when they have done these things, to have the Senate or the other House refuse to recognize the work they have been doing.

The Senator from Washington says that this legislation should go on the Post Office appropriation bill. So it could; but on



this bill—the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill—the salaries of the Postmaster General, his assistants, and his clerical force are taken care of.

Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. JONES addressed the Chair.  
Mr. BRYAN. I first yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have not carefully looked into this matter, but it struck me at first blush as being an innovation, and I question its advisability; but, as I say, I have not examined it carefully. If we give this authority to the Postmaster General to readjust salaries, shall we not also have to give it to the heads of all the other departments?

Mr. BRYAN. It would be a most excellent thing to do if we did so.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Florida thinks it would be?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the Postmaster General has that authority now. He can demote or promote any clerk in the department, but it must be done \$200 at a step; the clerk must be demoted or promoted at the rate of \$200 at a time.

Mr. GALLINGER. Has the Postmaster General that authority by law?

Mr. SMOOT. He has that authority by law.

Mr. BRYAN. Yes; he can do that now by law.

Mr. GALLINGER. Have the heads of all of the departments authority to demote and to promote at will?

Mr. SMOOT. They have.

Mr. GALLINGER. Notwithstanding that their employees are civil-service employees?

Mr. SMOOT. They have that authority under the law.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then the civil service does not count for much.

Mr. BRYAN. This only changes it to steps of \$100, instead of making him take steps of \$200.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Florida a question in connection with the remark he made a moment ago, that this is the proper bill for such legislation, because it is the bill on which the salaries for the employees of this department are made. I want to ask the Senator if this proposition were introduced as a separate measure would it not go to the Post Office Committee?

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. JONES. I refer to this particular paragraph.

Mr. BRYAN. No. The Senator from Washington understands that this is for the purpose of making appropriations.

Mr. JONES. I want to ask the Senator if a separate measure were introduced giving the Postmaster General certain authority in the demotion or classification of promotion of clerks, and so on, as a legislative proposition would it not go to the Post Office Committee?

Mr. BRYAN. I think not.

Mr. JONES. I think it would.

Mr. BRYAN. I am sure it would not.

Mr. President, I want to read to the Senator from Washington, from the hearings before the Senate committee, just a paragraph from the testimony of Mr. Denning, the chief clerk of the Post Office Department. A committee was appointed by the Post Office Department upon the question of whether their force was well enough paid in comparison with those engaged in like work in private employment. A committee of three visited New York and Philadelphia. They went into the offices of some of the great companies like the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., and others. They were under instruction as to the post-office employees to adjust their pay 20 to 30 per cent higher than the pay being given to men in private employ doing the same character of work. They selected the companies which they visited for the reason that their hours were the same as the hours in which the employees of the Post Office Department were employed. They want now to pay more money—20 to 30 per cent more—and they have drawn up this plan. They have the cooperation of the employees, which is a valuable thing to have; but if they have to hold a man to \$1,400, say, when, according to their own records, he ought to be paid \$1,500 by reason of half of his time being spent upon \$1,600 work, they are hampered by the law. So the Senator may understand that I am correct in that, Mr. Denning, the chief clerk, says:

We suggested there legislation that will permit us to pay \$100 more or \$100 less than the grade fixed. It frequently happens that an employee, based on the standard that we have worked out, will be earning \$1,500. It is manifest injustice to him to keep him at \$1,400 when, comparing his work with that of other clerks, he is earning and ought to receive \$1,500. If we promoted him we would have to pay him \$1,600. In other words, he would be placed in the position of receiving more than he was earning. It would help us a good deal if we could have

this provision which would authorize us to pay \$100 more or less than a grade.

So much for the merits of the proposition, Mr. President.

The Senator from Washington and the Chair will observe that in the text of the House bill numerous references are made to the transfers of clerks from the office of one of the Assistant Postmasters General to that of another. These transfers are indicated in parentheses, and there are a great many of them. That does not occur in the Senate committee amendment. The reason why it does not occur is because by this paragraph we make it unnecessary.

Mr. President, I believe that covers the case as laid before the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in connection with what I have already said, I wish to call attention to the fact that the average salaries of employees between the ages of 20 and 45 have been increased from \$1,185 in 1914 to \$1,248 in 1916, or \$63 per capita in two years. The average increase during the last four years of all employees has been \$13.50 a year. That average increase has come about, and yet a saving in the amount appropriated for running the Post Office Department here in Washington has occurred. As I stated before, there has been a reduction of hundreds of employees in the Post Office Department in Washington in the last few years brought about by the adoption of business principles by the Postmaster General in dealing with the clerks of that department. I think we ought to encourage the Postmaster General in the work he has done so well, and I would like to see the same work accomplished in all the departments. The Postmaster General has shown us all what can be done by applying business principles in Government work.

Mr. JONES. Let me ask the Senator if the Postmaster General saw fit to demote one of the employees by \$100 under this bill, and sitting beside that employee was another employee who really deserved promotion, there is nothing here to require him to promote that employee, is there?

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; there is nothing here to require him to do it, but it authorizes him to do it.

Mr. JONES. But there is nothing to require him to use the money that he has saved by demoting one employee to promote another deserving employee?

Mr. SMOOT. That is the object of the provision.

Mr. BRYAN. That is the whole purpose of it.

Mr. JONES. But it does not say so. It says he may do it, but it does not say that he shall do it.

Mr. SMOOT. Under the present law, I will say to the Senator, the Postmaster General has the power to demote any clerk in the department from one grade to a lower grade, and he has the power to promote any clerk from one grade to another, provided he does not exceed the number of clerks in the particular grade appropriated for; in other words, under the present law, if we appropriate for 54 clerks, the Postmaster General can not promote to that particular grade a clerk if the promotion would bring the number above 54, but he could demote, or if there were a vacancy in that grade he could promote from a lower grade into that higher grade under the present law.

Mr. SHERMAN. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. The language of the bill is that "the unused portion of such salary may be used to increase the salary of any clerk in any class by not exceeding \$100 above the salary fixed by law for such class." In the event the Postmaster General advanced this one clerk \$100, and should give the clerk \$5 of it, what becomes of the other \$95?

Mr. SMOOT. I take it for granted that the Postmaster General would use the whole amount saved by the demotion.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then it is a discretionary power with the head of the department, instead of fixing it by an act of Congress?

Mr. SMOOT. Under this provision, if the Postmaster General made any increase at all, it would have to be \$100, whilst under the present law, if there is any increase made, it must be \$200. So if the clerk were given an increase at all, he would get the entire \$100 under this provision.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator from Utah think that that would be the necessary effect of it—that, for instance, \$25 of the amount would not be called an increase and the other \$75 be carried to the surplus?

Mr. SMOOT. No; because of the fact that the present law provides that any increase in the case of a clerk shall be in steps of \$200. So to-day the Postmaster General could not increase a third-class clerk to a fourth-class clerkship and pay him anything but \$1,800, while this provision will allow him to increase or decrease the salaries of clerks in steps of a hundred dollars, instead of \$200.



Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from Utah when that provision was placed in the statute giving this authority? Is it an old provision?

Mr. SMOOT. It is an old law, and it has been in force ever since the classification of clerks was made, at the time when the salaries were fixed for the four different classes of clerks.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a delightful provision, so far as favoritism is concerned.

Mr. SMOOT. That authority has long been given to the Postmaster General. I think, as the Senator says, that there may be favoritism under the pending provision; but, even at that, it is better than the present law, because favoritism to-day can be shown by granting an increase of \$200, whereas under this provision an increase of only \$100 might be allowed.

Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Washington not to make the point of order against the amendment. I know the provision will save the Government of the United States money, and I am certain that it will not be abused any more than the present law is, and not so much.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from Utah explain how it is going to save money?

Mr. SMOOT. Two constructions have been put upon this provision of the bill; but the object was wherever there was a demotion there could be a promotion made to the extent of a hundred dollars instead of \$200, and therefore there would be a hundred dollars saved on the promotion.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I do not understand the Senator's mathematics. Under the present law when \$200 is taken off one man's salary and given to another man there is no saving. Under this bill if \$100 is taken off one man's salary and given to another man I do not see that there will be any saving.

Mr. SMOOT. As I have said, there are different constructions of the wording of the provision. If an increase could not be granted without a demotion, then there would be no saving; but suppose there is a death or a vacancy occurring otherwise in the service? At the present time the Postmaster General can not make a promotion except in steps of \$200, but under this provision if a vacancy occurs the Postmaster General can make a promotion to the extent of \$100 instead of \$200. In that case there will be a saving to the Government of the United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, I am still dense on that point.

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly what the result will be if this provision shall be adopted by the Senate and become a law.

Mr. GALLINGER. If there is a vacancy it is filled by the Civil Service Commission, of course; that vacancy does not stand permanently.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator this is how it will work: If a vacancy should happen in a clerkship by death or resignation, then the vacancy is filled by the Civil Service Commission; but the Postmaster General is not compelled to call for a clerk to fill the vacancy occasioned by death. He may promote a clerk from one of the other divisions into the division where the vacancy occurs and then ask for a clerk from the Civil Service Commission to fill the clerkship in the division below. That is the way many of the promotions are made in the departments of the Government.

Mr. GALLINGER. But the idea that it will bring about a saving to the Government is still nebulous in my mind.

Mr. SMOOT. It seems rather strange, I will say to the Senator, to think of such a thing; but this is one of the departments that has accomplished that very thing, and it is so rare in the history of the Government service that I think we ought to encourage the head of any department who will undertake it.

Mr. BRYAN. It has been done in this way: The clerical force has been decreased, or it has not been increased. As I said a moment ago, when the new post-office building was occupied no additional expense was incurred, because clerks were transferred from other divisions of the department.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will simply say that, so far as I am concerned, I am not antagonizing the amendment, because I know very little about it, and I take the word of Senators who know more about it than I do; but when it comes to a question of saving I think I might well quote the words, "It would spoil it if you tried to explain it."

Mr. BRYAN. It is claimed that it will save \$23,000 or \$24,000 per annum. Now, let me suggest this plan to the Senator from Washington: I am sure it is not the intention of the Postmaster General to promote in less than \$100 steps. Furthermore, it is his intention to use whatever money is saved by demotions in granting promotions. If the Senator thinks that the Postmaster General would not do that without positive instruction, we can so change this language as to require him to do it. Of course the reason why it was put as it stands in the amendment

was in order not to require him to advance a clerk every time another clerk was demoted, and we ought to be careful to get the language in such shape that that situation can not be brought about; but I believe that the Senator's purpose would be accomplished by changing in line 9 the word "may" to the word "shall"; then in line 10, after the word "class," by inserting the words "entitled thereto." Furthermore, in order to meet the objection of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] that not the whole \$100 might be used but a mere fraction of it, we might strike out the word "exceeding" and insert the words "less than." It seems to me that would cure any possible objection to the provision.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Florida that I think I shall not insist upon the point of order, if it is understood that those amendments are to be made. I will say that the modification does not entirely meet my objection. I really do not think this provision ought to go in the bill. We have a law approved August 23, 1912, one section of which reads as follows:

SEC. 4. The Civil Service Commission shall, subject to the approval of the President, establish a system of efficiency ratings for the classified service in the several executive departments in the District of Columbia based upon records kept in each department and independent establishment with such frequency as to make them as nearly as possible records of fact. Such system shall provide a minimum rating of efficiency which must be attained by an employee before he may be promoted; it shall also provide a rating below which no employee may fall without being demoted; it shall further provide for a rating below which no employee may fall without being dismissed for inefficiency. All promotions, demotions, or dismissals shall be governed by provisions of the civil-service rules. Copies of all records of efficiency shall be furnished by the departments and independent establishments to the Civil Service Commission for record in accordance with the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That in the event of reductions being made in the force in any of the executive departments no honorably discharged soldier or sailor whose record in said department is rated good shall be discharged or dropped, or reduced in rank or salary.

Then there follows a provision for punishing violations of the act. The pending provision may not affect that section, if I am not sure as to that.

Mr. BRYAN. I am sure it does not.

Mr. JONES. I am not sure what effect it may have upon ; but, with the suggestions made by the Senator from Florida and in view of his assurance and the assurances of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], I withdraw the point of order. Of course, I am just as much interested in economy and efficiency in the service as are other Senators.

Mr. BRYAN. I understand that, Mr. President.

Mr. JONES. I know that they know more about this matter than I do, because they have given it special consideration; but I do think that it is legislation of such importance that it ought to be considered separately. However, because they have investigated it very carefully and are satisfied that it is in the interest of the service and in view of the suggestion of the Senator from Florida, I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BRYAN. I offer to the amendment reported by the committee the amendment which I have already suggested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In the committee amendment on page 117, line 9, after the word "salary," it is proposed to strike out the word "may" and insert "shall"; in line 10, after the word "class," to insert the words "entitled thereto"; and in the same line, after the word "not," to strike out "exceeding" and insert the words "less than," so as to read:

In making readjustments hereunder, the salary of any clerk in any class may be fixed by the Postmaster General at \$100 below the salary fixed by law for such class and the unused portion of such salary shall be used to increase the salary of any clerk in any class entitled thereto by not less than \$100 above the salary fixed by law for such class.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is at the top of page 143, to strike out:

To investigate and report upon matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and especially investigate the questions of infant mortality, \$72,120.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, while I am a member of the committee, I was unable to attend the hearings or the meetings of the committee when this item was considered.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, there are a number of Senators interested in this matter, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.



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

Borah	Jones	Poindexter	Swanson
Bryan	Kenyon	Pomerene	Thomas
Chilton	La Follette	Saulsbury	Thompson
Clapp	Lane	Shafroth	Tillman
Cummins	McLean	Sheppard	Vardaman
Curtis	Martine, N. J.	Shepherd	Warren
Fletcher	Myers	Smith, Ga.	Watson
Gallinger	Norris	Smith, S. C.	Williams
Hollis	Overman	Smoot	
Husting	Page	Sterling	
Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Stone	

Mr. CHILTON. I desire again to announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I have been requested to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] on account of official business.

Mr. CHILTON. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent on official business.

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

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. BRANDEGES, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. LEE of Maryland, Mr. SHIELDS, and Mr. WADSWORTH answered to their names when called.

Mr. BRADY, Mr. JAMES, Mr. OLIVER, and Mr. NEWLANDS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, as I stated a few moments ago, while I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations which considered this bill, I was busy working on another committee and was unable to attend the meetings when this question was up. I should like to have the chairman of the subcommittee having charge of this bill inform the Senate why the provision on the top of page 143 was stricken out. It provides as follows:

To investigate and report upon matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and especially investigate the questions of infant mortality, \$72,120.

I find from the reports that this bureau is doing a good and wonderful work and covering a great field. It looks into the care of children; dependent, defective, and delinquent classes; examines the laws of the various States relating to mothers' pensions; also the administration of such laws; inquires into infant mortality, which covers many fields; the child-labor question; amendments to the child-labor laws; the administration of child-labor laws. All these questions are of great importance to the people of this country.

It does seem to me that the item stricken from the bill is of great importance to the bureau. I have read the report of the hearings before the House, and it appears that at said hearings Miss Lathrop and others representing this bureau made a showing which would justify not only the House but the Senate in giving to the bureau the \$72,120 for the purposes mentioned in the item; and I should like to have the chairman explain why the item was stricken from the bill.

With the information now on hand, so far as I am personally concerned, I am opposed to the committee amendment, and hope it will be rejected, and that the bureau will be given this \$72,120 to carry on the splendid work that it has been doing and will continue to do. There should be no lack of funds for carrying on this vitally important work.

I notice also that the general appropriation in line 21 has been reduced from \$95,000 to \$58,000. The bureau asked, instead of \$95,000, for \$173,400 to do the work covered by this appropriation. After a hearing in the House we have the bill coming to the Senate carrying \$95,000. That was reduced by the committee, and the bill comes to the Senate carrying \$58,000.

I do not intend to take up the time of the Senate to have read the report of the hearings before the House; but I want to say that they are very complete, and in my judgment they justify the bureau in asking for these two appropriations. I hope the action of the committee will not be sustained in reducing it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator look on page 143, line 9?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I should like very much to hear what the Senator is saying, and we can not hear him on this side on account of the noise in the Chamber.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will examine page 143, line 9, he will notice that in the case of the employment of experts and temporary assistants—I do not know how numerous they are—the compensation is reduced from \$8 to \$6 per day, so that that will somewhat account for the reduction in line 21.

I do not know whether it covers it all or not. Like the Senator from Kansas, I was not present when it was considered.

Mr. CURTIS. I did not have time to look over the estimates to see how many they have and how many experts were asked for, and so I can not tell the Senator how great a reduction will be made on account of the change from \$8 to \$6 a day; but it would seem to me that it would not make a very great reduction.

Mr. GALLINGER. "Experts and temporary assistants," it will be observed, is the language.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN rose.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield the floor.

Mr. KENYON. If the Senator from Florida is going ahead, I will not take up the time; but it seems that the committee has placed the amounts just as they were last year. The amount last year for traveling expenses, per diem, and so forth, was \$58,000. I doubt if they have calculated at all the reduction that will come from reducing the salaries to \$6 a day in getting at that result.

Mr. BRYAN. Yes; the House committee did that. The House committee allowed a per diem of \$6, and the House raised it to \$8. That explains the difference between \$58,000 and \$95,000. The committee thought \$6 enough.

Mr. KENYON. Does that cover the whole difference in that item?

Mr. BRYAN. That is my understanding of it. The Senate committee put it back as the House committee reported it to the House; to have it in conference, after having read, however, the hearings before the House committee. My understanding is that that is what it is due to.

Mr. KENYON. I do not understand how that could be, because the number of experts and temporary assistants to be employed under this section is optional with the bureau head, apparently. There is no stated number that could be employed.

Mr. BRYAN. Oh, well, of course; but then they stated before the committees how many people they had. That explains that item, so far as I understand it.

Now, coming to the item stricken out of the bill at the top of page 143—an appropriation of \$72,120 for the Children's Bureau to investigate and report upon matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and especially to investigate the questions of infant mortality—the reasons that induced the committee to strike that out, I think, can be best stated by reading from the House hearings the testimony of Mr. Wood, of the Efficiency Bureau. I will not read it all, but here is the situation which exists now. The Bureau of Health is engaged in this same kind of work. The Bureau of Labor is engaged in the same sort of work. For instance, under the heading "Field investigations," in the Bureau of Health, I find the following:

For investigations of diseases of man and conditions influencing the propagation and spread thereof, including sanitation, etc., \$250,000.

That is in the sundry civil bill of last year. In this very bill, on page 102, we find the following:

For investigation of rural education, industrial education, and school hygiene, including personal services in the District of Columbia, etc., \$45,000.

Then there is an appropriation in the Bureau of Education.

Here is what is said by this member of this board that has been directed to investigate duplication of work in these various bureaus and departments:

Mr. GOOD. I have noticed that the Department of Labor published last year Bulletin No. 162, Vocational Education Survey of Richmond, Va. The Bureau of Education is publishing a similar work of that kind. Have you investigated duplication of that kind?

Mr. WOOD. We have examined the publications of the departments for the past year and found many places where, if there was no real duplication there was at least an overlapping of functions. For example, the Bureau of Education and Health Bureau are both pursuing studies of school hygiene, though not in the same districts. Each is doing work that might be done by the other. Similarly, the Children's Bureau and the Health Bureau both publish bulletins on the care of babies.

Mr. GOOD. That necessitates the keeping in two or more separate bureaus the same character of employees that ought to do the work in one bureau?

Mr. WOOD. The trouble seems to be that the authorizations given to the different bureaus cross or overlap. For example, the Children's Bureau is authorized to investigate anything pertaining to children. That includes children's health and education and various other matters. The Health Bureau is authorized to investigate health, whether of children or adults.

I have just shown that they have a quarter of a million dollars for that.

The Bureau of Education is authorized to investigate questions pertaining to education. Again, the Labor Bureau has always concerned itself with health insurance among laboring men. The Bureau of Public



Health has recently taken up health insurance as a health measure. Both have issued publications on that subject.

Mr. GOOD. You have not gone into that?

Mr. WOOD. We have made a partial list of cases in which different bureaus seem to cover the same field, but we came to the conclusion that it would be better to get every bureau to report to us every job it is working on, to index those jobs so that all relating to health would fall in one place, all relating to children in another, etc., and then to go carefully through the index, make note of cases in which there is duplication or overlapping, and bring them, first, to the attention of the various bureaus, in order to get their statements of the case, and then to the attention of Congress. We hope to do that by the next Congress.

So I beg to assure the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Iowa that it is not due to any opposition on the part of the committee to this work being done that this amendment is proposed; but there is no need to have the work done by four or five bureaus. That is the principal reason, or one of the principal reasons, why the committee recommended one year ago that Congress authorize this efficiency staff to go into these various departments and cut out duplications of work. It is done not only here in the work of the Children's Bureau, but it exists in many places, and we have been trying to cut that out.

With \$45,000 appropriated here to the Bureau of Health on this last subject, and a quarter of a million dollars more carried in the sundry civil bill upon a general subject covered by each of the departments, and the Department of Labor, under which this bureau is, having an appropriation to do the very identical work, it did seem that it was not necessary to repeat it. Of course, if you let each bureau do the same work, duplication of expenditures, at least, is bound to come, whether duplication of work does or not.

Mr. VARDAMAN and Mr. BORAH addressed the Chair.

Mr. BRYAN. I yield first to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Do I understand that the work which was contemplated to be covered by the appropriation which has been stricken out would be the same work which is being done by another department for which an appropriation was made?

Mr. BRYAN. The language I read here explains it. I do not know how better to express it, if the Senator heard it.

Mr. BORAH. I heard the reading; but the difficulty I have in determining the question is whether this appropriation which is asked for by the Children's Bureau covers work which actually would be done by some other department. As much as I am interested in the Children's Bureau, I do not want any duplication there or in any other bureau; but if it is not a duplication, I certainly feel disposed to support the appropriation. Even if it were a duplication, I should rather have the work done by the Children's Bureau, in my judgment, than by the other department.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Rather than by the Department of Health?

Mr. BRYAN. Of course, the language is not exactly the same, but I will read it to the Senator. Here is an appropriation in the Bureau of Education:

For investigation of rural education, industrial education, and school hygiene, including personal services—

And so forth. Under that language they make the same sort of an investigation.

Mr. BORAH. Well, do they?

Mr. BRYAN. That is what this bureau tells us.

Mr. BORAH. The head of the Children's Bureau contends that that is incorrect; that it is not the same kind of work; that it is not the same work at all; and some of us are a little at a loss to know whether it is the same work or not, because we have to rely upon the statements of those who are doing it, and they seem to differ. I am disposed to rely upon the statements of Miss Lathrop.

Mr. BRYAN. Yes; I suppose naturally the Senator would be.

Mr. BORAH. Not because I would make comparisons as to veracity, but because she seems to know whereof she is speaking.

Mr. BRYAN. Yes; she does.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I want to say that there were exhibited before the committee a document gotten out by the Bureau of Health and one gotten out by the Child Labor Bureau that looked very similar to me. I did not have time, of course, to examine them in detail, but it looked as though they were doing the same kind of work. The headings were the same, and it looked like exactly the same work.

I want to say to the Senator from Idaho that we have instructed the Efficiency Board to inquire into this matter and report on it thoroughly. If other departments are doing the same work that the Children's Bureau is doing we want to strike it out of their appropriation and give the Children's Bureau the right to do it. That is all there is about it. We wanted to know about it, and we did not think we ought to make this appropriation until we got the final report.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Why not let the Children's Bureau go on and do the work it is doing and take it from some other bureau?

Mr. OVERMAN. That is the very point.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Why not take it from some other bureau where there is some doubt as to whether this particular work is within the scope of its duties? The character of that work being done by this bureau is of such vital importance that it will not be prudent to take any chances on it.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is the very point I am making. I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that this other bureau is doing the same kind of work now. Shall we cut them off or give them an additional appropriation to begin this work and let these three departments go on? Then, when we get a report, your committee will say: "This work must be done by the Children's Bureau, and not by these other two."

Mr. VARDAMAN. The question with me is whether it is not better to let this bureau, that is engaged upon this work and have it so well in hand, do it rather than permit some other bureau to undertake it.

Mr. BRYAN. The trouble is that the other bureau was doing it before this one was created.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator let me make a suggestion? Is not a bureau composed of physicians and experts in matters of health better prepared to study children's diseases than the Children's Bureau?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I think not.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Well, I think it is vastly more so, unless they organize a corps of physicians in the Children's Bureau.

Mr. VARDAMAN. This bureau investigates not alone the physical conditions of the child, but the moral conditions also. It looks after child life, which embraces every question touching the moral, mental, and physical status of the child.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I supported the bill creating the Children's Bureau, and believe there is a great work for it to do; but we have the Health Bureau, in which there are men skilled in the science of medicine. We are spending money to develop it in the study of all kinds of diseases. To transfer the subject of children's diseases to the Children's Bureau, where they are not equipped with physicians, where they have no students of the problem of health, would seem to take it from where we can hope to have the best work done and to put it where it would not be nearly so well done, unless we duplicate in the Children's Bureau the medical force found in the Health Bureau.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I would like to say, for the information of the Senators, that there seems to be some confusion on this subject. The work of the several bureaus is entirely distinct and separate, and neither one should by right infringe upon the others.

The Health Bureau is organized for the inspection of children attending school, to prevent contagion and epidemics of disease, to trace them to their source and remove the cause of them, to test food supplies, to trace the source of infection in case of typhoid fever, and so forth, and look out for the health and welfare of children and the general public, and in that way keep them healthy and from infecting other people with their diseases. The physician in charge of that has no time to look into the general welfare of children or their home lives further than it is brought to his notice by particular cases, whereas the duty of the Children's Bureau would be to look into the general management of homes, the sanitary conditions existing in them, the nourishment of the child, and the attention which it receives in the way of cleanliness and proper care from its parents.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, that is what they are doing.

Mr. LANE. That is what they are doing; and that is a separate and distinct matter from going as a physician and taking your test tubes and tracing the disease and making tests to enable him to diagnose the case.

Mr. OVERMAN. This is for another matter.

Mr. LANE. This is for another matter. I say they are separate and distinct, and there is room for all of them if they do their duty.

Now, the Bureau of Education do in a way look out for the welfare of the child; but what is their immediate duty? To go to the school, to visit it, to see if it is kept in sanitary condition, if the drain pipes are in order, to ascertain conditions there—the conditions of light as they affect the eyesight, the condition of the air, whether it is foul or whether it is pure and fresh, and so on. The effect of foul air upon children is disastrous, and so is bad light; and many children come to school who are defective in some way. The investigators find them to be defective; then they refer them to the Health Bureau to inspect their vision and examine the condition of their nasal passages; and a small



operation sometimes makes of a dull child one of the brightest students in the school.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is what they are doing now.

Mr. LANE. Their duties are separate and distinct from that of the Child's Bureau, and you will make a mistake if you do away with either of them. You may be appropriating too much money for this bureau. I do not know.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator is right.

Mr. LANE. You can not appropriate too much money, however, to keep young, growing children healthy. A child's life has a potential value of \$5,000 to the country, and a loss of more than that if it becomes an ill-developed and an underaverage citizen of the country, while the difference in cost in the beginning would be but a trifle.

I read an article the other day, in the issue of the Literary Digest of about two weeks ago, relating what a correspondent had seen over in Belgium. He saw 1,200 children in a bread line, where each child received a piece of bread and some broth—not much bread or broth, but just barely enough to keep it alive until the next day when it came for food again. He said he saw several women on guard, and once in a while one would rush in and grab a child and pull it to one side, and the child would cry and scream and kick. He saw another one do that, and he went to one of them and asked, "Why do you pull the child out of that line? It is hungry." She said, "Yes, the child is hungry, but there is not enough bread and broth to give it any to eat. We can not give to a hungry child anything to eat until it shows signs of starvation. They must be losing weight—must be actually starving—before we can feed them. This child will stay out of this row until it shows signs of starvation. When it does so, we will put it back for a minimum of food to save its life, but not enough to keep its appetite satisfied." Just about the time I read that, only a few days ago, three little children came to a friend of mine, to the back door, begging for stale bread. They said, "It does not matter how stale it is, we want it; we are hungry."

Now, here is where your Child Bureau ought to be, and we should busy ourselves to help them to meet that condition in this great Capital City of the Nation. The doctor would never learn of that child; it would die of starvation without being brought to his attention. But here are women making an investigation of those conditions and suggesting to you and me that we have a duty to perform.

I read another article two or three weeks ago which stated that there was a banquet given, in Philadelphia I think, where each guest's meal cost the host \$500 a plate; and you saw day before yesterday an item in the morning papers stating that in New York City the "down-and-outers" were selling the blood out of their veins for \$25 a head. It was too much to pay for the meal and too little to pay for the blood.

Here is where we can afford to make a change, not to be too liberal, not overgenerous with the people's money, but to be fair, and thus guard the future of the Nation, where your children and mine and our grandchildren and their children will have to live. I would not forget them. I would make my analysis of the last year, and make it as economical as we can in the salaries which they receive, but I would give warm-hearted, generous attention to the needs of little children. "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not."

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon before he takes his seat what the connection is between a banquet costing \$500 a plate and the investigation of infant mortality?

Mr. LANE. It has this effect, that there is an inequitable, unjust amount being paid for human blood at the time the market value of a high-priced dinner is \$500. The money of the country, for that matter, is not equitably distributed among the people, but the ill-nourished child to-day is a down-and-out; in 25 years from now he will have to sell his blood.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If the Senator will pardon me, I should like to suggest, in response to the question asked by the Senator from Colorado, that if the Treasury of the United States is so depleted that we have to economize, the best thing to do, instead of cutting on questions of this kind, is to tax the fellow who can give the \$500 dinner and raise the money.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, I can understand that proposition easily, but still I can not understand the connection between a dinner at \$500 a plate and the investigation of infant mortality. As to what the Senator has said in regard to infant mortality and the question of food, surely these things can be ascertained and provided against by the health authorities, whose duty it is to look after such things. The other part of the matter, pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, I can very readily see is entirely within the province of the Children's Bureau.

Mr. LANE. Allow me to say that you do not have the knowledge, perhaps, it being something to which you have not paid much attention, but it harks back to the underfed child, the baby in arms, that lies on its back with its little head sweating on the pillow. That child has a form of disease known as softening of the bones, the scorbutic child, the scurvy child, the one that is the most easily attacked by tuberculosis or any other disease, and which dies in a larger ratio than others better fed. The little child that is ill-nursed, or where there are mistaken methods of nursing and of food, needs the Child's Bureau. That is the child which in larger percentage becomes a derelict later along, for the reason that as a baby it never had enough nourishment to put the vitality into it, to make of it a fighting man whom we may need to go out and defend the country or to fight to protect your property or the national honor. He is the man who can not go far, or the woman when she arrives at maturity—the mother—does not bring forth a healthy and fine type of physical citizenship to the country's need. You can not do better than to send some one out to search for these children and turn them over to some beneficent instrument of the Government for advice and care. The doctor has not the time, but let the Child Bureau go from one house to another in the poor districts and pick out the underfed and undernourished children, and then refer them to the Health Bureau for medication and the type of food they need. It does not usually call for medication to bring them around to a proper and normal state of health.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, yesterday I offered an amendment to this bill. We are not going to get through with the measure to-day. I have consulted with several Senators and made several changes in the amendment. So I desire to present it for printing. It is the amendment which I intend to propose relating to employees of the Senate when personal amendments are in order. I ask that it may be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). It is so ordered, without objection.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he desires to go on further with the bill to-night? It can not be finished to-night.

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to go on until 6 o'clock, if the Senator pleases.

Mr. CHILTON. We are going to have an executive session, I understand.

Mr. OVERMAN. I asked the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], and he said he did not think we would.

Mr. STONE. I have not inquired of the executive clerk as to the business, but I will say that there is a very small calendar.

Mr. CHILTON. There ought to be an executive session.

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to go on for at least half an hour.

Mr. KENYON. If there is to be no executive session, as far as I am concerned, I am ready to go on.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I wish to take 20 or 30 minutes on this matter. I believe it is an exceedingly important provision we are now considering. I am very strongly in favor of all kinds of proper economy. We sometimes differ as to what is proper economy, it is true, but I am not in favor of crippling one of the best bureaus of the Government for the purpose of economy or trying to save any money by curtailing work which may be of benefit to the children of the country.

This bureau was created by an act of Congress of April 9, 1912, and the bureau, in the law creating it, was ordered to report on all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life. It will be observed that this bureau has been in existence for but a comparatively short time. The first two years there were 15 people employed. The appropriation was \$35,540 per year. In 1914 the staff was increased to 76 persons and the appropriation was \$164,640. I think there has been no change in the staff or the appropriation since that time. Indeed, the bill as amended by the committee would carry that amount of appropriation. I think it is exactly the same.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is the same appropriation that we have made heretofore.

Mr. KENYON. In the estimate of appropriations submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury the amount which has been desired for the Child Labor Bureau which is set forth would be substantially the amount allowed by the House, with the exception, I think, of about \$20,000, which was considered to be the cost of an exhibition car to go around the country and exhibit the work of the Children's Bureau. The bill came to us from the House in that condition.

I think perhaps, to make it plainer, I ought to say that the committee reporting to the House did not report this amount,



but it was put on in the House. The purpose of the provision at the top of page 143 is to increase the statutory roll in the bureau itself. The amount suggested on line 21, before amendment by our committee, was to cover the work of experts in the field and the collection of data, books of reference, newspapers, and matters of that kind. The two are somewhat interwoven, so that the two should be discussed together.

The objection is raised that there is some duplication of work. There may be some slight duplication of work. This work should be carried on by the Children's Bureau; though in talking with Miss Lathrop, who is at the head of the Bureau, she suggests that there is practically no duplication, but that where it has been apparent there might be some duplication there has been a coordination of the work—for instance, in the investigation of the feeble-minded in the State of Delaware, work that is being carried on by the Children's Bureau. Dr. Thomas W. Salmon was designated by the Public Health Bureau to a committee known as the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, and he has written Miss Lathrop concerning that work, which, I think, shows how the departments are coordinating in this work instead of duplicating. I send the letter to the desk and ask the Secretary to read it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa permit me to ask a question of the Senator in charge of the bill? I want for my own information to know if there were any hearings on the bill touching this question.

Mr. OVERMAN. Miss Lathrop was before us.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Has her statement been published?

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I wanted to know so that I might get it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will have the clerk of the committee furnish the Senator with a copy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the letter sent to the desk by the Senator from Iowa.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR MENTAL HYGIENE,  
New York City, January 13, 1917.

Miss JULIA C. LATHROP,  
Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MISS LATHROP: I have read with much interest the preliminary report on the feeble-minded in Delaware, and also the summary of the report on the feeble-minded in New Castle County, Del. It seems to me that this kind of report sets a standard for other work of a similar nature. I think that the type of cooperation that existed between the Children's Bureau and the United States Public Health Service in these studies is just the kind which should exist elsewhere between agencies which are essentially medical and those which are essentially social.

We are trying to do the same sort of thing in Kentucky at the present time, and have been given an appropriation by the Rockefeller Foundation to supply the State commission on mental defectives, appointed by the last Legislature of Kentucky, with the services of an expert adviser who will not only conduct field work and direct the work of others, but will aid in the formulation of a State policy and plans for institutional development. A number of States have been appointed in recent years in Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Utah. Usually, however, these commissions have no funds and must depend for their investigations upon such agencies as the Children's Bureau, the United States Public Health Service, the eugenics-record office, our committee, and the committee on provision for the feeble-minded. Each of us, I think, can supply a little different kind of service, and I believe it will be possible for our own committee to secure from the Rockefeller Foundation appropriations for the salary and expenses of scientific advisers at a compensation of \$500 per month. This we hope to do during the coming year in Alabama, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, and Mississippi. It is extremely difficult to find men of the requisite training, but we have been very successful in our work with the insane in detaching some of the best men in the country for temporary periods.

I would like very much to talk over with you recent developments in work for provision for the feeble-minded. If you are planning to attend our annual meeting in February, would it not be possible for us to devote some time to such a conference?

Do you wish that I should return the copies of the report and summary which you sent me, or shall I keep them?

Sincerely, yours,

THOMAS W. SALMON,  
Medical Director.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the friends of the Children's Bureau, and I think everyone should be included in that, are not asking that the amounts be raised at all as the bill came from the House, but are asking that those amounts be held as they are. The lady at the head of this bureau is as well qualified, better I believe, than anyone in this country to know what the bureau needs. We rely on other heads of bureaus to tell us what they need in the way of help, and if we can not have confidence in the splendid head of this bureau and accede within reasonable bounds to what she may ask to carry on this great work for the children of the country, then she ought to be removed and some one appointed in whom we can have confidence. But I do not believe in the whole world there could be found a woman with more enthusiastic devotion to the work of the Children's Bureau.

It is pretty hard to answer when you are asked to say just what this Children's Bureau has done; what particular thing it

has accomplished; just what particular children it has saved; what particular home it has made happy. That is hard to do in the case of many bills. Here is an amendment introduced to-day by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] to the sundry civil bill with relation to schools for naturalization, studying the problems that confront our naturalized citizens. It would be pretty hard to show where any particular benefit might occur, but it is a great work to help in educating the naturalized citizen to understand the genius and spirit of our American institutions. So this work fundamentally upon children's welfare reaches into many lines. You can not put your hands on just the particular things possibly that may be accomplished, but it is creating a sentiment in this country along lines of social progress. This is a bureau that is working along those lines of social and industrial justice which should appeal to all. It is not simply an investigation of the medical question; not at all. It goes into the industrial question, investigating the relationship of poverty and wages to the death of little babies and the development of children; and there is no other bureau in the Government which carries on that kind of an investigation.

In this country last year there were 300,000 babies under 1 year of age, as the statistics show, who died; one out of every eight of the babies born failed to reach 1 year of age. This bureau has investigated this question of infant mortality. That is one of the great features of the work that it has done. They went into Manchester, in the State of New Hampshire—

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say that they are doing that work now?

Mr. KENYON. They are doing that work now.

Mr. OVERMAN. Of investigating the question of infant mortality?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly; and if the Senator had read the last report of Miss Lathrop he would have seen that she set out instances where they have made these investigations. I am going to read from page 6 of her report as to Manchester. She says:

The mortality rate among the 1,564 live-born babies studied in Manchester was 165 per 1,000 births, which is considerably higher than the estimated rate for the whole country.

Manchester is primarily a textile town, and the textile mills employ 36.3 per cent of all the fathers of babies born in Manchester during the 12 months covered by the study. Of the fathers 13.7 per cent were earning less than \$450 per year, 48.5 per cent less than \$650, 22.9 per cent \$850 or more, 6.4 per cent \$1,250 or more.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, that is the point I am getting at. I have seen Miss Lathrop's report stating that they have been doing this work for two years. But the question in the mind of the committee was, if they were already doing that work with the funds now provided and doing it very faithfully, whether we should increase this appropriation for the next year when the Children's Bureau is already doing the work and has field agents engaged who are being paid \$6 a day. Under these circumstances we did not understand why we should give another lump sum.

Mr. KENYON. Miss Lathrop has been making these mortality investigations through her department, and they are being continued. For instance, investigations which are now going on in the city of Baltimore, according to her report, will require one year to make the survey, and this work is to be extended throughout the country.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KENYON. I was not through reading the report about Manchester. I will yield to the Senator in a moment.

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to have the Senator complete that.

Mr. KENYON. The report continues:

Of the babies with fathers earning less than \$450, about 1 in 4 died before it was 12 months old. The great majority of the babies had fathers in the wage group from \$450 to \$849, and of these about 1 in 6 died. Of the babies whose fathers earned \$850 but less than \$1,050, 1 in 8 failed to survive. Where the fathers earned \$1,050 or more, 1 baby in 16 died in the first year.

Showing that there was an intimate relationship between the poverty of the parents and the death rate of the babies. I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I more particularly rose to ask that the Senator conclude reading from the report in regard to Manchester. I think the situation set forth as to that city is explainable to some extent. Manchester has large textile industries, one concern employing about 20,000 people, I think. They are of almost all nationalities—French Canadians, Greeks, Poles, and almost every other nationality that could be thought of. A great many of them are ignorant people; they are unskilled people. They go there and get employment and are paid as large wages there as anywhere else,



so far as I know. Beyond a doubt the percentage of mortality among the children where the parents are ignorant, uneducated, and uninstructed, is larger than that among the children of parents of the higher classes. So I presume that those statistics are correct, and yet they are explainable, to a degree at least.

I have always supported this bureau, except that I once voted against an appropriation for it because the same work was being done by the Department of Labor, and, as a result, I was very severely criticized and called an enemy to the Children's Bureau; but if Miss Lathrop can in any way lift up those people from the poverty and the ignorance in which they are in Manchester, N. H., or anywhere else, she is doing a magnificent work, and I hope she will be able to continue it; and yet it seems to me that there are insuperable obstacles in her way to accomplish the results that we would all like to see accomplished.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, if the amount that is stricken out by the committee of about \$100,000 would save the life of one of these babies, I do not think anybody would find any fault with or objection to it. If the work of this bureau even indirectly helps to reduce the death rate of the babies of the country the money appropriated, even be it a much larger sum, is wisely appropriated.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask whether Miss Lathrop presents any suggestion as a result of her inquiry that would be beneficial to those children?

Mr. KENYON. That question is interwoven, of course, with the second subject that the bureau goes into, and that is the maternal mortality also, and I might add that the bureau has been sending out bulletins; they have been sending out people to instruct along those lines, and have been carrying on an enormous correspondence with relation to these vital questions. To help carry on that correspondence necessitates some additional clerks, which she asks for here. I do not know how many letters this bureau is writing, but the number is close up to the hundred thousand per annum.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does the Senator think it possible for us, through the children's bureau, to undertake the work and instruction of the parents by personal visitation throughout the entire United States, so as to relieve them of their ignorance?

Mr. KENYON. I hardly think it possible to visit each particular case.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is it not rather the proper work of the bureau to gather the information, furnishing it to central points and to people in the States who will utilize it, leaving the final burden of instruction and the actual work upon the States and localities?

Mr. KENYON. And to help create a general public knowledge of conditions.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. And a public interest in the remedying of those conditions.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; but not detail work.

Mr. KENYON. Not detail work; but I have on my desk extracts from a letter written by a woman in one of the Western States, 65 miles from a railroad, who has known of the work of the Children's Bureau, and the question of advice to mothers—

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. KENYON. Just a moment. She had two children of her own and had adopted two others, and asked to have some one sent out there—it was a very pitiable story—to instruct them and assist them in this work. I do not know that we can go that far; of course, that would open up a tremendous field.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I want to say to the Senator—

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KENYON. The Senator from New Hampshire rose first, and I yield first to him.

Mr. GALLINGER. I simply want to add one word concerning Manchester. I am very glad that Miss Lathrop and her bureau are taking up the work in that city, a city of about 80,000 persons, largely devoted to manufacturing, the textile industry being the leading industry. I want to say for the men who are employing these people, as I suggested a moment ago, many of them poor, uneducated, and ignorant, that the greatest corporation in that city is doing a very magnificent work. For instance, it has established a very large playground upon property owned by the corporation; it has a hospital; it has two textile club buildings constructed by the corporation, one for the women and one for the men; it builds houses, which it rents at a very

low rate of interest; it furnishes medical attendance to the operatives free; and it is doing a great deal for these people. Yet, beyond a question, there is an opportunity to do more, and I hope that through the instrumentality of the Children's Bureau great reforms will be achieved in Manchester as well as in all the other manufacturing cities of the country.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I would not want the Senator to understand that that was the only place where the study had been carried on. It has been carried on in Johnstown, Pa., Montclair, N. J., and in other places.

Mr. GALLINGER. It has been carried on in Manchester and Johnstown, but I think that those are pretty nearly the only cities. I have been reading the report while I have been sitting at my desk.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa now yield to a motion for an executive session?

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Do I understand the Senator has moved to proceed to the consideration of executive business?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Very well.

#### WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. MYERS. Before the motion is put, I should like to ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business has been laid aside temporarily by unanimous consent.

Mr. MYERS. I should like to have it laid before the Senate so as to make it the unfinished business for to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate House bill 408, the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 9 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 19, 1917, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate January 18, 1917.*

##### UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Robert Lynn Batts, of Austin, Tex., to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice A. P. McCormick, deceased.

##### UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEY.

Albert C. Wolfe, of La Crosse, Wis., to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin, vice William F. Wolfe, deceased.

##### APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

##### SIGNAL CORPS.

Lieut. Col. George O. Squier, Signal Corps, to be Chief Signal Officer, with the rank of brigadier general, for the period of four years beginning February 14, 1917, vice Brig. Gen. George P. Scriven, to be retired from active service February 13, 1917.

##### PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Naval Constructor David W. Taylor, with rank of captain, to be naval constructor in the Navy, with rank of rear admiral, from the 29th day of August, 1916.

Medical Inspector William C. Braisted, with rank of commander, to be medical director in the Navy, with rank of rear admiral, from the 29th day of August, 1916.

Passed Asst. Surg. Cary T. Grayson, with rank of lieutenant commander, to be medical director in the Navy, with rank of rear admiral, from the 29th day of August, 1916.

Pay Director Samuel McGowan, with rank of captain, to be pay director in the Navy, with rank of rear admiral, from the 29th day of August, 1916.

Civil Engineer Frederic R. Harris, with rank of lieutenant commander, to be civil engineer in the Navy, with rank of rear admiral, from the 29th day of August, 1916.

Lieut. Cleon W. Mauldin to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 29th day of August, 1916.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 7th day of June, 1916:

Charles N. Ingraham, and  
Robert H. Grayson.



Paul W. Wilson, a citizen of California, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 10th day of January, 1917.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 18th day of January, 1917:

James M. Howard, a citizen of North Carolina,  
Albert E. Leggett, a citizen of Mississippi,  
Alexander B. Hepler, a citizen of Pennsylvania,  
E. Arthur Stephens, a citizen of Pennsylvania,  
Jesse W. Allen, a citizen of Ohio,  
Horace E. Spruance, a citizen of Delaware,  
Leo C. Thyson, a citizen of the District of Columbia,  
William R. Levis, a citizen of Pennsylvania,  
Leonard Hays, a citizen of Maryland,  
William E. Glanville, a citizen of New York, and  
Park M. Barrett, a citizen of Ohio.

The following-named citizens to be dental surgeons in the Navy, for a probationary period of two years, from the 17th day of January, 1917:

Ralph B. Snapp, a citizen of Virginia.  
George M. Frazier, a citizen of the District of Columbia.  
Frederick C. Vossbeck, a citizen of Colorado.  
Edward M. Slack, a citizen of the District of Columbia.  
Frank S. Tichy, a citizen of Illinois.

#### POSTMASTERS.

##### ALABAMA.

Rufus S. Shirey to be postmaster at Guin, Ala. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### ARKANSAS.

Gabe D. Anderson to be postmaster at Okolona, Ark. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Ernest W. Cato to be postmaster at Gravette, Ark., in place of W. H. Austin, resigned.

W. E. Dickson to be postmaster at Waldo, Ark., in place of George F. Puska. Incumbent's commission expired August 8, 1916.

Oscar L. Green to be postmaster at Plainview, Ark. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Muzette M. Hunter to be postmaster at Amity, Ark. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Amy Jane Stewart to be postmaster at Greenwood, Ark., in place of Charles C. Stewart, deceased.

##### CALIFORNIA.

C. Claire Smale to be postmaster at Raymond, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### CONNECTICUT.

Lyman E. Smith to be postmaster at Middlebury, Conn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### FLORIDA.

E. O. Douglas to be postmaster at Sebring, Fla. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### IDAHO.

J. I. Allen to be postmaster at Rockland, Idaho. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

J. V. Nash to be postmaster at Cottonwood, Idaho, in place of C. W. Greenough, resigned.

Clarence P. Sweeney to be postmaster at St. Maries, Idaho, in place of P. T. Sweeney, resigned.

##### ILLINOIS.

John Cahill to be postmaster at Cherry, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Myrta J. Caldwell to be postmaster at Arrowsmith, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Edward H. Dudenhofer to be postmaster at Harvel, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Richard J. Simmons to be postmaster at Macomb, Ill., in place of W. H. Hainline, removed.

Charles W. Witt to be postmaster at Sidney, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### IOWA.

E. F. Gauss to be postmaster at Shenandoah, Iowa, in place of W. D. Jamieson, resigned.

##### KANSAS.

F. A. Brooks to be postmaster at Arlington, Kans. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Ella M. Meyer to be postmaster at Riley, Kans. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### LOUISIANA.

Christina Derouen to be postmaster at Ville Platte, La. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### MARYLAND.

George E. Peeling to be postmaster at Asbestos, Md. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### MASSACHUSETTS.

Augusta M. Kelley to be postmaster at Centerville, Mass. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

##### MICHIGAN.

Leo R. Glassford to be postmaster at Capac, Mich., in place of S. B. Coddington, deceased.

##### MISSISSIPPI.

William E. Davis to be postmaster at Duncan, Miss. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

##### MONTANA.

C. E. Davison to be postmaster at Roundup, Mont., in place of C. E. Wofford, resigned.

##### NEW MEXICO.

R. A. Dodson to be postmaster at Tucumcari, N. Mex., in place of T. F. Gorman, deceased.

Charlie McDonald to be postmaster at Lovington, N. Mex. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### NORTH CAROLINA.

D. O. Daniel to be postmaster at Southport, N. C., in place of R. S. Newton, resigned.

Edgar F. McCulloch, jr., to be postmaster at Elizabethtown, N. C. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### NORTH DAKOTA.

William E. Wright to be postmaster at Dunseith, N. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### OHIO.

Robert L. McKim to be postmaster at Mount Victory, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### OKLAHOMA.

Sullivan G. Ashby to be postmaster at Ringling, Okla., in place of T. R. Dunlap, resigned.

John F. Garner to be postmaster at Mill Creek, Okla. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### PENNSYLVANIA.

John Foster to be postmaster at Washington, Pa., in place of Joseph W. Martin, removed.

Michael S. Kerney to be postmaster at Drexel Hill, Pa. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

John W. Manning to be postmaster at Elkins Park, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### TENNESSEE.

T. C. Howell to be postmaster at Chattanooga, Tenn., in place of John Emory Conner, deceased.

K. W. Southern to be postmaster at Harrogate, Tenn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### TEXAS.

Oscar G. Compton to be postmaster at Dayton, Tex., in place of M. P. Daniel, removed.

Jessie Conn to be postmaster at Kountze, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Earl L. Cowart to be postmaster at Silverton, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Lawson B. Fulgham to be postmaster at Voth, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

##### UTAH.

Frank M. Shafer to be postmaster at Moab, Utah. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### WEST VIRGINIA.

J. Hornor Davis to be postmaster at Clarksburg, W. Va., in place of J. Carl Vance, resigned.

R. D. Rose to be postmaster at Hinton, W. Va., in place of John Haynes, deceased.

##### WISCONSIN.

Samuel Tufts to be postmaster at Knapp, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### WYOMING.

George R. Bringham to be postmaster at Lovell, Wyo. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.



## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 18, 1917.*

## NAVAL CONSTRUCTOR.

David W. Taylor to be naval constructor in the Navy with rank of rear admiral.

## POSTMASTERS.

## ARIZONA.

Lee L. Scott, Ajo.

## CALIFORNIA.

David A. Curry, Camp Curry.  
R. G. Pettigrew, Brea.

## MISSOURI.

Joe B. Todd, Sugar Creek.

## ILLINOIS.

Charles D. Resler, Cisne.  
Thomas C. Sayers, Herscher.  
Frank E. Woessner, Shannon.

## NEW YORK.

John M. Sullivan, Long Lake.

## TENNESSEE.

James W. Emison, Alamo.

## UTAH.

Abraham O. Smoot, Provo.

## VIRGINIA.

William B. Dew, Sweet Briar.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

*THURSDAY, January 18, 1917.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee for the life, character, and public service of a great man who has been called from life to Life. And we bow in sorrow with a mourning Nation at his going. Admiral Dewey has left behind him a record worthy of emulation and will live in the hearts of his countrymen so long as memory endures. Comfort us and those nearest and dearest to him by the blessed assurance that he has heard the words from the lips of the Master, "Well done, good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." And everlasting praise be Thine in the name of Him who came that we might have life and that we might have it more abundantly. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of Delaware was granted leave of absence for two days on account of important business.

## NIAGARA RIVER.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on Senate joint resolution 186, authorizing the Secretary of War to issue temporary permits for additional diversion of the water from Niagara River, and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana calls up a conference report, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the conference report.

## CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1315).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 186) entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to issue temporary permits for additional diversions of water from the Niagara River" having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert the following:

"Any such permittee who without further authority of Congress diverts after the time herein named for the expiration of such permit any part of the additional amount of water, authorized by Congress to be diverted for the first time under this resolution, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine not exceeding \$2,000 nor less than \$500, or by imprisonment

not exceeding one year nor less than 30 days, or both in the discretion of the court; and each and every day on which such violation occurs or is committed shall be deemed a separate offense: *Provided*, That where such violation is charged against the company or corporate body, the offense shall be taken and deemed to be that of any director, officer, agent, or employee of such company or corporate body ordering, directing, or permitting the same."

And the House agree to the same.

H. D. FLOOD,  
CYRUS CLINE,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

MARK A. SMITH,  
JOHN K. SHIELDS,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. CLINE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman explain the effect of House amendments 2 and 3 from which the House receded?

Mr. CLINE. It is just a change in phraseology and does not change the resolution in any important manner.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the only substantial change was in amendment No. 4?

Mr. CLINE. The only substantial change was in amendment No. 4, which provides a penalty for taking the water after the expiration of the permit.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. There was a change in the time limit.

Mr. CLINE. There was a change in the time limit from March 4, 1917, to July 1, 1917.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The agreement is that the time be fixed as of July 1.

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

Mr. CLINE. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. This resolution proposes to give to the existing power plants at Niagara the use of this additional power granted under the terms of the treaty with Canada.

Mr. CLINE. That is right—the use of a temporary permit to July 1.

Mr. AUSTIN. Which means a use of an additional 50,000 horsepower.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Forty-four hundred cubic feet.

Mr. AUSTIN. Which is equivalent to about 50,000 horsepower.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. CLINE. I will say to the gentleman that the information of the committee is that the power companies can not use the whole forty-four hundred cubic feet, but will use only about thirty-five hundred cubic feet.

Mr. AUSTIN. The purpose of this is to give the American users of power an opportunity to make up for what the Canadian power companies have withdrawn.

Mr. CLINE. The purpose is to give the manufacturers of Niagara Falls power to supply the deficiency that has been created by withdrawal of power by the Canadian companies.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then this power is absolutely necessary?

Mr. CLINE. It is absolutely necessary, and it will not then meet the demands of the manufacturers of Niagara Falls.

Mr. AUSTIN. If this resolution be adopted, then on the 1st day of July, if in the meantime the Congress has not provided permanent legislation, this power will be withdrawn, or these people will suffer a penalty?

Mr. CLINE. I will say to the gentleman that this is the situation: The conferees understood it to be the opinion of the House, or the sense of the House, that at the end of the time that was fixed in the resolution if any water should be taken under the permits herein authorized there should be a penalty fixed for taking the water; at the same time the House wanted to give an opportunity for the manufacturers of Buffalo and Niagara Falls to secure this additional power. I will say to the gentleman that the people representing capital in Niagara Falls and in Buffalo have now invested some \$5,000,000 in a steam-power plant, consisting of five units, each unit to furnish 25,000 horsepower. They have already in operation one unit which will furnish the 25,000 horsepower and expect to have another ready by the 4th of March, the third one ready by the 1st of June, and that will supply the deficiency that now exists at Buffalo and Niagara Falls.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then, at the end of June, or on the 1st of July, if in the meantime Congress does not enact permanent or



general legislation, we are to discontinue the use of this additional power?

Mr. CLINE. At the end of that time the diversion of water created by this temporary permit is to be shut off, and there is sufficient penalty prescribed in this temporary resolution to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. AUSTIN. Why should we shut off this power and let it go to waste, when we can use it and let these people run their manufacturing plants?

Mr. CLINE. I understand that there is a strong probability of getting permanent legislation through to meet these demands that exist up there now.

Mr. AUSTIN. But if you fail to pass your general bill, or permanent law, then this power ceases to be utilized on the 1st of July and goes to waste.

Mr. CLINE. That can be corrected by a resolution to continue the permits now issued under this resolution.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is that the purpose of the committee?

Mr. CLINE. The purpose of the committee, if the condition still exists as exists now and we are unable to pass permanent legislation controlling this matter, is that a resolution may be introduced continuing the permits that will be issued under this joint resolution.

Mr. AUSTIN. The absurdity of the proposition, Mr. Speaker, to me in this matter is this: This power is to continue manufacturers that are going concerns, employing thousands of people, and lighting a number of cities in New York State. Now, if Congress fails or neglects to pass either permanent legislation or a continuing resolution under the operation of this joint resolution this power must be withdrawn and these manufacturing plants and cities that actually need it are to be inflicted with punishment, either that or close down their plants.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. No; it is not exactly that; they will not have to close their plants. We simply provide that the machinery they now have and plants already constructed instead of taking the amount of water they now take in addition thereto can take 4,400 feet divided between the two concerns there now, and on the 1st day of July, if no further permit is to be issued or authority granted, they will continue to operate just exactly as they are now operating. As the acting chairman of the committee pointed out by that time the Buffalo power plant designed to produce power by coal will have been completed as far as two units are concerned, and there will be available for all these purposes more power than is granted by this bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. We withdraw 50,000 horsepower that will be in use on the 1st day of July, if Congress fails or neglects to pass this legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That is absolutely so.

Mr. CLINE. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee he is slightly mistaken about that.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLINE. I was going to direct attention to an error the gentleman from Tennessee made in his statement. In the meantime the people of Buffalo will have put themselves in a position to supply 75,000 horsepower which we are depriving them of now by the withdrawal of these temporary permits on the 1st day of July.

Mr. AUSTIN. Why does not the Government continue to furnish this power which is going to waste?

Mr. CLINE. There may not be the necessity at that time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman in favor of drying up Niagara Falls?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; but it has been developed we can use this water without injuring navigation or the scenic beauty.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman now yield for a question in relation to the matter referred to by the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. CLINE. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. I read the report of the Secretary of War of the hearings before the committee, and I would like to inquire whether I have the right information. My understanding was that the Secretary of War stated that it was desirable to grant temporary permits for the use of this water, that there was now being constructed in Buffalo a steam plant which would furnish the same amount of electric power which could be obtained this way, but those plants were not yet quite available for use, but would be by the 1st of June.

Mr. CLINE. That is my understanding of the situation, and I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that there has been withdrawn by the hydroelectric commission of Canada 72,000 horsepower.

Mr. MANN. So if this resolution, or permits under this resolution, are revoked on the 1st of July, the power that is sup-

plied through the extra water obtained under this resolution will then be supplied by these steam plants?

Mr. CLINE. Certainly.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me ask the gentleman in charge of this bill, how much additional power have they notified the American consumers they are going to withdraw in addition to the amount the gentleman stated?

Mr. CLINE. Fifty thousand horsepower, I understand; but we have no—

Mr. AUSTIN. Making a total withdrawal of 120,000 horsepower; and you propose to substitute that amount with a steam plant that will produce 50,000 horsepower?

Mr. CLINE. No; I did not state they proposed to do that. I stated before that the steam plant proposed to establish five units to develop 25,000 horsepower each. Three of those will be ready, I understand, by June 30, making 75,000, and after all are in operation they will make the full amount withdrawn.

Mr. AUSTIN. Has the gentleman any idea that we will pass a permanent bill at this session of Congress?

Mr. CLINE. We are going to try to pass it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am sure of that.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I did not attend the conference on this resolution, and therefore I desire to ask information from one of the conferees. Under the resolution as the conference committee has reported it the permittees could use up to 20,000 cubic feet per second.

Mr. CLINE. That is all, I will say to the gentleman. I have information from the power plant that they are able at present to use more than 3,500 cubic feet per second, and there will be about 900 cubic feet per second they are not proposing to place under the temporary permits.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That would be 19,500 cubic feet per second, would it not, which they would use under this resolution?

Mr. CLINE. Four thousand, four hundred less the 900—3,500 cubic feet.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It would be 20,000 feet less 500—19,500 cubic feet a second. Then 500 feet of the maximum per second—

Mr. CLINE. Then 900 cubic feet.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if I read this conference report correctly, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] is wrong in his construction. The amendment to the resolution which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] proposed, and which was adopted the other day, provided for the payment of a certain sum by way of compensation. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois how that was worded? Does the gentleman recall?

Mr. MANN. I think it required compensation at the rate of \$100 per cubic foot per annum for each cubic foot used.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Additional?

Mr. MANN. Only the additional, and what was obtained under permit granted under this resolution.

Mr. CLINE. That was after the expiration of the permit?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Which would be equal to \$5 or \$10 per horsepower.

Mr. MANN. That was intended as a penalty.

Mr. SMITH of New York. We have substituted a jail penalty for that.

Mr. MANN. Now, I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] in reference to the proposition now brought before the House, in the first place, if this resolution is passed at all, it is passed as a matter of temporary relief. As I understand from the Secretary of War, we are waiting the completion of the steam plants up there, and not probably to involve the question of compensation for the use of waterpower. That was not my idea in introducing the amendment. The amendment which I did introduce was to provide a penalty. The House and the Senate—let us be perfectly frank about the matter—I think are perfectly deadlocked on the question of compensation for use of water in the hydroelectric plants. And it was stated to me by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] that the Senate would not agree to the amendment which I had offered and which the House had put in, because they thought it involved their giving up their theory in reference to the question of compensation, and as the amendment which I had offered was for a penalty, I said to the gentleman from Virginia that so far as I was concerned, I believed I would rather have a direct penalty than even the amendment which I had offered.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. May I ask the gentleman a question? The Senate contention is not that the amount named in the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois was excessive,



but that Congress has no right to require any compensation at all?

Mr. MANN. Well, I do not know how far they go. Whatever their reasons may be, they are opposed apparently to the question of compensation, and I think the House has a right to exact compensation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from New York has just remarked that the Senate conferees said the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois "squinted" toward compensation. I take it, therefore, they were opposed to even so much as a squint in that direction.

Mr. MANN. I think that is the case.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is it not fair to the Senate members of the conference committee to say that they oppose compensation being paid to the National Government, but favor payment to the States?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In other words, though the Government of the United States has the right, in its discretion, to grant or not to grant to corporations or individuals privileges of great value, those conferees denied that it has any right to demand even the slightest compensation because that would, by implication, retain in the United States Government the power to control in the interest of the general public? That is what they declare; and we might as well understand what the issue is.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows very well that he and I are in accord.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Exactly.

Mr. MANN. I think the House is in accord with our proposition.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. So far as I am concerned, the amount of compensation does not especially weigh with me; that is, the amount is not the primary consideration. It does not constitute the issue. But that the Congress has not the right to impose terms and conditions whenever it grants a valuable franchise or privilege the granting or the refusal of which is a matter entirely within its discretion I can not agree. I am opposed to the report of the conference committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on page 1712 of the Record the report of the committee reads as follows, and I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee to it:

Any such permittee who without further authority of Congress diverts after the time herein named for the expiration of such permit any part of the additional amount of water authorized by Congress to be diverted for the first time under this resolution shall be guilty of a misdemeanor—

And so forth.

That is a provision for the punishment of any corporation or its officers or any individual who after the 1st of July next shall use any of this additional 4,400 feet permitted to be used by the resolution. But suppose they should continue to use after that date the other 15,600 feet which they have been using without authority for some time. Where is the provision for punishment or the penalty? Where is the squint toward compensation? Where is the provision for the arrest or imprisonment of anybody? The only provision that I interpret as a provision for arrest and punishment, fine or imprisonment, relates exclusively to the additional 4,400 cubic feet. Now, as every gentleman here knows, it is an ordinary rule of statutory construction that the mention of one thing in a statute is the exclusion of the other. This resolution mentions only the proposed additional 4,400 feet here for the first time authorized to be used to make up the maximum of 20,000 cubic feet per second permitted by the treaty with Great Britain to be diverted on the American side of the Falls; and, therefore, no mention being made of the 15,600 feet, these companies may after that date use the 15,600 feet without any threat over them of penalty or arrest. Is not that so?

Mr. CLINE. We are only dealing with the amount that the power company is actually authorized to take.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But suppose that these companies continue to use the 15,600 cubic feet. Is there any limit of time fixed respecting that use?

Mr. CLINE. There is not any limit of time fixed, because the Secretary of War has been instructed by the Attorney General in a letter to him to the effect that the Secretary under the terms of the Burton Act, although it has expired, expressed the intention of Congress to permit the use of 15,600 cubic feet. We are not legislating on that point at all.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The Secretary of War came before our committee and admitted that he had no authority to issue a permit.

Mr. CLINE. Yes; he admitted that he had no authority to issue a permit for an additional amount. But the previous Secretary of War had issued a permit for the use of the addi-

tional 4,400 cubic feet, and after that the present Secretary of War had renewed the permit, but upon examination concluded that he had no authority to issue the additional permit and came to Congress to have authority given to him to issue it under those circumstances.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But what authority have they to use these 15,600 cubic feet?

Mr. CLINE. They have authority to do that under the Burton Act, which has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Under what lawful authority are these people using the 15,600 cubic feet? Not under an act which by its own terms expired years ago.

Mr. CLINE. As I said before, the Attorney General in a letter to Mr. Taft under his administration expressed the opinion that the President had the right to control the issue of 15,600 cubic feet of water as it had been controlled under the Burton Act until the legislation of Congress changed the rule.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But the Burton Act by its own terms expired on a definite date. Then it was renewed and again expired. The Secretary of War admitted that he had no authority to issue permits for the additional 4,400 feet; but he had the same authority to issue permits for the additional amount that he has or had to issue permits to use the 15,600 feet. His only authority came from the Burton Act.

Mr. CLINE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, evidently the complaint of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] is that this resolution does not provide for a penalty after the 1st of July affecting the use of all the water power at Niagara Falls. Fifteen or twenty years ago two or three power companies were located on the American side, and according to the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs those power companies represented an expenditure of \$60,000,000. At that time Congress made no claim to control or fix a royalty for the use of power. Everybody believed at that time, and the Supreme Court of the United States had decided up to that time, even up to the 11th day of December, 1916, that the States had the right to control this matter.

Accordingly these power companies in good faith invested their \$60,000,000, and have operated under a charter or contract from the State of New York. They exercised that right or privilege without question until Congress stepped in with the Burton Act and a treaty with Canada.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] suggests the idea that this resolution is lacking in a penalty if all of this power is not withdrawn on the 1st of July, if Congress in the meantime fails to do its plain duty. In other words, because the two branches of Congress are deadlocked on this proposition, or on this legislation, it would appear to be his contention that it is fair and just and right for this House to step in and by a joint resolution absolutely stop the wheels of every industry at Niagara, affecting a city built largely as the result of these power companies, with a population of 50,000, with 20,000 wageworkers, and in two additional near-by cities, which have grown up and developed their manufacturing interests as the result of this power, we are to put a penalty upon them and close their plants. Then we must shut off the light in the cities of Buffalo and Niagara Falls and other cities and leave them absolutely in total darkness, and withdraw from the inhabitants of those cities the pleasure and comfort of having their homes lighted. Why, Mr. Chairman? Why, because we have failed, on account of a deadlock between the two Houses of Congress, to enact needed legislation. It is absurd, ridiculous, and would be a reflection upon the intelligence of this House to entertain such a monstrous proposition for a minute. [Applause.]

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, the main difference in this conference report and the resolution that we passed the other day, as I understand it, is that the permit is extended from the 4th of March to the 1st of July, and also a penalty is added for the excessive use of water beyond that time.

Mr. CLINE. The main difference is that we have extended the life of the permit from the 4th of March to the 30th day of June, and have fixed a more stringent penalty than was enacted in the Mann amendment.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Now, I want to ask what, if anything, have they paid to the Federal Government for this power?



Mr. CLINE. They have never paid anything, and do not expect to pay anything until permanent legislation goes through this House.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Now, why should they be permitted to use this water power absolutely free and at no cost to themselves and with no profit to the Government, and yet any other enterprises on navigable streams throughout the country that happen to have their plants established by a dam have had to pay a good stiff price for the water?

Mr. CLINE. Well, Mr. Speaker, that involves a very complicated situation that I am satisfied the gentleman understood if he gave some thought to it and some examination of the subject matter, and better than he appears to now.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman give me three or four minutes?

Mr. CLINE. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that I have tried to give this subject some study, but I can not see the difference. I can not see why, simply because one company happens to be at Niagara Falls, it should get this power free, whereas others elsewhere do not get it free, and the gentleman has not explained it, and I do not think that he or anyone else can. I think it an outrage.

Mr. CLINE. The corporations using power in navigable rivers throughout the country are using power generated where the Federal Government has made investments in locks and dams, and authority is given the Federal Government to make charges to remunerate it for the expenses incurred. That situation does not exist at Niagara Falls.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE], if he will be so kind as to give me his attention, that I share with him the exact views that he has just advanced. But I am sure that he will agree with me that this is no time for us to make a practical application of them. If conservation is good for the West, as I think it is, it is also good for Niagara Falls and the East. However, we are in an exigency at this time. There are at Niagara Falls a great many industries that are fundamental to industries elsewhere throughout the United States. All the chemical industry of the United States is at this hour dependent upon water power at Niagara Falls; for instance, in the manufacture of dyes and things of that kind.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If the gentleman will allow me—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit me to make my statement? We are in this exigency: We are trying in another bill to pass general legislation that will cover the exact point the gentleman has raised, namely, that there shall be some charge paid to the Federal Government by the permittees who are using the water power at Niagara Falls. We, however, in this present resolution are not permitting the construction of any new plants or any enlargement of the plants already existing at Niagara Falls. We are simply permitting the present users of water there to use this additional amount to compensate for the loss that has been sustained by the withdrawal on the part of Canada of a large amount of water power. I think the gentleman will agree with me that we can well afford and must give aid to the industries of this country by permitting this additional water to be withdrawn, and then settle the permanent legislation as soon as we can get to it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If the gentleman will permit, I am very well aware that the purview of this resolution does not take in that; but I would like, for my own satisfaction, to hear some explanation of the justice of it, if there is any justice in it, which I do not think there is.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. In reply to the statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] that there exists no authority for the use of the 15,000 cubic feet that are now being used, I beg to direct his attention to this state of facts, that water power is now being used under permits heretofore issued. My recollection is that that authority, or the law under which it is exercised, contains no provision relative to revocation. Of course, there remains in the grantor of the permit the power, when the time specified therein has expired, to alter, amend, or repeal in any way; but until Congress acts they are justified in continuing to allow the water to be used and to utilize the plants they have there constructed without breaking any law and without any additional permit. I, however, trust that we will all be able to legislate permanently on this subject this winter in order that there may be a separate fundamental law governing the use of water power at Niagara Falls.

That is all I care to say.

Mr. NORTON. Can the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] tell me about what the water-power companies of Niagara Falls charge for the use of a horsepower for an entire year?

Mr. CLINE. I will say to the gentleman that the amount varies with the different companies.

Mr. NORTON. Is it not about \$20 a year?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Oh, it is less than that; an average of about \$12.

Mr. NORTON. About \$12 a year?

Mr. CLINE. About \$12 a year.

Mr. NORTON. About how many horsepower are being generated there now, if the gentleman knows?

Mr. CLINE. I think about 200,000 horsepower.

Mr. NORTON. If this power is sold at about \$12 per horsepower per year, and it costs \$20 per horsepower per year to generate power by steam, the difference between the cost of horsepower produced by steam and the cost of horsepower generated by water power goes as profit to the hydroelectric companies, does it not?

Mr. CLINE. The gentleman is assuming a situation that does not exist, of course.

Mr. NORTON. There may not be as great a difference as that between the cost of power generated by steam and the cost of power produced by the waterfall; but the difference goes entirely to the electric companies, does it not?

Mr. CLINE. I do not know whether the difference goes to the electric companies or to the users of that power; but I will say to the gentleman that we can not undertake to thrash that proposition out here on this resolution. There is a bill pending before this House involving all these questions that we hope to get through at a very early date and meet these propositions and let them be determined by the House.

Mr. NORTON. At the present time there is no law that permits the Government to charge the electric companies anything for the use of this power?

Mr. CLINE. I understand that the Public Service Commission of the State of New York have laid very heavy taxes upon these power-generating companies in the way of franchise taxes, and so forth, which virtually equal the difference between the power generated by steam and that generated by electricity.

Mr. NORTON. Does either the Federal Government or the State government now have the right to control the price charged for the hydroelectric power generated at Niagara Falls?

Mr. CLINE. I will say to the gentleman that that is a mooted question that has been discussed for the last six years in the Senate, and no determination upon it has been reached.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman inquired whether one or the other can do it. The State of New York is doing it now. We claim we have some authority, but we have not yet exercised it. The State of New York is actually doing it through its public-service corporation.

Mr. NORTON. It seems to me this case now before the House simply emphasizes a condition that exists in the Nation that should make every Member of the Congress hang his head in shame. I have for a number of years given some thought and study to these conditions, and it seems to me there is no good or justifiable reason why the Congress should not long before this have enacted a law authorizing the Federal Government to charge these power companies for the use of this water power, and giving to the Federal Government control and regulation of the rates to be charged by these hydroelectric companies for the power sold by them.

Mr. CLINE. I will say to the gentleman that there is a bill now before the House which provides for something of that character. It provides that the Federal Government shall levy taxes for the use of the water.

Mr. NORTON. I understand there is such a bill before the House, and that this subject has been considered in one way and another for the last 20 years, but nothing has been done. I want to say that I believe that it is about time that something should be done to protect the interest of all the people of the country, and that the committee having the bill referred to in charge should see that it is taken up and considered in the House.

Mr. CLINE. I will say that there has been no consideration for 20 years, but the subject matter has been inquired into by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is a three-angled proposition, and everybody interested has been heard, and we have reported out a very comprehensive bill. I will further say that the bill would have come up in the House yesterday, if the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. Flood, had not been ill and confined to his room.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. There is a sharp conflict between the claims of the State of New York and the claims of this Government.



Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CLINE, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

SUSAN O. McCONNELL.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged report from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 439 (H. Rept. No. 1316).

*Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Susan O. McConnell, widow of James I. McConnell, late a messenger on the soldiers' roll of the House, a sum equal to six months of his compensation as such messenger and an additional amount, not exceeding \$250, to defray the funeral expenses of said James I. McConnell.

Mr. LLOYD. That is the usual resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

LAMAR TRIBBLE.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged report from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 433 (H. Rept. No. 1317).

*Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Lamar Tribble, clerk to S. J. TRIBBLE, deceased, late a Representative in the Sixty-fourth Congress from the eighth district of Georgia, at the time of his death, December 4, 1916, the sum of \$125, being an amount equal to one month's salary of a clerk to a Member of Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following further privileged report from the Committee on Accounts:

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 399 (H. Rept. No. 1318).

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs be, and is hereby, authorized to have made an index of the hearings had before said committee on the subject of Army appropriation bill, the costs and expenses thereof, not exceeding \$300, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers audited by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts, evidenced by the signature of the chairman thereof.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, this resolution gives the Military Committee authority to index the hearings before the committee on the Army appropriation bill. I yield five minutes to the chairman of the committee, Mr. DENT.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, this Congress at the last session authorized the Military Committee to expend the sum of \$300 for the purpose of indexing the hearings on the national-defense act. This appropriation of \$300 is asked for now because the hearings on the appropriation bill at this session of Congress are a continuation in effect of the hearings under the national-defense act. The sum of \$300 to index the hearings under the national-defense act would partly be thrown away, to say the least of it, unless these hearings are also indexed. Mr. Speaker, Congress passed the national-defense act on the 3d day of June, 1916, under which we undertook to federalize the National Guard. On the 18th day of June, following the passage of that act, the President called the National Guard into the Federal service, sending them to the Mexican border.

Since we have begun the hearings on the Army appropriation bill necessarily questions have been propounded to different heads of the Military Establishment as to the actual operations of that act of June 3. So that the Committee on Military Affairs has been engaged in hearing of the actual operation of the theories which were put into legislation on the 3d day of last June. Therefore we are not asking anything unusual for indexing an appropriation bill because it is merely a continuation of the hearings under the national-defense act for which this Congress has already made this appropriation of \$300. These hearings, Mr. Speaker, are being called for all over the country. I have already requests from different sources, from Senators, Members of the House, from people in public life everywhere, to put them on the list for the purpose of getting these hearings. In other words, they want to know exactly how this act that we passed last June was put into practical operation.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, some years ago I believe it became almost the practice of this House to provide certain clerical and

other assistants for committees, and then when any of the employees did anything, to pay them extra for their work, on the theory that you employed a man to receive a salary and not to work; and then if he worked, to be paid extra for that. We abolished that custom and I hope we are not going to return to it.

Now, last year Mr. HAY introduced his national-defense bill, and had long hearings upon it. The national-defense act was not reported to the House, I think, until considerably later than this time in the session. The hearings were very long, and the House provided that he might employ some one to make an accurate index of the hearings. I think that was justified. There was an unexampled case. The Committee on Military Affairs not only had to make up its annual appropriation bill, but it had these long hearings upon the Hay bill.

That is taken as a precedent for the resolution now before us. But the resolution now before us simply provides for the indexing of the hearings upon the annual appropriation bill. It is now only the middle of January; this committee did not commence its hearings, I think, before the middle of December. They have two clerks. What are those clerks for? A clerk, if he is good for anything at all, can index the hearings, and if he is not capable you can get some one in the Library of Congress to index them for less than \$100.

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

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. I want to state to the gentleman that the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, consisting of about 6,000 pages—

Mr. MANN. I shall come to that in a moment, but I desire to present this in a consecutive form. The Committee on Military Affairs has a clerk at \$2,500 a year and an assistant clerk at \$1,500 a year. The Committee on Naval Affairs has a clerk at \$2,400 a year and an assistant clerk at \$1,500 a year. The hearings upon the annual appropriation bill in the Committee on Naval Affairs are four times as long as the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs on their annual appropriation bill. If we provide for an indexer to index these hearings, to be paid to some special pet, then we must provide for the hearings to be indexed by a pet in the other committee.

The Committee on Agriculture has a much more varied lot of subjects before it than has the Committee on Military Affairs. It is a good deal harder to index the agricultural hearings than the hearings of the Committee on Military Affairs. The same is true of the Committee on Indian Affairs and of a number of the other appropriating committees. The Committee on Appropriations has, I believe, five subcommittees. They have hearings which amount to five or six or seven thousand printed pages, but the clerks in that committee index their own hearings. I presided for some time over a committee that had a great deal more to do in the way of public hearings than the Committee on Military Affairs ever had. My clerk did not receive any higher salary than the clerk to the Committee on Military Affairs, yet our hearings were indexed. Take it from me, if you are going to start paying extra to have any work done by the clerks of the Committee on Military Affairs in the way of indexing the hearings, you will have to do the same thing for every other appropriating committee and every other committee that has a large number of hearings. If the clerks of the Committee on Military Affairs do not know enough—and I do not believe that is true—to index the hearings, what the Committee on Military Affairs needs are new clerks and not more money. It is no great matter to make an index. When you have a page proof of hearings, it is a very simple matter to make an index. If we paid at this rate in the Library of Congress, the indexing there would cost us a hundred thousand dollars a year. It is unnecessary, it is a bad precedent, and, while I regret very much to oppose the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] who makes this request, still I think if he had been chairman of his committee for a longer time he would not have made the request. He found a precedent last year and probably thought that that was the precedent for the Committee on Military Affairs. The case then was unexampled, but it ought not to be repeated now. [Applause.]

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

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. How would the gentleman suggest curing the present difficulty? Here we have had hearings all this season before the Committee on Military Affairs, and they have not been available. They are not indexed now. I have them merely in proof form in a way they can not well be handled. Something has to be done or those hearings are not going to be of any use to the Members of the House.

Mr. MANN. It is the duty of the Committee on Military Affairs to index them.



Mr. GARDNER. I know it is their duty. I do not blame Mr. Baker, the assistant clerk of the committee, but some one has neglected his duty. How are you going to remedy it without this money?

Mr. MANN. When you hire a man to do something and he does not do it, the way to remedy it is not to hire somebody else to do it, because the other fellow will not. [Applause.]

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, these six large volumes which I have had placed upon the table contain the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations during the last session of Congress. They represent about the average amount of testimony taken at each session by that committee. There are more than 5,000 printed pages of testimony. The hearings are indexed and the indexing is a part of the regular work of that committee. If the clerks of that committee could not index the hearings and have them ready for the committee when the bills are ready for consideration, they would not be fit for their work and they would not be employed there. We have frequently started a hearing at 2 o'clock in the afternoon of a day and had the hearings indexed and printed upon the table of the committee room for the consideration of emergency deficiency bills the following morning. If that were not possible, the committee could not do its work. The Committee on Appropriations has six regular appropriation bills, and frequently two or three additional deficiency appropriation bills, in a session of Congress. That committee has four clerks. The Committee on Military Affairs has two clerks and two appropriation bills. The vicious practice existed for many years of doing what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said was done at both ends of the Capitol—appointing men to positions and then giving them extra compensation whenever they did anything. It took a long time to break down the practice in both places. It is ended now and it ought not to be begun again. I can not find any excuse for expending \$300 for indexing the hearings before this committee. Indexing is the simplest thing in the work of committee clerks. The testimony comes back all subheaded by the official stenographers, and all that is necessary to do is to have some one take the manuscript and keep the headings and arrange them alphabetically, and then when the page proof of the hearings come from the printer put the paging after the headings. It requires no very great skill. It requires some time, but employees of Congress are expected to devote at least some time to the duties of the positions which they fill. If there be any justification for asking for extra compensation for clerks, it is for the clerks to the Committee on Appropriations. For the 3 weeks before the Christmas holidays and for 10 of the days up to this time in this session they have worked until 11 o'clock every night in the week, and they have worked on every Sunday during that period; and when I say every Sunday, I mean on an average until about 9 o'clock at night. They do it without complaint and without asking for any extra money, and I commend their example to other clerks and employees about this Capitol. [Applause.]

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague [Mr. DENT] has been perfectly fair and frank with the House. He has asked for just \$300, the amount necessary to do this work. If he had asked for \$300,000, the opponents of small appropriations would, in all probability, have favored the resolution, but when a Member comes into this House and asks for the small amount of \$300 he does not get the attention of gentlemen who think in terms of millions. [Applause.] When the amount of \$300 was asked for for this work, the same amount allowed by the last Congress, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] come forward and commenced to make a fuss. Their interest and excitement in and over this little item asked by the Committee on Military Affairs reminds me of the performance of a big white rooster that I knew in my childhood. He would pass unnoticed whole ears of corn and go up into the woods and scratch around until he found a little worm, and then he would cluck and cluck until every chicken in the settlement came running to him, and just as they arrived he swallowed the worm. [Laughter and applause.] Talk about economy. You have cost the country more than the \$300 here asked in the time that you have consumed in opposing this resolution. [Applause.] This is an important piece of work. It was done before by authority of the House and it ought to be done again. This index work ought to be done. The Committee on Military Affairs wants it done. It will be very beneficial to all of us who have to consult the hundreds of items in the months that are to come, and I hope that these gentlemen who are straining at a gnat and swallowing

an elephant will permit this item of \$300 to go through. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Military Affairs had a change of chairmen at the beginning of this session of Congress and there was also a change in the clerical force. The hearings before that committee this session will be very voluminous. As the chairman of the committee stated, they have had hearings on the efficiency and effect of the national-defense act, in which questions the whole country is interested. We have gone into every little detail affecting military appropriations. I have been on that committee some 12 years. I do not recall that ever heretofore has so much time been taken up by the committee in bringing out, for the information of not only the committee, but the membership of this House and the people of the country at large, all the little details appertaining to the legislation that has been enacted within the last year on military matters. I should be averse to coming before this House and asking for such an appropriation under ordinary circumstances. But this is not an ordinary circumstance.

The hearings before the Committee on Appropriations are entirely different from those before the Committee on Military Affairs. The Committee on Military Affairs appropriates millions of dollars in lump sums for a great many items contained in a single paragraph of the bill. The details of those items cover many pages of printed matter. They all ought to be properly indexed, at least this year, because these hearings will be scanned year after year in the future as to what the Army officers charged with the duty of putting the new legislation into effect said regarding the national-defense law, its strength, and its weakness. The amount asked is not large for this work. It has to be done carefully. The committee is unanimous in the request that it ought to be done. I feel, if properly done, it will be in the interest of every Member of the House who wants to look over the hearings held before that committee at this session of Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say, as a member of this committee, that every man who knows anything about the voluminous hearings of the Committee on Military Affairs in the House of Representatives knows it is necessary to have a system of indexing the hearings in order for each Member of the House to know something about the evidence and items in that great long bill. The question that confronts the mind of each Member is, Why does not the clerk of the committee do this? As the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] has just explained to you, it is different from any other committee of this House. The clerk of that committee is a busy man, and while I stand as a man of economy and for economy, as every man here can vouch, this sum of \$300 that is asked for this purpose will be one of the best investments that this House could make. If you only could know the hundreds and thousands of items all through the appropriation bill before the Committee on Military Affairs, you would say perhaps fifty times as much as \$300 would be necessary. The members of that committee are hardly able to keep up with these items, and there are so many new items of expenditure asked each session by each branch of the service which comes before that committee, until it is necessary from the time these hearings are printed until the bill comes up on the floor, so that every man who wants to inform himself on this matter needs these hearings properly indexed in order that he may turn to it while the bill is under consideration on the floor of the House for that index to be of any use to him. I think it will be a matter of vital importance to every Member, and I submit to you, gentlemen, that the Committee on Military Affairs is entitled to this little item. We are entitled to the best help we can get in order to present this information to the House in a sensible, quick form, so that every man can turn to it and see what he is considering. The way it is now our clerk can not do it, he does not do it, and it has not been done. The passage of this resolution for the sum of \$300 to put this work before the House is certainly an important matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has been stated here that the committee has two clerks. Now, the gentleman states those clerks can not do it. I would like to ask as a matter of information why they can not?

Mr. QUIN. Because the one clerk and assistant clerk to that committee are kept busy. Now, this committee from the first day this Congress opened until now has been having hearings with the exception of the holiday recess. We just came from



that committee on a call of our chairman to vote for this little item. We had before us the superintendent of the Military Academy at West Point. He has been before us for three days. We had to leave that officer, who was giving us detailed information, and come here and vote on this question. That is the reason why the clerks are working more than those of any other committee of this House and have no time to index the items, the subjects, and the evidence.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this resolution because we have got to have that index, but I can not too strongly condemn the neglect of duty on the part of somebody connected with that committee. The Naval Affairs Committee and most of the committees of this House, as soon as their hearings are held, have the manuscript corrected and printed so that the Members who are following the legislation can use them. I have sent up to the Committee on Military Affairs and have been told that I could not have the hearings until they were all ready to be printed; that they would be ready in plenty of time for use. Finally, I wrote to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT], and asked if I could not have some of those hearings transcribed at my own expense. I said I was willing to have Gen. Crozier's evidence and Gen. McCain's evidence transcribed at my own expense. He very kindly said that he would let me have the proofs of the hearings when they came back. I have had those proofs. I have inconvenienced the committee the last two or three days, I dare say, by retaining the proofs while I tried to read them. They were most difficult to use without an index. In their present shape it is almost impossible to use the hearings of the Committee on Military Affairs. I am not blaming Mr. Baker, the assistant clerk of that committee. He is an excellent man. But the duties of somebody have been neglected. The committee has not printed the hearings as they went along, and now they have such a mass of stuff that something has got to be done in order to straighten it out. The hearings this year are of exceptional value, as has been said. If they are not indexed by this House, I, for my own use, shall be obliged to have a rough index made for my personal use. At the present moment the situation is such that if the hearings are not indexed, and indexed now, they will be useless to this House.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to take any time answering any charge of neglect on the part of any member of the committee or any employee of the committee. If anybody has been guilty of neglect, it is my fault, and I will take the blame. I am pursuing this policy because I am following that of my distinguished predecessor, the Hon. James Hay, of Virginia. He pursued this policy, as I understand, in the hearings on the national-defense act. In reply to the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] that these hearings have not been printed as fast as we had the different officers of the Army before us, I have to say that the reason for it is that I expected to get this little sum of \$300 to index the hearings. And they could not be indexed until they were completed.

Mr. GARDNER. I leave it to the gentleman whether the other committees of this House, as well as your own committee, last year did not print the hearings as they were held?

Mr. DENT. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, no. The national-defense act was printed as the hearings were held. On the appropriation bill they were not, because that was not what the public was interested in last year. This year the evidence taken on the appropriation bill is of the same sort as the hearings you held on the national-defense act last year.

Mr. DENT. My recollection is that they were not printed until we completed the hearings. I may be mistaken in my recollection.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is quite correct. The hearings were printed originally, but not indexed. The hearings were indexed when they were assembled.

Mr. DENT. I thought we pursued the same policy.

Mr. GARDNER. Does the gentleman say the hearings were printed piecemeal this year?

Mr. DENT. Yes, sir. They were printed just as fast as I could get them from the Printing Office.

Mr. GARDNER. I have repeatedly tried to get them. But all that you have sent me is merely the proofs.

Mr. DENT. That is what I mean, the proofs. Of course, not the final print.

Mr. GARDNER. You have not gotten out the pamphlet after each hearing, the way it is done in the Committee on Naval Affairs and the way it was done last year. And as to the proofs, they were not available to me until I wrote a personal letter to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. That is true, and I am sorry the gentleman had not called on me earlier.

Mr. GARDNER. I supposed Mr. Baker, your clerk, knew the situation. I sent my secretary up there and I telephoned, and I was informed by other people, too, that they were not printed.

Mr. DENT. I am sorry the gentleman was treated in that way, and I regret I did not know about it until he communicated with me himself.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. DENT. I would like one minute more.

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

Mr. DENT. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make this statement. As has been said, this is a continuation and completion of the hearings of last year under the national-defense act. You paid \$300 last year when we were theorizing, and we are now only asking for the same sum when we are examining the practical effects. These hearings were indexed by an employee of the Quartermaster General's Department, employed by Mr. Hay. I intend to employ the same man to do the work again so as to get it completed in satisfactory form.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether this House fully realizes the troubles of the Committee on Accounts or not. Your troubles become our troubles, and we have to bear the responsibility. Most Members here who have brought matters before the Accounts Committee are aware of the fact that that committee assumes its own responsibility as a rule and objects to any kind of expenditure out of the contingent fund of this House that ought not to be made.

I fully concur in all that has been said by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] with reference to the practice which we are now beginning. I am decidedly opposed to it and have so stated to the chairman of this committee, and the Committee on Accounts are in accord that we ought not to establish this precedent. And I want it distinctly understood that in presenting this resolution we are not doing it with the understanding that it shall be a precedent, but with the distinct understanding that it shall not be a precedent. It is an unfortunate situation and it is unfortunate for the chairman and unfortunate for the House. The former chairman of this committee, Mr. Hay, resigned the last of September. Mr. DENT, splendid man that he is, and the excellent chairman that he is proving to be, was appointed the 1st of October to assume the duties of this important position. It became necessary for him to select a new clerk, and the truth is that we have now a new chairman of that committee and a new clerk of that committee, and it is necessary, in order to protect the House, to secure for him the additional help that is necessary to prepare this index.

Mr. NORTON. Were those hearings held while the other clerks were in charge of the committee or with the present clerks in charge?

Mr. LLOYD. The present clerks in charge.

Mr. NORTON. What have the present clerks to do in their committee more than the clerks in any other committee who index their work?

Mr. LLOYD. I have intimated, by indorsing the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that it is the duty of these clerks to prepare this index. And I am trying to impress upon you that they claim they have not the time. At least, they were not preparing the index. The House of Representatives must have an index, and apparently the only way we can secure the index is to make this little allowance for it.

Now, gentlemen, you understand the position of the Committee on Accounts. It is unfriendly to resolutions of this kind. It wants to give notice to the House that, so far as it controls the matter, this shall never serve as a precedent. And I want to say further that last year, when the resolution was offered by Mr. Hay and presented to this House, we notified Mr. Hay and those who came to the committee asking for the passage of the resolution that it should not be considered as a precedent. But, unfortunately, this present chairman of that committee did not hear that statement. We are giving notice to everybody that this is under no circumstances to be considered a precedent.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.



Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Apparently the precedent was established a year ago.

Mr. LLOYD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. And this will further confirm that precedent, if it is adopted. But may I make an inquiry? If the clerks of the committee are not preparing the index because they say they have not the time, what is to prevent them from saying the same thing next year and the following year, and what is to prevent the clerks of every other committee in the House from saying it? Why not discharge the clerks and get somebody else?

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Baker is given notice for the future that it is of no use for the Committee on Military Affairs or any other committee to come before the House and ask for an index to do the duty that ought to be performed by the committee clerks.

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

Mr. LLOYD. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. Suppose another committee comes in with exactly the same state of facts. Are you going to draw the line on that committee? What will the chairman of the Committee on Accounts do on exactly the same state of facts that we have here? What will you do?

Mr. LLOYD. I can not speak for the next chairman of the committee, but I can speak for the chairman of the committee up to the 4th day of March, and I can say that no other chairman of a committee in this House can present such a resolution as this, because I can assure him that the Committee on Accounts will not allow such a resolution to be reported favorably.

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

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Would it not relieve the situation for this House to vote down the resolution?

Mr. LLOYD. It would not relieve the committee. It would not give them what they need.

Mr. FESS. But it would relieve the Committee on Accounts if the House were to vote down this resolution?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

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

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. Does not the gentleman think that, considering the large expenditures which the bill carries, the House ought to have that information in the hearings indexed?

Mr. LLOYD. There is no question but that it should be indexed. Other committees furnish indexes. This committee at this time does not furnish the index, and it is necessary for the House, in order to secure the index, to make some kind of proper provision.

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

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. There is somebody living who can furnish this index?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUTLER. Why not have him as the clerk of the committee to furnish it?

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

Mr. LLOYD. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand it, the hearings on the Army bill have been virtually completed—have been completed, in fact, as I am informed by a member of the committee. What is to prevent the clerk or assistant clerk from taking a few nights and doing the work he is called upon to do?

Mr. LLOYD. I can not answer that question. That can only be answered by the chairman of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. LLOYD. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 113, yeas 65.

So the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. LLOYD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MANN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. MANN. I want to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. It is all over, so far as that resolution is concerned.

Mr. NORTON. I was on my feet trying to get recognition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows; but the Chair announced that, and recognized the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] to make a motion and to lay that motion on the table. The Chair can not see every gentleman in this House at once, and gentlemen must exercise their lungs. The gentleman makes the point of no quorum.

Mr. NORTON. No; I will withdraw the point, but I think I have some right to be recognized.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize anybody that he sees is trying to get recognition.

ADMIRAL GEORGE DEWEY.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. DALE] represents the district in which Admiral Dewey was born. I ask unanimous consent that he may address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. DALE] may address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DALE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, the passing of the chief of heroic figures in this Nation and the ranking naval officer of the world is announced by the President of the United States in a message to the Congress.

Admiral George Dewey was a native of the State of Vermont and was appointed to the Naval Academy from what is now the second congressional district of that State.

From his home, under the shadow of the dome of the State capitol, he went a youth from the mountains out upon the seas. After 40 years from the steps of that capitol he beheld the largest throng of people ever assembled within the State as they welcomed him home with the acclaim of the glory of his achievement. That was a long period of time between those two dates. Even so, it illustrates the primal element in the character of the man, that by the restriction of his energy and the confinement of his study to the one purpose of his life through all these years he became thoroughly equipped for the victorious response to the great requirement of his country.

The records of history may be searched without finding a like illustration of the man meeting the event so completely ready.

These are the perfected qualities of the soul of the man:

Discipline—to obey the superior command that sent him away from that which in equity seemed to be his opportunity.

Courage—to convey his fleet over the waters that might at any moment engulf it as Habana Harbor did the Maine.

Skill—to maneuver and operate to the annihilation of the Spanish squadron, and with the loss of not one United States marine.

Poise—to maintain the rights of international law amidst the provocations of the German fleet and to keep the welfare of his country above his own ambition when the full flush of victory was upon him. [Applause.]

To the Navy and naval affairs he devoted his whole life and during the later years he gave the inestimable benefit of his experience to many sessions of Congress down to the present. With no attempt to become conspicuous in other positions, he passed from his achievements followed by the homage of the whole people of his country to the glory that awaits him over the unknown sea. [Applause.]

The deeds of his heroic life are history, and of it the Nation is justly proud. The spirit of such a life lives on—an inspiration forever.

It is a glorious reflection that this Nation has given such an influence to all the world, and beyond that stands the superlative fact that Vermont gave him to the Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the remarks of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. DALE] I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received from a prominent citizen and banker of Cincinnati, Ohio, the following telegram:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, January 17, 1917.

HON. ALFRED G. ALLEN,  
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Two events of the first importance to the American Navy have happened within the last 24 hours. The death of Admiral Dewey, whose memory the American people desire to honor, and the acquisition by the United States of the Danish West Indies, the naming of which is now before Congress. I suggest that Congress could do no more grateful act than to name the islands after our great and lamented naval hero, the Dewey Islands.

ALEXANDER A. LANDESCO.



That telegram suggested to me the following joint resolution, which I prepared and introduced this morning, as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 344) to change the name of the Danish West Indies to the Dewey Islands.

*Resolved, etc.*, That on and after the date of the physical occupation of the Danish West Indies by the Government of the United States, the name of these islands shall be changed and they shall thereafter be designated and known as the Dewey Islands, in honor of George Dewey, late Admiral of the United States Navy, whose services to his country shall thus for all posterity be commemorated and gratefully acknowledged.

Mr. Speaker, I have had this resolution referred to the appropriate committee, with the request that it be given early and favorable consideration, for I know of nothing more appropriate than the naming of these islands after the great hero of Manila Bay.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 7782. An act to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Frederick B. Wells* to *Otto M. Reiss*;

S. 7781. An act to authorize the change of name of the steamer *George W. Peavey* to *Richard J. Reiss*;

S. 7780. An act to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Frank T. Heffelfinger* to *Clemens A. Reiss*; and

S. 7779. An act to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Frank H. Peavey* to *William A. Reiss*.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has learned with profound grief of the death of Admiral of the Navy George Dewey, who has served his country brilliantly for more than 62 years.

*Resolved*, That the President of the Senate is directed to transmit to his bereaved family a copy of these resolutions and an assurance of the sympathy of the Senate in the loss they have sustained.

*Resolved*, That the President of the Senate appoint a committee of seven Members to confer with a like committee of the House, and, after consultation with the family of the deceased, to take such action as may be appropriate in regard to the public funeral of Admiral Dewey.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect the Senate do now adjourn.

And that the Vice President, under the third resolution, had appointed as the committee on the part of the Senate Mr. TILLMAN, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Maine, Mr. CLAPP, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. PAGE.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

*Resolved*, That the President of the Senate appoint a committee of 12 Members of the Senate to join the committee to be appointed by the House to attend the funeral services of Admiral George Dewey at Arlington, Va.

*Resolved*, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of this resolution, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith on the part of the committee of the Senate be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

And that in compliance with the foregoing resolution the Vice President had appointed as said committee Mr. TILLMAN, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. CLAPP, Mr. LODGE, Mr. PAGE, Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. KERN, Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. SAULSBURY, and Mr. SMOOT.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

#### House concurrent resolution 68.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That in recognition of the long and distinguished service rendered the Nation by Admiral George Dewey, appropriate funeral services be held in the rotunda of the Capitol on Saturday, January 20, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m., and that the two Houses of Congress attend said services.

That as a further mark of respect his remains be removed from the Capitol to Arlington Cemetery for burial in charge of the Navy Department, attended by the Sergeant at Arms and the committees of the two Houses.

That invitations be extended to the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet, the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Diplomatic Corps (through the Secretary of State), such officers of the Navy as may be designated by the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chief of Staff of the Army to attend the exercises in the rotunda of the Capitol.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 198) providing for the confirmation of the agreements between the States of South Dakota, Montana, and Idaho and the United States relating to the selection of lieu or indemnity lands.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

#### PICKETING THE WHITE HOUSE.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker and gentleman of the House, I desire to address the House at this time concerning the conduct of certain persons who think they are working for the cause of woman's suffrage by annoying the President of the United States by placing pickets about the White House. [Applause.]

In the first place, the President has nothing to do with the amending of the Constitution of the United States, other than as a private citizen. The Constitution is amended by two-thirds of the Members of each branch of Congress voting to submit such a resolution to the States for ratification, and the President could not even veto such a resolution and does not have to approve it. I desire to say that I favor woman's suffrage by States and by Federal amendment, but as a friend of woman's suffrage I desire to condemn this conduct on the part of these advocates. Such conduct is unbecoming, and instead of advancing the cause, actually retards the cause. And while I differ from the President politically, I desire at this time to place my disapproval upon such conduct. It is an insult to the high office of President of the United States, even if it could do any good.

I trust these enthusiasts will discontinue this practice and thus show that they are entitled to the suffrage. The President submits to it because they are women, for if men did those things they would be placed in jail. This conduct is not upheld by a majority of the woman's suffrage party in the United States, and especially by those of Ohio. I trust these misguided women will see the error of their way and see that such proceedings are stopped. [Applause.]

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Under the rule heretofore adopted, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 18994) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings; to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings; to authorize the erection and completion of certain public buildings; to authorize the purchase of sites for certain public buildings; to abolish the Office of Supervising Architect of the Treasury and to create and organize in the Treasury Department a bureau of public buildings and define its duties, powers, and jurisdiction; to create and establish the office of commissioner of public buildings; to fix the salary and prescribe the duties and powers of the said commissioner of public buildings; to create a board of estimates and prescribe its duties and powers; to provide for the standardization of certain classes of public buildings, and for other purposes, with Mr. CLINE in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Flint, Mich., \$100,000.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KELLEY: Page 5, line 16, after the figures "\$100,000," at the end of the line, add the following:

"The Treasury Department is hereby authorized and directed to prepare the necessary plans and specifications immediately after the approval of this act, and proceed with the work herein authorized at the earliest date practicable."

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk I desire to say that the authorization carried in the bill is for building an addition to the post office at Flint, Mich. If my amendment is adopted by the House, it will direct the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare the necessary plans and specifications, and proceed to construct the building at the earliest practicable date. I want to say to the House that I would not offer this amendment if I did not believe that the situation and the needs at Flint, Mich., are unusual. In the first place, in the last few years the city of Flint has come to be one of the great automobile centers of the Nation. The great Buick plant is located there. The Chevrolet, Dort, and Patterson plants are there. The town has increased its population in the last 10 or 12 years from 13,000 to upwards of 80,000.

Not only that, but there are in process of construction and almost completed additions to those great factories which will



give employment to 10,000 more men, who, when they are employed there, will bring the population of Flint up to 125,000.

The post-office building at Flint was authorized in 1903, at a cost of \$80,000. It was intended to accommodate 22 employees. There are 60 employees in the post office there now. The nine rural carriers and the parcel-post business have been transferred to the basement, which was not intended to be used at any time for office purposes. It has no proper ventilation and no daylight. The basement was intended by the architect only for the boilers and for storage purposes, as the department notified me in a letter only yesterday.

I want to call particular attention further to the conditions at Flint, as to the growth of the town. In 1903 there were 13,000 people; in 1910, 38,000 people; in 1916, 80,000 people, and when the factory additions that are now almost completed are ready they will employ 10,000 more men, which will bring an additional population of 40,000 or 50,000 people.

In 1903 there were 2,445 school children in Flint. In 1910 there were 6,185. In 1916 there were 12,737. In other words, there are as many school children now in the city of Flint as there were inhabitants in the town when the present post office was provided for.

Last year the city voted \$600,000 for additional school buildings for the city. So far as the business of the town is concerned, in 1904 there were \$4,000,000 invested in industries in the city. In 1916 there were invested \$55,620,000. In 1904 there were 2,494 persons employed in the factories, and in 1916 there were 20,000. The pay roll for 1904 in the city of Flint was \$1,267,000. In 1916 it was \$18,540,000.

The output of the factories in 1904 was \$6,177,000. In 1916 it was \$111,240,000.

The bank clearings of Flint for 1915 were \$16,000,000; for 1916 they were \$51,446,000.

The post-office receipts when the present building was authorized in 1903 were \$40,000. In 1910 they were \$97,000, and in 1916 for the calendar year they were \$170,000.

These facts, it seems to me, puts the city of Flint in a class by itself, and it ought not to be compelled to wait three or four years before the improvement contemplated in this bill can be started. I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I agree with what the gentleman from Michigan has said about the city of Flint, but I can not see any earthly necessity for the amendment. The object of the legislation which we are incorporating in the bill is to expedite the construction of all these buildings. This amendment only gives certain directions to the Treasury Department to speed it up as far as Flint is concerned. I am perfectly willing to do that, but it will be done if this legislation is adopted. Flint will be relieved at an early day.

Mr. KELLEY. I think the chairman of the committee recognizes the fact that the needs of this particular situation are very great.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No question about that.

Mr. KELLEY. I understand the department is three or four years behind, and it seems as though this ought to be considered an emergency case and that it is ahead of some other cities not quite so pressing.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will state that there are a number of cases in this bill as urgent as the case of Flint.

Mr. KELLEY. I was told at the department the other day that there was no situation in the United States so urgent as the city of Flint.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think Binghamton, N. Y., would be as urgent. I want to say to the gentleman that it is the purpose of this legislation to hurry all of these matters along, and if this amendment should be adopted, then every Member on the floor would want the same kind of an amendment attached to his item, and you would load the bill down with directions. I would have no objection at all to a general direction in the bill, but I can not see what good it would do, urging the Bureau of Public Buildings to expedite all of these matters. That is the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I ask if the general legislation to which the gentleman refers will result, in his opinion, in actual building of some of these buildings so urgently needed?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think it will.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. And result in the building of them within a reasonable time, say, two years.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think so. I want to say, as I said in my opening speech, that the committee is perfectly willing

to accept any amendment that will accelerate it. The only effort of the committee is to get the buildings economically and expeditiously constructed, and if Members can help us I want them to do so.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I wish to say that I visited Flint, Mich., not so very long ago, and I can testify to the conditions set out by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Nobody disputes that.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. And I was about to say that there are other places in as serious a situation. I can refer Members of the House to another city that is in an even worse condition, and I would like to see them both relieved.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield? Suppose it is absolutely impossible to transact the business in a building that is not large enough to transact the business of the mails, let alone the working of them, and in which it is impossible to secure other quarters, then would the gentleman think that we ought to do the business in the street?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not think, and I do not think my colleague would insist on it, that we should select items out of the bill and direct officials of the Treasury to prefer those to other items. We ought to leave all that to the bureau of public buildings which we propose to establish.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Would not a great emergency make a difference?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am perfectly willing that there should be a general provision in the bill directing the bureau of public buildings to take up the most urgent cases first. I think that ought to be done, but I do not think we ought to attach a provision like this to different items, and if the amendment should prevail that undoubtedly would be the result.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, after line 16, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"To provide for the purchase of additional land and for the erection thereon of an addition to the post-office building at Boulder, Colo., \$72,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$7,000 of this amount shall be used for the acquisition of additional land for the enlargement of the present site."

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I am not one of the Members of this body who become frightened when bills of this character, designated as pork-barrel bills, come up for consideration in the House. I believe it is a patriotic duty which we owe to the various communities of the country to provide for adequate mail facilities, and therefore I am in sympathy with this bill and will gladly support it. The amendment which I have offered is for an addition to the post-office building at Boulder, Colo. Boulder, Colo., is the home of the University of Colorado and it is a fast-growing town. The university has a student body of 2,200. Within a few miles of that city there are from 20 to 30 mining camps, which have sprung up since the present building was constructed. This building was constructed in 1910, at a cost of \$59,951.85. The city has absolutely outgrown the building and the facilities there for handling the mail are very incomplete, indeed, so much so that the commercial organization there requested that the two Senators from Colorado and myself visit their city for the purpose of having first-hand information as to conditions. This we did in the month of November, and we found all of the claims they had presented were fully justified in what we saw. The outer vestibules to the building were completely occupied with desks for city carriers and other postal business. When the building was constructed there was no provision in the law for a parcel post, and that has added tremendously to the business there. I introduced a bill early in this session asking for \$50,000, \$40,000 for the addition to the building and \$10,000 for the purchase of an additional site. Referring this to the Treasury Department, they recommended that it will require \$65,000 to construct an adequate addition to the present capacity of the post office to properly handle the mail there. They suggested that \$65,000 be appropriated and \$10,000 for a site.

I have in my possession, furnished by the commercial organization there, an option upon the land adjacent to the building, the only land available. It was intended to be built upon by the owner this summer. The organization induced him to desist, and they secured an option upon it for sufficient time to determine whether the Government would take hold of it. They pay a monthly rental on this of \$25, to expire when the Government refuses to purchase the land or when it is purchased by the Government. The postmaster there in a letter shows that the postal receipts since 1910 have increased about 50 per cent, and



that the city has increased 50 per cent in population. Taking these matters into consideration, it is my hope that the chairman will allow this amendment to prevail.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to support the amendment offered by my colleague. I feel that I would hardly be doing my full duty to one of the most beautiful and best little cities in the West if I did not indorse what my colleague has said concerning the necessities of the city of Boulder. It is not in my district, but for six years I had the honor to represent the State of Colorado at large, including, of course, that splendid city. The city of Boulder is entitled to very much better post-office accommodations than it has at present. It is the site of our State university, one of the great universities of this country. We have many hundreds of young people from all over the United States who go to that university, and there ought to be a suitable Federal building there, one commensurate with the importance of an important city and a great seat of learning. There are many thousands of people come there every summer to attend the Colorado-Texas Chautauqua; and there are many thousands of visitors there every year. The post-office building which they have there now is really wholly inadequate. It is no ornament, as it should be to that kind of a city. The building ought, by all means, to be enlarged at least sufficient to do the business of the city. In reality the city should have a new building three times the size of the present one. Colorado is proud of our university city, and the country is proud of our State university, and our Government ought justly to have a suitable public building there. I do feel that there could be no appropriation that would be more meritorious, more needed, or better expended than this one offered by my colleague Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I hope the committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word on behalf of the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. TIMBERLAKE], and incidentally about the bill. I represent the city of Denver, which has a building which cost millions of dollars, contributed to by the people of the United States, and voted through the generosity of their Representatives in this body. I am glad to announce in this presence that I do not consider this a pork-barrel bill but a patriotic and deserving bill. I come from a district which will get no part of the money appropriated, but I am glad to say that I am going to cast my vote for the bill. I am glad to note in the bill that in all the other districts in Colorado a building has been provided. I know they are deserved and ought to be constructed. The city of Denver is within 28 miles of the city of Boulder—and I state it in that way in compliment to my colleague, for I ought to say that the city of Boulder is 28 miles from Denver. However, we know that it is a great city, a great university is there. The city needs more postal facilities and ought to have the amendment asked by the gentleman. The people in Denver are the kind who do not believe because a subsidized press all over the country is giving utterance to the views of the Navy League and the munition factories that therefore no public buildings should be constructed, but they believe that some of the money contributed by the people should be returned to them in the shape of public buildings. They believe that their Representative in Congress ought to vote for this bill. They are not so lost to the sense of appreciation as to fail to recall that through the generosity of the representatives of the people in the past the city of Denver has now a magnificent structure, nor do they believe that since Denver has no present needs in the premises that the people in other portions of the country who desire only small and modest buildings should be denied simply because a venal press, inspired through the business office, practically advocates that all the revenue wrung from the people shall go to enrich the Shipbuilding Trust, armor plate and munitions factories combination, and none to the comfort and welfare of themselves. In behalf of a city that is appreciative enough to look upon the Government's bounty to it as well deserved, and would not have its Representative denounce as "pork" the reasonable requirements of other communities in this great country, I sincerely hope that this bill will pass and that it may be improved by the adoption of the amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. TIMBERLAKE. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that the proposition submitted by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE] is entirely worthy and meritorious, but there are thousands of just as meritorious projects which could not be incorporated in the bill. There must be a limit placed somewhere. I want to say that it is not the fault of my friend from Colorado that the item is not in the bill. It would have been in the bill, I think, beyond question, if the matter had been called to his attention in time, and he could have

submitted it to the committee so that it could have been investigated, but the gentleman from Colorado did introduce bills for other places, one of which is included in this bill, and this matter was called to his attention only a few days ago. If anybody is to blame, it is the people of the city of Boulder, or those in charge, who did not call his attention to this condition of affairs. Mr. Chairman, if this item goes in, there are various others, which will mount into millions, which will probably be incorporated, which would result in the bill being killed by its own weight. We feel that we have gone as far as we ought to go in public-building construction at this session of Congress. While I agree with the gentleman absolutely as to the merits of the proposition, I sincerely trust that this amendment will not prevail, because it means loading down this bill to a point where it will never pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, after line 16, insert the following as a new paragraph: "To provide for the purchase of a site for an addition to the post-office building at Boulder, Colo., \$7,000."

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer this second amendment for this reason. As stated in presenting the other amendment the citizens of Boulder have at an expense to themselves secured an option of the only available site they will ever have for an addition to their present post-office building. The price asked for this property was \$10,000—

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

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I will.

Mr. COX. How long does that option run?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Six months. And for this option they pay \$25 a month—

Mr. COX. What is the date of the option?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. The date of the option? I now disremember.

Mr. COX. Approximately?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Some time in December, 1916.

Mr. COX. The option is for \$7,000?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. COX. And they agreed to keep the option alive for six months?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Yes, sir; and for which they pay \$25 a month rental. I sincerely hope that the committee will allow this amendment, that this site can be purchased now, while it is available, and can be procured at a reasonable cost, for the Government must of necessity and very soon provide more adequate mail facilities for the city of Boulder when this time does come. If this amendment is approved, proper grounds are ready to receive the additional facilities. If not, it may not be available when required.

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

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the yeas appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. TIMBERLAKE) there were—ayes 29, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Houlton, Me., \$50,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,000 of this amount shall be used for the acquisition of additional land for the enlargement of the present site.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, after line 2, insert the following:

"For the repair and improvement of the old post-office building at Houston, Tex., for the purpose of its use for post-office and other governmental purposes, \$40,000."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Kenosha, Wis., \$75,000.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in view of the comment made about Wisconsin items, I want to occupy a few minutes to show the character of this particular provision for Kenosha, Wis. Kenosha is one of the most thoroughly enterprising, up-to-date, and thriving of cities. In 1890 its population was 6,532, in 1900 it was 11,608, in 1910 it was 21,371, and in 1916 it is conservatively estimated, on the basis of the school



census, to be from 32,000 to 34,000. The post-office receipts at Kenosha in 1890, calendar year ending December 31, were only \$8,781. In 1900 they were \$19,327, in 1910 they were \$63,855, and for the year ending December 31, 1915—the year before I introduced my bill—the receipts were \$95,619. In that year the post office at Kenosha turned over \$48,082.94 to the United States Treasury, net revenue over and above all expenditures for the office itself.

According to the Federal census report of manufactures, the value of the products manufactured in Kenosha in 1914 was \$28,341,000.

True, the building was constructed not many years ago, but the business of the office has increased with such great rapidity that the present quarters are grossly inadequate. They have had to put in a mezzanine floor and the mezzanine floor obscures the light, and is in other ways far from being a good thing. The clerks have to use the vestibule for the purposes of the parcel post, something for which, of course, it was not constructed. The necessities of the public business require either the renting of additional quarters or the erection of an addition to the building. The Government of the United States owns an ample site there and ought promptly to build an addition that is most urgently needed and will be of very great service. [Applause.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MONTAGUE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 186) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue temporary permits for additional diversions of water from the Niagara River.

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Lowell, Mass., \$250,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 of this amount is to be used for the acquisition of additional land adjoining the present site: *Provided further*, That if the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem such course more advantageous to the best interests of the United States, he is further authorized to sell, in such manner and upon such terms as he may deem for the best interests of the United States, the present post-office building and the site thereof in said city; to convey said land and building by the usual quitclaim deed to the purchaser thereof; to contract for the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of a suitable site; and to contract for the erection and completion on such new site of a suitable and commodious building, including fireproof vaults, heating, hoisting, and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, complete, for the use of the United States post office and other Government offices. The proceeds of the sale of the present post-office building and the site thereof may, together with a sum not exceeding \$250,000, be applied to the cost of acquiring such new site and of erecting and completing such new building thereon.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to engage the attention of the chairman of the committee. There is provided in the bill, I believe, three items where provision is made for the disposition of present post-office sites. In all of those sections a different method of disposal by the Secretary of the Treasury is provided. For instance, in this case it is left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury to use such methods as he deems best in case it is decided that the present post-office site and building should be sold. On page 20, there is an item providing for a post office at Greenville, S. C., and provision is made for directing him to sell at public sale for cash to the highest bidder. Then, there is another provision on page 35 relating to the post office at Faribault, Minn. There the provision is that he may be authorized to sell at a proper price. I thought it was best for the interest of administration to have one method of disposal for these various sites, and I believe it is not to the best interest of the Government to have a direction to the Secretary of the Treasury to sell those sites at public sale, because the gentleman is certainly acquainted with the fact that the time might not be opportune to sell at public sale, and the bidder might get the property below its actual value. Now, I have prepared an amendment. I am not rising to be critical or hypercritical, but merely for the purpose of trying to perfect this language, and I want to inquire whether the gentleman would have objection to it or similar language in these three cases where the Secretary of the Treasury may be called upon to sell the present post-office building and site. It is the policy which has been followed in other instances where we have disposed of public sites; for instance, just recently in the House we authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the marine hospital station at Cleveland, and it carried a similar provision.

I am not rising in criticism of the committee, but merely to try to perfect the language, if possible, by inserting, after the word "sale," the following: "at public or private sale, but at not less than the value as determined by an appraisal thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That would be perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. STAFFORD. That, I contend, would safeguard the interests of the public and would also be a relief to the Secretary of the Treasury if in case of a public sale the price was not adequate.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That will be perfectly satisfactory to the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then strike out the words "in such manner."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That will be perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. STAFFORD. 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 6, line 15, strike out the words "in such manner," after the word "sale," and insert "at public or private sale at not less than the value first determined by an appraisal thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection at all to that.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman in regard to the practical difficulty of determining how much of an authorization he has for this Lowell (Mass.) building before he sells the old building. Is it the purpose to go on using the old building until the new building is completed?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That has been the policy, and that is the policy we want to pursue.

Mr. TILSON. If so, how can you tell how much you are going to sell your old building for before you have erected your new building, so that you can sell your old building?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. You can not.

Mr. TILSON. Have you not left yourself in an almost impossible situation?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; I think not. The Government will use the old building until the new one is completed. Then it is to be sold.

Mr. TILSON. The amount of the authorization for the new building is dependent upon the amount for which you can sell the old building. You can not dispose of the old building until after you have erected the new building, and you do not know what your authorization for the new building will be until you have sold the old one, thus going around in a circle. I call the gentleman's attention to it, because a similar difficulty arose in the case of the new post-office building in my own town.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. To what is the gentleman directing his attention?

Mr. TILSON. Lowell, Mass. It says:

The proceeds of the sale of the present post-office building and the site thereof may, together with a sum not exceeding \$250,000, be applied to the cost of acquiring such new site and of erecting and completing such new building thereon.

In other words, the amount which you could expend on the new building would depend upon the amount for which you sold the old.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The sale is made with the understanding that the Government is to use the property until the new building is completed.

Mr. TILSON. Then you would sell the building for future delivery, as it were?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. With the Government's right as user until the new building is completed.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office, customhouse, and courthouse at Minneapolis, Minn., \$100,000.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I wish to offer.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: Page 7, line 11, after the words "United States," strike out "post office, customhouse, and courthouse" and in lieu thereof insert "Federal office building and customhouse."



Mr. CLARK of Florida. We have no objection to that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Albertville, Ala., \$25,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

This bill contains about 406 items. It carries authorizations for the expenditure of \$38,000,000. It is commonly called the "pork bill," and we really ought to take no offense at this, when we consider items such as the one under consideration at present, and more than 100 more like it, are included in this bill. Albertville, Ala., according to the figures of the committee that considered and reported this bill, had a population in 1910 of 1,544, and the post-office receipts for 1915 were \$5,633.04. Mr. Chairman, we certainly should not take offense because many items in this bill are dominated as "pork."

What is "pork" in appropriation bills? It is a term that might ordinarily be difficult to define or to apply as a standard in every individual item. Fortunately for us, so far as this bill is concerned, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has set a standard to govern Congress. It lays down a rule that separates the good items from the bad, the meritorious projects from "pork."

In the last paragraph of this bill the committee, I take it, lays down what it feels is the correct rule for making authorizations and appropriations for public buildings. That paragraph provides that no city, town, or village within the United States shall be considered by any committee as being suitable for erecting therein a Government building, and no Government building shall be erected therein, unless for three consecutive years the postal receipts shall aggregate more than \$10,000 per year. This standard is far from being perfect, but it is a step in the right direction. It should, however, guide us in our deliberations so far as the items in this bill are concerned. The vice of the provision is that it is only intended to guide future Congresses and not to guide us as to items in this bill.

Here is a village where, for the year 1915, the postal receipts were only \$5,500. The gentleman from Florida, and also the gentleman from Alabama, in whose district this place is located, both criticized the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FEAR] because he has referred to this bill as a sectional bill. They ought to have said nothing about that. They should have let that charge go unanswered, because when you examine this bill that is the only conclusion that any disinterested man can arrive at. Let us see whether it is a sectional bill or not if measured by the rule that the committee that reported it said was a correct rule, and that is that a city, town, or village to receive an authorization for a public building must have \$10,000 of receipts for three executive years. This town has but \$5,500 receipts, and by the rule of the committee is "pork."

Let us apply this rule to the bill. In Alabama we have 10 Members of Congress. There are 10 items in this bill for Alabama; only 2 of them come within the provisions of the last paragraph of this bill. In only two of the places in Alabama are the receipts more than \$10,000 per year.

Take Arkansas, with seven Members of Congress, it has eight items in the bill. In only three of the eight places are the annual receipts of the post office more than \$10,000 per year. Take Florida, with four Congressmen, and seven items; in only five of the seven places are the receipts more than \$10,000 per year.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. No; I can not yield just now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman repeat the last remark about Florida?

Mr. GOOD. In Florida there are seven items. In five of them the receipts are more than \$10,000 per year and in two the receipts are less than \$10,000 per year.

Take Georgia, with 12 Members in the House, with 19 items in the bill; in only 2 of them are the receipts more than \$10,000.

By your action in the last paragraph of the bill you say that 17 of them are not legitimate items and ought to be excluded; that in the future such projects will be excluded. We ought not to lay down here a proposition for future Congresses that this Congress is not willing to stand by.

Take the State of Kentucky, with 11 Members of Congress. Fourteen items for Kentucky are in this bill. In only two of them are the receipts of the post office more than \$10,000 a year. Twelve of the fourteen Kentucky items, by the rule of the committee, ought to have been excluded from this bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to a Representative from Kentucky now?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the gentleman notice in this provision that this \$10,000 limit fixed in the last clause of the bill shall apply only where there are no Federal activities except those of the post office?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and the proviso is that it shall not apply to items in this present bill, but shall apply to the actions of Congresses hereafter.

Mr. LANGLEY. It applies to places where there are no other activities besides post-office work.

Mr. GOOD. Yes. Take Louisiana, with eight Members of the House. There are eight items for Louisiana in this bill in addition to one special item. In four of those places they have less than \$10,000 receipts and four of them do meet the requirements of the bill.

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

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

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to ask the gentleman if he will not be fair enough to name these towns instead of simply saying "four" or "three"?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I will name the towns if I have the time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is good.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. I will name the towns that I reach in a moment, and in extending my remarks I will name every town, and I will give receipts and population as shown by the committee's statistics.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I would like to have the names now.

Mr. GOOD. Take the State of Mississippi, with eight Members of Congress. There are seven items in this bill from Mississippi. In only one are the receipts more than \$10,000, and in six of them, according to your own estimate, the authorization is pure "pork."

Take North Carolina, with 10 Members of Congress, with 16 items in this bill. In only 4 of the 16 are the receipts of the Post Office Department more than \$10,000 a year, and in 12 of the 16 places the receipts fall much below \$10,000 per year.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman pardon me a moment?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I would like the gentleman to name these towns.

Mr. GOOD. I am coming to Tennessee. That is a very good one, where it is 100 per cent pure; but it is pure "pork," because there is not an item in Tennessee that comes within the provisions you have laid down to govern future Congresses.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Then the gentleman can not name them except in one State?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I can name them all. If the gentleman thinks I am not correct in this I will give it in every State he wants.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I know the gentleman is correct in some of his statements, but not in others.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] may have 15 minutes in which to give the information that he has been asked for.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa may proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GOOD. I can not name them unless you give me at least 15 minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Well, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will agree not to refer to these towns by number, but will name each specific town, I shall not object to his having the additional time.

Mr. GOOD. I will name them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Take the State of Mississippi. In Mississippi there are, as I said, eight Members of Congress and seven items in this bill, and in only one place are the receipts more than \$10,000, and that is in Jackson, where the receipts are \$114-



150.25. But in Columbia the receipts, according to the statement furnished me by the committee, are \$8,505.15. In Pascagoula the amount is \$6,179.94. At Lexington it is \$8,421.84. In Indianola it is \$7,661.88. In Winona it is \$8,584.35, and in Okolona it is \$6,160.70. Are those the correct figures?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. They are absolutely not.

Mr. GOOD. I am reading from a statement that was given to me by the clerk of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. It is entitled "A statement of bills referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, showing all items included in the public-building bill, House of Representatives, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, revised and corrected to July 25, 1916, inclusive." [Laughter.] This publication was given to me by the committee less than 10 days ago.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Showing the receipts for 1915?

Mr. GOOD. Absolutely showing the receipts for 1915.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; and what are the receipts for 1916?

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman say that he has a publication of this kind of a later date?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have not; but I have the receipts. I have the receipts from the Auditor for the Post Office Department.

Mr. GOOD. And it was on that compilation that this committee based the bill, reported to the House long before the receipts for 1915 were available—reported on December 16, 1916, and toward the close of the fiscal year.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Just to remind the gentleman of what he just read. That provision here provides that for three successive years the figures must be \$10,000; and in any case, if those figures are correct, they would be correct for only one year.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; that is true. Take the case of North Carolina. There are 10 Members of this House from that State. There are 16 items in the bill for that State. In 12 of the places the receipts, according to this publication, are less than \$10,000 a year, and in only 4 of the places are the receipts more than \$10,000 a year. Does the chairman of the committee deny that statement?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will deny it directly. I am going to let you have all the rope you want.

Mr. GOOD. At Louisburg the receipts are \$8,128.64; at Wadesboro, \$8,254.70; at Sanford, \$9,568.04; Rockingham, \$9,095.60; Mount Airy, \$11,692.02; Lumberton, \$12,433.98; Dunn, \$9,252.97; Albemarle, \$8,759.99; Lenoir, \$9,827.27; Morganton, \$10,211.35; Wilson, \$24,560.94; Williamston, \$6,043.18; Mount Olive, \$5,679.28; Clinton, \$6,254.73; Marion, \$8,315.52; and Edenton, \$8,861.03.

South Carolina has seven Members of this House. It has 12 items in this bill. In 9 of those places the receipts, according to this statement, were less than \$10,000, and in only 3 of the 12 places were the receipts more than \$10,000.

The items in South Carolina referred to were as follows:

Aiken, \$13,818.85; Rock Hill, \$23,975.34; York, \$8,596.98; Dillon, \$7,733.63; Conway, \$6,030.89; Hartsville, \$9,884.33; Greenwood, \$23,297.36; Manning, \$5,435.28; Summerville, \$7,796.61; Easley, \$5,342.35; Greer, \$6,643.48; Bamberg, \$5,762.12.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that at all of those places the gentleman has named there are no other Federal activities save those of a postal character?

Mr. GOOD. I did not say that. I do not believe there is much other Federal activities at any of them.

Mr. LANGLEY. That makes a difference.

Mr. GOOD. I do not know that this publication gives all that information. In a few instances it does, but there are very few instances where other activities are mentioned. Everyone who knows anything about it knows that the other Government activities conducted in the post offices of these small villages are negligible. In most of them there is but little postal activity.

Mr. SAUNDERS. As I understand, the rule which the gentleman has cited does not apply, save to those cases where the sole activities are of a postal character.

Mr. LANGLEY. That is the point I made a moment ago.

Mr. GOOD. Tennessee has 10 Members of the House and nine items in this bill. In every one of the nine places the receipts for the year 1915 were less than \$10,000—100 per cent pure "pork," according to the rule contained in the last legislative paragraph of this bill. These are the places: Lewisburg, \$9,430.44; Rogersville, \$7,679.56; Rockwood, \$6,242.98; La Follette, \$5,065.98; Lenoir City, \$6,400.46; McMinnville, \$8,724.74;

Huntington, \$4,427.28; Dickson, \$7,451.91; Brownsville, \$8,111.42.

There is not a single town in Tennessee provided for in this bill where the receipts are more than \$10,000 a year.

Take Texas, which has 18 Members of this House and 20 items in the bill. In 14 of those items the receipts are more than \$10,000, and in 6 of the items they are less than \$10,000.

Mr. SLAYDEN. A pretty good record.

Mr. GOOD. Texas is away above the record of the other Southern States, but nothing to brag about. Do you say this is not sectional? I have given you 11 Southern States carrying 130 projects. In only 42 of those projects are the receipts more than \$10,000 a year, and in 88 places they are under \$10,000 a year. Measured by the rule contained in the last paragraph for detecting "pork," 42 of the 130 places for Southern States are meritorious, and 88 are pure "pork." Excluding Texas, in 10 Southern States there are 110 projects in the bill of which 26 are meritorious and 84 are pure "pork."

I have also examined this same publication as to 24 of the Northern States. I have taken California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, and Washington. I find that in those States you have provided in this bill for 200 projects. In all of those places except nine are the receipts more than \$10,000 a year. Out of 200 projects there were 191 with receipts over \$10,000 a year, and in only 9 places were the receipts less than \$10,000 per year. I will give them by States if you want them. California has 11 Members in the House. It has 14 items in this bill. In only one, and that is the bill introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] are the receipts less than \$10,000 a year. Colorado has 4 Members of Congress and 3 items in the bill. All of them have receipts of more than \$10,000 a year.

Connecticut has 5 Members of this House and 3 items in the bill. Every one of the places has receipts greater than \$10,000 a year. Delaware has 1 item, and its receipts are over \$10,000 a year. Idaho has 2, and the receipts in both places exceed \$10,000 a year. Illinois has 27 Members of the House and 18 items in this bill. In only three of them are the receipts below \$10,000 a year. In one of these places the bill was introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], who, standing on the floor of this House a few days ago, asked Congress to deny to the Federal employees a living wage, but by his bill he would put pork in his own district by building a public building in a town where the receipts are only \$7,854.96 per year.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GOOD. Just a very brief question.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Does the gentleman charge, then, that this bill is sectional?

Mr. GOOD. I do, measured by the committee's rule.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Or partisan, or both?

Mr. GOOD. I am dealing particularly with the sectional feature of it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman tell me what are the aggregate appropriations in the North and in the South?

Mr. GOOD. I have not made that computation.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Why not?

Mr. GOOD. I have not had the time.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Oh, I see.

Mr. LANGLEY. I think it would be a good idea if the gentleman would do that.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, is that the idea? Will you take a meritorious project, like Chicago, Ill., that handles more mail than several of your Southern States, and say that a meritorious project like that should be denied unless the bill also carries items for every congressional district in the United States? That illustrates the evil of this kind of legislation. That is what makes the public call this kind of legislation "pork." Some Members apparently feel that they must have "pork" for their districts in order to return to Congress, irrespective of the good of the service.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I suppose in wanting to come back our fellows are different from you.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. No; I can not yield now. When I have finished this statement, then I will yield.

Indiana has 13 Members of the House and 9 items in this bill. There is not a single place provided for in that State where the receipts are under \$10,000 a year. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] says he is going to answer; and when he answers let his answer for Hazard, Ky.—



Mr. LANGLEY. I will.

Mr. GOOD. Where the report is to the effect that Hazard has 537 people and receipts of \$4,447, and yet Hazard, Ky., is getting \$40,000 by this bill out of an empty Treasury.

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

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes more.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I shall object if the gentleman will not answer questions.

Mr. GOOD. Well, gentlemen, there are plenty of other items in this bill.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I object; the gentleman is ranting over these items without any foundation.

Mr. MANN. "The galled jade winces."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. CARAWAY. I object. If the gentleman wants to make statements of that kind let him make them on the floor.

Mr. MANN. Then, Mr. Chairman, there will be no more extensions this session.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not care.

Mr. MANN. Neither do I.

Mr. NOLAN. The regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California demands the regular order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida was recognized.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield just a minute?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. May I have unanimous consent to extend my remarks to those items in the various cities that I have read, especially the 11 Southern States, giving the amount that was in dispute. I do not want to be placed in the attitude of misrepresenting them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the items referred to.

Mr. GOOD. And to finish the list of the Southern States.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will yield.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman include in his statement the figures from the Post Office Department for the last fiscal year, 1916, instead of 1915, which he read to the House?

Mr. GOOD. I will include only the figures furnished me less than 10 days ago by the committee that reported the bill as the figures on which this bill was framed, because it was formulated before the complete report of the figures for 1916 were available.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman include the figures of 1916 if they are furnished him?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, the gentleman can print those himself.

Mr. LANGLEY. Let the gentleman from Iowa ask again to extend his remarks, and I express the hope that my friend from Arkansas will not insist upon his objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I wish to ask the gentleman from Iowa if when he went to the committee room he was informed by the clerk that these were the figures, or did he ask specifically for the figures, or a copy of the printed record.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the objection that I made to the request of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GOOD. In reply to the gentleman from Florida I will say that I do not remember exactly what I asked the clerk, but the clerk gave me this book, which was very kind of him. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Iowa has 11 Members in this House; 13 projects for Iowa are named in this bill, and in only one place are the receipts less than \$10,000 per year.

Kansas has 8 Members of the House; 11 Kansas items are provided for in this bill, and in but two of the places named are the receipts less than \$10,000 per year.

Maine has 4 Members in this House; 4 items for Maine are in this bill, and in each of the 4 places provided for Maine the receipts are more than \$10,000 per year.

Massachusetts has 16 Members in this House; 14 Massachusetts items are provided for in this bill, and in every one of those places the postal receipts are more than \$10,000 per year.

Michigan has 13 Members in the House; 10 Michigan items are provided for in the bill, and in only one of those places are the receipts less than \$10,000 per year.

Minnesota has 10 Members in the House; 7 items are provided for in the bill, and the postal receipts in each of those places are more than \$10,000 a year.

Montana has 2 Members in the House; 4 Montana items are authorized in the bill, and in all of those places the receipts are more than \$10,000 a year.

Nebraska has 6 Members in the House; there are 6 Nebraska items in the bill, and in only one of those places are the receipts less than \$10,000 a year.

New Hampshire has 2 Members of the House; there are 2 items in the bill for New Hampshire, and the receipts in each of those places are more than \$10,000 a year.

New Jersey has 12 Members in the House, and 7 items provided for in this bill, and in all of those 7 places the receipts are more than \$10,000 a year.

New York has 43 Members in the House; there are 21 New York items in this bill, and in every place provided for New York the receipts are more than \$10,000 per year.

North Dakota has 3 Members in the House, and 2 items in this bill. In both of those places the receipts are more than \$10,000 a year.

Ohio has 22 Members in the House, and 14 items in the bill, and in each of those places the receipts are in excess of \$10,000 per year.

Oregon has 3 Members in the House, and 4 items in the bill, and in the 4 places the receipts are in excess of \$10,000 a year.

Pennsylvania has 36 Members in the House, and 25 items in the bill, and in all of those places the postal receipts are in excess of \$10,000 a year.

South Dakota has 3 Members in the House, and 3 items in the bill, and in each of those places the receipts are in excess of \$10,000 a year.

Washington has 5 Members in the House; there are 3 Washington items in this bill, and in each of the Washington places the receipts are more than \$10,000 per year.

Measured therefore by the same rule, and taking the same postal receipts for the same years, we have 10 Southern States, excluding Texas, carrying 110 items in the bill, and in 84 of those places the receipts are less than \$10,000 a year, and in only 26 of those places are the receipts more than \$10,000 a year; while in 24 Northern States the bill authorizes 200 projects, 191 of which are, according to the committee's rule, meritorious, and 9 should be rejected. In other words, out of 110 southern cities provided for in this bill 26 are meritorious projects and 84 are pure "pork," according to the committee's rule; while out of 200 northern cities 191 are meritorious projects and only 9 are pure "pork." And yet the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], the chairman of the committee that reports this bill, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], also a member of the committee reporting this bill, complain because the gentleman from Wisconsin has characterized this bill as a sectional one.

The rule of the committee for measuring "pork," provided for on page 62 of the bill, is as follows:

That from and after the passage of this act no city or town in the United States where there are no Federal activities other than the post office shall be considered, either for the purchase of a site or for the construction of a Federal building, by the commission of public buildings or the bureau of public buildings or by any committee of Congress, unless it shall appear that the postal receipts for such city or town have amounted to at least \$10,000 annually for three successive years: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall apply to cities or towns where sites for public buildings have been acquired or authorized.

In answer to practically the only criticism of this analysis, that I have not taken into account the other activities of the Government in these towns and villages which obtained an authorization in this bill, where the receipts are less than \$10,000 per annum, I desire to call attention to the fact that in Alabama not in a single one of the eight places mentioned in the bill where the receipts are under \$10,000 is there any other activity mentioned in this report from which I have read.

In Arkansas no Government activity is mentioned in the three villages referred to where the receipts are under \$10,000.

Likewise in Florida none of the towns with receipts under \$10,000 are referred to as having any other Federal activities.

So, too, in Tennessee, in none of the nine towns mentioned in the bill is any other Federal activity referred to.

North Carolina mentions 2 of the 12 as having other Federal activities.

In South Carolina one of the eight places complained of is named as having other Federal activities, and in Mississippi



one of the six is described as having other Government activities. It will be observed, therefore, that there is absolutely no merit in this contention. It appears that these villages have not only small postal receipts but also no other Federal activities.

In accordance with the promise to extend in the RECORD the complete data furnished me by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I submit the following: Detailed statement with regard to the States to which I have referred is taken

literally from the "Statement of bills referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, showing all items included in the public-building bill, House of Representatives, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, revised and corrected to July 25, 1916." The statement does not show the bills introduced upon which no action was taken by the committee reporting the bill. Otherwise it is taken literally from said statement and shows everything shown by the original statement regarding the towns and villages included in the bill.

*Statement of bills referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, showing all items included in the public-building bill, House of Representatives, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, revised and corrected to July 25, 1916.*

## ALABAMA.

No. of bill.	Introduced by—	City.	Purpose.	Amount asked.	Treasury estimate.		Gross postal receipts, fiscal year 1915.	Population, 1910.	Branches of the service requiring accommodations.	Remarks.	Committee recommendations.	Purpose.
					Building.	Site.						
84	Mr. Almon.....	Athens.....	Building and site.	\$150,000	\$45,000	\$5,000	\$9,393.82	1,715	Post office.....		\$35,000	Building and site.
85	do.....	Sheffield.....	do.....	100,000			7,968.77	4,865	do.....		5,000	Site.
3678	Mr. Steagall.....	Union Springs	Building	50,000	45,000		7,027.98	4,055	do.....	Site already authorized.	25,000	Building.
9531	Mr. Dent.....	Montgomery..	Building and site.	1,000,000	600,000	175,000	191,567.19	38,136	Post office, United States court, Departments of War and Agriculture, Internal Revenue, and Land Office.		175,000	Site.
10036	Mr. Blackmon..	Sylacauga.....	Building	75,000	25,000		7,256.27	1,456	Post office.....	Site already authorized.	30,000	Building.
13108	Mr. Dent.....	Greenville.....	do.....	60,000	35,000		9,294.81	3,377	do.....	do.....	30,000	Do.
13384	Mr. Burnett.....	Albertville.....	do.....	50,000	30,000		5,633.04	1,544	do.....	do.....	25,000	Do.
13286	do.....	Attalla.....	do.....	50,000	25,000		5,633.04	2,513	do.....	do.....	30,000	Do.
15525	Mr. Gray.....	Mobile.....	Enlarge and remodel present building.	250,000	250,000		211,941.40	51,521	Customhouse.....		100,000	Extension.
16639	Mr. Steagall.....	Ozark.....	Site.....	5,000			6,416.74	2,229	Post office.....		5,000	Site.

## ARKANSAS.

3640	Mr. Caraway...	Blytheville...	Building and site.	\$75,000	\$50,000	\$10,000	\$11,683.91	3,849	Post office, Agriculture.		\$9,000	Site.
3641	do.....	Forrest City..	Building	100,000	55,000		9,087.77	2,484	do.....	Site already authorized.	25,000	Building.
3702	Mr. Oldfield...	Brinkley.....	Building and site.	50,000	25,000		6,114.53	1,740	Post office.....	do.....	25,000	Do.
4747	Mr. Wingo.....	Van Buren.....	do.....	60,000	45,000	5,000	9,884.36	3,878	do.....		6,000	Site.
4800	Mr. Jacobway...	Conway.....	Building	75,000	55,000		13,126.17	2,794	Post office, Agriculture, Internal Revenue.	Site already authorized.	40,000	Building.
4802	do.....	Little Rock...	Building and site.	1,000,000	550,000	200,000	345,988.12	45,941	Post office, court, Internal Revenue, Navy, Interior, War, and Agriculture.		175,000	Site.
6462	Mr. Taylor.....	Stuttgart.....	do.....	60,000	50,000		12,940.02	2,740	Post office, Agriculture.	Site already authorized.	30,000	Building.
	do.....	El Dorado.....	Building				9,806.93	4,202	Post office.....		25,000	Do.

## FLORIDA.

254	Mr. Sparkman..	Arcadia.....	Building and site.	\$100,000	\$50,000	\$5,000	\$14,564.89	1,736	Post office, Agriculture.		\$5,000	Site.
8927	Mr. Sears.....	West Palm Beach.	do.....	56,000	60,000	10,000	25,850.58	1,743	do.....		10,000	Do.
10304	Mr. Clark of Fla.	Lake City.....	Building	60,000	50,000		11,203.32	5,032	do.....	Site already acquired.	35,000	Building.
14909	do.....	Perry.....	Site.....	5,000		5,000	6,439.25	1,012	Post office.....		5,000	Site.
14910	do.....	Monticello.....	do.....	5,000		5,000	6,065.70	1,829	do.....		5,000	Do.
16416	Mr. Sparkman..	Clearwater.....	Building and site.	100,000	40,000	5,000	10,959.77	1,171	do.....		40,000	Building and site.
16752	Mr. Sears.....	Kissimmee.....	Building	40,000			12,048.85	2,157	do.....		35,000	Building.

## GEORGIA.

395	Mr. Vinson.....	Sandersville..	Building.....	\$65,000	\$55,000		\$7,855.16	2,641	Post Office, Agriculture, Internal Revenue.	Site already acquired.	\$30,000	Building.
3567	Mr. Park.....	Pelham.....	do.....	60,000	25,000	\$5,000	6,719.12	1,880	do.....		6,000	Site.
3568	do.....	Cairo.....	do.....	60,000	45,000	5,000	7,273.48	1,505	do.....		6,000	Do.
3569	do.....	Blakely.....	do.....	60,000	40,000	5,000	6,827.50	1,838	do.....		6,000	Do.
4794	Mr. Edwards.....	Waynesboro...	do.....	75,000	30,000		7,622.28	2,729	do.....	Site already authorized.	25,000	Building.
7542	Mr. Tribble.....	Covington.....	do.....	75,000	35,000	5,000	7,931.21	2,697	Post office.....		5,000	Site.
7543	do.....	Monroe.....	do.....	75,000	45,000		7,361.51	3,029	Post office, Agriculture.	Site already authorized.	30,000	Building.
7646	Mr. Bell.....	Commerce.....	do.....	50,000	25,000	5,000	6,290.89	2,238	Post office.....		5,000	Site.
7647	do.....	Winder.....	do.....	60,000	45,000	5,000	7,317.19	2,443	do.....		5,000	Do.
8021	Mr. Howard.....	Decatur.....	do.....	75,000	40,000	8,000	7,230.65	2,466	Post office, Agriculture.		8,000	Do.
8022	do.....	East Point.....	do.....	75,000	45,000	10,000	11,425.61	3,682	Post office.....		8,000	Do.
8478	Mr. Lee.....	Rossville.....	do.....	50,000	30,000		8,062.48	1,959	do.....	Site already authorized.	25,000	Building.
9665	Mr. Hughes.....	Hawkinsville..	Building and site.	75,000	45,000	10,000	8,129.91	3,420	do.....		8,000	Site.
10127	Mr. Walker.....	Baxley.....	do.....	50,000			6,639.50	831	do.....		5,000	Do.
13425	Mr. Crisp.....	Cuthbert.....	Site.....	10,000		5,000	7,813.40	3,210	do.....		5,000	Do.
13426	do.....	Ashburn.....	do.....	10,000		5,000	6,468.82	2,214	do.....		5,000	Do.



## Statement of bills referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, etc.—Continued.

## GEORGIA—continued.

No. of bill.	Introduced by—	City.	Purpose.	Amount asked.	Treasury estimate.		Gross postal receipts, fiscal year 1915.	Population, 1910.	Branches of the service requiring accommodations.	Remarks.	Committee recommendations.	Purpose.
					Building	Site.						
15873	Mr. Wise.....	Thomaston....	Building and site.	\$60,000	\$30,000	\$5,000	\$6,144.63	1,645	Post office.....	.....	\$5,000	Site.
15874	.....do.....	Jackson.....	do.....	60,000	30,000	5,000	6,647.65	1,862	do.....	.....	5,000	Do.
16940	Mr. Hughes.....	Fort Valley....	Site.....	8,000	.....	.....	10,408.97	2,697	do.....	.....	8,000	Do.

## KENTUCKY.

6843	Mr. Powers.....	Barbourville..	Building and site.	\$100,000	\$25,000	.....	\$4,532.95	1,633	Post office, Agriculture, mine rescue station.	Site already authorized.	\$25,000	Building.
10649	Mr. Kincheloe..	Madisonville..	Building.....	65,000	50,000	.....	12,615.03	4,966	Post office, Agriculture.	do.....	40,000	Do.
10651	Mr. Cantrill....	Eminence.....	do.....	50,000	30,000	.....	4,402.53	1,274	Post office.....	do.....	40,000	Do.
11248	Mr. Helm.....	Stanford.....	Site.....	10,000	.....	.....	6,228.48	1,532	do.....	.....	5,000	Site.
11862	Mr. Thomas.....	Russellville..	Building and site.	75,000	.....	.....	8,512.50	3,111	do.....	.....	10,000	Do.
11866	.....do.....	Central City...	Building.....	75,000	30,000	.....	5,707.92	2,545	Post office, Internal Revenue.	Site already authorized.	30,000	Building.
12117	Mr. Langley....	Hazard.....	Building and site.	75,000	25,000	\$5,000	4,447.43	537	Post office.....	.....	40,000	Building and site.
12118	.....do.....	Pikeville.....	Building.....	70,000	25,000	.....	6,149.72	1,280	do.....	Site already authorized.	35,000	Building.
12279	Mr. Rouse.....	Falmouth.....	do.....	50,000	25,000	.....	5,638.24	1,180	do.....	do.....	25,000	Do.
13843	Mr. Powers.....	Pineville.....	Building and site.	100,000	35,000	6,000	7,369.33	2,161	do.....	do.....	5,000	Site.
14186	Mr. Barkley....	Murray.....	Building.....	75,000	.....	.....	6,357.93	2,089	do.....	Site already authorized.	25,000	Building.
14187	.....do.....	Hickman.....	Building and site.	75,000	45,000	5,000	8,538.80	2,736	do.....	.....	5,000	Site.
16663	Mr. Cantrill....	Owenton.....	Site.....	10,000	.....	.....	4,368.68	1,024	do.....	.....	7,500	Site (supplemental bill).

## LOUISIANA.

461	Mr. Lazaro.....	De Ridder.....	Building and site.	\$75,000	\$45,000	\$5,000	\$8,854.54	2,100	Post office.....	Site to be donated.	\$30,000	Building.
544	Mr. Aswell.....	Winnfield.....	do.....	100,000	40,000	5,000	9,098.12	2,925	do.....	.....	30,000	Building (site to be donated).
557	.....do.....	Alexandria....	Increase limit of cost of extension.	30,000	30,000	.....	72,261.35	11,213	Post office, courthouse.	\$65,000 already authorized for this purpose.	30,000	Increase.
6336	Mr. Martin.....	Morgan City...	Building and site.	50,000	30,000	7,000	8,370.63	5,447	Post office, customs.	Site already authorized.	40,000	Building.
6837	.....do.....	Houma.....	do.....	50,000	50,000	10,000	12,095.41	5,024	Post office, Department of Agriculture.	.....	50,000	Building and site.
6885	Mr. Watkins....	Mansfield.....	do.....	75,000	35,000	5,000	11,192.23	1,799	Post office.....	.....	35,000	Do.
10923	Mr. Morgan.....	Plaquemine....	do.....	75,000	30,000	5,000	11,437.05	4,955	Post office, Agriculture.	.....	35,000	Do.
15684	Mr. Wilson.....	Monroe.....	Enlargement of present building.	40,000	.....	.....	52,764.15	10,209	Post office.....	.....	30,000	Increase, for extension (supplemental bill).
16531	Mr. Estopinal..	New Orleans..	Building.....	500,000	.....	.....	.....	339,075	Quarantine station.	.....	500,000	Building (site to be donated).

## MISSISSIPPI.

12423	Mr. Collier.....	Jackson.....	Addition to present building.	\$100,000	\$100,000	.....	\$114,150.25	21,262	Post office, courthouse, and Agriculture.	.....	\$100,000	Extension.
13832	Mr. Harrison...	Columbia.....	Site.....	10,000	.....	\$6,000	8,505.15	2,029	Post office.....	.....	5,000	Site.
13921	.....do.....	Pascagoula....	do.....	10,000	.....	5,000	6,179.94	3,379	do.....	.....	5,000	Do.
14773	Mr. Humphreys..	Lexington.....	do.....	5,000	.....	5,000	8,421.84	2,428	Post office, Agriculture.	.....	5,000	Do.
14774	.....do.....	Indianola.....	do.....	5,000	.....	5,000	7,661.88	1,098	Post office.....	.....	5,000	Do.
16304	Mr. Sisson.....	Winona.....	Building and site.	100,000	30,000	5,000	8,584.35	2,512	do.....	.....	7,500	Do.
16867	.....do.....	Okolona.....	do.....	75,000	.....	.....	6,160.70	2,584	do.....	.....	5,000	Do.

## NORTH CAROLINA.

3108	Mr. Pou.....	Louisburg.....	Building and site.	\$125,000	\$50,000	\$10,000	\$8,128.64	1,775	Post office, Agriculture.	.....	\$6,000	Site.
3655	Mr. Page.....	Wadesboro....	Increase limit of cost of site.	5,000	.....	5,000	8,254.70	2,376	Post office.....	\$5,000 already authorized for site.	5,000	Increase.
3656	.....do.....	Sanford.....	Site.....	10,000	45,000	5,000	9,568.04	2,282	do.....	.....	7,000	Site.
3663	.....do.....	Rockingham...	Increase limit of cost of site.	5,000	.....	5,000	9,095.60	2,155	do.....	\$5,000 already authorized for site.	5,000	Increase.
8230	Mr. Stedman...	Mount Airy...	Building.....	100,000	55,000	.....	11,692.02	3,844	Post office, Agriculture, Internal Revenue.	Site already authorized.	55,000	Building, \$5,000; increase for site.
8479	Mr. Godwin....	Lumberton....	do.....	75,000	45,000	.....	12,433.98	2,230	Post office.....	do.....	30,000	Building.
8480	.....do.....	Dunn.....	Building and site.	85,000	40,000	8,000	9,252.97	1,823	do.....	.....	7,000	Site.
9043	Mr. Doughton..	Albemarle....	do.....	70,000	45,000	10,000	8,759.99	2,116	do.....	.....	8,000	Do.
9526	.....do.....	Lenoir.....	Building.....	75,000	55,000	.....	9,827.27	3,364	Post office, Internal Revenue.	Site already acquired.	30,000	Building.



## Statement of bills referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, etc.—Continued.

## NORTH CAROLINA—continued.

No. of bill.	Introduced by—	City.	Purpose.	Amount asked.	Treasury estimate.		Gross postal receipts, fiscal year 1915.	Population, 1910.	Branches of the service requiring accommodations.	Remarks.	Committee recommendations.	Purpose.
					Building	Site.						
9532	Mr. Webb.....	Morganton....	Building and site.	\$100,000	\$55,000	\$6,000	\$10,211.35	2,712	Post office, Agriculture, Internal Revenue.		\$35,000	Building and site.
10770	Mr. Kitchin....	Wilson.....	Increase limit of cost so as to provide for United States court.	50,000	60,000		24,560.94	6,717	Post office, United States court, Agriculture.	\$80,000 already authorized.	75,000	Increase.
11797	Mr. Small.....	Williamston..	Building and site.	75,000	30,000	5,000	6,043.13	1,574	Post office.....		5,000	Site.
11867	Mr. Hood.....	Mount Olive..	Building.....	50,000	35,000		5,679.28	1,071	do.....	Site already authorized.	30,000	Building.
14622	do.....	Clinton.....	Site.....	10,000		5,000	6,254.73	1,101	do.....		5,000	Site.
14768	Mr. Britt.....	Marion.....	Building and site.	100,000			8,315.52	1,519	do.....		6,000	Do.
16181	Mr. Small.....	Edenton.....	Building.....	60,000	35,000		8,861.03	2,789	do.....	Site already authorized.	25,000	Building.

## SOUTH CAROLINA.

8245	Mr. Byrnes.....	Aiken.....	Secretary of Treasury authorized to either remodel old building or build new one.	\$60,000	See report.		\$13,818.85	3,911	United States court.		\$75,000	Extension.
9422	Mr. Finley.....	Rock Hill....	do.....	60,000	\$125,000	\$30,000	23,975.34	7,216	United States court, Agriculture.		125,000	Building.
9424	do.....	York.....	Building and site.	100,000	35,000	5,000	8,596.98	2,326	Postoffice.....		9,000	Site.
10403	Mr. Ragsdale...	Dillon.....	Building.....	50,000	30,000		7,733.63	1,757	do.....	Site already authorized.	25,000	Building.
10408	do.....	Conway.....	Site.....	5,000		5,000	6,030.89	1,228	Post office, Agriculture.		3,000	Site.
10409	do.....	Hartsville...	do.....	(1)		5,000	9,884.33	2,365	Post office.....		3,000	Do.
11167	Mr. Aiken.....	Greenwood....	Provides for new building and site or enlargement of present post office building.	100,000	80,000	10,000	23,297.36	6,614	United States court.	See supplemental report.	125,000	Building and site.
14076	Mr. Whaley.....	Manning.....	Site.....	10,000			5,435.28	1,854	Post office.....		5,000	Site.
14078	do.....	Summerville..	do.....	10,000		5,000	7,796.61	2,355	do.....		5,000	Do.
14128	Mr. Aiken.....	Easley.....	Building and site.	100,000			5,342.35	2,983	do.....		5,000	Do.
14481	Mr. Nicholls...	Greer.....	do.....	50,000			6,643.48	1,673	do.....		5,000	Do.
15871	Mr. Byrnes.....	Bamberg.....	Site.....	5,000			5,762.12	1,937	do.....		5,000	Do.

## TENNESSEE.

304	Mr. Houston...	Lewisburg....	Building and site.	\$65,000	\$50,000	\$5,000	\$9,430.44	1,830	Post office.....		\$5,000	Site.
641	Mr. Sells.....	Rogersville...	do.....	75,000			7,679.56	1,242	do.....	Site already authorized.	25,000	Building.
687	Mr. Austin.....	Rockwood....	do.....	60,000			6,242.98	3,660	do.....		6,000	Site.
688	do.....	LaFollette...	do.....	160,000			5,065.98	2,816	do.....		6,000	Do.
690	do.....	Lenoir City...	do.....	60,000			6,460.46	3,392	do.....		6,000	Do.
3068	Mr. Moon.....	McMinnville..	do.....	50,000	45,000	5,000	8,724.74	2,299	do.....		5,000	Do.
3106	Mr. Sims.....	Huntington...	Building.....	50,000			4,427.28	1,112	do.....	Site already authorized.	25,000	Building.
6788	Mr. Padgett...	Dickson.....	Building and site.	65,000	40,000	5,000	7,451.91	1,850	do.....		5,000	Site.
13668	Mr. Garrett....	Brownsville..	do.....	50,000	30,000	5,000	8,111.42	2,882	do.....		5,000	Do.

## TEXAS.

63	Mr. Slayden...	Coleman.....	Building.....	\$65,000	\$50,000		\$10,723.84	3,046	Post Office, Agriculture.	Site already acquired.	\$30,000	Building.
334	Mr. Stephens...	Plainview....	Building and site.	50,000	45,000	\$5,000	16,330.20	2,829	Post office.....		45,000	Building and site.
4656	Mr. Gregg.....	Crockett.....	Building.....	75,000	45,000		7,801.03	3,947	do.....	Site already acquired.	25,000	Building.
5790	Mr. Dies.....	Jacksonville..	Site.....	10,000			12,763.95	2,875	do.....		5,000	Site (supplemental bill).
5794	Mr. Callaway...	Fort Worth...	Remodeling of old building, acquisition of new site, and erection of building.	800,000	500,000	200,000	411,999.85	73,312	do.....		500,000	Building and site.
8920	Mr. Buchanan...	Lockhart.....	Site.....	10,000			10,617.08	2,945	do.....		6,000	Site.
9811	Mr. Sumners...	Dallas.....	Building and site.	2,250,000	1,250,000		1,070,751.49	92,104	Post office, court, internal revenue, customs, Departments of Interior, Labor, Agriculture, War, and Navy.	Also authorize sale of old building and site after completion of new building.	1,250,000	Building, also \$550,000 for sub post-office building and site.
9816	Mr. Hardy.....	Mexia.....	do.....	80,000	45,000	6,000	10,500.86	2,694	Post office.....		35,000	Building and site.
11422	Mr. Buchanan...	Georgetown...	Building.....	75,000	45,000		12,281.22	3,096	do.....	Site already authorized.	30,000	Building.

<sup>1</sup> No amount specified.



*Statement of bills referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, etc.—Continued.*  
TEXAS—continued.

No. of bill.	Introduced by—	City.	Purpose.	Amount asked.	Treasury estimate.		Gross postal receipts, fiscal year 1915.	Population, 1910.	Branches of the service requiring accommodations.	Remarks.	Committee recommendations.	Purpose.
					Building	Site.						
11532	Mr. McLemore..	Kingville....	Building and site.	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$5,000	\$13,261.14	\$1,500	Post office, Department of Labor.		\$40,000	Building and site.
11789	Mr. Smith.....	Sweetwater....	Building.....	100,000	55,000		14,349.94	4,176	Post office, Agriculture.	Site already acquired.	35,000	Building.
12546	Mr. Eagle.....	Huntsville....	do.....	75,000	55,000		10,707.61	2,072	Post office.....	do.....	30,000	Do.
13710	Mr. Black.....	Paris.....	do.....	200,000	200,000		46,498.85	11,269	do.....	Site now owned by Government.	170,000	Do.
13826	Mr. Davis.....	San Benito....	Building and site.	60,000	40,000	5,000	8,199.12	1,000	Post office, customs.		6,000	Site.
13919	Mr. Dies.....	Lufkin.....	do.....	100,000	45,000	10,000	12,026.45	2,749	Post office.....		35,000	Building and site.
13977	Mr. Garner.....	Seguin.....	Building.....	50,000	45,000		10,884.68	3,116	do.....	Site already acquired.	30,000	Building.
14032	Mr. Burgess....	Alvin.....	Building and site.	65,000	35,000	5,000	9,051.14	1,453	do.....		6,000	Site.
15094	Mr. Young.....	Henderson.....	do.....	65,000	25,000	5,000	6,666.76	3,200	do.....		5,000	Do.

## CALIFORNIA.

211	Mr. Curry.....	Sacramento...	To provide accommodations in present building for United States court.	\$50,000	See report.		\$437,816.28	44,696	United States court.		\$50,000	Extension.
244	Mr. Stephens...	Venice.....	Building and site.	100,000	\$50,000	\$10,000	18,591.77	5,000	Post office.....		10,000	Site.
375	Mr. Raker.....	Placerville....	do.....	50,000	55,000	7,000	10,038.38	1,914	Post office, Agriculture.		10,000	Do.
378	do.....	Susanville....	do.....	60,000	45,000	5,000	7,058.08	888	Post office, Land Office, Weather Bureau, Forestry and Veterinary Services.		10,000	Do.
428	Mr. Kent.....	Petaluma.....	do.....	60,000	50,000	15,000	32,348.61	5,880	Post office.....		60,000	Building and site.
521	Mr. Kettner....	San Bernardino.	Building.....	150,000	85,000		47,247.08	12,779	Post office, Departments of Labor and Agriculture.	Site already acquired.	70,000	Building.
3610	Mr. Randall....	Long Beach....	do.....	303,000	230,000		99,319.04	17,809	Post office.....	do.....	200,000	Do.
4725	Mr. Stephens...	Santa Monica..	Building and site.	200,000	55,000	20,000	41,139.36	7,847	do.....		15,000	Site.
4846	Mr. Kahn.....	San Francisco..	Building.....	500,000	600,000			416,912	Marine hospital.		600,000	Buildings.
4925	Mr. Church.....	Modesto.....	do.....	100,000	65,000		24,634.82	4,034	Post office.....	Site already authorized.	65,000	Building.
10834	Mr. Elston.....	Oakland.....	do.....	1,000,000	650,000		509,256.09	150,174	Post office, Internal Revenue, Customs, Departments of Labor, War, and Navy.	Present site to be used.	650,000	Do.
12028	Mr. Kettner....	Redlands.....	Site.....	30,000		35,000	40,527.68	10,449	Post office, Agriculture.		30,000	Site.
14728	Mr. Hayes.....	San Mateo.....	Building and site.	100,000	45,000	10,000	17,909.63	4,334	Post office.....		15,000	Do.
14766	do.....	San Jose.....	Authorizing sale of present site and building, acquisition of new site, and erection of building.	350,000			143,972.60	28,946	do.....		15,000	Do.

## COLORADO.

25	Mr. Taylor.....	Montrose.....	Building.....	\$250,000	\$200,000		\$17,919.54	3,254	Post office, land office, courts, Reclamation Service, Forest Service.	Site already acquired.	\$150,000	Building.
3714	Mr. Timberlake.	Sterling.....	do.....	75,000	55,000		17,969.35	3,044	Post office, land office, Agriculture, Interior.	Site already authorized.	55,000	Do.
11473	Mr. Keating....	Canon City....	do.....	100,000	55,000		23,383.58	5,162	Post office, Agriculture.	Site already acquired.	55,000	Do.

## CONNECTICUT.

438	Mr. Oakley.....	Manchester....	Building.....	\$90,000	\$45,000		\$10,462.38	3,600	Post office.....	Site already acquired.	\$40,000	Building.
462	Mr. Glynn.....	Winsted.....	Building and site.	100,000	50,000	\$15,000	29,672.37	7,754	do.....		60,000	Building and site.
4720	Mr. Hill.....	Norwalk.....	do.....	150,000	115,000	25,000	27,246.60	6,954	Post office, customs.		140,000	Do.
12983	Mr. Freeman....	Essex.....	do.....	60,000	25,000	10,000	8,087.39	2,100	Post office.....		6,000	Site.

## DELAWARE.

14121	Mr. Miller.....	Newark.....	Building.....	\$40,000			\$11,388.31	1,913	Post office.....	Site already authorized.	\$30,000	Building.
-------	-----------------	-------------	---------------	----------	--	--	-------------	-------	------------------	--------------------------	----------	-----------



## Statement of bills referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, etc.—Continued.

## IDAHO.

No. of bill.	Introduced by—	City.	Purpose.	Amount asked.	Treasury estimate.		Gross postal receipts, fiscal year 1915.	Population, 1910.	Branches of the service requiring accommodations.	Remarks.	Committee recommendations.	Purpose.
					Building	Site.						
297	Mr. McCracken.	Coeur d'Alene.	Increase limit of cost so as to provide accommodations for United States court.	\$25,000	\$88,200	.....	\$19,499.84	7,291	Post office, Interior, United States court, Agriculture.	\$100,000 already authorized.	\$88,200	Increase.
6795	Mr. Smith.....	Blackfoot.....	Building and site.	100,000	55,000	\$10,000	18,414.45	2,202	Post office, United States land office.	.....	65,000	Building and site.

## ILLINOIS.

95	Mr. Stone.....	Spring Valley.	Building.....	\$100,000	\$35,000	.....	\$10,372.32	7,035	Post office.....	Site already authorized.	\$30,000	Building.
4683	Mr. Gallagher..	West Side, Chicago.	Increase.....	4,250,000	.....	\$5,000,000 to 6,000,000	23,418,574.86	2,185,283	.....do.....	\$1,750,000 already authorized.	4,250,000	Increase.
5768	Mr. Wheeler....	Carlinville....	Building and site.	75,000	45,000	.....	12,566.28	3,616	.....do.....	Site already authorized.	30,000	Building.
6029	.....do.....	Springfield....	Addition to present building.	300,000	.....	.....	291,809.41	51,678	.....do.....	.....	100,000	Extension (supplemental bill).
6032	Mr. Fuller.....	Peru.....	Building and site.	100,000	45,000	10,000	16,247.75	7,984	.....do.....	.....	45,000	Building and site.
6059	Mr. Foster.....	Effingham.....	.....do.....	75,000	50,000	10,000	12,093.76	3,898	Post office, internal revenue.	.....	45,000	Do.
6101	Mr. Denison....	Carbondale....	.....do.....	75,000	50,000	7,000	15,980.68	5,411	Post office.....	.....	60,000	Do.
9410	Mr. King.....	Galva.....	.....do.....	60,000	45,000	10,000	15,691.44	2,498	.....do.....	.....	45,000	Building site.
9430	Mr. Sterling....	Bloomington....	.....do.....	150,000	135,000	50,000	122,227.54	25,768	Post office, Departments of War and Agriculture.	.....	150,000	Building and site.
9824	Mr. Wm. Elza Williams.	Pittsfield.....	.....do.....	60,000	35,000	5,000	11,289.17	2,095	Post office.....	.....	35,000	Do.
11880	Mr. McAndrews.	Oak Park.....	Building.....	400,000	135,000	.....	83,670.58	19,444	.....do.....	.....	150,000	Extension.
12115	Mr. Rodenberg.	Highland.....	.....do.....	60,000	30,000	.....	9,611.45	2,675	.....do.....	Site already authorized.	25,000	Building.
14193	Mr. McKinley..	Decatur.....	Enlargement of present building.	50,000	70,000	.....	152,410.29	31,140	.....do.....	.....	50,000	Extension.
14429	Mr. Tavenner..	East Moline....	Building and site.	70,000	55,000	10,000	14,252.47	2,665	.....do.....	.....	45,000	Building and site.
14663	Mr. Chipfield..	Lewistown....	Site.....	15,000	.....	5,000	8,311.56	2,312	.....do.....	.....	5,000	Site.
16996	Mr. Wilson.....	Harvey.....	Building and site.	100,000	.....	.....	22,017.42	7,227	.....do.....	.....	55,000	Building and site.
17080	Mr. Rainey....	Havana.....	Building.....	40,000	.....	.....	12,106.02	3,525	.....do.....	Site already authorized.	40,000	Building.
17081	.....do.....	Carrollton....	.....do.....	25,000	.....	.....	7,854.95	2,323	.....do.....	.....do.....	25,000	Do.

## INDIANA.

97	Mr. Cullop.....	Linton.....	Building.....	\$100,000	\$45,000	.....	\$11,988.51	5,906	Post office.....	Site already authorized.	\$35,000	Building.
3072	Mr. Cline.....	Fort Wayne....	Building and site.	500,000	400,000	\$175,000	323,056.53	63,933	Post office, United States court, Internal Revenue, Departments of Labor and Navy, Weather Bureau.	.....	550,000	Building and site.
3612	Mr. Lieb.....	Mount Vernon	Building.....	100,000	55,000	.....	13,233.74	5,563	Post office, Agriculture.	Site already authorized.	40,000	Building.
11946	Mr. Morrison..	Lebanon.....	.....do.....	100,000	60,000	.....	18,287.34	5,474	.....do.....	.....	45,000	Do.
15493	Mr. Adair.....	Decatur.....	.....do.....	60,000	55,000	.....	17,099.73	4,471	.....do.....	.....	45,000	Do.
16493	Mr. Dixon.....	Lawrenceburg	Building and site.	100,000	.....	.....	13,357.26	3,930	.....do.....	.....	10,000	Site.
16494	.....do.....	Franklin.....	.....do.....	100,000	.....	.....	12,920.99	4,502	.....do.....	.....	10,000	Do.
16680	.....do.....	Greensburg....	Building.....	75,000	.....	.....	18,477.35	5,420	.....do.....	.....	45,000	Building.
16701	Mr. Rauch.....	Hartford City	Building and site.	80,000	.....	.....	15,983.64	6,187	.....do.....	.....	50,000	Building and site.

## IOWA.

664	Mr. Kennedy....	Fairfield.....	Building.....	\$100,000	\$50,000	.....	\$28,798.31	4,970	Post office.....	Site already authorized.	\$50,000	Building.
769	Mr. Towner....	Corning.....	Building and site.	60,000	45,000	\$5,000.	10,133.25	1,702	.....do.....	.....	35,000	Building and site.
779	Mr. Kennedy....	Mount Pleasant.	.....do.....	100,000	.....	.....	17,011.87	3,874	.....do.....	.....	7,500	Site.
4682	Mr. Hull.....	Marango.....	Building.....	50,000	30,000	.....	7,503.33	1,786	.....do.....	Site already acquired.	30,000	Building.
7618	Mr. Woods.....	Algona.....	Building and site.	80,000	45,000	10,000	15,210.44	2,908	.....do.....	.....	45,000	Building and site.
8022	Mr. Ramseyer..	Newton.....	Building.....	90,000	55,000	.....	32,156.54	4,616	.....do.....	Site already authorized.	55,000	Building.
9522	Mr. Towner....	Shenandoah....	Enlarge present building.	25,000	50,000	.....	68,266.65	4,976	.....do.....	.....	14,000	Extension.
11868	Mr. Sweet.....	Eagle Grove..	Building and site.	80,000	45,000	10,000	11,625.90	3,387	.....do.....	.....	35,000	Building and site.
12493	Mr. Haugen....	Oelwein.....	Building.....	100,000	40,000	.....	16,333.03	6,028	.....do.....	Site already acquired.	40,000	Building.
12588	Mr. Green.....	Harlan.....	Building and site.	50,000	45,000	7,000	11,809.90	2,570	.....do.....	.....	35,000	Building and site.

Statement of bills referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, etc.—Continued.

## IOWA—continued.

No. of bill.	Introduced by—	City.	Purpose.	Amount asked.	Treasury estimate.		Gross postal receipts, fiscal year 1915.	Population, 1910.	Branches of the service requiring accommodations.	Remarks.	Committee recommendations.	Purpose.
					Building.	Site.						
14065	Mr. Steele.....	Sioux City....	Additional land and enlargement of present building.	\$350,000	\$275,000	\$60,000	\$416,151.14	47,828	Post office.....		\$335,000	Extension.
16464	Mr. Dowell.....	Knoxville.....	Building and site.	50,000			12,949.11	3,190	do.....		40,000	Building and site.
16466	do.....	Indianola.....	do.....	50,000			12,538.14	3,283	do.....		5,000	Site.

## KANSAS.

106	Mr. Campbell...	Columbus.....	Building and site.	\$75,000			\$13,279.63	3,064	Post office.....		\$50,000	Building and site.
107	do.....	Oswego.....	do.....	75,000	\$45,000	\$5,000	15,166.97	2,713	do.....		5,000	Site.
708	Mr. Ayres.....	Wellington.....	do.....	15,000				7,034	Entomological laboratory.		15,000	Building.
4733	Mr. Taggart.....	Olathe.....	do.....	75,000	45,000	10,000	15,919.26	3,272	Post office.....		55,000	Building and site.
4734	do.....	Fort Scott.....	Addition to present building.	75,000	85,000	5,000	34,351.90	10,463	Post office, courthouse.		5,000	Additional land.
6917	Mr. Helvering...	Junction City..	Building and site.	75,000	50,000	10,000	17,777.05	5,598	Post office.....		55,000	Building and site.
7558	Mr. Shouse.....	Dodge City.....	do.....	100,000	55,000	12,000	21,246.73	3,214	Post office, Agriculture, Interior.		60,000	Do.
7612	Mr. Connelly.....	Norton.....	do.....	50,000	35,000	5,000	9,398.69	1,787	Post office, Agriculture.		35,000	Do.
8931	Mr. Doolittle....	Council Grove..	do.....	35,000	45,000	7,500	9,141.27	2,545	Post office.....		35,000	Do.
13615	Mr. Anthony.....	Holton.....	Building.....	60,000	35,000		12,501.30	2,842	do.....	Site already authorized.	35,000	Building.
15003	Mr. Ayres.....	Wichita.....	Additional land and enlargement of present building.	100,000			331,003.87	52,450	do.....		75,000	Site.

## MAINE.

474	Mr. McGilli-cuddy.	Bath.....	Increase limit of cost for extension.	\$10,000	\$10,000		\$26,122.96	9,396	Post office.....	\$55,000 already authorized for this purpose.	\$10,000	Increase.
475	do.....	Farmington.....	Building and site.	60,000	45,000	\$10,000	11,924.96	1,240	do.....		45,000	Building and site.
14297	Mr. Hinds.....	Sanford.....	do.....	75,000	45,000	11,000	13,837.02	6,800	do.....		50,000	Do.
14482	Mr. Guernsey....	Houlton.....	Additional land and enlargement of present building.	50,000	50,000	5,000	24,538.41	5,700	do.....		50,000	Extension.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

75	Mr. Gallivan....	Boston.....	Building and site.	\$3,750,000	\$1,750,000	\$1,500,000	\$8,069,113.07	670,585	All except post office.		\$1,500,000	Site.
155	Mr. Walsh.....	Provincetown..	Building.....	125,000	55,000		11,191.78	4,000	Post office, Customs.	Site already authorized.	30,000	Building.
314	Mr. Roberts.....	Everett.....	Building and site.	125,000			( <sup>c</sup> )	33,484	Post office.....		115,000	Building and site.
3660	Mr. Paige.....	Gardner.....	do.....	100,000			39,783.65	13,910	do.....		90,000	Do.
4711	Mr. Roberts.....	Malden.....	Amending act of Mar. 4, 1913, so as to make part of authorization available for site.		150,000	25,000	( <sup>d</sup> )	44,404	do.....	\$150,000 previously authorized for building and site.	Reported in general bill.	
4722	Mr. Tague.....	Boston.....	Increase.....	120,000	120,000			670,585	Immigration station.	\$375,000 previously authorized for building and site.	100,000	Increase.
5787	Mr. Treadway..	Great Barrington.	Building and site.	125,000	45,000	5,000	18,372.93	3,500	Post office.....		50,000	Building and site.
6041	Mr. Dallinger...	Wakefield.....	do.....	100,000	55,000	15,000	21,469.26	11,310	do.....		65,000	Do.
8045	Mr. Carter.....	Framingham....	do.....	100,000			84,899.01	2,000	do.....		100,000	Do.
10311	Mr. Gallivan....	Boston.....	Enlarge and extend present building.	250,000	250,000		8,069,113.07	670,585	Departments of Interior, Justice, and Agriculture; Customs.		250,000	Extension.
13766	Mr. Rogers.....	Lowell.....	Building and site.	600,000	350,000	150,000	183,713.79	106,294	Post office.....		250,000	Do.
13841	Mr. Gardner....	Salem.....	Site.....	( <sup>c</sup> )			136,500.08	43,697	Post office, Customs.		130,000	Building and site.
16746	Mr. Phelan.....	Peabody.....	Building and site.	125,000			25,130.96	18,625	Post office.....		100,000	Do.
17021	Mr. Winslow....	Westboro.....	Site.....	20,000			14,552.31	4,500	do.....		15,000	Site.
17022	do.....	Whitinsville..	do.....	20,000			10,597.37	4,500	do.....		10,000	Do.

<sup>c</sup> Branch of Boston.<sup>d</sup> No amount mentioned.



## Statement of bills referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, etc.—Continued.

## MICHIGAN.

No. of bill.	Introduced by—	City.	Purpose.	Amount asked.	Treasury estimate.		Gross postal receipts, fiscal year 1915.	Population, 1910.	Branches of the service requiring accommodations.	Remarks.	Committee recommendations.	Purpose.
					Building.	Site.						
555	Mr. Hamilton..	Benton Harbor	Building and site.	\$100,000	\$85,000	.....	\$54,702.56	9,185	Post office, Agriculture.	Site already authorized.	\$80,000	Building.
3109	Mr. Smith.....	Marshall.....	do.....	125,000	55,000	\$6,000	62,763.35	4,236	Post office.....	.....	75,000	Building and site.
9322	Mr. Fordney...	St. Johns.....	do.....	75,000	55,000	5,000	15,792.43	3,154	do.....	.....	55,000	Do.
10751	Mr. Kelley.....	Flint.....	Enlarge present building and site.	100,000	125,000	13,500	124,574.58	38,550	do.....	.....	100,000	Extension.
13283	Mr. Scott.....	Boysie City...	Building and site.	75,000	35,000	.....	11,063.17	5,218	do.....	Site already authorized.	30,000	Building.
13770	Mr. Fordney...	Alma.....	do.....	100,000	.....	.....	15,658.26	2,757	do.....	.....	5,000	Site.
14818	Mr. Loud.....	Clare.....	do.....	50,000	40,000	5,000	10,017.88	1,350	do.....	.....	35,000	Building and site.
16098	Mr. McLaughlin	Ludington.....	do.....	100,000	60,000	10,000	27,069.41	9,132	Post office, Agriculture, customs.	.....	75,000	Do.
16705	Mr. Doremus...	Detroit.....	Site.....	1,500,000	.....	.....	3,292,227.62	465,766	Post office.....	.....	1,250,000	Site.
16706	Mr. Smith.....	Eaton Rapids.	do.....	10,000	.....	.....	8,985.23	2,094	do.....	.....	7,500	Do.

## MINNESOTA.

135	Mr. Smith.....	Minneapolis...	Remodeling of present building.	\$100,000	\$150,000	.....	\$2,625,454.86	301,408	Post office and courts, Internal Revenue, Customs, Departments of Labor, Agriculture, War, and Navy.	.....	\$100,000	Extension.
390	Mr. Davis.....	Northfield...	Building and site.	60,000	45,000	\$6,000	21,099.96	3,265	Post office.....	.....	51,000	Building and site.
572	Mr. Steemerson	Thief River Falls.	do.....	100,000	45,000	12,000	20,630.66	3,714	do.....	.....	55,000	Do.
637	Mr. Anderson..	Albert Lea...	Enlarge present building.	100,000	60,000	.....	43,636.28	6,192	do.....	.....	50,000	Extension.
6459	Mr. Miller.....	Duluth.....	Site.....	1,500,000	1,000,000	.....	429,124.11	78,466	Post office, courts, Internal Revenue, Customs, Departments of Commerce, Interior, Labor, Agriculture, War, and Navy.	Site already acquired.	300,000	Building.
11476	Mr. Volstead..	Litchfield.....	Building and site.	50,000	45,000	5,000	12,368.58	2,333	Post office.....	.....	35,000	Building and site.
13617	Mr. Davis.....	Faribault.....	Authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey certain land to the city.	.....	.....	.....	35,719.47	9,001	.....	Department has no objection to bill.	Reported in general bill.	
13834	Mr. Lindbergh..	Wadena.....	Building and site.	50,000	30,000	5,000	11,267.23	1,820	Post office.....	.....	35,000	Do.

## MONTANA.

49	Mr. Evans.....	Butte.....	Enlargement of present building.	\$250,000	\$225,000	.....	\$176,905.48	39,165	Post office, Internal Revenue, Departments of Labor, War, Navy, and Agriculture.	.....	\$150,000	Extension.
604	Mr. Stout.....	Lewistown...	Building and site.	100,000	85,000	\$15,000	42,862.76	2,992	Post office, Land office, Agriculture.	.....	100,000	Building and site.
10494	Mr. Evans.....	Missoula.....	Enlarge present building.	75,000	35,000	.....	55,838.69	12,869	Post office, United States court.	\$125,000 previously authorized for this purpose.	35,000	Extension.
1067	(1).....	Bozeman.....	Authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey to the city certain land for alley purposes.	.....	.....	.....	31,757.61	5,107	.....	.....		Reported in general bill.

## NEBRASKA.

76	Mr. Kinkaid...	O'Neill.....	Building and site.	\$75,000	\$25,000	\$10,000	\$8,924.77	2,089	Post office.....	.....	\$6,000	Site.
78	do.....	Broken Bow	do.....	135,000	55,000	10,000	11,948.10	2,260	Post office, land office.	.....	6,000	Do.
3589	Mr. Shallenberger.	Superior.....	do.....	90,000	45,000	10,000	11,495.82	2,106	Post office.....	.....	35,000	Building and site.
15000	Mr. Sloan.....	David City...	do.....	60,000	35,000	5,000	11,990.90	2,177	do.....	.....	6,000	Site.
15001	do.....	Seward.....	do.....	60,000	35,000	5,000	10,191.59	2,106	do.....	.....	6,000	Do.
16556	Mr. Stephens...	Wayne.....	Site.....	8,000	.....	.....	10,709.54	2,140	do.....	.....	5,000	Site (supplemental bill).

<sup>1</sup>Senate bill.

## Statement of bills referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, etc.—Continued.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE.

No. of bill.	Introduced by—	City.	Purpose.	Amount asked.	Treasury estimate.		Gross postal receipts, fiscal year 1915.	Population, 1910.	Branches of the service requiring accommodations.	Remarks.	Committee recommendations.	Purpose.
					Building.	Site.						
630	Mr. Wason.....	Claremont.....	Building and site.	\$150,000	\$45,000	\$10,000	\$22,856.10	6,800	Post office.....	.....	\$55,000	Building and site.
4775	Mr. Sulloway...	Manchester....	Additional land and enlargement of building.	300,000	150,000	75,000	170,999.64	70,063	Post office, War Department, Internal Revenue.	.....	225,000	Extension.

## NEW JERSEY.

3111	Mr. Drukker....	Passaic.....	Building.....	\$150,000	\$175,000	.....	\$124,972.43	54,773	Post office.....	Site already acquired.	\$125,000	Building.
6092	Mr. Bacharach..	Atlantic City..	Enlarge present building and site.	60,000	125,000	\$45,000	307,308.09	46,150	.....do.....	See report....	60,000	Additional land, remodeling, etc.
8646	.....do.....	Millville.....	Increase.....	50,000	25,000	.....	21,833.07	12,451	.....do.....	\$55,000 already authorized.	25,000	Increase.
11480	Mr. Lehlbach....	Newark.....	Amending act of Mar. 4, 1913.	.....	.....	.....	1,410,925.67	347,469	Post office, court-house, internal revenue, customs, Departments of Interior, Labor, Agriculture, War, and Navy.	.....	600,000	For site, or can be used for additional land and extension of present building.
12486	Mr. Hart.....	Phillipsburg..	Building and site.	250,000	50,000	15,000	24,243.33	13,903	Post office.....	.....	60,000	Building and site.
14190	Mr. Lehlbach....	Montclair.....	Acquisition of additional land for present site.	.....	.....	10,000	.....	.....	.....do.....	.....	10,000	Additional land.
15265	Mr. Eagan.....	Weehawken....	Building and site.	250,000	85,000	50,000	\$2,857.54	11,228	Post office, Agriculture.	.....	125,000	Building and site.

## NEW YORK.

358	Mr. Fairchild...	Binghamton..	Building.....	\$500,000	\$500,000	.....	\$281,439.83	\$48,443	Post office, court, Internal Revenue, War, Navy, and Agriculture.	Site already acquired.	\$500,000	Building.
422	Mr. Mott.....	Oneida.....	.....do.....	85,000	55,000	.....	33,153.88	8,317	Post office.....	.....do.....	55,000	Do.
537	Mr. Bruckner...	Bronx, New York City.	.....do.....	1,000,000	.....	.....	( <sup>1</sup> ) 4,766,883	24,766,883	.....do.....	Site already authorized.	850,000	Do.
780	Mr. Charles.....	Canajoharie...	Building and site.	65,000	50,000	\$10,000	25,913.58	2,273	Post office, Agriculture.	.....	60,000	Building and site.
3051	Mr. Danforth...	Albion.....	.....do.....	80,000	45,000	10,000	18,169.35	5,016	Post office.....	.....	10,000	Site.
3052	.....do.....	Dansville.....	.....do.....	100,000	45,000	15,000	46,034.18	3,938	.....do.....	.....	60,000	Building and site.
0051	Mr. Mott.....	Lowville.....	.....do.....	85,000	45,000	10,000	14,307.29	2,940	.....do.....	.....	10,000	Site.
8034	Mr. Platt.....	Newburgh.....	.....do.....	200,000	110,000	50,000	91,896.74	27,805	.....do.....	.....	140,000	Building and site.
8671	Mr. Snell.....	Potsdam.....	.....do.....	75,000	45,000	10,000	19,320.22	4,036	.....do.....	.....	9,000	Site.
8817	Mr. Ward.....	Liberty.....	.....do.....	100,000	50,000	10,000	17,948.57	2,072	Post office, Agriculture.	.....	55,000	Building and site.
8827	Mr. Snyder.....	Ilion.....	.....do.....	100,000	45,000	15,000	25,409.50	6,588	Post office.....	.....	65,000	Do.
8909	Mr. Snell.....	Ticonderoga...	.....do.....	75,000	.....	.....	11,513.32	2,475	.....do.....	.....	35,000	Do.
8918	Mr. Hamilton...	Wellsville.....	Site.....	12,500	.....	12,500	21,834.16	4,382	.....do.....	.....	12,500	Do.
9709	Mr. Caldwell...	Long Island City.	Increase.....	100,000	100,000	.....	185,891.69	( <sup>2</sup> )	Post office, Internal Revenue.	\$260,000 already authorized.	100,000	Increase.
10224	Mr. Pratt.....	Bath.....	Building.....	75,000	45,000	.....	24,992.62	3,884	Post office.....	Site already authorized.	50,000	Building.
11870	Mr. Oglesby....	Yonkers.....	Increase.....	200,000	125,000	.....	180,753.79	79,803	.....do.....	\$500,000 already authorized.	51,500	Increase.
12538	Mr. Snyder.....	Utica.....	Amending former act so as to provide for demolition of present building and erection of new one, instead of remodeling present building.	.....	.....	.....	333,996.11	74,419	Post office, court.	\$405,000 already authorized for remodeling, additional land, etc.	Reported in general bill.	
12652	Mr. Gould.....	Lyons.....	Building and site.	100,000	45,000	.....	16,460.72	4,460	Post office.....	Site already authorized.	40,000	Building.
13226	Mr. Snell.....	Plattsburg....	Extend and remodel present building.	75,000	70,000	.....	42,110.32	11,138	Post office, Customs, Agriculture.	.....	50,000	Extension.
13722	Mr. Parker.....	Mechanicsville	Site and building.	75,000	45,000	15,000	17,757.39	6,634	Post office.....	.....	55,000	Building and site.
13763	Mr. Husted.....	Nyack.....	Building.....	100,000	40,000	.....	25,257.19	4,619	.....do.....	Site already authorized.	50,000	Building.
.....	.....	Albany.....	Remodeling, etc.	10,000	.....	.....	679,446.07	100,253	.....do.....	.....	10,000	Remodeling, etc.

## NORTH DAKOTA.

15049	Mr. Heigeser...	Fargo.....	Building.....	\$300,000	\$350,000	.....	\$241,282.87	14,331	Post office, Departments of Justice, War, and Navy.	Site already authorized.	\$250,000	Building.
16469	Mr. Young.....	Jamestown....	Increase.....	40,000	35,000	.....	30,749.45	4,358	Post office, court.	\$85,000 already authorized.	35,000	Increase.

<sup>1</sup> Branch of New York.<sup>2</sup> Greater New York.



## Statement of bills referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, etc.—Continued.

## OHIO.

No. of bill.	Introduced by—	City.	Purpose.	Amount asked.	Treasury estimate.		Gross postal receipts, fiscal year 1915.	Population, 1910.	Branches of the service requiring accommodations.	Remarks.	Committee recommendations.	Purpose.
					Building.	Site.						
148	Mr. Ashbrook..	Mount Vernon	Building and site.	\$100,000	\$55,000	\$15,000	\$30,729.19	9,087	Post office.....		\$70,000	Building and site.
3592	Mr. Emerson...	Painesville...	do	200,000	60,000	10,000	41,738.05	5,501	do		70,000	Do.
4686	Mr. Hollingsworth.	Steubenville...	Increase.....	150,000	115,000	10,000	64,389.77	22,391	Post office, United States court.	\$120,000 previously authorized.	125,000	Increase.
4687	do	East Palestine	Building and site.	100,000	45,000	10,000	14,043.55	3,537	Post office.....		7,500	Site.
7608	Mr. Key.....	Findlay.....	Enlarge present building.	50,000	50,000		61,191.49	14,858	do		50,000	Extension.
8662	Mr. Matthews...	Napoleon.....	Building and site.	65,000	50,000		12,854.36	4,007	do	Site already authorized.	35,000	Building.
11426	Mr. Sherwood...	Port Clinton...	do	50,000	45,000	6,000	12,785.02	3,007	do		40,000	Building and site.
13619	Mr. Gard.....	Eaton.....	Site.....	8,000	30,000	5,000	11,290.79	3,187	do		35,000	Do.
13772	Mr. Key.....	Gallon.....	do	20,000		18,000	24,930.60	7,214	do		15,000	Site.
15192	Mr. Overmyer...	Norwalk.....	Building and site.	130,000	70,000	20,000	28,659.16	7,858	do		65,000	Building and site.
15776	Mr. Ricketts...	Circleville...	do	100,000	45,000	14,000	17,505.63	6,744	Post office, Agriculture.		65,000	Do.
16094	Mr. Brumbaugh	Columbus...	Site.....	250,000			1,139,149.32	181,511	Post office.....		240,000	Site.
16178	Mr. Fess.....	Urbana.....	Building.....	60,000	55,000		22,967.85	7,739	do	Site already authorized.	50,000	Building.
16552	Mr. Cooper.....	Niles.....	do	100,000			26,674.27	8,361	do	do	55,000	Do.

## OREGON.

3666	Mr. Sinnott....	Hood River...	Building and site.	\$100,000	\$55,000	\$10,000	\$19,455.41	2,331	Post office, Agriculture.		\$60,000	Building and site.
4662	Mr. Hawley....	Oregon City...	do	100,000	55,000	15,000	20,334.98	4,287	Post office, land office.		70,000	Do.
4664	do	Corvallis...	do	100,000	60,000	10,000	27,479.83	4,552	Post office.....		10,000	Site.
16853	Mr. McArthur..	St. Johns...	Building.....	50,000			(1)	4,872	do	Site already authorized.	25,000	Building.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

283	Mr. Kreider....	Middletown...	Building and site.	\$75,000	\$45,000	\$15,000	\$14,468.46	5,374	Post office.....		\$65,000	Building and site.
499	Mr. Griest....	Lancaster...	Building.....	250,000	300,000		185,543.28	47,277	Post office, Internal Revenue, War, Navy, and Agricultural Departments.	Site already authorized.	250,000	Building.
6839	Mr. Moore.....	Philadelphia..	Building and site.	2,000,000	700,000	800,000		1,549,008	Customhouse.....		750,000	Site.
8038	Mr. Garland....	Pittsburgh...	Removal of present building and construction of new one.	2,500,000	3,000,000		3,457,149.06	533,905	Post office, courts, Internal Revenue, customs, Departments of Commerce, Interior, Labor, Agriculture, War and Navy.		50,000	Remodeling of present building and sale of old site.
8047	Mr. Lafean....	York.....	Increase.....	25,000	25,000		151,512.72	44,750	Post office.....		25,000	Increase.
8342	Mr. North.....	Brookville...	Building and site.	100,000			14,742.57	3,003	do		10,000	Site.
8488	Mr. Butler....	Lansdowne...	do	75,000	30,000	15,000	25,667.33	4,066	do		65,000	Building and site.
9048	Mr. North.....	Kittanning...	Building.....	75,000	50,000		24,526.51	4,311	do	Site already authorized.	50,000	Building.
10019	Mr. Heaton....	Pottsville...	Enlarge present building.	75,000	50,000		63,719.44	20,236	Post office, Internal Revenue.		50,000	Extension.
10648	Mr. Leshar....	Sunbury.....	Increase limit of cost so as to provide for United States court.	25,000	50,000		36,932.84	13,770	Post office, United States court.	\$125,000 already authorized.	40,000	Increase.
11244	Mr. Rowland...	Philipsburg...	Building and site.	30,000	45,000	15,000	17,016.64	3,585	Post office.....		60,000	Building and site.
11337	Mr. Hopwood...	Somerset.....	do	75,000	45,000	15,000	16,076.75	2,612	do		58,000	Do.
11945	Mr. Bailey....	Tyrone.....	Building.....	125,000	60,000		98,485.58	7,176	do	Site already authorized.	80,000	Building.
12206	Mr. Watson....	Doylestown...	Building and site.	100,000	40,000	15,000	15,471.81	3,304	do		5,000	Site.
13775	Mr. Miller....	Greenville...	do	100,000	75,000	15,000	31,245.42	5,909	Post office, Agriculture.		75,000	Building and site.
14072	Mr. Focht....	Lewisburg...	do	100,000	40,000	15,000	15,203.71	3,081	Post office.....		10,000	Site.
14073	do	Lewistown...	Increase.....	30,000			22,463.27	8,166	do	\$75,000 already authorized.	20,000	Increase.
14192	Mr. Temple....	Midland.....	Building and site.	85,000	30,000	8,500	10,619.45	1,244	do		5,000	Site.
14300	Mr. Barchfeld	Duquesne...	do	125,000	40,000	15,000	13,740.49	15,727	do		75,000	Building and site.
15159	Mr. Watson....	Norristown...	Extension, etc.	65,000	65,000		72,230.37	27,875	do		55,000	Extension.
15876	Mr. Kless....	Williamsport	do	100,000			176,125.37	31,860	do		80,000	Do.
15951	Mr. Temple....	Beaver Falls	Extension of present site and building.	43,000	35,000	8,000	43,718.35	12,191	do		58,000	Do.
16240	Mr. Casey....	Plymouth...	Building and site.	100,000	40,000	23,000	12,778.20	800	do		15,000	Site.
16241	do	Nanticoke...	do	100,000	45,000	20,000	13,325.70	18,877	do		60,000	Building and site.
16947	Mr. Farr.....	Seranton....	Extension, etc.	125,000			543,981.26	129,867	do		100,000	Extension.

(1) Accounts kept with Portland office.

## Statement of bills referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, etc.—Continued.

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

No. of bill.	Introduced by—	City.	Purpose.	Amount asked.	Treasury estimate.		Gross postal receipts, fiscal year 1915.	Population, 1910.	Branches of the service requiring accommodations.	Remarks.	Committee recommendations.	Purpose.
					Building.	Site.						
149	Mr. Dillon.....	Canton.....	Building and site.	\$85,000	\$45,000	\$5,000	\$10,006.24	2,103	Post office.....		\$6,000	Site.
152	.....do.....	Vermilion.....	Building.....	75,000	45,000		13,266.10	2,187	.....do.....	Site already authorized.	35,000	Building.
14975	Mr. Johnson.....	Aberdeen.....	Remodeling of present building.	100,000	75,000		86,810.02	10,753	Post office; Internal Revenue; Departments of Justice and Agriculture; Bureau of States Relations.		60,000	Extension.

## WASHINGTON.

590	Mr. Humphrey.	Seattle.....	Building and site.	\$500,000				237,194	Immigration station.		\$275,000	Building; site to be donated.
3088	Mr. Johnson....	Hoquiam.....	.....do.....	150,000	\$45,000	\$15,000	\$23,230.21	8,171	Post office.....		75,000	Building and site.
4776	.....do.....		Additional land for United States penitentiary at McNeil Island.	10,000					United States penitentiary.		10,000	Additional land.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am not at all surprised at the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goob], not at all. He is just about as near correct in his statement just made as he is in almost anything else that I have heard him discuss. That is the reason I wanted him to name the items. He took up Alabama, for instance. Here are the towns:

Athens, building and site, \$10,710.64. It goes beyond the requirements of the law. Sheffield has only a site, and yet its receipts are \$10,096.65.

Union Springs, where a site had already been procured, provided for by a former Congress, and I stated in my speech that these questions were fully considered by the committee, and the committee finally determined that as long as the Government owned the land and Government money was invested in the property, that we had just as well provide a modest building for these places, and in the future, carrying out the great reform with respect to the work which this legislation does, we would see to it that no more sites were granted in places of that size, and therefore the building was granted. I want to say for Union Springs that the last quarter's postal receipts show that it will go beyond the \$10,000 limit the present fiscal year.

Take Sylacauga, a place in exactly the same situation as Union Springs. The postal receipts were \$7,698.67. The site is already bought. We did not feel that the Government money ought to lie there idle when a modest building could be placed there without great expense to the Government to carry on the public business.

Greenville, where we place a building on the site already obtained, has postal receipts of \$10,848.94, beyond the limit required by law.

Albertville, another of the places, and Attalla, which my colleague, Mr. BURNETT, will refer to, because they are in his district. These are two places where sites had already been provided and the Government money invested, and it was a question whether your committee would let it lie idle or put a modest building upon the site and let the Government use it, and we decided to erect a building.

Ozark, where we only provide a site, the postal receipts are \$6,872.32.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to get through these figures first. The gentleman next takes my own State of Florida. We put in a site for Arcadia, a town that has receipts of \$15,358.14. We put in a site for West Palm Beach, a town that has postal receipts of \$28,441.79. We put a building at Lake City, in my own district, where a site had already been bought by the Government and where the receipts amount to \$11,735.51—over the limit.

We provided for a site at Perry, where the receipts are \$7,218.79, more than a thousand dollars over the law fixed by the Senate in the 1913 bill and concurred in by the House.

We provide for Clearwater in the district of my colleague, Mr. SPARKMAN, who is retiring from Congress. Arcadia is in his

district, and we gave him a modest site there. We gave him a building and site at Clearwater, where the postal receipts are \$10,727.51. Is there a man upon this floor who would say that we did wrong in giving to the district of this distinguished gentleman, who for 22 years has been on the floor, a modest building at Clearwater and a site at Arcadia, when both came within the law?

The next place is Kissimmee, the home town of my colleague, Mr. SEARS.

A site had already been purchased, and we provided a building for Kissimmee, where the receipts are \$11,295.70—more than a thousand over the limit. At Monticello we allowed a site, where the receipts are \$6,003.12—beyond the limit of the law. Not in one item, in so far as Florida is concerned, can the gentleman put his finger on a place where we have not tracked the law absolutely—not one.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I pause for the gentleman to do it.

Mr. GOOD. The last provision of your law provides that the receipts must be for three calendar years.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Hereafter. Can not the gentleman read? Does he not know that that provision is intended to apply to future bills and not to this one?

Mr. GOOD. I understand that.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. We are operating under the law of 1913.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman now yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. For a question.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman say that the figures that he is now giving us are the ones upon which the committee in reporting this bill based its action?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I said in my original argument that in the framing of this bill we took the items, and when the fiscal receipts of 1915 had shown such growth as to indicate beyond the peradventure of a doubt that they would go beyond it, we acted upon that, and we are justified by subsequent facts, because they have gone beyond it in practically every instance.

Mr. GOOD. The report which the committee gave me and from which I read was printed July 25, 1916.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Undoubtedly.

Mr. GOOD. Before one-half, or just about the close of one-half, of the fiscal year, and therefore the figures for 1915 were the figures that the committee had.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have just told the gentleman what we acted upon, but if he can not understand it, I shall try to state it again. I said we took the figures for 1915, the fiscal year. We got the figures for the last quarter and looked into the growth of the town, and in cases where they were very near the line marked out in the 1913 law and gave every promise of going over it, in some instances we allowed sites or buildings, and we have been justified in that because the figures demonstrate that we were right.

Mr. GOOD. Then the whole bill is built on speculation and the report of 1915?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Not at all.



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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. And as my colleague on the committee, Judge RUCKER, says, in most cases we had the fiscal receipts for the past quarter and for the calendar year. The gentleman takes up Georgia. At Sandersville, we allowed a building where a site had already been obtained and paid for; the receipts were \$8,618.05. At Cairo, where the receipts were nearly \$8,000, we allowed a site. At Pelham, where the receipts were over \$7,000, we allowed a site. At Blakely, where they were nearly \$7,000, we allowed a site. At Covington, where they were more than \$7,000, we allowed a site. At Monroe, where they were \$8,000, we allowed a site. At Commerce, where there were over \$7,000, we allowed a site. At Winder, where there were more than \$8,000, we allowed a site. At Decatur, where there were more than \$7,000, we allowed a site. At East Point, where there were over \$11,000, we allowed a site. At Rossville, where a site had already been obtained, we allowed a building; the receipts were much over \$8,000.

I wish the gentleman from Iowa would listen to these figures, if he wants to be fair. I want him to hear them. He has attacked a whole section of the country. He has attacked 11 States. He charges this bill with being sectional, when the fact is that about \$25,000,000 of the money authorized in it goes to the Northern States, and only about \$6,000,000 to this much demeaned Southern section. That is the truth, and he can not get away from it. It makes no difference what may be the extent of the gentleman's venom, the facts and figures are against him. I continue with Georgia: Hawkinsville, where we simply fixed a site, had nearly \$9,000 in receipts. Baxley, where a site was provided, there are receipts of over \$6,000. Cuthbert had nearly \$8,000, and only a site was provided. At Ashburn, where the receipts are over \$6,600, only a site. At Thomaston, over \$6,000, just a site. At Jackson, over \$7,000, a site was provided. At Fort Valley, with \$11,000, only a site.

Mr. Chairman, that is the record of Georgia in this bill, and the gentleman animadvertes upon it and charges us with distributing pork. The gentleman says there is but one item in Mississippi that goes beyond the \$10,000, but he was not fair enough to state that at some of these places there were other activities besides the post office. He was not fair enough to state that other activities were to be housed, but he dismissed the proposition with the statement that only one of them went over \$10,000. What did the committee do? At Columbia, with receipts of over \$8,500, we provided a site. At Pascagoula, where there is a post office and customhouse, with nearly \$7,000 of receipts, we provided a site. At Lexington, with over \$8,500, we provided a site. At Indianola, with over \$8,000, we provided a site. At Winona, with over \$8,800, we provided a site. At Okolona, with over \$6,700, we provided a site. Wherein have we offended against the law? Will the gentleman name one place?

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. For what purpose?

Mr. GOOD. For a question.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Certainly.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman mean to say that I did not correctly state what was stated on page 29 of this report with regard to Pascagoula? That report shows only a post office, and if there is a customhouse there the committee itself is derelict in failing to inform the House as to the conditions. I took what was in the report.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am not responsible for what the printer may do or what mistakes may be made in getting up a printed document. The report was in the office, and if the gentleman had wanted to know the truth he could have gotten it; but he did not do it.

Mr. GOOD rose.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does the gentleman think he is treating the House fairly; does the gentleman think he is treating anybody fairly; I will ask the gentleman, does he think that he is treating himself fairly when he states a part of the truth and does not state the rest of it?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that every word I said on the floor of this House is the truth as propounded by his committee.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. As far as the gentleman went, but the gentleman did not state it all.

Mr. GOOD. I would have gone further but for the objection from the gentleman from Arkansas for me to proceed with regard to all of these items.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman knows that if he had it would have demolished his case; that is the reason.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. When the gentleman stands up here in the face of the fact that the Northern States are getting \$25,000,000 in this bill and the South is only getting \$6,000,000, and charges it with being a sectional bill in the interest of the South the gentleman's reasoning qualities are at fault or else he did not want the House and country to know the real facts. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman state what caused the committee to write the last paragraph on page 62, that hereafter buildings used for the Post Office Department alone should only be authorized and sites acquired for them if the postal receipts for three consecutive years amounted to more than \$10,000?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman think that is a good rule to be guided by?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do.

Mr. GOOD. Then why were not you guided by it in the formation of this bill? That is what I am complaining of.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Because the Government had already bought the land and we did not believe it should lie vacant.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman does not mean to say that.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do.

Mr. GOOD. The bill here authorizes more than 100 sites where they have not bought the land. It authorizes the sites, and in most of them the receipts are under \$10,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Because that is the law we are acting under now.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, if it is a good position day after to-morrow, is it not good now?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. And was put in the bill by a Republican Senate and signed by a Republican President. [Applause.] The gentleman did not protest when it went in, because in the last bill, if I mistake not, the gentleman from Iowa had some pork.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. In just a moment—yes; just for a question.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I desire to ask, if the gentleman constructed this bill along partisan lines, how did it happen my amiable friend from the second Tennessee district [Mr. AUSTIN] got 25 per cent of the projects going to the State?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If it was constructed along those lines—

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman mean to say that in the last appropriation bill an item was included for my district where the receipts of the post office were under \$10,000?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, no; I did not.

Mr. GOOD. Of course not.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. But I did mean to say the gentleman had a finger in the last pie, and the gentleman did not kick about it. The gentleman did not ask for it to be stricken out.

Mr. BURNETT. And he did not kick about the last bill, either.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No. Now, in regard to North Carolina. Lewisburg, a site, \$8,500 receipts. Wadesboro, \$9,500 receipts, received simply a little increase for site of \$5,000. Stanford, with \$10,600 receipts, only got a site. Rockingham, with \$9,900 receipts, got a site or an increase for site of \$5,000. The site had already been provided in another bill. Mount Airy, with \$12,700 receipts, got a building, as a site was already provided. Lumberton, N. C., with \$13,954 receipts, got a building, with a site already provided. Dunn, with \$10,033.89 over the limit, got a building and a site. Albemarle, with more than \$9,700 receipts, got a site. Lenoir, with \$10,865 receipts, got a building, as a site was already provided. Morganton, with \$11,361, got a building and a site. Wilson, with \$27,000 of receipts, with a Federal court convening there, the building was arranged for before the court was established, making necessary an increased appropriation in order to provide quarters for the court. Williamston, with \$6,023.18 receipts, got a site. Mount Olive, with \$6,381 of receipts, got a building, as a site had already been bought. Clinton, with about \$7,000 receipts, got a site. Marion, with over \$8,000 receipts, nearly \$9,000, got a site. Edenton, with over \$9,000 receipts, got a building, as a site was already provided. Then my friend comes to South Carolina. Aiken got an extension of an old building. Rock Hill,



simply an increase there to take care of the court. That is quite a little city in our section of the country. York, with \$9,718 receipts, got a site. Dillon, with nearly \$8,000 receipts, with a site already bought, had a building provided for it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I did not understand the gentleman. When he says "Got a site," does he mean that it was already provided for by previous legislation?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I mean got a site in this bill.

Conway, with over \$6,000, was given a site; Hartsville, with over \$11,000, was given a site; Greenwood was given simply an increase there to take care of the court; Manning, with over \$5,800, was given a site; Summerville, with \$8,500, was given a site; Easley, with over \$6,000, was given a site; Greer, with over \$7,000, was given a site; and Bamberg, with over \$6,000, was given a site. And that is all there is to South Carolina's pork.

Now, take Tennessee. Lewisburg, with nearly \$9,000, gets a site; Rogersville, with over \$6,000, was given a site; Rockwood, with over \$7,000, gets a site; La Follette, with over \$6,000, gets a site; Lenoir City, with nearly \$7,000, gets a site; McMinnville, with over \$9,000, and the other two, with over \$6,000, were each given a site. In Huntingdon, with nearly \$5,000, a site has already been bought there, and it gets a building in this bill. Brownsville, with over \$9,000, gets a site; and Dickson, with nearly \$8,000, gets a site.

Texas is the next one.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. In Texas, Coleman, with \$11,000 of receipts, gets a building on a site already provided; Plainview, with over \$19,000, gets a building and site; Crockett, with over \$9,000, gets a building on a site already bought; Jacksonville, with over \$12,000, gets a site; Lockhart, with over \$11,000, gets a site.

I shall not mention Fort Worth and Dallas, because I do not suppose that even these gentlemen who are yelling sectionalism will attack those places.

Mexia, with \$10,132, gets a site; Georgetown, with over \$12,000, gets a building on a site already provided; Kingsville, with over \$13,000, gets a building and a site.

Sweetwater, with receipts of over \$18,000, gets a building on a site already bought; Huntsville, with \$12,000 of receipts, gets a building on a site already provided; Paris, Tex., where the post office and courthouse have been burned, is given \$170,000 for the construction of a new building; San Benito, where there is a customhouse and post office, and where the receipts are over \$8,000, gets a site; Lufkin, where the receipts are over \$13,000, gets a building and a site; Seguin, where the receipts are over \$12,000, gets a building and a site; Alvin, with receipts of over \$8,000, gets a building on a site already acquired; Henderson, where the receipts are over \$7,000, gets a site.

There is the status as to these Southern States which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] attacks.

Mr. GOOD. I observe the gentleman said nothing about Tennessee.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I did. Every item in that State I went over. And Missouri is just as good as these that I have gone over, and the other States. I want to say to the gentleman once and for all that he will find that the day has passed on the floor of the American Congress for a man to make a reputation by undertaking to raise the sordid cry of sectionalism. [Applause.] I want to say to him that every Republican upon this committee except two joined in the making of this report. Every Democrat except two joined in the making of this report. There was absolutely nothing partisan or sectional in it. And the gentleman, I fear, underrates the intelligence of his constituency when he believes that he can court favor with the good people of Iowa by coming upon this floor and making an attack like this without a single justification for it. I want to say to him that on my committee among my clerks is a young man who gave him this printed document, who is from the State of Iowa. He did come from a good State. There is no sectionalism in the committee or in any of its acts. And this bill shows that if there is any the gentleman's part of the country got the best of it.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I will suggest that the gentleman close his remarks by paraphrasing those lines from Spartacus, the gladiator:

Hear ye yon lion roaring in his den?  
'Tis three days since he tasted meat.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think the roaring, instead of being from the lion, comes from another animal. [Laughter.] I think the gentleman imagines he is a lion.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. He roars like one, but God knows he is not one.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I think the gentleman from Florida could well quote another passage from Spartacus, when he said he had met all forms of both animal and beast. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky moves to strike out the last two words, and asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Thereupon the committee rose; and Mr. FITZGERALD having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, 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 H. R. 18994, the public-buildings bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SPEAKER FOR TO-DAY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOM,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1917.

I hereby designate Hon. JOHN. J. FITZGERALD to serve as Speaker on Thursday, January 18, 1917.

CHAMP CLARK, Speaker.

LATE ADMIRAL GEORGE DEWEY.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution No. 68.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in recognition of the long and distinguished service rendered the Nation by Admiral George Dewey appropriate funeral services be held in the rotunda of the Capitol on Saturday, January 20, 1917, at 11 o'clock antemeridian, and that the two Houses of Congress attend said services.*

That as a further mark of respect his remains be removed from the Capitol to Arlington Cemetery for burial in charge of the Navy Department, attended by the Sergeants at Arms and the committees of the two Houses.

That invitations be extended to the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet, the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Diplomatic Corps (through the Secretary of State), such officers of the Navy as may be designated by the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chief of Staff of the Army to attend the exercises in the rotunda of the Capitol.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of another resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 457.

*Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives appoint a committee of 25 Members, to join the committee to be appointed by the Senate, to attend the funeral services of Admiral George Dewey at Arlington, Va.*

*Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this resolution, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith on the part of the committee of the House be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.*

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

There was no objection.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rules the House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the public-buildings bill, with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will resume its sitting. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] is recognized.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. CLARK of Florida], who has just taken his seat, defended the items in the bill for the various other Southern States that have been attacked by the gentleman from Iowa and others, but he did not refer to the Kentucky items that they have also attacked. I assume that, so far as the items in my district are concerned, he left it for me to defend them, and I thank him for doing so, because I am proud of the privilege which is thus afforded me, and I ask the attention and indulgence of Members while I do this briefly. But first I wish to make a few general observations.

Mr. Chairman, this House and the country have been stirred recently as they have not been for years by the charge, publicly made and widely and promiscuously circulated, that Members of the legislative and executive branches of the Government have been engaged in prostituting their official duties to private ends, and many gentlemen in this body, who have been and are still trying to serve their constituents honestly and faithfully—some having spent the best portion of their lives in such service—have been startled by the readiness with which a large element of our population gives credence to these charges. Gentlemen, do you know why such is the situation? Of course, a good deal of the responsibility for it is justly chargeable to that class of newspapers and magazines of the country that flippantly and without regard for truth charge men in the public service with conspiring together to loot the Treasury for their respective districts, and to frame and pass "pork" bills with that end in view and without regard to the merits of the propositions involved. The course which these newspapers and magazines have taken, and the reckless misstatements of fact in which they have indulged is reprehensible enough, the Lord knows. But at the same time I think that much of the responsibility for the situation to which I have referred is justly chargeable to certain Members of Congress themselves—

A MEMBER. That is right!

Mr. LANGLEY (continuing). Who, assuming "a holier than thou" attitude, having joined in these unjust criticisms and reckless misstatements of fact, and through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and otherwise have helped to lay the foundation for this public distrust of the people's servants at Washington. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I admire a game fighter. I have no quarrel with, but genuine admiration for, anyone who, confining himself to the truth, argues in decent, logical, and manly fashion against the wisdom of proposed legislation or against the merits of a proposition involving the expenditure of the people's money. But when these newspapers and magazines and these Members of Congress, without regard to the facts, and apparently without endeavoring to know the facts, indulge in such misstatements and seek to make them the basis of criticism involving the sincerity and even the integrity of sworn public officials, I have not sufficient command of the English language to fitly express my contempt for such conduct. [Applause.] I was somewhat surprised and disappointed at my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], who is usually so fair and logical, and for whom I have always entertained the greatest respect, when, in his address in this Chamber last Tuesday, he intimated that we were seeking to pass this bill, although we knew it ought not to be passed, merely in order to promote our own political ends, and in order to enable us to go home to our constituents and say, "Here is what I got for you," and also for contending that we of the committee included in this bill the general legislation which it carries—the expediency, wisdom, and necessity of which are generally conceded—not so much because we wanted such legislation enacted but because we hoped it would help us carry through the iniquities of the bill. This was not his exact language, it is true, but it was the inference inevitably to be drawn from what he said.

Mr. Chairman, not long ago there was another omnibus bill pending in this House—the fish hatchery bill—and it will be remembered that the gentleman from Wisconsin severely criticised that bill and vigorously called attention to the fact that it carried nothing for his State. I might have charged that he was

opposing that bill because it did not carry any "pork" for Wisconsin, but I did not do that. I gave him credit for opposing it on higher grounds. Gentlemen, what else can we expect than to call forth "Tom Lawsons" from every hamlet in the land if we continue this spectacle for the edification of the public of constantly impugning each other's motives and whining and growling about "pork" and "loot" and "graft," instead of rising to the higher plane of dignified and manly argument? Mr. Chairman, I have been criticized lately in the public press in various sections of the country for seeking to get recognition for my district, and the charge has been repeatedly made that the items included in the bill at my instance are without merit; that I know this to be the case; and that the efforts I am making are solely to further my own political fortunes. These things have been reiterated by Members here in this body. Conscious of the injustice which these publications and these charges have done me and the district which I have the honor to represent, I do not propose to remain silent any longer, especially in view of what has been said on this floor to-day, and I am going to answer these charges now and without waiting until the items are reached in the reading of the bill. I see the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX] is present, and I am glad he is, because I want to pay my respects to him for a moment or two. [Laughter.]

There appeared recently in the Journal of the American Institute of Architects an article written by one Charles Harris Whitaker, its editor. He says that it was written avowedly for the purpose of showing that "the whole system of appropriating money for public buildings betrays the shameless manner in which public funds are squandered in order that political patronage may be distributed."

In this article specific reference is made to me, and, among other things, it is stated that at my instance an item was inserted in the bill for \$40,000 for a public building in Hazard, Ky., a town of 537 persons, and \$35,000 for a building in Pikeville, a town of 1,280 inhabitants. An advance summary of this article appeared in the Washington Evening Star, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX], without any inquiry as to the accuracy of the figures or the truth of the article in general, inserted it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it appeared in a conspicuous place in the RECORD, so that wider publicity was thereby given to it. [Laughter.] Such procedure may be in accordance with the gentleman's conception of his duty to his fellow Members, but it is not my conception of my duty to them. The gentleman from Indiana ought to have verified some of the figures and allegations before having them printed in the RECORD. He should have given me an opportunity to tell him what the facts were before publishing me in such a false light. It would not have taken him 30 seconds to have ascertained that he was quoting antiquated figures and that the city of Hazard has over 4,000 population now instead of 537, which the article that he gave prestige and credence to by putting it in the RECORD asserts. It would not have taken him any longer to have ascertained from me that the city of Pikeville has a population of over 3,000 instead of the number stated in the article, and that each of these cities is located, respectively, in the center of two of the greatest coal fields in the world, where marvelous developments are in progress. He could have easily ascertained that this article is an infamous libel, pure and simple, so far at least as these two cities and their Representative in this body are concerned. It is true that their population was shown by the census of 1910 to be what the article says, but that census was taken seven years ago, and a great deal has happened in that section of Kentucky since then. The trouble about the article is—and the same is true of numerous other articles published in various papers and magazines, and of statements made on this floor as well—that they seek to mislead by the assertion that this is the present population. During the decade from 1900 to 1910 the unparalleled development which has recently occurred in this section had scarcely started, and yet the population of the county in which Hazard is located increased 39 per cent during that time, and the population of the county in which Pikeville is situated increased 36 per cent during the same period, while the general average for the whole country was only 21 per cent.

During this same period what was going on in the district which the gentleman from Indiana represents? The census shows that during that period his district not only did not gain in population but actually lost 2,217. A gentleman who has lived, moved, and had his being in such environment can not, of course, fully understand how a town can become a city in seven years. [Applause.]

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for one question?



Mr. LANGLEY. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. The gentleman does not mean to imply that the loss of population was due to the Representative here, and that the gain was due to the other Representative? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. No; I do not mean to imply that, but I do want to say to my friend from Missouri that there are scores of people from the third Indiana district who have moved to the mountains of Kentucky, many of them into the tenth congressional district, and are now prosperous citizens there; and it has been reported that nearly all of the A No. 1 congressional timber has moved over into Kentucky, which may account for the ease with which the gentleman is able to succeed himself in this body. [Laughter and applause.]

They ought not be blamed for migrating from such a decadent district, represented by a parsimonious Congressman, who is always looking toward the setting sun. [Laughter and applause.] I am reminded in this connection, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] who is making such fierce onslaughts upon this bill, and who a few moments ago challenged me to defend Hazard, represents in part a State which, according to my recollection, lost 4 per cent of its population during the decade to which I have referred. Of course, gentlemen like my friend from Indiana and my friend from Iowa, who for all these years have been breathing the atmosphere of retrogression, can not understand the marvelous and wonderful progress that is going on in the mountains of Kentucky. [Laughter.] They can not conceive of how a village of 537 souls can in such a short space of time increase in population as Hazard and Pikeville have.

They can not conceive of the fact, which I assert to be the fact, that there is one place in my district where the census enumerator in 1910 had to ride a mule over a mountain trail to get the names of the inhabitants that is now the site of a city of 3,000 or 4,000 people, with electric lights, water works, paved streets, an artificial lake of 70,000,000 gallons of water, a club house that cost \$50,000, a power plant that cost more than three times that much, furnishing light, heat, and power for miles and miles around. I refer to that splendid, progressive city of Jenkins, in Letcher County, for which I expect to get a public building a little later on. They can not understand how in such a short time there can be such development, nor that where a jolt wagon could then scarcely go, there are to-day splendidly graded roads, with up-to-date automobiles dashing back and forth and crossing the summit of the Cumberland Mountains as readily as a Ford can climb Capitol Hill. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. I hope the committee will grant me 10 minutes more. I was to have had 20 minutes in the general debate yesterday, but was unavoidably absent when the bill came up unexpectedly and general debate upon it was exhausted before my return, so that I lost that opportunity to address the committee.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I ask unanimous consent that 10 minutes additional be granted the gentleman.

Mr. POWERS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may continue for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. I want to say this to my friend from Indiana and my friend from Iowa and others of that class [laughter], that if I thought I was getting too much salary I would not take it all. If I thought that the mileage allowance was excessive and part of it graft, I would not accept the excessive and graft part, and I certainly would not scramble to get at the head of the line at the cashier's desk when the time came for receiving the mileage. [Laughter.] I have no patience with gentlemen who will talk about "pork" and "loot" and "graft" and then take their share of it.

Gentlemen, I could say much more than I have said about the rapid growth of Hazard and Pikeville, and the unparalleled progress of that section of Kentucky generally if I had the time and you the patience to listen. Why, Mr. Chairman, there have been expended in recent years in the upper valley of the Big Sandy and Kentucky Rivers over fifty millions of dollars in railroad construction and over twenty millions in the development of the coal fields; and yet these industries in these sections are still in their infancy. I have a statement here from the mayor of Hazard and resolutions passed by the Commercial Club of Hazard, and several other letters and documents which I shall insert in the RECORD under the leave granted me, and

which not only show that its present population is between 4,000 and 5,000, but that it is likely to be doubled at the present rate of increase by the time this proposed building shall have been erected. Its population has increased over a thousand a year for the past three years. Extensive preparations have been made for additional street improvements. It has recently erected a \$50,000 school building and a \$60,000 courthouse. It has over 800 school children within the common-school age, and an average attendance of over 600. It also has a splendid institution of learning, the Baptist Institute, with an average daily attendance of over 200. There are 19 school teachers employed in Hazard who are paid annual salaries aggregating about \$12,000. A number of power plants have been erected in that immediate vicinity for coal operations and other purposes, and preparations are being made for additional plants, some of which are to be the finest in the country. There are three large coal operations at Hazard, and 16 altogether within a radius of a few miles of it, representing a total investment of two and one-half million dollars. The output of coal has increased from 100,000 tons in 1915 to over 500,000 tons in 1916, and as the Lexington Herald, one of Kentucky's leading papers, said editorially a few days ago, the surface has hardly yet been scratched. It is one of the finest coal fields in the world. The postmaster of Hazard, who, by the way, is a good Democrat, informs me that between 8,000 and 9,000 people, which includes the mining population outside the city limits, get their mail at the window of his office, and that in the aggregate in the neighborhood of from 20,000 to 25,000 people are supplied with mail through that office, and yet the gentleman from Indiana, and his coconspirator, "Charley Whitaker," and these great daily papers and magazines of the country, would have you believe that Hazard is only a crossroads village of 537 souls.

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

Mr. LANGLEY. My time is short, but I will yield.

Mr. GOOD. Did I understand the gentleman to say that 25,000 people in that neighborhood of Kentucky were supplied through this office at Hazard?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; the mail goes to that office, to be sent from there—

Mr. GOOD. Why, my dear sir, last year, according to the official report, the receipts were only \$5,320.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am talking about the star routes that converge there, and the employees at that office have to handle that mail in transit. There are eight post offices, most of them located at mining-operation plants, within a radius of 5 miles of Hazard. All of these are supplied through the Hazard office. Not only that, but a large portion of the service in the adjacent counties of Leslie and Knott are supplied through that office, so that I am safely within the facts when I say that fully 20,000 people are served directly and indirectly through the Hazard office. Not only is all this true, gentlemen, but a bulletin recently issued by the Geological Survey shows that in near-by territory, in the same river valley—the Kentucky—one of the greatest petroleum oil fields in the world is being rapidly developed, and hundreds of barrels of oil are to-day gushing out of some of the wells recently drilled, and millions of capital are being invested for the further development of the field. Great as has been the progress of Hazard, the glory of her future has hardly yet begun to shine. Only the glimmer of her sun of prosperity is beginning to show over the eastern hills. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman include in his remarks Proctor Knott's speech on Duluth?

Mr. LANGLEY. Hazard will surpass Duluth even, if you will only give us a little time and help us along with a Federal building. [Applause.]

Reference has been made to the fact that money could be saved by continuing the present plan of renting a building there for the post office. Let me tell you what sort of a building we have the post office in now. It is a frame building, wholly unsuited and unequipped for the purpose. It is such a character of building that it is impossible to get fire insurance upon it, and it is a disgrace to the Government to transact the business in such quarters, as the documents I shall print in the RECORD will show.

But, Mr. Chairman, the proper and decent dispatch of the post-office work there is not the only purpose for which we need a Federal building at Hazard. I have here a letter from the Director of the Bureau of Mines showing the imperative need of a mine rescue station there.

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

Mr. LANGLEY. I must decline to yield. My time is getting short.



Mr. CRAMTON. Just a question.

Mr. LANGLEY. I understand; but it all takes time. We need a mine rescue station there. The Director of the Bureau of Mines appeared before our committee and made a statement of the imperative necessity for a mine rescue station there and room in the Federal building for that purpose. There are nearly 4,000 miners employed in that immediate vicinity, and there will soon be many more thousands, and the topography of the country is such that they can not be cared for by mine rescue provisions that they now have and are to have in the adjacent coal fields; so that, as the Director of the Bureau of Mines says, we must have a mine rescue station there in order to properly provide for the protection of the lives and health of the miners. And that alone would justify the appropriation that we are asking for in this bill.

There are other Government activities there that I could refer to, but I will not take the time now.

I feel that I have said enough to show unmistakably that the criticism of Hazard that has been so freely and recklessly indulged in is wholly without foundation, and that I have convinced this great body that instead of being a "pork" advocate I am simply asking justice to a great people and a thriving city; and I hope that when we come to the Hazard item those who have been opposing it will not have the courage to vote against it, so that it will receive your unanimous approval.

Mr. Chairman, one would think, after reading all that has been said about me in this connection in the press of the country, that the tenth congressional district is literally covered with "pork" filched from the people's Treasury; and yet it is a fact that there is not a single Federal public building in the tenth district, as now constituted, and not a single public work of any kind in it, except a water gauge which the Weather Bureau a good many years ago put upon one of the piers of the county bridge at Pikeville which cost about \$100 and which measures the tide in the Big Sandy River, especially when it is on a rampage. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURRAY. How are you fixed for water and other drinks down there?

Mr. LANGLEY. We have plenty of water, but we are getting a little shy and a little dry, too, in other lines, due partly to the heavy demand from Oklahoma. [Laughter.]

With due deference to the intelligence and information of gentlemen of the House, I am satisfied that most of them are not accurately advised as to the wonderful and unparalleled progress that is going on in that section of Kentucky, and that is why I have trespassed thus far upon your courtesy and kindness in discussing these things, and why I shall ask you to bear with me for a few moments longer while I call attention to the other section of the district, the Big Sandy Valley, in which Pikeville is situated. The Big Sandy River, which empties into the Ohio at Catlettsburg, traverses one of the richest and most beautiful sections of country in the South for a distance of nearly 200 miles. Government experts have estimated that in this valley alone there are 10,000,000,000 tons of coal, enough to supply the world for a hundred years. This valley is traversed by two great railroads, the Chesapeake & Ohio and the Norfolk & Western, and it is understood that in the near future the Baltimore & Ohio will extend its lines through the valley. As a result one can easily foresee the great future which awaits us there when our resources are fully developed. Pikeville is practically in the center of this great valley. There is not a single Federal public building in this entire valley. The Government has provided a site for one at Pikeville, and this bill authorizes the appropriation of \$35,000 to erect the building.

The city has grown from a comparatively small town of a few years ago until it has now between 3,000 and 4,000 population, with some of the finest and best buildings in all that section of the country. In addition to the common and high schools, it has a college, with several hundred pupils enrolled. It has recently erected a high-school building costing about \$50,000. All the streets are paved with brick, and the city recently spent many thousands of dollars on this improvement alone. It has two national banks and many industries that I will not stop to name. In fact, it has all of the modern improvements and facilities of an up-to-date, progressive city. In addition to the need of post-office accommodations, room is also required for the United States commissioner, who is located there, and for the deputy United States marshal; also for a deputy collector, soon to be located there. It is also expected that in the near future provision will be made for the holding of a term of the Federal court there, as a very large percentage of the business of the court in the eastern Kentucky district comes from that section; and the building is to be so constructed as to admit of an addition to it for this purpose when the occasion arises.

I wish, gentlemen, that I had the time to picture to you all of the greatness of this section of our country, of its people, and of its matchless resources, so that you could understand as I understand what an unspeakable injustice has been done us by these articles and other criticisms to which I have referred.

I have noticed another editorial this week in the New York Times, which is so fond, apparently, of maligning the people of the mountains of Kentucky. This time they seek to evade the question of veracity which the people of Hazard raised against it when they conclusively showed that it had misstated the facts, and this time refer facetiously to the "exceptional marksmanship" of the Kentucky mountaineers.

I presume the editor of the Times is not familiar with the history of the people of the Kentucky mountains, and how they have always responded to their country's call. Of course, he does not know that Hazard and Perry County were named in memory of the great mountaineers of Kentucky who were with Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry when he attained the immortal place which he holds in American history. Of course, the editor of the Times is not familiar with the fact that when the life of this Nation was imperiled the patriotic mountaineers of Kentucky poured forth by the thousands to defend the flag, one county alone furnishing more Union soldiers than there were legal voters in the county, showing that even our mountain boys went to the front, just as they would do again if a foreign foe should ever attack us, and I guess they would receive a hearty welcome by the New York Times and others of that great metropolis if the attack should happen to be at that point.

We have grown sick and tired of this wholesale misrepresentation of our people in the great daily press of the country, which, ignorant of the truth and apparently not desirous of obtaining it, fill their columns with infamous libels of the mountain people whenever they are short of news, and which practice, I presume, when this leak investigation is over and the European war is ended, will be renewed.

I am proud of this opportunity of saying in this great presence that the mountains of Kentucky are inhabited by a people who are as God-fearing and as law-abiding as are found in any other sections of the Republic, and the standard of morality, Christianity, and education are just as high. More than a century and a quarter ago there came across the Cumberland Mountains from North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia the descendants of the Huguenots, the Scotch, the Irish, the English, and the Teutons, bringing with them the Christian beliefs and high conceptions of the duties of citizenship inherited from their ancestors, and settling in the wilds of the mountains of Kentucky, they helped to drive out the wild beasts and savages, and paved the way for the wonderful development which is now going on in that section.

Our people of the mountains of Kentucky have not only been practically ignored by our own State government, but by the Federal Government as well, and yet they have borne patiently, unselfishly, and patriotically their share of the burdens of Government. They have even contributed uncomplainingly their part of the millions that have been expended in the erection of great monumental buildings in our large cities, like New York, Boston, Chicago, and San Francisco, in which are located some of the great papers which have been misrepresenting and maligning them. I hope that what I have said here to-day about the people and the resources of the Kentucky mountains will contribute a little bit of information to the editors and news gatherers of these papers which will aid them in being a little more considerate and accurate in the future. If I accomplish that, I shall feel that I have rendered them a far greater service than merely securing an appropriation for a public building, however much it may be needed. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I wish to say that other gentlemen can think as they like and take whatever action may suit them and satisfy their conscience and the obligation of their oath, but my idea of representative government is that each representative should stand for his own people and section first, being ready, of course, to meet others in a spirit of reasonable and honorable compromise, and thus in the end accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number, which is the most that the instrumentalities of government can do. Speaking for myself, I want to say in conclusion that so long as I am a member of this body I propose to stand for the people of my district against the balance of the world.

Just as I stand for our own country as against any other country in the world, so I stand for the people of the mountains of Kentucky as against any other section of the country, because they sent me here as their representative, and I conceive it to be my highest duty to put their interests first. If I should ever find myself unable to do that, I shall hand back to them the commission they have given me, so that they can choose some one who will. [Applause.]



Under the leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and in support of the statements I have made above, I include as a part of my remarks the following letter from the mayor of Hazard; resolutions adopted by the Commercial Club of Hazard; a letter from the Director of the Bureau of Mines; an editorial and article from the Lexington Herald; two editorials from the Hazard Herald; a letter from D. J. Richards, a citizen of Hazard; a letter from Buford C. Tynes, addressed to the editor of the New York World, in answer to an article appearing in that paper regarding Hazard:

ONE TOWN DESERVES ITS "PORK."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WORLD:

I have no disposition to take issue with you on the principle involved in an editorial appearing in your columns of December 20 under the caption "Public-buildings pork," for with that principle I am in hearty accord. But it is surprising to find that a paper of your standing should assume to cite specific instances of abuse in this connection without some foundation in fact therefor. As scores of New Yorkers who have capital invested in that section already know, five years ago Hazard, the county seat of Perry County, established in the wake of the Battle of Lake Erie, was a village of some 500 inhabitants, situate on the Kentucky River in the heart of the mountains of Kentucky, some 45 miles from the nearest railroad point. In 1912 the Lexington & Eastern extension of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad was projected on to Hazard and beyond into the greatest bituminous coal region of the United States perhaps. Hazard has now grown into a town of some 4,000 inhabitants, and is destined to be the commercial and industrial center of this vast coal region. The Hazard community proper, within a radius of 2 miles from the courthouse, has a population of some 7,500 inhabitants. It is the shipping point as also the mail-distributing point for the adjoining counties of Leslie and Knott.

At the present time the United States post office is housed in a dilapidated metal-side building, but lately devoted to a warehouse for a feed business, which is badly lighted and poorly ventilated, and which is in every respect wholly inadequate for the business done therein. Real estate values in Hazard are so prohibitive that the Government has been thus far unwilling to pay the prices asked for more commodious and appropriate quarters.

There is also located at Hazard a referee in bankruptcy for the district, composed of five of the wealthiest coal counties in the State, and also the deputy United States marshal and deputy United States collector for the districts in which Perry County is placed. Taking into consideration all these things, therefore, and the fact that Hazard's future is assured, it occurs to me that it would be truly an economy for the Government to own its own building.

The wholesome benefits that would accrue to a long-neglected citizenship in this mountainous section, oft outlandishly scandalized in blood-and-thunder articles appearing periodically in the Sunday editions of metropolitan yellow journals, and indoffensively romanticized by John Fox, Jr., and Charles Neville Buck, would be out of all proportion to the amount expended by the Federal Government.

Is it possible that the World is as much in error as to the conditions obtaining in the other villages named in its editorial? May we offer the suggestion that the World bring the next edition of its almanac up to date in respect to Hazard, at least? With the other towns we are not concerned.

NEW YORK, December 22.

BUFORD C. TYNES.

HAZARD, KY., December 22, 1916.

The efforts of Hon. WILLIAM E. Cox, Congressman from Indiana, in his fight against the public-buildings bill, who uses the editor of the Journal of the American Institute of Architects, comments, as an argument against certain appropriations mentions the town of Hazard, Ky., in Hon. JOHN W. LANGLEY's district, as a small, insignificant town of 537 persons, and also mentions other places in eastern Kentucky, giving what were facts in 1910, but lacking a good deal of truth when we consider facts as they are in this good year 1916.

The town of Hazard, instead of being a small town in the sixth class, is now in the fourth class. It is the center of the coal fields of eastern Kentucky, and has a population of 4,000. The last school census gives, in the Hazard district, some 825 boys and girls between the ages of 6 and 20. Within a radius of 5 miles there are 16 coal operations, all independent, with capital invested in plants of over \$2,000,000, employing at this time from 3,000 to 4,000 men. This being the county seat, the business to a certain extent is done here. As work progresses rooms will be turned, and in reasonable time the capacity be doubled, which means increased population. This being the center of the coal field on the L. & E. extension of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad, there is need at this time for the establishment of a mine rescue station, and the public building upper part is to be used as such, the lower part for post office. The building now occupied is such that no insurance can be had on it, and there is an actual need of a suitable place and building for the great increase in the post office department. If there is not any need of a building here, then it is not needed anywhere. Collier's Weekly had an article on the same line as the utterances of the Congressman from Indiana, made during the campaign just ended. The Hazard Herald, published here, replied, and sent a marked copy to the publishers, but no mention was made correcting the previous statement. If men who are so everlastingly opposed to seeing beyond the boundaries of their own district would come in person to investigate, or wake up to the fact that many changes can take place in seven years, there would be less buncomb, especially in Congress, and more real men's work done in that part of the world known as the Halls of Congress.

D. J. RICHARDS.

#### HAZARD PUBLIC BUILDING.

The great city newspapers are having much to say these days about the proposed public building for Hazard, and constantly refer to Hazard as a city of 537 souls. The New York Times is one. That great newspaper has the reputation of being exceptionally careful about accuracy as to facts in its news columns. The same should be true with the New York Sun, World, and other great newspapers. Try at least to avoid doing injustice to other communities without the slightest investigation. The circumstances are such as to strongly suggest ill purpose on the part of these newspapers.

When the editor found the 1910 census, crediting Hazard with "537 souls," the fact of a \$40,000 public building being proposed should have suggested inquiry to an analytic editorial mind. Strange that it did not. There is always room for progress, and Hazard has developed for the past five years with a steady, rapid stride that has caused the rest of the State of Kentucky to look on with marvelling admiration. The very fine quality of the coal here has caused some of the finest operations in the country to be located here, and more are immediately in prospect. The main object of the public building is a mine rescue station for the benefit of the thousands of miners in this section. The great city dailies will certainly not gainsay that great important humanitarian object.

The large city newspapers, whom we feel sure have thoughtlessly done injustice to our situation here, should make ample correction in their columns to properly inform their readers, and we feel confident that they will not hesitate to do so. Properly the Hazard Commercial Club should take the matter up direct with them to that end.

#### HAZARD GROSSLY MISREPRESENTED BY A NUMBER OF METROPOLITAN NEWSPAPERS.

In the annual appropriation bill for public buildings introduced in the present session of Congress is a provision for the appropriation of \$40,000 for a Government building for Hazard. This provision in this bill is due to the efforts of our Congressman, JOHN W. LANGLEY. It looks like the bill will pass—not, however, without some modifications. It provides for a good many other public buildings in various parts of the United States, mainly in cities where no public building has heretofore been erected.

It is but natural, therefore, that many of the larger cities of the country, already provided for with expensive Government buildings, oftentimes costing millions of dollars, should resent the building of a post office or other public building in the smaller cities.

But just now Hazard is getting rather more of her share of opposition from the heretofore more favored communities. Thus it is that we have newspapers like the New York Times, the New York World, New York Evening Sun, San Francisco Chronicle, Collier's Weekly, and many others, knocking this community for even presuming to want a post-office building. Some of them are knocking our Congressman as well. All this is done under the idea that the bill making this appropriation is called "pork barrel," and other epithets of like meaning and import. In every instance Hazard is referred to as a town of 537 population.

In this these newspapers and all of them who have handled this subject in that way show their utter ignorance of the true situation. Of course, it is absolutely unknown to them, perhaps unbelievable on their part, that this city has a voting population—a legal voting population, if they please—of more than twice the number given as the population thereof. Perhaps also it is unknown to them that in and around Hazard there is a population largely in excess of 5,000, tributary to this post office, and that long before any building under this or any other measure can be constructed there will be a population in this city of from two to three times that number. Of course, it is unknown also to these newspapers in the large cities that there are some 15 or 20 large coal mines within a radius of 4 miles of this city, all in continuous operation and all shipping a large tonnage of coal from this point, and that the development of the coal industry in this section has just begun. All this brings Government business not only through the post office but in hundreds of other ways. And why should not the Government of the United States furnish suitable buildings—suitable office buildings for its employees? Other large business does this.

The New York Sun suggests that this and 37 other similar appropriations should be cut in half and that this would enable the Government to build a submarine named "U(nselfish) 38." We quote here an editorial from this paper:

#### AN INLAND SUBMARINE.

"The porkiest bill ever put before Congress is now pending. A good many of the rural Congressmen are not only bent upon bringing home the bacon but are resolved to rejoice their constituents with the finest strips of fat. A streak o' fat for the hill town, a streak o' lean for the city, seems to be the prescription most favored. A fine sample of the fat is to go to the town of Hazard, Ky., if Representative JOHN WESLEY LANGLEY can compass it. Pork knows no party. Mr. LANGLEY is a Republican.

"The population of Hazard is 537. Yearly post-office receipts are under \$5,000. Rental of the present post-office quarters is \$250 a year. The public-building bill would appropriate \$40,000 for a Government building which would require \$3,500 a year for maintenance.

"We have never been able to comprehend the passion for resplendent post offices. If the money were for schools or for the support of teachers a certain lavishness with it would be understandable. But the school district pays for the school house and pays the teacher—we wonder how much she gets in Hazard—whereas the 2-cent stamps of the city dwellers pay for the marble corridors of Government buildings in Hazards from Maine to California.

"Now, it is possible that the people of Hazard do not quite realize that this country needs guns and battleships. They are not on the seacoast. With good reason they feel tolerably secure. But a number of settlements whose wealth would make possible their Government building have not the same comfortable sense of safety. Isn't any reasonable compromise possible? Perhaps for \$20,000 Hazard could have a thoroughly adequate Government building, serviceable, substantial, and dignified if not showy. The other \$20,000 might go to buy a piece of artillery or some smokeless powder. In the same public-building bill which favors Hazard there are plump sums to erect buildings or buy sites in 16 North Carolina and 21 Missouri villages. If all these and Hazard were to halve the money designed for them they could pay for a submarine, which might be christened the U(nselfish) 38."

We have not space to answer it in full, but we venture to remark that New York City has had millions appropriated to it to every cent which has been appropriated to the entire tenth congressional district of Kentucky since the Civil War, to say nothing of the millions that went to that city before that time. No; we do not specially need submarines or want them. Certainly not half so badly as New York will need our coal if once we should have war.

And, speaking of marble corridors in Hazards from Maine to California, it might not be improper to inquire just who paid for the marble post-office building that cost millions in the city of New York. And did not the people of Hazard help pay for that building as they have helped pay for all the other buildings?



True we pay our teachers, and we paid for our \$50,000 school building as well, and we have a school in Hazard which would compare favorably with the public schools of New York, and it has a larger daily attendance than the total population given to Hazard by these papers.

(Hazard employs 19 teachers and pays them \$11,795 annually.) Just here we might say that we have taken the time to investigate the records of the Hazard post office, and this is approximately the amount of business we find in the post office which these newspapers, which are supposed to give correct information to their readers, say serves 537 souls. The number of people served directly—and this means through the windows of the Hazard post office—is estimated by the Hazard postmaster from his records at 8,000.

In addition to this the Hazard post office serves, through its routes, every post office in Leslie County, with the exception of two or three in the extreme lower part of that county, and the number of people served in that county by the Hazard post office is conservatively estimated at 8,000; then, again, the Hazard post office serves more than half the population of Knott County, and this number is conservatively estimated at 5,000. Thus we see, from the actual records of the United States Post Office Department, the Hazard post office serves more than 20,000 people. Yet the New York Sun, in its gigantic misrepresentation or in its monumental ignorance, lets out an awful howl about "pork." We know only from reading such reports what "pork" means; we have never had any experience in the matter in these Kentucky mountains; we have been forced to do the best we could without Government aid in a financial way, but we do wish that these newspapers which have been attacking Hazard so malevolently and viciously would stop to investigate the truth before they publish such libels and spread their broadcast throughout the country.

We believe that if the New York Sun and World and those other papers would investigate the conditions of the Hazard post office they would not only repudiate the obnoxious articles referred to herein, but would openly advocate the appropriation by Congress of the \$40,000 proposed in the public-buildings bill. We need just such a building, and everyone who knows the conditions here knows that we need the building. It is up to us to stand by our Congressman, JOHN W. LANGLEY, and to arm him with facts and figures which will show the other Members of Congress that he is justified in his efforts in our behalf. We can do it and we must do it.

[From the Lexington Herald, Jan. 11, 1917.]

HAZARD INVITES NEWSPAPERS THAT CHARGE "PORK" IN \$40,000 POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION TO SEND REPRESENTATIVES TO INSPECT MUSTING PERRY COUNTY CAPITAL.

Metropolitan newspapers which have had editorials, based on incorrect data, derogating the \$40,000 appropriation for a post-office building for Hazard, Perry County, are asked to send their special representatives to Hazard for the purpose of learning the real facts about the city in resolutions adopted by the Hazard Commercial Club. President J. B. Hoge, of the club, is authorized to send copies of the resolution to the New York Sun, New York Times, New York World, Colliers' Weekly, Washington Star, San Francisco Chronicle, and "other large journals known to have printed these mistaken, incorrect articles about Hazard."

Hazard recently, through Congressman JOHN W. LANGLEY, asked for an appropriation of \$40,000 for the post-office building. The bill will come up before the House Saturday for final vote. The newspapers, basing their claims on a Hazard population of 537, where in reality it is more than 4,000 the commercial club says, ask that the appropriation be held up, alleging "pork."

The Hazard Herald, in defense of the city's claims, recently pointed out the newspapers' errata in news stories, and in an editorial gave also a digest of the coal activities about Hazard.

Resolutions adopted by the Hazard Commercial Club follow:

"Whereas several large city newspapers have been publishing articles derogating an appropriation by Congress for a public building at Hazard, referring to us as a town of 537 souls"; and

"Whereas Hazard now has a population of over 4,000 people (which is increasing rapidly, with a near-by country and mining population of about 4,000 more people, who patronize the Hazard post office direct, besides which there are within a radius of 4 miles of Hazard eight recently established post offices serving locally that many different coal operations, including over 7,000 people; and

"Whereas there are within the same radius, already under way, 16 coal operations—some of them among the finest plants in the country—with still others in early contemplation, and all together employing thousands of men; and one of the chief objects of the proposed public building being to house a mine rescue station for their protection, as well as protection of the thousands of men in the mines now operating on the head of the Kentucky River, and other mines which will soon be started in this rapidly developing field of exceptionally good coal; and

"Whereas in the reference of these great newspapers in providing for the public defense, they forget that in case of attack on New York City by an enemy they would be eagerly calling for the defense of their fortifications these hardy Kentucky mountain men, famed in every war of our country for their daring, their cunning, and their exceptional marksmanship—these men whose patriotism would naturally be fired brighter by having a building in our midst over which Old Glory waves encouragingly every day of the year. Men from the county and county seat whose names memorialize the hero of the famous battle of Lake Erie—Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry—named for him by Kentucky mountain men who were with him in his daring battle and glorious victory and loved him as a kindred spirit: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Hazard Commercial Club, That we trust Hazard, Perry County, may soon say, with Commodore Hazard Perry, 'We have met the enemy, and they are ours.' That the big cities may realize the justice of the smaller cities having a material token of our Federal Government, of which the entire community may be proud, as well as the large cities, which are all so bountifully provided along that line. That the hardest body of fighting men for the defense come from the less urban communities. But especially that these great city newspapers shall at once set their readers aright as to the city of Hazard, where much—very, very much—has taken place since the census of 1910. That common justice and fairness demands that this be done, and that we urge the sending of their own special representatives here to see for themselves what has happened to and about the city of 537 souls, to learn that that events push on regardless of a census, and that we need the public building.

"Resolved further, That the president is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the New York Sun, New York Times, New York World, Collier's Weekly, Washington Star, San Francisco Chronicle, and other large journals known to have printed these mistaken, incorrect articles about Hazard, and also to our Senators and Congressmen, thanking them in advance for their kindness and good will to the thrifty 'baby city' of our Commonwealth, and on behalf of the miners in their hazardous occupation of getting out the 'black diamonds,' who certainly deserve as much consideration as the cities, for the benefit of which they take their risks underground to get the coal.

"J. B. HOGE, President.

"R. L. CONNELL, Secretary."

The Hazard Herald of January 4 has the following editorial on the post-office situation:

#### HAZARD PUBLIC BUILDING.

"The great city newspapers are having much to say these days about the proposed public building for Hazard, and constantly refer to Hazard as a city of 537 souls. The New York Times is one. That great newspaper has the reputation of being exceptionally careful about accuracy as to facts in its news columns. The same should be true with the New York Sun, World, and other great newspapers. Try at least to avoid doing injustice to other communities, without the slightest investigation. The circumstances are such as to strongly suggest ill purpose on the part of these newspapers.

"When the editor found the 1910 census, crediting Hazard with 537 souls, the fact of a \$40,000 public building being proposed should have suggested inquiry to an analytic editorial mind. Strange that it did not. There is always room for progress, and Hazard has developed for the past five years with a steady, rapid stride that has caused the rest of the State of Kentucky to look on with marveling admiration. The very fine quality of the coal here has caused some of the finest operations in the country to be located here, and more are immediately in prospect. The main object of the public building is a mine-rescue station for the benefit of the thousands of miners in this section. The great city dailies will certainly not gainsay that great, important, humanitarian object.

"The large city newspapers, whom we feel sure have thoughtlessly done injustice to our situation here, should make ample correction in their columns to properly inform their readers, and we feel confident that they will not hesitate to do so. Properly, the Hazard Commercial Club should take the matter up direct with them to that end."

The Hazard case, as presented by the Hazard Herald of January 4, follows:

"In the annual appropriation bill for public buildings introduced in the present session of Congress is a provision for the appropriation of \$40,000 for a Government building for Hazard. This provision in this bill is due to the efforts of our Congressman, JOHN W. LANGLEY. It looks like the bill will pass—not, however, without some modifications. It provides for a good many other public buildings in various parts of the United States, mainly in cities where no public building has heretofore been erected.

"It is but natural, therefore, that many of the larger cities of the country already provided for with expensive Government buildings, oftentimes costing millions of dollars, should resent the building of a post office or other public building in the smaller cities.

"But just now Hazard is getting rather more than her share of opposition from the heretofore more favored communities. Thus it is that we have newspapers like the New York Times, the New York World, New York Evening Sun, San Francisco Chronicle, Colliers' Weekly, and many others, knocking this community for even presuming to want a post-office building. Some of them are knocking our Congressman as well. All this is done under the idea that the bill making this appropriation is called "pork barrel" and other epithets of like meaning and import. In every instance Hazard is referred to as a town of 537 population.

"In this these newspapers, and all of them who have handled this subject in that way, show their utter ignorance of the true situation. Of course, it is absolutely unknown to them, perhaps unbelievable on their part, that this city has a voting population—a legal voting population, if they please—of more than twice the number given as the population thereof. Perhaps, also, it is unknown to them that in and around Hazard there is a population largely in excess of 5,000 tributary to this post office, and that long before any building under this or any other measure can be constructed there will be a population in this city of from two to three times that number. Of course, it is unknown also to these newspapers in the large cities that there are some 15 or 20 large coal mines within a radius of 4 miles of this city, all in continuous operation and all shipping a large tonnage of coal from this point, and that the development of the coal industry in this section has just begun. All this brings Government business, not only through the post office but in hundreds of other ways. And why should not the Government of the United States furnish suitable buildings—suitable office buildings—for its employees? Other large business does this.

"The New York Sun suggests that this and 37 other similar appropriations should be cut in half, and that this would enable the Government to build a submarine named 'U(nselfish) 38.' We quote here an editorial from this paper:

#### "AN INLAND SUBMARINE.

"The porkiest bill ever put before Congress is now pending. A good many of the rural Congressmen are not only bent upon bringing home the bacon, but are resolved to rejoice their constituents with the finest strips of fat. A streak o' fat for the hill town, a streak o' lean for the city, seems to be the prescription most favored. A fine sample of the fat is to go to the town of Hazard, Ky. If Representative JOHN WESLEY LANGLEY can compass it. Pork knows no party. Mr. LANGLEY is a Republican.

"The population of Hazard is 537. Yearly post-office receipts are under \$5,000. Rental of the present post-office quarters is \$250 a year. The public-buildings bill would appropriate \$40,000 for a Government building, which would require \$3,500 a year for maintenance.

"We have never been able to comprehend the passion for resplendent post offices. If the money were for schools or for the support of teachers a certain lavishness with it would be understandable. But the school district pays for the schoolhouse and pays the teacher—we wonder how much she gets in Hazard; whereas the 2-cent stamps of the city dwellers pay for the marble corridors of Government buildings in Hazards from Maine to California.

"Now, it is possible that the people of Hazard do not quite realize that this country needs guns and battleships. They are not on the seacoast. With good reason they feel tolerably secure. But a number of settlements whose wealth would make possible their Government



building have not the same comfortable sense of safety. Isn't any reasonable compromise possible? Perhaps for \$20,000 Hazard could have a thoroughly adequate Government building, serviceable, substantial, and dignified, if not showy. The other \$20,000 might go to buy a piece of artillery or some smokeless powder. In the same public-buildings bill which favors Hazard there are plump sums to erect buildings or buy sites in 16 North Carolina and 21 Missouri villages. If all these and Hazard were to halve the money designed for them they could pay for a submarine, which might be christened the U(nselfish) 38.

"We have not space to answer it in full; but we venture to remark that New York City has had millions appropriated to it to every cent which has been appropriated to the entire tenth congressional district of Kentucky since the Civil War, to say nothing of the millions that went to that city before that time. No, we do not specially need submarines, or want them. Certainly, not half so badly as New York will need our coal if once we should have war.

"And, speaking of marble corridors in Hazards from Maine to California, it might not be improper to inquire just who paid for the marble post-office building that cost millions in the city of New York. And did not the people of Hazard help pay for that building, as they have helped pay for all the other buildings?

"True, we pay our teachers; and we paid for our \$50,000 school building as well; and we have a school in Hazard which would compare favorably with the public schools of New York, and it has a larger daily attendance than the total population given to Hazard by these papers.

"(Hazard employs 19 teachers and pays them \$11,795 annually.)

"Just here we might say that we have taken the time to investigate the records of the Hazard post office, and this is approximately the amount of business we find in the post office which these newspapers—which are supposed to give correct information to their readers—say serves 537 souls: The number of people served directly—and this means through the windows of the Hazard post office—is estimated by the Hazard postmaster, from his records, at 8,000. In addition to this the Hazard post office serves, through its routes, every post office in Leslie County, with the exception of two or three in the extreme lower part of that county, and the number of people served in that county by the Hazard post office is conservatively estimated at 8,000; then, again, the Hazard post office serves more than half the population of Knott County, and this number is conservatively estimated at 5,000. Thus we see, from the actual records of the United States Post Office Department, the Hazard post office serves more than 20,000 people. Yet the New York Sun, in its gigantic misrepresentation, or in its monumental ignorance, lets out an awful howl about "pork." We know only from reading such reports what "pork" means; we have never had any experience in the matter in these Kentucky mountains; we have been forced to do the best we could without Government aid in a financial way; but we do wish that these newspapers which have been attacking Hazard so malevolently and viciously would stop to investigate the truth before they publish such libels and spread them broadcast throughout the country.

"We believe that if the New York Sun and World, and those other papers, would investigate the conditions of the Hazard post office they would not only repudiate the obnoxious articles referred to herein, but would openly advocate the appropriation by Congress of the \$40,000 proposed in the public-buildings bill. We need just such a building and everyone who knows the conditions here knows that we need the building. It is up to us to stand by our Congressman, JOHN W. LANGLEY, and to arm him with facts and figures which will show the other Members of Congress that he is justified in his efforts in our behalf. We can do it, and we must do it."

"Coal Notes," from the Hazard Herald, showing the activities in that section follow:

"The Hazard coal field in January, 1915, was producing on an average 60 cars of coal a day, or 3,600 tons. The field is now averaging 160 cars a day, or over 9,600 tons. As a matter of fact on some days the output runs up to much more than this. But for the shortage of cars during the last three months the field would have averaged considerable more. This output is from 14 mines. Of these the Blue Grass is averaging 17 cars a day; the East Tennessee, Kentucky Jewel, Ashless, Himyar, are averaging 15 cars a day; Columbus No. 4 puts out an average of 10 cars; the Hazard Coal Co. and the Daniel Boone average 12 cars; Diamond Block is averaging now about 6 cars; the Four Seams Collieries Co. puts out 3 cars a day. These last two companies are just getting well under way, and their output will increase rapidly from now on.

"These 10 mines are in and around Hazard, and this output is all handled through the Hazard freight office. The four companies on First Creek ship out through Typo, but they are of course part of the Hazard field proper. On First Creek the Harvey Coal Co. is turning out 12 cars a day; Kentucky Block, 7; First Creek Coal Co., 7; and Blue Diamond, 12. Each car of coal shipped out of this field will weigh on an average 60 tons. The output of the First Creek companies will gradually increase as the entries are lengthened and the car service improves. They are all new operations, but they are under the management of some of the best coal men in the eastern Kentucky field, and all have very neat and modern plants and efficient employees. The Harvey Coal Co. plant is in the head of the creek, has a good location, enabling it to extend its tippie across the hollow and work over a greater area at one time. Before the middle of the summer there will be at least three more companies working on this creek.

"The Kenmont Coal Co. has its plant on Buckeye Creek completed and is now ready to begin mining coal, but is being delayed a little pending the completion of the Kentucky River Power Co.'s large central plant. The power company is furnishing power now up to the full capacity of its old plant, but expects to have at least one unit of its new plant in operation within a few days, thus lessening the strain on the old plant. The output from the Kenmont mine will not be handled through the Hazard railroad office. The new mine of the Columbus Coal Mining Co., on Walkers Branch, mine No. 3, will not be ready to ship coal for a few weeks, owing to the fact that it must wait for the completion of the railroad to bring in heavy steel for the tippie and other heavy equipment. The company has some 4,000 tons of coal stacked outside, which it will load as soon as the railroad gets up in the hollow and ship mine run. All the company's tracks are down, power lines are up, motors are on the ground working, and 18 entries and air courses are being driven as rapidly as men can press the work on both sides of the hollow in the No. 4 coal. This company ought to be shipping from 15 to 20 cars a day within three months after they begin operations. The station on Walkers Branch will be known as Alais, named in honor of the president of the Columbus Coal Mining Co., of Chicago.

"A good percentage of the present output of the Hazard field was contracted for last year, so that local operators are not all profiting as much as they should by reason of the present high prices prevailing all over the country. For instance, a good deal of block coal is now going out under old contracts at from \$1.10 to \$1.50, while occasionally a car is sold at the present-day price, at \$3 to \$4 per ton. All new orders that can be filled come at good prices now, slack in some instances bringing \$2.50 and \$3. Local operators, being unable to fill orders for slack, have been buying all the slack from the small wagon mines around town, and paying a good price for it loaded on cars at the railroad station."

#### HAZARD COMMERCIAL CLUB.

Whereas Hon. JOHN W. LANGLEY, Representative in Congress from the tenth Kentucky district, has secured approval of an appropriation for a public building at Hazard; and

Whereas we feel that no city in the country more urgently needs such a building than does Hazard, and none more properly merits such recognition and aid on the part of Congress, under the circumstances: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Hazard Commercial Club, That the sincere thanks of the entire citizenship of Hazard are hereby extended to Representative LANGLEY and others who have aided him in securing the authorization, together with the urgent request and hope that the appropriation may certainly be made.

J. B. HOGE, President.

R. L. CONNELL, Secretary.

[Editorial, the Lexington Herald, Jan. 11, 1917.]

#### JUSTICE FOR HAZARD.

There are published in other columns of this issue resolutions adopted by the Hazard Commercial Club in response to articles in numerous papers deprecating or opposing an appropriation of \$40,000 for the erection of a public building in Hazard. There are also published articles from the Hazard Herald showing what has been the growth of Hazard since the taking of the census upon which those papers base their opposition.

Few Kentuckians even realize how rapid has been the development of the coal fields of eastern Kentucky, of which Hazard is the center. It is not surprising, therefore, that papers published in other States should have no adequate conception of that growth, which has transformed Hazard from a village of 537 inhabitants, as given by the census, to a growing, bustling, hustling, populous town of 4,000 inhabitants, the center of a region that is developing more rapidly than any section in the South. When it is understood that the growth and development of the coal fields of eastern Kentucky has but begun, that the surface has but been scratched, it can easily be realized that within a comparatively short time Hazard and other cities and towns in that region will rival in population and in business many cities that but a few years ago far surpassed them both in population and in business.

Not as yet have the coal mines of that field begun to produce their capacity. Thousands of acres are as yet untouched. But even with the present development Hazard is entitled to the consideration of the Federal Government, and with the purpose for which the citizens of Hazard are striving for a public building, there should be peculiar and sympathetic interest on the part of all who appreciate the need for instruction to the miners in all methods of scientific mining and conserving of human life.

It is the desire and the purpose of the citizens of Hazard to have established at Hazard a mine-rescue station, where there will be demonstrated the latest and most scientific methods of operating mines and the most effective means of preventing accidents in mines. Even on the business done by the population of to-day, Hazard is entitled to such a building as is contemplated in the bill which has been ridiculed and opposed by the great city papers. Judged by the prospects of development, within the next few years, even by the time that that public building can be erected, Hazard will be entitled to the erection of a more extensive building than the one now proposed.

There is no paper that has more consistently opposed all "pork" projects than has the Lexington Herald; but it is unjust to apply such terms to the project for the erection of such a building at Hazard as is desired by the citizens of eastern Kentucky. It is not only not improper but most eminently proper that the Federal Government should give the recognition of a suitable building for the transaction of the public business.

HAZARD, KY., January 9, 1917.

Hon. J. W. LANGLEY,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In connection with the efforts to secure an appropriation for a public building here, I beg to state that our estimates and figures show that the city of Hazard now has a population somewhat in excess of 4,000. The rate of increase has been something like an average of 1,000 per year for the past three years, and, in our belief, the conditions are such that this estimated rate of increase will be maintained for some time to come, probably at least two or three years.

There are three coal operations entirely within the corporate limits of the city, and two of the three operations are beginning expansions of their plants, which will necessitate a considerable addition of men. The third one has just reached the point of beginning to run coal and it will take in quite a number of additional families steadily for a year or two. This, however, is only a part of the actual growth of the city. In the residence and business sections the growth is steady and consistent and the increase there during the next two or three years will probably exceed the very material and rapid addition in population and building of the past two or three years. The city authorities have already taken steps toward paving all the principal streets in the city during the coming summer, which will be a very material inducement to the growth of the city, as you understand.

The city now has a public school, including high school, with 14 teachers, and in addition to this there is the Hazard Baptist Institute, a secular school, which has an average attendance of over 200, with an equipment of 5 teachers. The average attendance of the public school is over 600. The Hazard graded school district extends beyond the limits of Hazard and has in it several ward schools.

I trust that the above information may be of some benefit and help in your efforts to show to your fellow Members of Congress that Hazard is unmistakably entitled to a public building. We all feel here that the building proposed will be inadequate for our needs by the time it can be completed, but we will be none the less glad to have the build-



ing and then secure enlargements later on, if possible. We are especially interested in securing a mine-rescue station here, but we feel that you have this in mind as well, and that you will handle the matter to that ultimate end.

Very truly,

W. M. PURSIFULL, Mayor.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
BUREAU OF MINES,  
Washington, January 11, 1917.

Hon. JOHN W. LANGLEY,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LANGLEY: In reply to your letter of January 7, 1917, referring to the proposition to establish a mine-rescue station at Hazard, Ky., I am glad of the opportunity at this time to reiterate the statement which I made to subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives on April 21, 1916, to the effect that I recommend the establishment of the mine-rescue station above mentioned.

On account of the topography of the country surrounding Hazard, it is impractical to furnish the mine-rescue and first-aid training which the miners of that locality should receive from headquarters located at other points. Since the Lexington and Eastern branch of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad has been completed to this point, the coal-mining industry in the vicinity has increased tremendously. In 1913 there were but three shipping mines in this district, which it is understood produced less than 100,000 tons of coal. In 1914 the approximate production of Perry County was 221,000 tons, which figure was increased to 548,000 tons in 1915, this amount of coal being shipped from 10 producing mines. According to recent reports other new mines are being put on an operating basis, and in view of these facts it would appear to me that the recommendation made to the above-mentioned committee has been fully substantiated.

As you are aware, it is the plan of the Bureau of Mines to detail a foreman miner to take charge and instruct the workmen in the district in mine-safety and first-aid methods, and as soon as the proposition has been placed upon a sound footing to turn the entire matter over to the operators and let them maintain the station on their own account. It is felt that cooperation of this kind by the bureau would encourage the mining men in the district in question to undertake this humanitarian work and would aid them in its permanent establishment.

Cordially, yours,

VAN. H. MANNING, Director.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity for the purpose of answering some criticisms made against the provisions carried in this bill in favor of Tennessee and the district I have the honor to represent. They were criticisms made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], on page 13 of his speech, which has been extensively circulated, calls attention to two Federal buildings in my district—Jellico and Maryville. In the table he prints they are both classed as post offices, the one at Jellico carrying an appropriation of \$80,000 and the one at Maryville \$70,000. The building at Jellico was finished more than a year ago, and the Maryville building will be completed in a few months.

The gentleman failed to state, although it was written in the act authorizing the appropriation, that the Jellico building was not only to be a post office, but also to provide a mine rescue station, which made it necessary to carry an additional amount of money.

We have had in the last 10 or 15 years a number of very serious mine accidents in that district. I remember one where 162 miners were killed; not a man escaped. This place, Jellico, is in the center of the great coal-mining district of the South. There are in a radius of 75 miles of this mine rescue station in the States of Tennessee and Kentucky more than 15,000 miners. The receipts of this post office last year were \$10,615, so that it is within the law passed by Congress carried in the last public-buildings bill.

The Maryville building is to house the post office, and on the second floor the local officials of the Appalachian Forest Reserve, now without a home, will have headquarters. When I secured the appropriation for the site for a building in that town the postal receipts were about \$5,400, and last year they were \$14,623. According to the census of 1910, there were 2,381 people in Maryville. To-day one new plant, the Aluminum Co. of America, has on its pay roll 3,500 men, and the population of the town and suburbs is over 8,000. In a short time the population of Maryville will reach 25,000. So both of these building propositions were in the interest of the public and in strict compliance with existing law.

Mr. Chairman, the criticism made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] was that in the towns carried in the bill providing for building sites for Tennessee the postal receipts were less than \$6,000.

When the pending bill was made up and site items passed upon by the committee, we had a report from the Post Office Department showing that in every instance the total amount of postal receipts covering 12 months was more than \$6,000—from \$6,540 to \$8,417—items criticized by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], and

the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK]. So every one of these propositions are within the law.

I submit the list of site places and the amount of postal receipts for the calendar year 1916:

La Follette	\$6,540
Rockwood	7,597
Lenoir City	8,081
Dixon	8,417

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

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to find out whether we can agree upon some time to end debate on the paragraph.

Mr. RAKER. I would like 10 minutes on the paragraph.

Mr. CRAMTON. I hardly feel that the chairman ought to ask that now, following three speeches on his side and time unrestricted. It might be difficult to tell how much time is wanted.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman from Iowa had 20 minutes, and I am simply trying to make an agreement. Does the gentleman want some time?

Mr. CRAMTON. I had thought of taking some time to say something, and moving to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is already pending. The gentleman from Iowa made that motion.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 43 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida moves that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto close in 43 minutes.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I will now answer the charge made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], and by others, that this is a sectional bill. My Republicanism is just as good as that of any man who sits on this side of the House. I say there is absolutely no foundation for that statement. I will venture the assertion that this bill authorizes a larger amount for States carried by Gov. Hughes than for the States carried by President Wilson in the recent November election. I will make a second statement, and that is that you will find, if you go through the bill from cover to cover, that the amount of money authorized in the districts represented by Republicans exceeds the amount of money authorized in the districts represented by Democrats. [Applause.]

The total authorization in this bill is about \$33,000,000, and of that amount \$5,684,000 goes to 12 Southern States. I can name three northern cities in this bill which are to receive more money than the 12 Southern States. The three cities are New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia.

Now, another proposition: The gentleman has been contrasting what the 10 Members from the State of Tennessee receive under this bill. There are nine propositions, carrying \$100,000. Let us see what Iowa secures. Eleven Members have 13 propositions in the bill, with a total amount of \$337,500.

So Iowa, with only one additional Member over that of Tennessee, gets \$277,500 more than Tennessee—a Southern State. If there is sectionalism there, it is in favor of his State against my State.

Now, what about the so-called pork barrel. The gentleman himself [Mr. Good], according to the records of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, introduced a bill for a post office at Marion, Iowa, where the population in 1890 was 4,400 and the postal receipts \$11,680, and his bill calls for \$100,000.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. When was that?

Mr. AUSTIN. In this Congress.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman to whom the gentleman from Tennessee is referring refused to go before the committee and commit himself to a bill carrying thirty-eight millions of dollars out of an empty Treasury, and refused to say anything in favor of it, did he not?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; but the gentleman committed himself by writing a bill and putting his name upon it and sending it to our committee.

Mr. GOOD. That was almost two years ago, was it not?

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, when we were introducing bills to go into this omnibus public-buildings bill. The amount carried in the gentleman's bill is about twice the amount carried in this bill for towns having postal revenues of \$11,000.



Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, was that done with the idea of preventing the gentleman from coming back to Congress?

Mr. AUSTIN. I want to say, in conclusion, the Democrats are in control in this House, and the majority of the Democratic Members come from the South. It would not be anything but natural and reasonable that they should have more items in the bill than the minority, but they have been absolutely fair and impartial in the division of these authorizations. [Applause.] The only complaint I have is that the Members from the South have not actually secured more for their section and that the bill does not carry far more for Tennessee and the district I represent.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, to my mind the passage of this particular bill at this particular time is nothing short of preposterous. I have listened to the arguments advanced for the bill by different gentlemen who are familiar with the figures in response to attacks made upon it with reference to sectionalism, partisanship, or treatment of individual districts. It is very plain that the "division" to which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] just referred, has been made with a strange mathematical nicety.

There is no partisanship in "pork." We all admit that. Whether a man is a Republican or a Democrat, he is just as pleased to receive it. In anything that I say here I do not desire to impugn the motives of any individual Member, but I do say that the system which has brought forth this bill is a system that is not desirable for the best interests of the country, and as a Member of this House I submit that I have a right to express my criticism of the bill and of the system, and even have the right to do so without having my motives questioned or impugned. I submit—and the members of the committee can correct me if I am wrong, for I have not tallied it up myself—that it is probably the truth that not a single Member of this House who has introduced a bill for a public building in his district but has had at least one bill reported out, unless he told the committee not to report it out. That is the basis on which "pork" bills are made, so that every fellow is going to have a square deal and will have his chance, and when you are making a "pork" bill the committee is bound to keep to established rules and customs.

Mr. Chairman, to relieve the mind of somebody who may be looking up the thing to find out what the Member of the seventh Michigan district asked for, I want to say that while there are propositions in my district more worthy than some here, propositions that could stand even the desirable rule recommended by the committee in the last paragraph of the pending bill, I did not introduce a bill or ask for anything. I do not have to move to strike out my item, as some of these gentlemen are so quick to suggest, even though I might consider it a good proposition; but I was so opposed to the system, and I am so opposed to this kind of extravagance at this critical time in our finances, that I had not the nerve to even ask the committee to report out a bill for me. So I did not introduce one. I amended the bill in that respect before the committee had a chance at it. I am opposed to the system.

There are other good reasons against this bill that I want to urge more emphatically than that. In the first place, there remain of this session only 39 legislative days, and you gentlemen know that there is no opportunity left for this Congress to consider anything of constructive legislation in those 39 days, and yet we come in with this pork bill, and we consume with it several of those 39 days. Yesterday we set aside Calendar Wednesday, which was won only by the progressive spirit of the country after a long, hard-fought battle, and I predict that for the remainder of this Congress we will dispense with that day very frequently. Still we have time to spend a week upon whether there shall be a building in this little town or that little town that has no particular need for it.

Again, while I have said there is no partisanship in pork, I want to say to the other side of the House that when a party is in power as is the Democratic Party to-day, controlling every branch of the Government, you have the responsibility upon you to see to it that you have enough money to pay your bills, and it is a pretty big problem at the present moment. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a statement issued by the Secretary of the Treasury in this administration, under date of December 31, 1916, in which he states that we will have a deficit for the year ending June 30, 1918, of \$379,000,000. Of course, of that amount \$279,000,000 is the actual hole there will be in the Treasury, but the law requires another hundred million dollars to be in the Treasury, and that brings it up to \$379,000,000. That does not include any public-buildings bill at all.

Here I extend my remarks by insertion of the statement in full, which reads as follows:

DECEMBER 31, 1916.

Secretary McAdoo said:

"The problem before the Treasury is this: The preparedness program adopted by the Congress at the last session, including the estimated disbursements for the Mexican border patrol, involves an estimated expenditure of \$683,918,000 for the fiscal years 1917 and 1918, in addition to the regular appropriations for the Army and Navy Establishments. There will be no deficit in the Treasury for the fiscal year 1917, and the impending deficit for the fiscal year 1918 is due solely to the great outlays that are being made by the Government for preparedness and for patrolling the Mexican border.

"Upon the basis of existing revenue laws the estimated deficit in the Treasury June 30, 1918, is in round numbers \$279,000,000. To this must be added \$100,000,000 for a necessary working balance in the Treasury. The Treasury, therefore, must be replenished to the extent of \$379,000,000 in the fiscal year 1918.

"How shall this money be raised? It is not for the Treasury Department to prepare revenue measures. That is the sole prerogative of the Congress. The function of the department is to furnish all available information and to submit suggestions for the consideration of the Congress. What I say is, therefore, merely an expression of my personal views. I am and always have been opposed to the issue of bonds to meet current expenditures of the Government. Nothing could be more unsound than to fall to pay as we go. There is, however, this distinction: First, that for permanent investments, such as the purchase of the Danish West Indies and the construction of the Alaskan railway; second, for the construction and purchase of vessels for the merchant marine and the construction of nitrate and armor-plate plants, all of which have a commercial and marketable value and which are also in the nature of permanent investments; and third, for extraordinary expenditures due to national emergencies, such as the necessity for patrolling the Mexican border, and which it is manifestly impossible to anticipate in revenue legislation—for all of these it is proper to issue bonds. This also applies to the Panama Canal, which is a permanent investment and on account of which there has already been expended out of current revenues \$231,108,283.

"Taking into consideration, however, only the following: Estimated expenditures for the Mexican border patrol up to June 30, 1917, \$162,418,000; estimated expenditures for the Alaskan Railway up to June 30, 1918, \$21,838,000, there will be a total expenditure of \$184,256,000 out of the general fund of the Treasury, for which it is clear that the Treasury ought to be reimbursed by the issue of a like amount of bonds.

"To summarize: The total new money to be raised for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, is, as estimated, \$379,073,000; proposed bond issue, \$184,256,000, leaving to be raised by taxation, \$194,817,000.

"The wealth and resources of the country are so great that it will not be difficult to raise this amount (approximately \$200,000,000) by internal taxation, which can be distributed in such a way as not to bear heavily or unjustly upon anybody.

"The Congress has already authorized the issue of bonds to provide the \$50,000,000 authorized for a merchant marine and the \$20,000,000 authorized for a nitrate plant. I presume that bonds will be authorized by the Congress for the \$25,000,000 required for the purchase of the Danish West Indies. If this should be done, and bonds should be issued to cover the Mexican border patrol and Alaskan Railway expenditures, a total issue of \$279,256,000 of bonds will be made ultimately.

"There is not included in the foregoing anything for an omnibus public-buildings bill.

"I earnestly hope that even as to some of the items which are included in the estimates, material reductions and savings may be effected. Rigid economy, to the extent that it does not impair efficiency, should be practiced in all departments of the Government."

So that every dollar that you are voting in this bill to put up a public building in Podunk—I was going to say Kentucky, but in view of the eloquent remarks of my friend from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], I will put it some other place—Podunk, anywhere, must be raised by direct taxation of the people of Podunk and elsewhere. I wonder how the people in the vicinity of every one of these little towns who see a big building put in the county seat, bigger than the needs of the town, look upon it? I wonder what the people who pay the taxes think about the matter, and whether they will enthusiastically get out the band to meet the Member of Congress who helped to squander the money? The Secretary of the Treasury has pointed out how a large part of this money can be raised by bonds, but he says that even with all of the bonds he is able to think of which could probably be issued, we shall have to raise in addition \$200,000,000 of new taxes. Ever since I have been in Congress you gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have been thinking up something new to tax, and still your Secretary of the Treasury says that you have to raise \$200,000,000 more.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] the other day stated that he would vote against the bill under certain conditions, and I prophesy that he will, because there will be no amendment made to this bill. That is one of the beautiful features of the system. I care not how meritorious a provision may be if it is offered here, whether it is Flint, Mich.; whether it be Iowa City, Iowa; whether it be any city; no matter how urgent its need of better postal facilities, it will not be put in this bill on this floor.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Or Boulder, Colo.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; I have been there, and know it is needed. On the other hand, no matter how urgent, how apparent may be the ridiculousness of any pork proposition in this bill, how little a town—and the committee itself in the last section of their bill condemns two-thirds of their bill, or a



large part of it, themselves—no matter how ridiculous may be any provision in the bill, it will not be taken out. That is the beauty of an omnibus pork bill; you have got to take it as it is. You can not add to it anything worthy, you can not take away anything unworthy.

I say that the committee themselves condemned their own bill, but—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there is a charge being constantly made on this floor to-day that this is a pork-barrel bill. I do not know whether gentlemen mean the same thing when they use the same term. If it is meant to imply by that term that this is a bill that is dishonest in its items, it means that those of us who advocate its passage are dishonest. If they mean that, they ought to have the courage to say so. If they mean by the use of the term only that this is an unwise expenditure of public money, then I think every honest man has the right to object to the use of the term. No man who has the courage of his convictions and who is the kind of a man that a white man ought to associate with will say anything about a Member on the floor of this House that he would not say to him on the street. He would not by implication say here about Members of this House that which he does not have the courage to say to him in the corridor. Any man who does so is not worth the respect of any man, I do not care who he is. [Applause.] The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] complains of the 11 Southern States receiving such enormous authorizations in this bill, and of the unmeritorious projects they have included in it. If we are such undesirable—

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield right there for a correction?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOOD. I am not complaining about the amount. My complaint is that you have put items in the bill which by the legislation you put in the last paragraph you admit should not be in the bill and no appropriation should be made for them. It is not the amount I have complained of in a single instance.

Mr. CARAWAY. No; the gentleman complained because these appropriations happened to go to that section of this country that had the good fortune not to have been his home. [Applause.] Now, if we are such undesirable neighbors as the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Iowa seem to think, why do not they have the courage and the manhood to rise in their seats as Members of this House and propose a constitutional amendment to withdraw from this Union. We will part from you without a tear.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman we lost a good many men and fought for four years to keep you in the Union. We love you and that is the reason we want you in the Union, and we would not ask to have a divided Union.

Mr. CARAWAY. No man of the gentleman's kind was lost in that struggle. That great struggle was not a contest in which was used the weapon with which Sampson slew the Philistines. I repeat, if this is a dishonest bill those gentlemen who compose this committee are dishonest men. All must say they are dishonest if the statements of these gentlemen are true. Now, this committee reporting out this measure is composed of 19 men. Only seven of them come from that section—the South—of which the gentleman complains so bitterly as having in this bill so many items of pork. Well, let us be honest, then. Either this bill is an honest measure and these other 12 men coming from other sections are honest men and do not agree with the gentlemen who have made this sectional charge, or they have not sense enough to represent their districts and have been overreached by the 7 Members from the South. This must be true, because 7 men are numerically fewer than 12. If these 7 men have overreached those 12 men from States not southern, those 12 should be retired, I take it, from this House, because they are not able to cope with the 7 men from that poor South, which the gentleman from Iowa so bitterly hates. Can anyone deny this? Therefore the gentleman assails his own friends by these silly charges.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] has said that he has not been able to bring back any building or appropriation for his district. The gentleman from Kentucky has introduced 11 projects, and I take it for granted he would not introduce one of those projects unless he thought they were all meritorious. The gentleman has intro-

duced a good many pension bills, and they have gone to a committee of which I am a member. I do not think the gentleman would introduce a pension bill unless he thought it was meritorious, judging from my conversation with him and from letters. Here are the 11 bills he has introduced, and I judge the gentleman is of the opinion this kind of legislation should go through. It is simply a matter of difference of opinion between the gentleman from Kentucky and some of the others. I want to say here that personally I am not drawing sectional lines.

I am not against the bill because it is from the North or the South, and since I have been in Congress I have never voted for or against a bill because it was from the North or South, and I never expect to draw that line.

Here are the bills which the gentleman has introduced:

Whitesburg, with 321 people; all that is asked for is \$75,000, and all the rest are for \$75,000; McKee, Ky., 146 people; Hindman, 370; Sayersville, 310; Jenkins, 1,897; Booneville, 236; Inez, Ky., not in the census of 1910; Hazard, 537 people; Pikeville, 1,280 people; Paintsville, 942 people; and Prestonburg, 1,120 people.

Mr. LANGLEY. They are not in this bill, if the gentleman will permit me.

Mr. JAMES. No; but it is not the fault of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. LANGLEY. Oh, well, not exactly—that is, I only asked for what I regarded—

Mr. JAMES. I do not believe that the gentleman from Kentucky would introduce a bill either for a pension or a building that he did not think ought to go through.

Mr. LANGLEY. Ultimately, yes; but not all in one lump. [Laughter.] The trouble about the gentleman is that he has not been here long enough to know how business is run. He is wasting his time.

Mr. JAMES. I sincerely hope I shall be here long enough to see McKee, with its 146 people, with a population that will entitle it to a public building.

Mr. LANGLEY. By the time they erect a public building in some of the places—

Mr. JAMES. I refuse to yield.

The gentleman laid a good deal of stress on the fact a short time ago that Hazard was entitled to a building because they were going to use it for a mine rescue station. Now, they do not establish mine rescue stations as permanent propositions. It was so stated at the hearings in behalf of his bill. They are only put there until such time as the operators or the authorities themselves can take them over. So when you give a building for Hazard, Ky., because part of it is going to be used for a mine rescue station, you are only wasting your time.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JAMES. Not now.

Mr. LANGLEY. I just wanted to correct the gentleman. He is simply mistaken.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] at a hearing some time ago on Marengo, Iowa, where the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] wanted a public building, said:

They have very small postal receipts and it is a very small town; \$7,500 postal receipts and only 1,786 population. That was the population in 1910, of course.

And yet that town of Marengo is larger than the item which the gentleman from Iowa asked to be stricken from this bill.

Mr. HULL of Iowa said:

The population is 2,200 now. They claim 2,500, and as the town is growing they may have it.

Mr. BURNETT. But the postal receipts are only about \$7,500?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Did I understand the gentleman to say that some gentleman from Iowa asked to have an item stricken from this bill?

Mr. JAMES. I say that this is from the hearing on the bill for Marengo, Iowa.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I thought he said some gentleman from Iowa asked to have an item stricken from the bill.

Mr. JAMES. I will quote further:

Mr. BURNETT. I notice that their postal receipts have increased only \$2,000 in 11 years. In 1905 they were over \$5,000, and this last year they were only \$7,000. That does not seem to be a very great increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman—

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

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Now, Mr. Chairman and fellow Members, my father had seven uncles in the Revolutionary War, and I had seven uncles and a father and a brother in the Confederate, or Rebel, War, but I quit fighting the Yankees when I



was about 12 years old, and thanked God that the war was over; and I have done so ever since.

When the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] raised the question of sectionalism on this bill, I began to look over the problem and analyze what he was talking about. I remembered being in his town of Cedar Rapids, and one of the magnificent scenes which the committee on entertainment wanted me to observe was the post office, a public building. It was a magnificent one, and I am glad they have it. It cost, according to the figures here, \$355,000, in round numbers. That amount would build all the items he complains of in the South, upon which the gentleman so spleenfully bases his cause of sectionalism, and still have, I think, about \$40,000 left.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman must be mistaken. He certainly does not mean to say that the gentleman from Iowa has a building of that size in his town?

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. If I am mistaken, the book from the Treasury Department is mistaken.

Mr. LANGLEY. But I can not believe it. [Laughter.] The printers made a mistake.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. When he is complaining about \$10,000 and \$15,000, and so on, in these country offices, where the people need stimulus and energy and recognition as our rural sections, jammed off, as they are, in the backwoods and neglected in various ways—why, I looked over and found that his post office cost \$355,000; and then I thought if I got time, as there has been so much talk about pork, that I would just ask the gentleman from Iowa if he had not often seen a burley, big hog after he got full root the trough over in order to keep the other hogs from getting any slop. [Loud laughter.]

Another proposition that the gentleman from Iowa presented was that he said Texas had 18 Members and got 20 items.

Well, he came within two of the correct membership. I suppose that is near enough to the truth for the gentleman from Iowa. [Laughter.] Texas has 18 Members by districts and 2 at large. I suppose we might count—sorter. [Laughter.] As I said in my talk the other day, I represent the State at large. I analyzed all these items and I know the towns. I have spoken in most of them. I have spoken in the gentleman's town, in Iowa. And say, if all the balance of the States represent the same merit and the same relation to public necessity in the prospects for the future that the items in Texas represent, there is not an ounce of "pork" or graft in this bill, not a particle. [Applause.]

I only wanted to make these remarks. I yield back whatever time I have remaining. I thank you, gentlemen. [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask unanimous consent for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, it is the item in my district that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] has moved to strike out. The defense that I will make of that item will be my answer to his attack upon other minor items of like character.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how to talk sectionalism. I quit that years and years ago. I believe that this is an indissoluble Union of indestructible States. [Applause.] I believe that we are all Americans, and this committee, not only under the chairmanship of the present incumbent but under the former chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Dr. Bartholdt, recognized the fact that there should be a proper and just division of Government buildings among the people of the whole country, regardless of whether we were poor in the South or whether the people were rich in the North. During my service on that committee, with a Republican majority, when my able and distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG] was the chairman of the subcommittee of which I was a member, the question as to whether one section of this Union was getting too much or one State too much never entered into its deliberations.

I want to say that the attack which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] has made upon this bill is an indictment of the integrity of one of the fairest Republican Members on the floor of this House and one of the fairest members of our committee—Mr. SMITH of Michigan—who was on the subcommittee with me, and who never sought to obtain any more than he believed to be a fair share for his people. If that man [Mr. SMITH of Michigan] had believed that there was sectionalism being practiced, if he had believed that there was "pork," in the sense in which the word is being used, would he have sat by without uttering a protest?

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. BURNETT. I can not yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. You are misquoting me.

Mr. BURNETT. I am not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BURNETT. I ask the gentleman to respect my refusal, because I have not the time to yield to him.

Mr. Chairman, in regard to the attacks that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] has made upon this bill, four years ago we passed the law which provides that sites might be authorized where the post-office receipts were not less than \$6,000, and buildings where they were not less than \$10,000. That is the law now. In that bill the item for a site in my district, which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] has attacked, was provided for. Mr. HARDWICK, of Georgia, in the conference report debate, tried to get instructions to the conference committee adopted to accept the Senate amendment, which read as follows:

*Provided, That no contracts authorized by any section of this act for the erection of buildings to be used exclusively as post offices, or for the purchase of sites for such buildings shall be entered into, nor shall any public moneys be expended for such buildings until the receipts from such post offices for which any such buildings or sites are intended shall amount to more than \$10,000 per annum—*

The Senate had put on that amendment and it was disagreed to by the House and it went to conference. When Mr. HARDWICK tried to have the House conferees instructed to agree to the Senate amendment there was a roll call, and when you examine the roll call you will find the name of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], like that of Abou ben Adhem, leading all the rest against that amendment. [Laughter and applause.] The gentleman from Iowa then had an item in that bill.

There is the inconsistency of the gentleman from Iowa, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS] has well said that when the gentleman who had an item on a bill got what he wanted he was willing to stand by it, pork barrel or no pork barrel. But the gentleman from Iowa voted then upon that bill for the authorization of sites in towns where the post-office receipts were less than \$10,000, and some of them less than \$6,000, and yet the gentleman now, after he has gotten his fill of the swill, comes up with that kind of a previous record and undertakes to attack the bill as a pork-barrel bill when he voted for it when it was a pork-barrel bill then, if this one is now.

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

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman does not mean to say that I got a site where the receipts were less than \$10,000?

Mr. BURNETT. No; but you voted with the rest of us for sites in towns where the receipts were less than \$10,000, and even less than \$6,000, and the question is whether the gentleman was dishonest when he voted that way, if that was his conviction when he voted for them in that bill. [Applause.] The gentleman had an opportunity to help put it in the law then, if he desired to do so, that no site should be acquired and no building should be constructed where the receipts were less than \$10,000; and yet the gentleman's virtuous indignation had not risen so high then that he thought he ought to vote against it. Truly, Mr. Chairman—

*When self the wavering balance shakes,*

*'Tis seldom right adjusted.*

We have had illustrious examples of that to-day.

Mr. Chairman, this item in my district is in line with a number of other items that I suppose gentlemen, in order to parade themselves, may move to strike out; but I hope that, having been given all this time for the discussion of the general proposition, they will not undertake to filibuster against this bill later.

In regard to the fairness of it—and that was a matter that was considered, as my good friend from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG] will bear me out, when under the chairmanship of that splendid gentleman from St. Louis, Dr. Bartholdt, we framed bills—we always considered the fact, and it is a proper matter for consideration, that as the great cities of the North got such large sums in order to be fair with all other parts of the country there ought to be recognition given to some places in the South and West that were not as large as places in the North with greater populations and with larger postal receipts.

In regard to the just division in this bill, Illinois and Wisconsin get more than all the 12 Southern States combined. I do not object to that. We put them in there because we believed that the great city of Chicago and the great city of Philadelphia and The Bronx and the other great cities that are provided for ought to have what we allowed them.

Mr. Chairman, Michigan alone gets as much as Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, and South Caro-



lina combined, and yet they do not get any too much, and their Representatives on the floor or on that committee never asked for anything that was unjust and unfair, and not a man on that committee even suggested that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] in the aggregate was getting a larger sum than several of the Southern States; but it remained for a few gentlemen to undertake to raise the cry of sectionalism; one gentleman who four years ago thought that even with the sectional division the bill was good enough to warrant him in voting for it. I had the control of that bill as acting chairman, and it was distributed as this bill was distributed, fairly, and as the bill was distributed in the former Congress in which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bartholdt] was chairman of the committee, when my good friend from Illinois [Mr. ROSENBERG] was one of the very active members. Those were matters of fair distribution that were always taken into consideration, and, gentlemen, they are fair and just and honest now, and it is a mean, venomous, vicious attack upon one section of the country that to-day loves the Stars and Stripes just as our brethren on the other side of Mason and Dixon's line love it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] to strike out the paragraph.

The question being taken, the motion was rejected.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Did the Chair overlook the gentleman from Iowa, or did he ask for a division?

The CHAIRMAN. No division was called for. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Alva, Okla.: \$45,000: *Provided*, That a suitable site in the city of Alva, Okla., to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, is conveyed by suitable warranty deed, free of cost to the United States.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Our customarily amiable friend from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], while proceeding to misquote me, and declining to yield for a correction, which, I am sure, was entirely unintentional on his part, told us that the Civil War in this Nation is over. Then he very kindly tried to come over into Michigan and start a little fratricidal strife between my good friend from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and myself, where none exists, and none can exist, because I love him greatly. I have no criticism of the way he performs his duties, and he is willing to let me perform mine as I see fit. Not only did I not say anything raising a sectional issue, as the gentleman from Alabama has unjustly charged, but, more than that, I expressly stated that in the distribution of pork there are no sectional lines and no partisan lines.

The gentleman talked about how much Michigan got. He will admit that Michigan would have gotten \$50,000 or \$75,000 more if, for my own home city, a splendid town as any, with postal receipts averaging \$13,000 a year, and with cramped post-office quarters at present, I had asked for that amount. The committee are fair enough. They did not have anything against me. They would put it in for me as for anyone else, for a man who asked for only one item. I am not kicking because Michigan got too much or too little. I am kicking because the bill is framed not upon the theory of merit, placing these buildings where they are needed regardless of whether Michigan gets 11 or Alabama 11, but because it is framed on a basis of geographical, or district line distribution, a matter of pork. When it comes in here merit cuts no figure, and you can not add anything, however good, or take out anything, however bad.

Now, when I had the floor before, and was cut off by the agreement, I was stating that the committee themselves, in the final paragraph of the bill, have condemned their own work. They are a splendid committee, and when they finally got it finished they added a good job in the last section.

I am sorry that the committee did not start at the other end first, and quit when they had perfected that last section, because there they provide that items such as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] has now so strenuously defended, for towns having receipts of less than \$10,000 a year, shall nevermore be included in future bills. If it is wrong five years from now, when, heaven hope, our financial condition will be better, to put a \$50,000 building in a town of 1,500 population, why, it is wrong now. The same committee, who have reported out a lot of these items, say in their last paragraph that the principle is wrong, and that after they get through with this one last grand grab, then it must not be done any more.

But they say buildings must be constructed in these small towns because the Government owns sites in some of them. Supposing the Government were a business institution. Supposing a corporation had gone, I will not say to Alabama,

for I will not be sectional, but up into the State of Michigan, and had bought a site in a town of 1,500 population and paid perhaps \$2,500 for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I think we have had enough discussion on this proposition. Can not the gentleman postpone this until later?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is quite immaterial, but I have taken no time of the committee unnecessarily, and I am going to take about so much anyway.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I shall not object. I am only asking the gentleman—

Mr. CRAMTON. I prefer to make my remarks continuous, so that I will not repeat myself, as I might otherwise do.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Supposing this corporation had gone up into Michigan and had bought a site and paid \$2,500, expecting that town to grow and increase, and expecting to put up an office building there when it was needed for its branch, but finding the town did not increase, that the office building was not needed. Because they had spent \$2,000 or \$3,000 for a site, would they go ahead and put up a \$50,000 building that they did not need? The committee in that last section have absolutely condemned their own bill.

Now, I want to submit that not only for those reasons, which obtain at all times, but right now under this glorious Democratic administration, with a tremendous deficit staring you in the face, you men on that side of the aisle have no right to saddle the people of the country with this \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 of extra expense, which your Secretary of the Treasury tells you must be raised by new direct taxes, along with \$200,000,000 more after you have floated all the bonds you can.

What is our condition? The other day the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] said that the people are prosperous and that it is a good time to raise the taxes. But the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] says we are not going to have to pay this money now, that we only authorize it; that none of these buildings will be built for two years. He does not point out that the passage of this bill, if it accomplishes what he says it will, by reforms in the method of handling these buildings, by a new system, instead of waiting six years from now to complete the construction of buildings authorized in 1913, will cause them to be completed in a year or a year and a half or two years. He is going to shorten the time four years for the building of several hundred buildings, and if you do not pass this bill they will not be built in the next two years. If you do pass this bill then they will be built in the next two years, and you have that expense, authorized in 1913, to carry at a time when your Secretary of the Treasury does not know where he is going to get the money to pay the bills.

As to the present, we can not afford it; and as to the future, when this bill does come in operation, what are to be the economic industrial conditions of the country then? Is any gentleman on this floor so blind to present world conditions as to believe that there is no danger of industrial disaster in this country when the war in Europe ends? Oh, at the best, he can say he does not know. We know there is danger awaiting us at a time within a year or two from now when taxation will be more of a distress to our people than it is now. Oh, we are prosperous now because for the year 1914 when you first came into power we exported abroad \$1,867,991,492 worth of goods, while this year—and I am speaking of 11 months ending in November in each case—we exported \$4,960,302,630, a gain in exports of \$3,000,000,000. There is your prosperity. What about it when these war orders cease? What kind of conditions will you have here at home? I do not want to get into a tariff speech, but I do want to remind you of a few things. Right now when 20,000,000 men are in the trenches in Europe, withdrawn from natural production, we have imported into this country—

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

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and other Government offices at Barboursville, Ky., \$25,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. This item is no different from many others, but presents a new question, which I wish to discuss briefly.



Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield? I wish to give notice that I shall move to close debate at the end of five minutes on the paragraph.

Mr. FREAR. This item of Barbourville, Ky., presents this new question: It is for a proposed building to accommodate the United States post office and other Government offices. I speak of other Government offices because this is said to be the exception that is not to be governed in any way by the rule of \$10,000 limitation in receipts. I think the matter of receipts has no bearing on the subject anyhow, but the committee claims to be governed by a \$10,000 annual limitation. Here is the excuse for ignoring the receipts; that is to say, the receipts may be small, and they are, but by putting in the bill "other offices" you are entitled under this procedure to the building because of the additional purposes. The bill says, "United States post office and other Government offices at Barbourville, Ky., \$25,000."

Barbourville had a population in 1910 of 1,633. The post-office receipts were \$4,532 last year, according to the report of the Treasury. The rent is \$406 a year. The estimate by the Treasury of maintenance of the new building is \$3,800 per annum, or nine times the amount of the rent we are now paying. The bill says that this is for a post office and other Government offices at Barbourville. I have in my hand a statement. I do not know whether it is accurate or not, but I desire to have the chairman later on correct me if it is not. It was sent through the mail. It comes from the American Institute of Architects and it gives data as to Kentucky, which is no different from many other States in this respect. It says of 22 new building items that were proposed for Kentucky and filed with the building committee this session, 17 contained demands for "other purposes" than post offices in these little towns. That is the case of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], who spoke a few minutes ago. Eight out of the 11 building propositions filed with the committee by the gentleman were "for other purposes."

Mr. LANGLEY. Not my items. The gentleman means the State.

Mr. FREAR. No. I am speaking according to this statement. I do not know that it is correct. Here are the bills presented for the gentleman's district. There is Whitesville, with a population in 1910 of 321. That is the first.

Mr. LANGLEY. It has 3,000 now. In most of these towns in the bill there are no other Government activities.

Mr. FREAR. I say practically every proposition—17 out of the 22—were for post offices and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGLEY. But the "gentleman from Kentucky" is not pressing those items.

Mr. FREAR. No; but the gentleman introduced all of them himself, and then in the omnibus bill he gets—

Mr. LANGLEY. A few at some places.

Mr. FREAR. It occurs to me that that is the only reason for putting in "for other purposes," so as to avoid the \$10,000 limitation. Anything may come under the minimum proposition, and this is the evidence of it. There is no limitation of receipts, if this statement is correct. I want to ask the chairman of the committee what, for instance—and I speak of it by way of illustration—what testimony would be presented to the committee in a case like Barbourville to show the character of the project?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. We would have the report of the Treasury Department, the report of the Post Office Department, and then we generally had the Representative of the district, and sometimes citizens of the town. We always had the Member of Congress, who ought to be familiar with it.

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

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] does not know anything about conditions at Barbourville, Ky., else he would not have made a motion to strike out the paragraph containing an appropriation of \$25,000 for a public building at that place. I think I am safe in saying that nobody has ever charged that the Democracy of the South has ever been overfriendly to me. The fact that the chairman of this committee, Mr. CLARK, a Democrat, is from the State of Florida; the fact that this House is now Democratic, and the fact that there has been incorporated an item in this bill appropriating \$25,000 for a public building at Barbourville, Ky., ought to be pretty conclusive proof that the appropriation is based on real genuine merit. I am glad to say that the Democrats of this House have treated me fairly. The gentleman from Wisconsin evidently has not read the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will state that the post-office receipts for the last six months at Barbourville clearly indicate

that they will be much more than \$6,000 during the present fiscal year.

Mr. POWERS. No doubt about that, Mr. Chairman. I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that he has not correctly read my bill. He said that it asked for an appropriation for the post office and "other Government offices." I will read the gentleman that section of my bill which covers the proposition: H. R. 6840; United States post office and "mine rescue station," and other Government offices. My bill calls for "a mine rescue station." We are situated, gentlemen, in southeastern Kentucky. We are in the midst of the development of its great resources. We have 10,000 square miles of bituminous coal territory in southeastern Kentucky. There are only 14,000 square miles in the entire State of Pennsylvania, and Pennsylvania has for all these years stood at the head of all the States in this Union in the production of both bituminous and anthracite coal. [Applause.]

The coal mine production of southeastern Kentucky with the development that is going on in that section of the State is simply marvelous. Only a few years ago there was not a coal mine being operated in all southeastern Kentucky. There was not a foot of railroad in all that section. To-day the toot of the iron horse can be heard while winding its way up our streams, through hill and dale, in search of the boundless wealth of that region. We are rich, and yet we are poor. We are rich in resources, especially in coal, and yet we are poor, because in years gone by we have never had any way of getting the coal to market. We are a favored people, and yet we have been unfortunate. There was no way for our ancestors to know the difference in possibilities between southeastern Kentucky and the northwest territory, out of which have been carved the great States of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. The Allegheny Mountain system forms a great wall along the eastern boundary line of our State. It has been a barrier to the great westward movement of progress. Population flowed to the north and west of us. The region around the Great Lakes, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois profited to our detriment. They built railroads. They established factories. They grew. They prospered. For over 100 years we have been in an eddy, so to speak. We were bottled up. Southeastern Kentucky had no outlet to the outside world. We had no railroads, no navigable streams, no bays, no harbors, no kindly arms to the sea. We were far removed from the great marts of trade and from the great thought and industrial centers of the world. We could not reach the outside world; the outside world could not reach us. We were misunderstood at home and maligned abroad. Neither the wealth of our hills nor the worth of our people were understood or appreciated. We, in the meantime, kept the even tenor of our way, when it was even. Our people continued to battle bravely against tremendous odds. They did not lose faith either in themselves or their country. Finally the sunlight of a better day shown in upon them. Railroads, as I have said, made their way into our counties. Coal mining operations soon sprang up, and our great development began. Bell County, for example, is a veritable hive of industry. Its population doubled from 1900 to 1910.

#### HELPS TO BUILD RAILROAD FROM BARBOURVILLE TO MANCHESTER.

There has been completed and put into operation within the last 30 days a new railroad from Barbourville to Manchester, Ky. Barbourville is the county seat of Knox County, Manchester the county seat of Clay. No railroad ever touched a foot of Clay County's soil until within the last few months. The citizens of Clay County have had no outlet except over rough wagon roads to either London or Barbourville. Both these towns are on the Louisville & Nashville Railroad. They have had no chance to reach the outside world with the products of their farms or the wealth of their hills. You must not conclude from what I have said that the citizenship of Clay County is in any way inferior to that of other sections of our country. Far from it. Clay County has produced her quota of great men. James Gerrard, a native of Clay County, was one of the early governors of the State of Kentucky. John C. White, another native son of the county of Clay, was once Speaker of this House. For four years he presided over the deliberations of this body. Clay County has produced other illustrious sons. Knox County, of which Barbourville is the county seat, has also produced her share of noted men. Silas Woodson, who was reared in Knox County, later became governor for the State of Missouri. Samuel F. Miller, another of Knox County's sons, served with distinction as one of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the decisions he rendered under the dome of this Capitol have been cited and followed by learned courts all over our land. Knox County has produced other illustrious sons.

When I was asked a year or more ago to make a donation toward building a railroad from Barbourville to Manchester so



the people of Clay County and many in Knox County could have an outlet I gladly responded and agreed to pay about \$700 when the road was completed, as this letter shows:

CUMBERLAND & MANCHESTER RAILROAD CO. (INC.),  
Barbourville, Ky., January 15, 1917.

Hon. CALEB POWERS,  
Congressman Eleventh District, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Yours 4th.

I inclose herewith a copy of the subscription note signed by you, the amount being \$500.

The amount of right of way I have paid in Knox County, not including buildings, amounts to about \$5,200, and there will probably be an additional \$1,000 yet to pay. There were 34 guarantors, including yourself. I am going to have this matter put into proper shape immediately, and will let you hear from me further. Your share of this will likely reach \$200, making your total subscription about \$700.

I inclose two copies of our passenger time-table.

Yours, truly,

CHARLES F. HEIDRICK.

I do not own a foot of land or even a home—I rent—in or around Barbourville, Ky. I do not own a foot of land along the route of the new railroad from Knox County into Clay; but I knew this new railroad would greatly benefit the people of both counties, and I shall gladly pay what I have promised toward the construction of this road.

The people in both the counties of Knox and Clay have stood loyally by me for these many years and I am only glad of an opportunity to be of service to them. I hope Manchester some day will have population and postal receipts sufficient to get an appropriation for a public building.

But let us return to Barbourville, Ky. In 1910 the population of Barbourville was 1,633. In 1913 it was 1,815. It is now possibly 2,100, with about \$6,000 in postal receipts. Barbourville is growing and will continue to grow from year to year. It has two good national banks, electric lights, paved streets, two good colleges—Union College and the Baptist Institute—six churches, and a good high school.

There are about 1,000 students in attendance in these three institutions. Barbourville has a brick plant and a spoke and stave factory. The new railroad coming in from Manchester will greatly increase both the population and the business interest of Barbourville; but the thing that will aid the growth of the town more than any other one thing is the building of good roads in Knox County. Barbourville is located on the Dixie Highway from Chicago to Florida. Every county in the district I have the honor to represent along the proposed Dixie Highway has voted upon itself enormous sums of money, their wealth considered, for the purpose of constructing the Dixie Highway. In every county along the route the work is now well under way. If properly constructed, these roads will greatly accelerate the travel and increase the wealth of our people.

PINEVILLE GETS \$5,000 TO PURCHASE SITE FOR PUBLIC BUILDING.

And this brings me down to the discussion of the \$5,000 item to purchase a site for a public building and mine-rescue station at Pineville, Ky. I am glad this House will, in a short time now, put its seal of approval on this item, as well as the \$25,000 item for a public building at Barbourville. Pineville and Bell County richly deserve it. Pineville is growing rapidly. Pineville's population in 1910 was 2,161, its postal receipts \$4,473.30. Pineville's population to-day is between 3,500 and 5,000 people. Its postal receipts for 1916 was \$9,144.68. It will reach \$11,000 this year. Bell County produces more coal than any other county in the State. It produced in 1915 over 3,000,000 of the 21,000,000 tons produced in the whole State of Kentucky. Kentucky produced this last year, in round numbers, 25,000,000 tons of coal. Bell County greatly increased her output, although the whole coal industry of southeastern Kentucky suffered greatly because of shortage of cars and scarcity of labor.

When I was preparing data on the Pineville post office last year I received the following telegram from Hon. White L. Moss, mayor of the city of Pineville:

We urge you to make every effort to secure appropriation for public building and mine-rescue station for Pineville. Am advised by postmaster to-day that sales of stamps for year ending March 31 will exceed \$8,000—to be exact it will be \$8,726—amount necessary for transfer of this office to second class. We are growing rapidly, and our present post-office facilities are absolutely inadequate—the lobby of the present building, about 8 by 24. Pineville is the center of southeastern Kentucky coal fields, producing about 5,000,000 tons annually. Has 30 passenger trains per day, reaching every coal mine in southeastern Kentucky.

By reason of its railroad and geographical location it is the logical place to establish a mine-rescue station. From this point, in case of accident, a special train could reach any mine in the field in less than two hours, and being a railroad terminal, transportation facilities will always be at hand. Pineville has more trained rescue teams than all of Kentucky, trained by Bureau of Mines experts, and these teams would be available at a moment's notice. Am sending map showing location of Pineville with reference to mines. If you desire further information, please command me. Suitable site for post-office building can not be obtained if matter is delayed much longer, as desirable places are rapidly being built upon.

W. L. Moss, Mayor.

This telegram is full of meat, and throws a flood of light on the situation there. I am glad this House has decided to give me an appropriation for both Barbourville and Pineville, Ky. Our people have all these years been paying their share of the taxes to help support this great Government. The bones of their ancestors have bleached the battle fields in every State in the Union.

Our people have always responded liberally to the Nation's call. They want to see Old Glory floating over public buildings at Barbourville, Pineville, Corbin, Williamsburg, Harlan, and other county-seat towns in the district as some evidence, at least, that the Government which they have so bravely defended is not ungrateful to them or unmindful of the great services they have rendered it in the days of its peril.

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

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Benton Harbor, Mich., \$80,000.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should judge from what the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS] says, the only other governmental activity at Barbourville is to be found in the Mine-Rescue Station, and I want to read from the statement of their own witness, Mr. Van H. Manning, of the Bureau of Mines—

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The gentleman is attempting to discuss a paragraph in the bill which has already been passed, and other business has intervened. Therefore his discussion is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that there is no quorum present. This is the first time that such thing as the gentleman from Kentucky has done has been attempted.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I hope the gentleman from Kentucky will withdraw his point of order so that we may proceed with the bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. I will do anything. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and courthouse at Binghamton, N. Y., \$500,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. In support of that, so as to be sure to proceed absolutely in order, which is my chief reason for making the motion. I desire to add my reasons for, first, opposing the passage of any bill, and, second, in order to prevent the passage of any bill larger than it has to be. I submit there never was a time which gave greater question, greater doubt, and greater danger as to what the immediate future has in store for this country financially than the present, following the close of the European conflict, and here you are rushing headlong with this \$38,000,000 appropriation to be added to the \$200,000,000 that the Treasury Department says you have to find new taxes for. What is to be our industrial condition under which the people are going to raise the money to pay these taxes? Our prosperity is dependent upon the market which our labor has for the goods it makes. I just called attention to the fact that our present prosperity is due to our immense amount of war orders, in which there has been a greater increase this year over two years ago.

Let me call your attention to other figures. During this time when twenty million men are withdrawn in Europe from ordinary production, we are importing from abroad more dollars' worth of goods made by foreign labor than we have ever done before in our history.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that the gentleman is not talking to the amendment.

Mr. LANGLEY. He is talking to his constituents. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order. I insist that while the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] may see fit to criticize me for speaking as I do, yet I would remind him that I do not speak to my constituents as he would do by the distribution of \$50,000 and \$75,000 public buildings in towns of two or three hundred people. That is not my way of talking to the people of my district. I am talking to this House, and I am talking primarily to you gentlemen on the other side who are responsible for the Government. Here are these figures: We imported in 1910 \$1,400,000,000 worth of foreign-made goods, and you Democrats have been telling us that our revenues have fallen off because we did not import enough during the war. This year—and by



"this year" I mean the 11 months ending with November—our total imports of foreign-made goods—

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking to his amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Brinkley, Ark., \$25,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. [Cries of "Vote!"] Oh, I desire to be absolutely fair, and as long as we have the opportunity of amendment I will state to you gentlemen that we intend to exercise it, no matter how heavy the steam roller may be. Some day you will not have it as large. You did not have it as large in the last river and harbor bill as you had in the bill preceding, and you will not have as large a steam roller the next time this bill goes through the House as you have now. Mark that. The next case is that of Brinkley, Ark. Brinkley had a population of 1,740 in 1910, according to the statement before me. The statement of the Treasury shows it had postal receipts last year of \$6,114.

Mr. GOOD. That is for the year 1915?

Mr. FREAR. Yes. The rent paid at Brinkley is \$550 a year. The cost of maintenance according to the estimate furnished by the Treasury Department for this item of Brinkley is \$3,500. In other words, the rent of \$550 is to be exchanged for an original investment in a palatial building for Brinkley, and we are to undertake an annual maintenance cost of \$3,500. Brinkley, let me repeat, according to the census, had a population of 1,740 in 1910 and postal receipts of \$6,114 in 1915. We now pay \$550 annually. Through this bill we will pay \$3,500 annually. What do you think of the investment?

Now, getting back to the practice which I have discussed in regard to these items, I want to get the situation accurately because it is very important to understand in the discussion of these public building propositions. The chairman of the Public Building Committee says that he called before the committee the Congressmen from the different districts in every case. Not only that, but there is only one other kind of evidence presented to the committee, I understand, and that is the Treasury Department's statement, furnished as to every project. Here is a letter from the Treasury Department which touches upon this very subject. It shows how the committee refused to receive the only impartial testimony that could be obtained. I will start right now with the reading of the letter, and if the time is not extended I will have to go into the next paragraph, because I want to get this letter squarely before the committee. It is a letter I received from the Treasury Department under date of December 29, 1916:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, December 29, 1916.

HON. JAMES A. FREAR,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The department is in receipt of your letter of the 28th instant, referring to the subject of estimates furnished by the Treasury Department as to probable expense in connection with the maintenance of public buildings erected at different points, and notes your inquiry as to whether such information has heretofore been given to Congress.

In reply, you are informed that in reporting on the bills which constitute the pending omnibus public buildings bill, this department did furnish estimates of the cost of maintenance of buildings in small villages, but received several letters from the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds requesting the department to refrain from incorporating this information in its reports, and stating that the committee desired simply the estimate as to probable cost of the proposed building. The department, believing, however, that it was its duty to give Congress the benefit of this information, continued embodying an estimate as to the cost of maintenance of all buildings of the class above referred to.

The department had in mind the fact that with the enactment of each successive omnibus bill the number of post office buildings in small communities had increased, with a corresponding cost to the Government, while in even ratio the necessity for relief in the cities and larger towns was increasing and the rental charge to the Government for outside space all the time was growing. Being in position to focus more accurately upon this condition, and to foresee the effect of still further extending it, the department felt warranted in giving to Congress any and all information along these lines for its consideration in dealing with the public buildings situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FREAR. May I have five minutes more? I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Borough of The Bronx, New York City, N. Y., \$850,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the committee that I am not trying to filibuster, but I am trying to give certain facts, and when I get through I will suspend. I move to strike out this item, and upon that I desire to say this: This is a large

item of nearly a million dollars. It may be entirely meritorious. If we strike it out, we will cut down the amount you have to raise by taxation after a year or two or three under conditions that do not now promise well. Now, we imported into this country in 11 months ending November, 1910, only \$1,400,000,000—

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order the gentleman is not speaking to the question.

Mr. GREGG. I make the point of order the gentleman is not discussing the amendment.

Mr. KING. I believe every bit he says, but it is not parliamentary.

Mr. CRAMTON. There are a lot of gentlemen who do not believe it, but it is the truth.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is speaking out of order and has been for the last half hour. It is nothing but a preconceived filibuster.

Mr. CRAMTON. May I be heard upon the point?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear from the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will state I am trying to proceed in order with an argument as to our probable industrial conditions, which, after a couple of years, are likely to be very serious, as a potent argument against saddling up that future with a large burden like this \$38,000,000.

Mr. HOWARD. I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. CRAMTON. I certainly will. I will say to the gentlemen I do not see why they should be so alarmed. I have very little more to say, and when I give that I am through, but I propose to give it and I hope to get through in this five minutes if I am permitted.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman would not yield, and I yield to nobody. For the 11 months ending November, 1910—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order—and let us have a ruling on it. The gentleman is not discussing the paragraph, and on that I would like to be heard. I think he is making a ridiculous farce of the proceedings of this committee in a speech like that, and while he may have some merit in his contention he is simply making the whole proceeding ridiculous.

Mr. HOWARD. And in absolute defiance of the committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. I anticipate being through in five minutes if—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I make the point of order the gentleman is not discussing the paragraph, and therefore is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Michigan desires to be heard on the point of order, the Chair will hear him briefly.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, upon that I simply state I think I am proceeding orderly and seriously. I intend to vote against this bill for the reason that the chairman of the committee tells us it will take effect in two or three years—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I submit the gentleman is not speaking to the point of order.

Mr. HOWARD. And that he is not discussing the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is made that the gentleman is not discussing the paragraph.

Mr. CRAMTON. I want to point out how my line of argument is directly relevant to this paragraph. If this paragraph is stricken out, it will reduce the bill \$850,000, and I am trying to point out that a year or two from now, when the money has to be raised—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman is not discussing the point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. It will be a very serious matter. I do not want to delay the House, but I am giving this committee what appears to me a fair argument.

Mr. HOWARD. I make the point of order the gentleman is not discussing the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say the gentleman must confine himself in this discussion to the question before the committee.

Mr. LANGLEY. The Chair has already told him that two or three times before, and he will not obey the Chair. How much longer—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I submit—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. CRAMTON. I may state to the chairman and the committee I desire to proceed absolutely in order. I am not actuated by any desire to delay proceedings, but I believe these points I am making are relevant to the paragraph. If the Chair directly rules me out, I will have to submit, of course, but until then I shall endeavor to give that information.



I have not sought to point out the line of argument others should follow, and I feel it is unfair for others to pass upon my line of argument as long as it is not intended to be obstructive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the motion to strike out the paragraph.

The motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Boyne City, Mich., \$30,000.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a new paragraph.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, following line 11, insert the following as a new paragraph: "That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to provide accommodations for the Land Office and Forest Service in the public building at Buffalo, Wyo., within the present limit of cost."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have no objection to that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Carrollton, Ill., \$25,000.

Mr. JAMES. According to the figures furnished by the Treasury Department, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that unless the gentleman wants to make some motion—

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The population of Carrollton, Ill., according to the figures furnished by the Treasury Department, in 1910 was 2,323, and the postal receipts, \$7,854. The postal receipts were \$8,324.13 in October last. The present rent is \$500, interest at 3 per cent. And the Treasury Department figures that maintenance will be \$500 a year.

I want to read how the Treasury Department figures on these small buildings of \$25,000, and I will read a letter from the Treasury Department, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, December 15, 1916.

Hon. W. FRANK JAMES,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Referring further to your letter of the 17th ultimo, in regard to the pending public-buildings bill, and requesting information relative to the probable cost of maintenance, etc., of a Federal building in places similar in size to McKee, Ky., the following data is furnished you:

The department estimate for a building at a place of this size and of similar postal receipts, for post-office purposes only, would probably be \$25,000 for the building itself and \$5,000 for the site. It is estimated that to furnish the building would require \$3,000 additional, making a total outlay of \$33,000.

Calculating 3 per cent on this investment, the interest charge would be \$990. The yearly depreciation of the building and furniture, together with the approximate cost of annual repairs, would amount to 2½ per cent on the amount invested in the project, exclusive of cost of site, viz, on \$28,000, which would be \$700. Janitors are not provided for buildings of this size, but an employee known as fireman-laborer at \$660 per annum, with a charwoman at \$300 per annum, making a total expenditure for this service of \$960. The cost of fuel, lights, and other supplies is estimated at \$960 per annum.

Very truly, yours,

B. R. NEWTON,  
Assistant Secretary.

I notice that on page 4 of the hearings on the public-buildings bill the committee states in part that it is fixed in its opinion that practically every item can be abundantly justified from the standpoint of economy, efficiency, and patriotism. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, as this particular item can not come under either class, I hope it will be voted out of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and other Government offices at Central City, Ky., \$30,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out this item.

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask the gentleman if he is going to move to strike out the Wisconsin items?

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman anticipates. We have not reached them yet.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am not anticipating, but asking a question.

Mr. FREAR. That is not in order.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have always a right to ask a question.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield, but can not, for my five minutes will be absorbed in a short time.

According to the report of the United States Treasury the population of Central City, Ky., in 1910 was 2,545; the annual receipts reached \$5,707 in 1915, according to the last report. The rent was \$500 a year and the total charge, according to the department's estimate, will be \$4,100 a year, or over eight times the amount of rent we are now paying. That will be the future annual carrying charges.

To resume the letter of instructions from the department on this very point, I wish to read—and this is the remainder of the letter that was sent from the Treasury Department explaining the method of handling these matters by the committee. The committee did not want the only tangible evidence that could be offered. It directed that real facts should not be furnished. I continue reading of the letter:

The department felt, further, that it might be subjected to criticism for the erection of buildings in places where the Federal activities did not appear to warrant the same, and that it should properly set forth in its report all facts which would show the effect of proposed legislation.

In reporting on these bills the department began by giving in the usual way, first, the estimated cost of site and building in accordance with the space required, and then added the population, postal receipts, and rental paid by the Post Office Department, concluding with the following paragraph:

"The department feels constrained, in view of all the conditions, to advise against the construction of a Federal building in this place at the present time."

After receiving the protests of the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds against this form of report on bills the department modified its form of report by giving merely the bare facts, showing the cost of maintenance, including interest on total investment, depreciation, and repairs, janitor service, supplies, etc., but omitting the recommendation of the department that no building be erected.

The chairman of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, in his letter of March 31, 1916, to the department stated as follows:

"Now, I desire to again ask that we hereafter confine ourselves to our proper jurisdiction. In future reports we only want a simple statement of the activities to be housed, the space needed by each, the postal receipts, the probable cost, etc. If we desire anything further in a particular case, we will ask for it."

In his letter of April 3 he used the following language:

"I desire again, therefore, to most respectfully ask that in making these reports you will confine it to a simple statement of the facts asked for, because that is all the committee desires to have."

The correspondence between this department and the chairman of the committee is contained in letters as follows:

Chairman committee to department, March 18, 1916.

Departmental reply, March 29, 1916.

Chairman committee to department, March 31, 1916.

Chairman committee to department, April 3, 1916.

Departmental reply, May 4, 1916.

Chairman committee to department, May 6, 1916.

The letters from the chairman of the committee and the departmental replies are undoubtedly on file and presumably the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will permit you to examine same.

Very truly, yours,

BYRON R. NEWTON,  
Assistant Secretary.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the information which the Treasury Department offered to the committee in regard to these various projects. All they took was the advice of the Member of Congress from each district. That is the way this bill has been made up, and 200 items are wasteful and indefensible, according to the Treasury estimates, which the committee refused to read.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, there is quite a good deal of noise here this afternoon, to say the least. I for one do not believe in the Treasury Department or any other department telling this Congress how to legislate. [Applause.] There are some men here, at least, whose constituents think they know how to legislate.

Central City in the last census, as I remember, showed a population of between 2,500 and 2,600. The Government has already purchased a site there, for which it paid, I believe, \$7,500, and title has passed to the Government. The town contains three railroads and has, I presume, about 75 business houses. It has a large coal mine, which employs from 300 to 350 men. There are in the county about 30 large commercial mines. That county is in the central portion of the western coal field of Kentucky. I presume the population of the town in the last year or two has increased 1,000 or more, and it is rapidly increasing.

The necessary land, the site, has been purchased, as I stated, and this building ought to be built. It seems to me it is time some gentlemen on the other side of the House were tumbling to themselves and should cease taking up the valuable time of this Congress in arguing about something that they know will do them no good at all. [Laughter.] If they want their constituents to hear them, let them put it in the RECORD and send it home. [Laughter.] Let them hire a horse and put some fellow on it and send it out to them. [Laughter and applause.]



Now, gentlemen, I did not really want to say anything, but, of course, when you attack my town I have to reply. I wish you people would hush talking and let us vote on this bill. It is going to pass. You recognize that fact. Why do you want to make all this noise? Simply to get yourselves in the newspapers and your pictures on the front page. That is about the size of it. Now, gentlemen, that is about all I wish to say. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the motion to strike out the paragraph.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and other Government offices at Coleman, Tex., \$30,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the population of Coleman, Tex., according to a report to the Treasury Department, is 3,046. The receipts last year reached \$10,723. The rent is \$876 annually, and the amount of maintenance fees is estimated at \$4,000; or altogether the amount named in this item is about four or five times the present cost.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say in reply, along this same line, to what has just preceded, that while the presentation of these facts may not be of any value, so far as the passage of this particular bill is concerned, the gentleman [Mr. Thomas] who spoke—and I am sorry I struck his particular project—the gentleman who spoke also spoke two years ago in favor of the river and harbor bill then passed by the House. He gave me the same advice then, but that bill was defeated in the Senate because in the House we had called attention to the weakness and viciousness of that bill.

That is what we are trying to do here now in the hope that we will awaken some conversions here and get results there.

Now, I want to quote some testimony, Mr. Chairman, that comes from eminent authority recognized by all as second to none on this subject, from a man who has studied the public-building problem and who has rendered an illuminating opinion on the subject. When I say it is the distinguished gentleman who now sits in the chair, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE], you will realize that what I am about to quote is good authority. He says in Report No. 1029 of the House, Sixty-second Congress, second session, as follows:

There seems to be a mania for the construction of public buildings, the cause of which the committee does not attempt to inquire into. We are also aware that some of our suggestions which we shall make will not meet with a cordial reception. We make them, however, because of conditions developed by the hearings and in such public documents as are within our reach and to inform Members who may not have had the time or inclination to investigate for themselves, but who are relying upon the committee to keep them informed as to the facts.

Many towns now have public buildings where private persons would have been glad to have equipped a building under the direction of the Government for its use for a rental of one-half the price paid for janitor service, to say nothing of the deterioration, heat, light, and general upkeep necessary to be looked after and paid for by the Government. The public under these conditions that have prevailed have been denominating the construction of public buildings in towns where the business absolutely does not warrant such construction as a "pork-barrel proposition." They ought not to be too severely criticized for it.

What better authority do you want? He continues:

We believe a Member ought to serve his district and promote its interests in harmony with well-defined business principles and the general public good; that is one way of measuring his usefulness in this body. Such service ought not to partake of a purely selfish interest, with the assumption that getting something for the district that in good conscience it is not entitled to will get something for him. The committee believes that the restriction for public buildings ought to be limited to a city of not less than 5,000 population and \$10,000 receipts. The cost of maintenance, with constantly increasing sums for expenditure of public funds, will become a serious matter unless some established rules or regulations are provided for. It is proper to state, however, that the violation of the rule of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has not occurred in the Legislature at this end of the Capitol.

There is expert opinion from the presiding officer, and this bill has scores of items that are barred by the official report from which I have quoted.

Now, can anyone say that that is not a fact? [Applause and cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say only a few words about this item which proposes a building at Coleman, Tex. If I had not thought it entirely justified I should not have offered the bill.

Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the census report, while perhaps reasonably accurate for 1910, can not even approximate the present population of most towns in the State of Texas. We have places of 5,000 to 10,000 inhabitants in that State that were not on the map in 1910.

The postal receipts for the fiscal year 1915 were \$10,723, and for the fiscal year 1905, \$5,206.

The postal receipts for the last quarter, supplied me by the postmaster at Coleman, indicated postal receipts of between \$13,000 and \$14,000. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have been very modest in asking for a \$30,000 building to accommodate the business of that town. There are a good many railway postal clerks who make it their headquarters.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. SLAYDEN. Gentlemen, be patient. I have not occupied a minute of time on this bill before, and I desire to say without interruption what I intended to say about this bill.

Mr. SUMNERS. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS. Coleman is a county-seat town, is it not?

Mr. SLAYDEN. It is a county-seat town, and the junction of two lines of railway, and the headquarters for a good many railway postal clerks.

Mr. Chairman, the bill is justified, and it is one of three bills that I have proposed, in which the amounts I have asked for were less than the ordinary amount, and less than the committees were willing to concede.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this taste and appetite for pork varies with the circumstances. If a big, juicy slice is coming toward me, I think it perhaps an excellent thing. If it is to be divided with my neighbor, I know that my part is all right, but I may have doubts about his; and if it goes only to the other fellow, of course, I have an aversion to pork that would gratify the author of the Mosaic code. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I have not the slightest doubt that this item will be agreed to by the committee. It makes its own argument. It is reasonable; it is proper. Coleman is a small town, of only 4,500 or perhaps 5,000 population, but the people of that town went down into their pockets and paid between \$6,000 and \$7,000 for a very desirable lot, one that was wanted, and presented it to the Government, \$1 being the consideration named in the deed. That same thing happened in the town of Brownwood, in my district, only in that case citizens paid between \$8,000 and \$10,000 for the lot they gave the Government; and people who do those things, and who do the amount of business that seems to be generally conceded to be the proper prerequisite for the granting of such an appropriation as this, are certainly entitled to the consideration of the House, and I believe there will not be more than one or two votes against such a laudable and proper item as this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to strike out the paragraph.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Crockett, Tex., \$25,000.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, on October 1, 1916, the postal receipts of this town, according to the statement of the department, were \$9,203. This is another item where the present rent is \$632, and the cost to the Government to maintain will be \$4,200. Of this \$900 will be for maintenance. I would like to read a letter regarding the cost of maintenance. It was stated on the floor the other day that \$900 was for soap. I want to read this letter:

THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, January 8, 1917.

Hon. W. FRANK JAMES,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Referring to your recent call at the department and request for information as to what constituted the item of supplies amounting to \$900, contained in reports recently submitted to Congress in connection with various contemplated buildings, the following information is furnished you:

From the experience of the department in connection with the maintenance of small buildings in various parts of the country costing approximately about \$50,000, it is estimated that the average cost for supplies amounts to \$900, as tabulated below:

Light	250
Fuel	350
Water	120
Ice, washing of towels, removal of ashes and rubbish, and miscellaneous supplies	180
Total	900

In connection with this estimate there is inclosed herewith a statement comprising the actual experience of the department relative to five buildings located in various sections of the country. As it will be seen, the cost for heating, as well as other items, varies materially, according to whether the building is located in the North or South.

Very truly, yours,

B. R. NEWTON, Assistant Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to strike out the item.

The question was taken, and the motion was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Decatur, Ind., \$45,000.



Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 23, strike out the figures "\$45,000" and in lieu thereof insert the figures "\$50,000."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Decatur is one of the places that comes within the line entitled to \$50,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Dillon, S. C., \$25,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I have passed over several of the items that I did not want to mention, although all are wasteful because of greatly increased annual cost, but I move to strike out this item. I have not examined and do not know the Representative in whose district this item is and desire to be relieved of prejudice against any particular item excepting on the basis of extravagance. At Dillon the population, according to the Treasury report, was 1,757 in 1910. The postal receipts were \$7,733, and the rent is \$400 per annum. According to the Treasury estimate the expense annually through a new building will be increased to \$4,000, or ten times the amount it now costs the Government. In arriving at a reasonable basis for public-building construction, let me read from the report (Doc. 936, 63d Cong., 2d sess.) from which I read a few moments ago. I have the report of the Public Buildings Commission, which has made an investigation since the last public-buildings bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin to strike out the item.

The question was taken, and the motion was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office, courthouse, and customhouse at Duluth, Minn., \$300,000. And the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to sell at public sale, after due advertisement, the present Federal building at Duluth and the site upon which the same is located, for not less than \$150,000, the proceeds of the said sale to be used in the construction of the new building.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 11, line 4, strike out lines 4 and 5, and in line 6 the words "less than \$150,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Or private sale at not less than the value as determined by the appraisal thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury, and upon such terms as he may deem for the best interests of the United States, in the present Federal building at Duluth, and the site upon which the same is located, and convey the said land and building by quitclaim deed to the purchaser thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 1, after the word "courthouse" strike out the word "and," and insert after the word "customhouse" the words "and other Government offices."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The committee has no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of making a few remarks; and I hope I may be permitted to complete my argument. I intended to say that before assuming an obligation that will have to be paid in a few years—

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 1, after the word "courthouse" strike out the word "and," and insert after the word "customhouse" the words "and other Government offices."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The committee has no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of making a few remarks; and I hope I may be permitted to complete my argument. I intended to say that before assuming an obligation that will have to be paid in a few years—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that no new paragraph has been read, and that there is nothing to strike out.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if it is necessary, then I move to strike out the paragraph, lines 1 to 7.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But no paragraph has been read. I make the point of order that there is nothing before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the committee has just perfected the paragraph. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Edenton, N. C., \$25,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the item. I want to say that I desire to deal fairly with the House, and I think Members can very well afford to permit me to conclude the very few remarks that I desire to make. I desire to call attention to the fact that for the 11 months of this year ending with November our imports from all parts of the country—

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. The gentleman from Michigan is not proceeding in order. He is not addressing himself to the paragraph or anything that is collateral to that paragraph, and the Chair has repeatedly so ruled.

Mr. LANGLEY. And I want to suggest, further, that the gentleman pledged himself that if he had five minutes he would stop, and he is therefore estopped from going any further.

Mr. HOWARD. As I understand the rule, when a Member is proceeding out of order he has to take his seat, and he has to purge himself of his disorder, and it has to be done by a motion; and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] has, in my judgment and in the judgment of practically every man on this floor, been trying to get away with that campaign rot that he delivered in Michigan in the late campaign on a bill of this sort for the specific purpose of filibustering.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the gentleman that the gentleman from Michigan will not be required to take his seat unless he is called to order by some Member of the House.

Mr. HOWARD. Then I call the gentleman from Michigan to order.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I demand that the gentleman from Georgia have the words to which he objects taken down.

Mr. HOWARD. Very well; I am ready.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard upon the point of order.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts whose words he desires to have taken down?

Mr. GARDNER. The words stated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] to which he objects.

Mr. HOWARD. The objection is not so much directed to the words but the defiance of the gentleman from Michigan to the repeated ruling of the Chair. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit me, the gentleman was proceeding with an argument, a portion of which on four different occasions within the last hour related to the tariff. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] made the point of order which the Chair sustained. Another gentleman made the point of order which the Chair sustained, and then a third gentleman [Mr. LANGLEY] made a point of order which the Chair very promptly and properly sustained. I made a point of order the gentleman was not proceeding in order. Now, on the fifth occasion he takes up the disconnected speech, campaign speech, not relating to anything in this bill, and for the fifth time, in defiance of the ruling of the Chair, he persists in proceeding with it when a point of order is made by a gentleman that he is not in order.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I call attention of the Chair to Rule XIV, section 5—

If a Member is called to order for words spoken in debate, the Member calling him to order shall indicate the words excepted to, and they shall be taken down in writing at the Clerk's desk and read aloud.

Mr. HOWARD. That is not the rule under which I am objecting.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that there is a special rule for the consideration of this bill requiring all gentlemen to limit all debate to the subject matter of the bill. The gentleman has not been called to order for any language used, but the point of order has been repeatedly made that he is not discussing the bill, and he has persisted in proceeding with that discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled that the gentleman was not proceeding in order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The Chair has repeatedly held that the gentleman was not in order. I want to put the gentleman on notice about the proposition that if I can get Members enough to stand by me we will stay here until midnight or daylight if necessary to pass this bill, and the filibuster of the gentleman is not going to accomplish anything.

Mr. CRAMTON. May I have a word on the point of order?

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman is perfectly correct. I did not know that was the rule that was being invoked by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD]. Only the Chair can require the gentleman from Michigan to sit down—

Mr. HOWARD. I understand that; that is elementary. I learned that in church.

Mr. CRAMTON. I wish to discuss the point of order. I desire to call the attention of the Chair to this: That I have uniformly stated that if the Chair ruled my remarks were not in order I would discontinue them, but as yet I have not understood the Chair to so rule.



The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the gentleman the Chair has several times ruled the gentleman was proceeding out of order and asked him to proceed in order. The Chair holds the point of order is well taken.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. This bill, I understand, makes authorization for a considerable sum of money. Is it out of order for a Member in discussing an item to refer to the condition of the Treasury or to the receipts of the Government of the United States? That is what the gentleman from Michigan, as I understand it, now is proceeding to do.

Mr. CRAMTON. Absolutely.

Mr. GOOD. Here is a bill that authorizes the expenditure of a great deal of money which must be paid out of the Treasury of the United States. [Cries of "Regular order!"] I do not understand that the Chair has held that it will be out of order for a Member to speak about the income of the Government from all sources and the condition of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair inform the gentleman we are proceeding under the five-minute rule in the discussion of this bill.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And that the gentleman must discuss the paragraph before the House or an amendment thereto.

Mr. GOOD. But the paragraph before the House might refer to a \$4,000,000 item or a \$30,000 item, and just to what extent that item goes and the effect of it, it seems to me, the gentleman has a perfect right within the rules to refer to the Treasury and the probable income to the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the gentleman's attention to Hinds' Precedents, volume 5, page 52, section 5049:

On a motion to amend, debate in the House is confined to the amendment and may not include the general merits of a proposition.

And there are cited several precedents.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, then I will proceed in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may proceed in order under the specified rule which confines the discussion to the rule itself.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say that I had not understood before the Chair had expressly ruled. I yield to his ruling. I have no desire to filibuster, and hence I will not attempt to proceed further on that line. But while I am on my feet I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CRAMTON. Under above leave to print, I desire to give the following interesting and instructive figures:

*Imports into United States.*

11 months ending November—	
1910.....	\$1,426,194,277
1911.....	1,391,684,958
1912.....	1,684,270,806
1913.....	1,608,570,909
1914.....	1,674,619,456
1915.....	1,606,764,190
1916.....	2,186,821,708

Even now, with the world at war and the men of Europe withdrawn from industrial production, we have imported for the last 11 months, for which figures are available, over half a billion dollars more of goods made by foreign labor than ever before in the same period of time. A representative of the people may well pause to consider what the conditions will be in this country in a year or two, when our market abroad for war orders is ended by the dawn of peace in Europe and when the present rush of foreign-made goods becomes a disastrous torrent. It is folly, with such possibilities in our early future to burden our people with millions and millions to decorate with congressional monuments small towns throughout the land.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the five minutes has already been used on this item, and I must object.

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES] wants to talk on the same side as the other gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman from Michigan was not permitted to talk on either side.

Mr. JAMES. I call attention to the fact that this is an appropriation of \$25,000. The original bill that was introduced by the sponsor thereof called for \$60,000, and the committee is to be commended for cutting it down to \$25,000. I find the population in 1900 was 3,046 and in 1910 was 2,789. It costs the Government now \$660 a year for rent, and the Treasury Department estimates that the cost of the maintenance of the new building

will be \$4,000. I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to strike out the paragraph.

The motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Eminence, Ky., \$40,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. According to the statement furnished by the Treasury Department for this \$40,000 appropriation, the population in Eminence, Ky., in 1910, was 1,274. The revenues of 1915 were \$4,402. The rent is \$193 annually. According to the estimates of the department it will cost \$3,700 a year to maintain a post office at Eminence, which to-day rents for \$193 annually, in addition to the original investment of \$40,000.

I call attention, Mr. Chairman, further to the minority report of this public-building commission, contained in Document No. 936, on this same point of ascertainment of what is the proper limitation in annual receipts, rental, and population when deciding upon public-building construction. This is from the present Postmaster General, who was a member of the commission and formerly a Member of this House. In his minority report he says, on pages 18 and 19:

If satisfactory quarters can be rented for an amount less than this sum the construction of a public building represents a large annual loss to the Government and should not be authorized.

Although the rental paid should be the basic factor for determining whether a public building should be erected, consideration must be given to the fact that abnormally high rental values may be fixed in some communities by unusual conditions or by the disposition of property owners to raise rents with a view to securing public buildings. To provide against the construction of public buildings in communities where the existence of artificial real estate values compels the Government to pay rentals exceeding \$1,000 per annum, it is necessary to establish a secondary or corrective condition.

The interest of the Government, therefore, requires that a public building for post-office purposes only, shall not be authorized for any place unless the rental paid for Government offices is as much as \$1,000 per annum, and then only when either the gross post-office receipts amount to as much as \$15,000 or the population to as much as 5,000.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Fairfield, Iowa, \$50,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the proposition ought to be in the bill, and I move that further debate on the paragraph just read be now closed. I refer to the item for Fairfield, Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida moves that all debate on the paragraph just read be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Falmouth, Ky., \$25,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, that, too, is a very deserving item, and I move that all debate on that item be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moves that all debate on this paragraph close.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and other Government offices at Fargo, N. Dak., \$250,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, that is also a very deserving item, and I move that all debate on it be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moves that all debate on the paragraph just read be now closed.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. FREAR. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were refused.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and other Government offices at Forrest City, Ark., \$25,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 20, strike out the figures "\$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$35,000."

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

Mr. JAMES rose.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that that is offered because of the fact that other towns of that size have



that sum, and in proportion to those the original sum is not sufficient. I move that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto be closed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman can not move to close debate when another gentleman has the floor—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Another gentleman has not the floor—

Mr. STAFFORD. Another gentleman, demanding recognition. He can not move to close debate until five minutes' debate has been had. The gentleman can not by these tactics foreclose Members from discussing items under the five-minute rule.

The Chair must take cognizance of the fact that five minutes have not been consumed on these respective items. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES], demanding recognition, should be recognized, and the Chair can not entertain a motion to close the debate before five minutes' debate has been consumed. I call the attention of the Chair to section 6 of Rule XXII, which reads as follows:

The committee may, by the vote of the majority of the Members present, at any time after the five minutes' debate has begun upon proposed amendments to any section or paragraph of a bill, close all debate upon such sections or paragraphs or, at its election, upon the pending amendments only (which motion shall be decided without debate); but this shall not preclude further amendment, to be decided without debate.

It has always been the practice, Mr. Chairman, to allow at least five minutes' debate under all conditions.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The very rule that the gentleman quoted says "after debate had begun." I had the floor. The gentleman from Michigan had not the floor. I offered an amendment, and discussed it, and after discussion made the motion. It was entirely in order.

I want to submit, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has its remedy in its own hands. It can vote down my motion if it sees fit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of gentlemen to the ruling on page 129 of Hinds' Precedents, volume 5, which reads as follows:

Thereupon Mr. Joseph W. Babcock, of Wisconsin, moved that debate on the amendment and amendments thereto close in one minute.

Mr. James D. Richardson, of Tennessee, made the point of order that debate could not be closed until the time allowed by the rules—five minutes for and five against the proposition—had expired.

After debate the Chairman said:

"The Chair is very clearly of the opinion that by section 5, five minutes' debate is allowed for an amendment proposed and five minutes against that amendment and then the debate closes itself without any motion. The sixth paragraph, which was adopted 10 years later than the one just referred to, provided for closing debate at any time after it shall have begun. It would have been entirely unnecessary if it had been limited to the condition described in paragraph 5, because the debate then is closed without any motion, or upon the interposition of the point of order by any gentleman on the floor. The Chair therefore rules that the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin is in order, that debate upon this amendment be closed in one minute."

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand from the ruling of the Chair, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES] is entitled to recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. This precedent establishes here the rule that when there has been debate on this proposition by the Chairman he can move to close the debate.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Then the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair hear me a moment on that?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman if he desires to discuss the point of order.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the Chair turn to page 390 of the rules of the House and look half way down the page until he finds this clause—

The CHAIRMAN. What page is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. GARDNER. Page 390 of the Manual. Look half way down the page.

The CHAIRMAN. What section?

Mr. GARDNER. Section 6. I read:

The motion to close debate is not in order until such debate has begun (V, 5225), which means after one speech of five minutes (V, 5226).

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman permit an interruption, a question, there?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does the rule say "debate of five minutes"?

Mr. GARDNER. That is the syllabus. I do not think the gentleman doubts that HINDS is good authority.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, I will read from the decision from Mr. Congressman Moody, of Massachusetts. The reference number is 5226. After debate on that Babcock motion the Chairman, William H. Moody, of Massachusetts, said:

The Chair is very clearly of the opinion that by section 5 five minutes' debate is allowed for an amendment proposed and five minutes against that amendment, and then the debate closes itself without any motion.

The sixth paragraph, which was adopted 10 years later than the one just referred to, provided for closing the debate at any time after it shall have begun. It would have been entirely unnecessary—

I see that the syllabus does not seem to agree with the decision.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair is ready to rule, I do not care to say anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CRISP. It seems to me that the matter is a very plain one, and easy of solution. Under the rules of the House, after general debate is ended, the bill is before the House for consideration under the five-minute rule. Now, what is the five-minute rule? It provides that when an amendment is offered, there can be five minutes' debate in favor of the amendment and five minutes' debate against the amendment, and then the rule, if strictly enforced, precludes all other debate. That is section 5 of the rule. Now, that rule is supplemented by section 6, which provides that after debate has commenced under the five-minute rule it is in order to move to close debate. It requires one speech under the five-minute rule to begin the debate on the paragraph or section; but surely no rule of the House requires any Member to consume all of his five minutes. He may make a speech of one minute if he desires, and after he has made a speech, if it is of a minute or half a minute, debate under the five-minute rule has commenced, and it is clearly in order to move to close debate, and if the committee desires to close debate, the committee will sustain the motion. If the committee does not desire to close debate, it will reject the motion, and debate can resume. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, after having had fuller opportunity to consult the precedents, I would like to be heard again.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. GARDNER. As a matter of fact in the citation made by the Chair (Hinds, V, No. 5226), the motion of Mr. Babcock of Wisconsin to close debate was made after Mr. John J. Fitzgerald had addressed the committee for five minutes on the pending amendment. Now, Mr. Moody, in making his ruling, was clearly in error. Mr. Moody first called attention to the fact that paragraph 5, Rule XXIII, makes the debate on amendments in Committee of the Whole close automatically after five minutes on one side and five on the other. Then he based his ruling that the point of order against Mr. Babcock's motion was not well taken, upon the statement that paragraph 6 of Rule XXIII would have been totally unnecessary unless it was desired to give the Committee of the Whole the right to close debate even before the five-minute debate had been concluded. But Mr. Moody overlooked the fact that section 6 gives the right to close debate on the whole paragraph after the debate has begun, whereas section 5 only gives the right to close debate or automatically terminate debate on some particular amendment, and not on the whole paragraph. So that Mr. Moody's decision is evidently made under a misapprehension of what section 6 of Rule XXIII actually does.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman a question. Section 6 of the rule says:

The committee may, by the vote of a majority of the Members present, at any time after the five minutes' debate has begun upon proposed amendments to any section or paragraph of a bill, close all debate upon such section or paragraph or, at its election, upon the pending amendments only.

Does the gentleman hold that no debate has been had upon this paragraph?

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman is not prepared to hold so, although he has heard it held so at a time when it used to be the fashion, in moving the previous question, to say, "I think it is a very good thing to move the previous question, and I move the previous question," and in that way cut off the 40 minutes' debate that is generally allowed after the immediate ordering of the previous question. I have known debate in the House to be closed by that device. I remember that it was done when Calendar Wednesday was adopted by an amendment to the rules of the House on motion of Mr. John Dalzell about six or seven years ago. Mr. Dalzell, from the Committee on Rules, reported a certain special rule which many Members did not want to have debated. Under the rules, unless there has been debate before the ordering of the previous question, debate



may continue for 40 minutes after the previous question is adopted. On this occasion Mr. Dalzell debated the special rule for two minutes and then moved the previous question on its adoption. I claimed the floor for debate under the 40-minute rule, but the Speaker was of the opinion that debate had already actually taken place. The House felt that this ruling was not a true interpretation of the meaning of the rule. Now, if the Chair thinks that the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors genuinely debated this paragraph, if the Chair thinks there has actually been genuine debate in Committee of the Whole, then I am aware that the point of order is not well taken. It is entirely in the power of the Chair to determine whether or not there was genuine debate.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make this suggestion concerning the point of order: There is no inconsistency between paragraphs No. 5 and No. 6. Paragraph No. 5 provides that there shall be 10 minutes' debate; paragraph No. 6 says that after debate has begun a motion to close debate may be made.

Now, after an amendment has been offered, the mover of that amendment has, unquestionably, five minutes under rule 5. He may use it or not, as he chooses. Suppose he only uses one minute and at the close he sits down, the chairman of the committee can then move to close debate; at the close of five minutes he can move to close debate. But there is no other opportunity to close debate after it has begun, because you can not take a man off his feet after he has received recognition by the Chair for any purpose until his time has expired under the rule. So there is nothing for the Chair to determine except whether debate had begun. The gentleman who is entitled to recognition and made the motion to strike out was entitled to use full five minutes under the rule if he desired, and, debate having begun, he had a right to exercise the power that was his under the rule.

So it seems to me there ought not to be any difficulty in the mind of the Chair on the point of order. A correct decision of the point of order is of vastly more importance than the passage of this bill or any item in it. I certainly do not desire that the Chair shall make any mistake which may be used as a precedent.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, after following the discussion on the point of order it seems to me that the gentlemen making it have shifted their ground. When the point was first made it was insisted that there must be five minutes of actual debate, before the motion to close debate could be made. But this contention seems to have been abandoned, and it is now insisted that the Member holding the floor must actually debate the proposition not that he must debate it for full five minutes, but in good faith must debate it for some appreciable portion of that time. If this is the point to be determined, and it strikes me that it is the only one that can be raised, then the question presented is of easy determination.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman tell me what question was being debated by the gentleman from Florida? How did he have the floor for debate? He offered no amendment.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, yes.

Mr. GARNER. He did offer an amendment increasing it from \$25,000 to \$35,000.

Mr. GARDNER. Then I am mistaken.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will answer the gentleman. The extent of the contribution to the debate is immaterial, so that it is appreciable. The Chair need only determine whether any argument has been advanced concerning the proposition before the House, not how much time the debater has consumed, but whether he has made any actual contribution to the debate. If the Chair is satisfied that the gentleman from Florida debated the subject matter, however brief his remarks may have been, then the debate had begun, and it was in order for the gentleman from Florida to move to close the discussion.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair is ready to rule I do not desire to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, while there do not seem to be many parliamentary precedents in matters of this kind, many times since I have been in the House a motion in the form in which it was made by the gentleman from Florida has been made, and never up to this time have I heard it questioned.

I remember a number of years ago in the case of an important bill, the national reclamation law, it became necessary in the face of a filibuster to make a motion to close debate after each item had been read in order to get through in the time fixed for the final vote on the bill. Mr. John Dalzell, one of the best

parliamentarians on the floor since I have been here, was among those who were filibustering. The motion to close debate was made successively on one paragraph after another, as made to-day by the gentleman from Florida; and I am certain that if the motion had not been properly made Mr. Dalzell would have resisted it.

Let me call the Chair's attention to the fact that the ruling which the Chair quoted by Chairman Moody, of Massachusetts, is entirely logical, for this reason: James D. Richardson made the point of order that debate could not be closed until the time allowed by the rule—five minutes on a side—had been exhausted. Now, the point of order put in that way raised the entire question as to whether paragraph 6 established a different rule than that laid down by paragraph 5. It is true that in that case Mr. FITZGERALD had occupied five minutes; but that does not change the situation any, because the point of order was that the entire period fixed by Rule V must be exhausted, and therefore the Chairman very properly took up that question and decided that paragraph 6 provided that after debate had begun on an amendment and proceeded for ever so brief a period the motion can be made to close debate. It may be amended, but no debate is allowed on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. This is the situation: The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], offers an amendment to the paragraph and after proceeding to explain why he offered the amendment he makes a motion that debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed, whereupon the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] makes the point of order that there had not been five minutes discussion upon the amendment. The Chair is inclined to think that inasmuch as discussion upon the amendment had been entered upon by the chairman of the committee the point of order is not well taken and the point of order is therefore overruled. The question is on the motion to close debate upon the paragraph and amendments thereto.

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

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Georgetown, Tex., \$30,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do that for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that Georgetown, Tex., is a very progressive city in that State. This is certainly an item that is worthy. I desire now to withdraw the pro forma amendment, and I move that all debate upon the paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on closing debate upon the paragraph and amendments thereto.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARDNER) there were—ayes 114, noes 6.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida to strike out the last word.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Green River, Wyo., \$25,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The town of Green River, Wyo., is a very prosperous place. There are many Federal activities there, and this post office is absolutely essential to that community. I move that all debate upon this paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to close debate upon the paragraph and amendments thereto.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FREAR) there were—ayes 97, noes 5.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida to strike out the last word.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAMES) there were—ayes 0, noes 52.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Greenville, Ala., \$30,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss the item—



Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is nothing before the House. What question is before the committee?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The adoption of this item.

Mr. GARDNER. But the gentleman can not be recognized unless he has an amendment to offer.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that many years ago I visited Greenville, Ala.—

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing his motion to strike out the last word.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; I am discussing it. This relates to Greenville, Ala. I want to say—

Mr. GARDNER. But the gentleman is discussing Alabama.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; Greenville, Ala. Having said what I did, that I visited this place several years ago, I can conclude my remarks by stating that it is rightly included in this bill. Mr. Chairman, I move that all further debate upon this paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida to close debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAMES) there were—ayes 83, noes 4.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). Five gentlemen have risen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I demand the other side.

Mr. MANN. There is no other side to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The rule is one-fifth of a quorum may decide whether there shall be tellers or not.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "\$30,000" and insert "\$25,000."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I moved to close all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto, and the motion has been agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion before the House is that of the gentleman of Florida to strike out the last word. That is the pending motion.

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

On a division (demanded by Mr. JAMES) there were—ayes 6, noes 82.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. What has become of my motion to strike out \$30,000 and insert \$25,000?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 4, strike out "\$30,000" and insert "\$25,000."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate close on the paragraph and amendments thereto.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, under the rules of the House it is impossible to save time by attempting to stifle debate. Of the procedure of the gentleman from Florida I have no criticism to make. Under the rules the motion to close debate is subject to amendment ad libitum, and upon every one of those you can have a division. After debate is closed you can offer amendments until the Chair goes blind, and I have never seen the Chairman of this committee get blind. Now, two or three gentlemen are here who desire to discuss certain items. The only way to do, after all, will be for the House to let them discuss those items in accordance with the rules. The time is not very great for any one item, and then this body, if it is necessary, might have to sit at night in order to pass the bill. That has occurred frequently in the past and will occur in the future; and if the House becomes satisfied that some Members are attempting to debate purely for filibuster, they never make any progress by that, whereas a filibuster is always successful in the effort to get a chance to debate. Now, Members are pretty well worked up to-night, and I suggest to the chairman of the committee he move to rise, and if necessary sit all to-morrow and to-morrow night and let gentlemen debate if they want to be heard.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to dispose of the pending proposition before taking any steps.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist upon his motion?

Mr. GOOD. I shall not only insist upon the motion but I shall make as many motions for each item as I can, as long as the chairman of the committee insists upon filibustering and preventing the committee from discussing these items as long as the committee is not filibustering.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman from Illinois will permit, I would like permission to proceed for about a minute.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to make this statement: For the first time in the history of Congress we have brought in an omnibus public-buildings bill here and thrown it wide open to discussion, to amendment, and to consideration. Three or four gentlemen have shown a disposition absolutely to block the progress of Congress. They have gone through this matter and put their whole case in the Record—

Mr. LANGLEY. Several times.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. One gentleman persisted in making a tariff speech here for an hour or more by moving practically to strike out the last word at the end of every line—

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; I will not—and undertook to make that kind of a speech for the purpose of delaying this bill. These gentlemen, as I say, have had ample opportunity to put their case in the Record. They have put it in the Record, they have seen the temper of the House, and they know that the House intends to pass this bill.

Now, they have made their arguments, they have presented their case, and why can they not in good conscience allow the Congress to go forward with its work and do its work? I want to say this, that I am going in a moment to ask the committee to rise, but not out of deference to these gentlemen who have sought to filibuster. I prefer to sit here all night. But some things are bothering some other gentlemen, and out of consideration for them I intend to move to rise. But I want to say this, that we have been perfectly fair, we have opened this bill to amendment for these gentlemen, and if they would offer their amendments and discuss the actual questions involved in the amendments there would be no objection to having the five minutes' debate. But they go out and ramble all over the wide, wide world and talk about rivers and harbors, the tariff, and everything under the sun except the amendments they offer. And I want to put them on notice now that if the House will stand by the committee we will put this bill through to-morrow, if we have to get another rule. We did try to get, and did get, a fair rule and tried to act fairly and squarely, but if gentlemen will insist on filibustering we will try to bring in a rule here that will put this bill through, and, if necessary, we will stay here all night to-morrow night to do it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the committee to dispose of this item.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; I will not.

Mr. GOOD. I wish to say to the gentleman that I am perfectly willing, inasmuch as the gentleman has stated he is going to rise, and I think that he will permit a limited debate on these things to-morrow, to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FITZGERALD] having resumed the chair, Mr. CLINE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 18994) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, etc., and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. SPARKMAN, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Lavinia Johnson (H. R. 5579, 63d Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

#### HOURLY MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day

it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

CANCELING DIE FOR WINTER CARNIVAL, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up the following resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following joint resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 332—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object. I do not know what it is. ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H. R. 10384. An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 19, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an item for inclusion in the sundry civil appropriation bill, in connection with the appropriation for construction and operation of railroads in Alaska (H. Doc. No. 1947); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CARLIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 336) extending until January 8, 1918, the effective date of section 10 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1319), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19239) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Pearl River, Miss., and the fourth ward of the parish of Washington, La., to construct a bridge across Pearl River, between Pearl River County, Miss., and Washington Parish, La., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1320), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CARAWAY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20209) to amend section 276 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1322), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19776) to authorize the United New Jersey Railroad & Canal Co., and such other corporations or individuals as may be associated with it, to construct a bridge across the portion of the Delaware River between the mainland of the county of Camden, State of New Jersey, and Petty Island, in said county and State, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1323), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LITTLEPAGE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 6154) for the relief of

Charles Lee Baker, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1321), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18066) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Thompson, and the same was referred to the Committee on 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. STOUT: A bill (H. R. 20249) to authorize the sale of certain lands at or near Yellowstone, Mont., for hotel purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 20250) to authorize the refund of duties collected on field kitchens imported during the year 1916; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20251) for the conservation of alcohol in the manufacture of dealcoholized fermented beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 20252) to incorporate the National Society of Sponsors of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 20253) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Galena, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20254) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Fredonia, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20255) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Neodesha, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 20256) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," as amended, in respect of car service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution (H. Res. 456) authorizing certain members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice to make investigations relative to the Federal prisons and institutions; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

By Mr. RODENBERG: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 343) making it unlawful for the head of any department of the Government of the United States to invite and accept bids from foreign manufacturers on contracts for supplies for use of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 344) to change the name of the Danish West Indies to the Dewey Islands; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 20257) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Borsekoeske; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 20258) granting an increase of pension to Andrew M. Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 20259) granting an increase of pension to Peter T. Nile, alias Patrick Nilan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 20260) granting a pension to Frank L. Schaarman, alias Frank L. Sherman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE: A bill (H. R. 20261) granting a pension to Emma Guetzlaff; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 20262) granting an increase of pension to James W. Beasley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20263) granting a pension to Lebbeus H. Brockway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20264) granting a pension to Pierce O'Connell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20265) granting a pension to Michael E. O'Donnell; to the Committee on Pensions.



By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 20266) granting a pension to Edwin M. Stupfell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALE of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 20267) granting a pension of Lucina Grigware; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 20268) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 20269) for the relief of William S. Colvin; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 20270) granting a pension to Flora A. Hubbard and her minor children; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 20271) for the relief of the William Gordon Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 20272) granting an increase of pension to Horace W. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 20273) granting an increase of pension to Noah W. Gerrish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 20274) for the relief of Charles T. Jackson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 20275) for the relief of Jacob M. Middlekauff; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEEKER: A bill (H. R. 20276) for the relief of the heirs at law of Jacques Clamorgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOSS: A bill (H. R. 20277) granting a pension to Lydia A. Keller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 20278) to place Albert Hamilton on the retired list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 20279) granting an increase of pension to Lottie Tanner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REAVIS: A bill (H. R. 20280) granting a pension to Cyrus A. Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 20281) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Melson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 20282) granting an increase of pension to William A. Davy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 20283) granting an increase of pension to Luther W. Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STAFFORD: A bill (H. R. 20284) granting an increase of pension to Michael Reichert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 20285) granting an increase of pension to Frank P. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 20286) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Blaisdell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 20287) granting an increase of pension to General Taylor Garrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20288) granting an increase of pension to Samuel McAtee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 20289) granting an increase of pension to John W. Harvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 20290) granting an increase of pension to Albert T. Hart; 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 Woman's Christian Temperance Union people of Fulton, Mo., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorials of Missouri Live Stock Producers' Association, in favor of Federal Trade Commission conducting investigation of marketing of live stock and meat packing industries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of B. W. Whitney and Gifford T. Vermillion, both of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the passage of House bill 19617; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Association of Stationary Engineers in re zone system of mail postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, telegram from A. Burlanes & Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against passage of any prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Henry Loeber, of Milwaukee, Wis., opposing prohibitory bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petitions of 135 people of First Congregational Church, 300 people of German Baptist Church, 75 people of Zion Norwegian Lutheran Church, all of Racine, Wis., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Bohemian branch of Socialist Party, Racine, Wis., protesting against passage of House bill 18986; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of members of Governor Harvey Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Racine, Wis., protesting against the abolishment of the Northwestern Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, near Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DARROW: Petitions of Christian S. Miller and 24 other residents of Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the enactment of bills providing for prohibition in the District of Columbia, forbidding mails to liquor dealers, prohibiting interstate commerce in liquors, and national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Alumnae Association of the Pittsburgh Training School for Nurses, in behalf of Senate bill 6667, to incorporate the American Nurses' Association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of James L. Hall, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the enactment of House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429, mail-exclusion bills; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petition of Luther A. Baughan et al., of Ketchum, Claremore, Big Cabin, and Sallisaw, Okla., in re postal legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Henry Buelow and 23 other residents of La Crosse, Wis., against prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, in re zone system of second-class postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers and Dealers' Association of America, opposing various prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany House bill 19965, for relief of Martin L. Rex; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Union Label Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, opposing prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Pan Greek-American Church of Chicago, Ill., opposing the enactment of House bill 18986; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Barnard & Miller, of Chicago, opposing the zone system for second-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of Holyoke Typographical Union, No. 253, Holyoke, Mass., and Boufort's Wine and Spirit Circular, of Louisville, Ky., in re bills excluding liquor advertisements from mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GILLETT: Petition of citizens of Northampton, Mass., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 845 voters of Springfield, Mass., and vicinity protesting against the passage of House bills 18986 and 17850, Senate bills 4429 and 1082, and House joint resolution 84; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petitions of numerous citizens, firms, and organizations in reference to 1-cent drop-letter postage and proposed increase in second-class postage rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petitions of 750 Woman's Christian Temperance Union people, 200 Presbyterian Church people, 200 members of Presbyterian Church, 250 people of South Broadway Presbyterian Church, 400 Methodist Episcopal Church people, and 300 members of Grant Avenue Church, all of Denver, Colo., for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL: Memorial of Branch 111 of National Association of Letter Carriers, of Salt Lake City, Utah., in favor of



the passage of the so-called Penrose-Griffin bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 325, Ogden Utah, of the International Union of the United Brewery Workmen, against all prohibitory legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Theatrical Stage Employees' Union, of Salt Lake City, against House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429 and similar exclusion legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Local Union No. 30, Brotherhood of Railway Mail Clerks, in favor of increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 64 of the International Union of the United Brewery Workmen, Salt Lake City, against all prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Petition of Junior Order of American Mechanics, of Hackensack, N. J., favoring an additional appropriation for field service of the Naturalization Bureau; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Zisso Vassiliades, Theocharis Kotrotos, Dionisios, Panayiotis Eliopoulos, Constantinos Leyackis, John N. Pappas, Pantalis Eliplos, Michail Saines, Dimitros Eliopoulos, M. Argeris, John Eliopoulos, John Pappageorge, George Eliopoulos, John Latouros, Peter Palavos, P. J. Anninos, Chris Touris, K. Porfirius, Panagiotis Spiliotopoulos, John Ferris, John Dinutrikopoulos, Constine Androustopoulos, Dimitros Andoniou, William Nicklis, George Peterson, Spiros Sarlis, John Dritsas, Michail Audis, George Sngeles, John Germinis, Dionisios Arvanitis, Dan Maroudes, John Beleris, George Diamandes, Andros Ganetos, M. Galustzolos, George Counas, and Dimitrios Ralis, all of San Francisco, Cal., praying intervention on the part of the United States in behalf of the starving citizens of Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 52 residents of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the enactment of House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429, mail-exclusion bills; Senate bill 1082, District of Columbia prohibition bill; House joint resolution 84, nation-wide prohibition bill; and House bill 17850, to prohibit commerce in intoxicating liquors between States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Dried Fruit Association of California and the Cannery League of California, favoring legislation to enforce the proper standardization of all food products, and the necessity for an appropriation to commence the work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOTT: Memorial adopted by New York State Fish, Game, and Forest League, urging enactment into law of House bill 20080; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition against the several prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWLAND: Petition of 403 people of Reabersburg Sunday School, of Reabersburg; 75 members of United Evangelical Sunday School of Aaronsburg; 275 people of Millheim Sunday School; 1,100 people of Reformed Church of Aaronsburg; and 115 people of Salem Evangelical Sunday School, of Aaronsburg, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of 135 Methodist Episcopal Church people, of McMoresville; 300 Methodist Episcopal Church people, of Whitlock; and 125 Wesley's Chapel people, of McMoresville, all in the State of Tennessee; favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Rex Dopp, members of Christian Endeavor Society, and members of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Prattville, favoring prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNELL: Resolution by the State Fish, Game, and Forest League of New York State, John B. Burnham, president, urging the passage of an act to give effect to the treaty recently perfected between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain and appropriating the sum of \$500,000 to enforce said law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union at Eldora and a public meeting at Eldora, Washington County, Pa., favoring a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of the Newburg (N. Dak.) Nonpartisan League, being certain resolutions favoring Government ownership of railroads, protesting against the reduction of the rate on first-class postage and against the increase on other classes, protesting against the large appropriations being made for military purposes, and requesting that an effective way be found to transport farm labor from the centers of population into the farming districts; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, January 19, 1917.

Rabbi Leo M. Franklin, of Detroit, Mich., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose hands are the destinies of men and nations, earnestly do we seek Thee in this hour. As in the ages past Thou hast guided men through storm and stress to safety and peace; as in all times Thy love has lifted and inspired the hearts of men to deeds of heroism and of self-forgetting sacrifice, so in these times, O Father, do Thou bless us with the light of Thine on-leading love, so that there may be kindled in our hearts the fires of loyalty to all that lifts life to the highest and makes a people worthy in Thy sight.

Oh, may this great people be true to the best in all its past. Do Thou inspire the hearts and the minds of its citizenry with a passion for righteousness and with a sense of sacramental service for humanity. May material success not stultify our souls or dwarf our spirits, and may great sorrows, even such as the Nation feels in the passing of a mighty hero, serve to inspire us the more to do our part bravely and loyally for God, for country, and for humanity.

O God, bless Thou this land whose walls are salvation and whose gates are praise, a land upon which may rest Thine eyes forevermore in benediction and in love. Amen.

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

## ELECTORAL VOTES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, authentic copies of the certificates of the final ascertainment of electors for President and Vice President chosen at the election on the 7th day of November, 1916, in the States of California and Mississippi, which were ordered to be filed.

## GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD (S. DOC. NO. 684).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 4th instant, a statement from the Commissioner of Education relative to the organizations known as the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, or any other private or corporate enterprise to the work of the Bureau of Education, etc., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by E. P. Taylor, Jr., one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed resolutions appointing a committee of 25 Members to join with a committee to be appointed by the Senate to attend the funeral services of Admiral George Dewey at Arlington, Va., and that the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. PADGETT, Mr. TALBOTT, Mr. ESTOPINAL, Mr. RIORDAN, Mr. HENSLEY, Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois, Mr. GRAY of Indiana, Mr. CALLAWAY, Mr. CONNELLY, Mr. HART, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. LIEBEL, Mr. VENABLE, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWNING, Mr. FARR, Mr. BRITTON, Mr. KELLEY, Mr. MUDD, Mr. LOUD, Mr. DALE of Vermont, Mr. GREENE of Vermont, Mr. FOSS, and Mr. KETNER.

## ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

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

S. 5718. An act to provide for an auxiliary reclamation project in connection with the Yuma project, Ariz.;

S. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to issue temporary permits for additional diversions of water from the Niagara River; and

S. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy which will occur March 1, 1917, in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. THOMAS. I present certain petitions from citizens of my State urging Congress to adopt a national constitutional prohibition amendment, which I ask may lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will lie on the table.

Mr. THOMAS. I also have a short protest from Dr. Orville D. Wescott and Dr. J. Gellen, of my State, against the so-called tuberculosis bill. It is very short, and I ask that it be printed in the Record without reading.