By Mr. SHOUSE: Petition of citizens of Harper County, Kans., favoring a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions of sundry citizens of Utica, N. Y., against involvng the United States in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of William P. Everts, Mary E. Wynne, Caroline W. Davis, Alice E. Streng, citizens of the State of Massachusetts, favoring the administration peace policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Emma M. George, Mary B. Core, Kate A. Coolidge, Mrs. Helen A. Emery, and Enoch Dill, members of the Massachusetts Branch of the League to Enforce Peace, urging the adoption of the league's peace proposals by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of citizens of Hebron, N. Dak., and vicinity, asking that proposal to declare war be submitted to vote of the people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *February 9, 1917.*

(*Legislative day of Thursday, February 8, 1917.*)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

SENATOR FROM UTAH.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, out of order, lays before the Senate the credentials of WILLIAM H. KING, Senator elect from the State of Utah, which will be printed in the RECORD and filed in the office of the Secretary.

The credentials are as follows:

STATE OF UTAH,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, A. D. 1916, WILLIAM H. KING was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Utah 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, A. D. 1917.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 1st day of December, A. D. 1916.

[SEAL.] DAVID MATTSON,
Secretary of State.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, 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:

Brady	Jones	Page	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Kenyon	Penrose	Smoot
Bryan	Kern	Poindexter	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kirby	Pomerene	Stone
Clapp	Lane	Ransdell	Thomas
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Thompson
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Townsend
Curtis	Lodge	Saulsbury	Underwood
du Pont	McCumber	Shafroth	Vardaman
Fernald	McLean	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Walsh
Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Warren
Harding	Myers	Simmons	Watson
Husting	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	Weeks
James	Norris	Smith, Md.	Williams
Johnson, Me.	Overman	Smith, Mich.	Works

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I was requested to announce the absence of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] owing to illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The District of Columbia appropriation bill is before the Senate.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19119) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill, on page 71, line 12.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Health department," on page 71, line 22, after "$1,200," to insert "serologist, $2,500; scientific assistant, $1,200," and on page 72, line 2, after the words "in all," to strike out "$74,040" and insert "$77,740," so as to make the clause read:

Health officer, $4,000; assistant health officer, $2,500; chief clerk and deputy health officer, $2,500; chief, bureau of vital statistics, $1,800; clerks—1 $1,600, 5 at $1,200 each, 4 at $1,000 each, 2 at $900 each, 1 $720; sanitary inspectors—chief $1,800, assistant chief $1,400, 8 at $1,200 each, 2 at $1,000 each, $3 at $900 each; food inspectors—chief $1,800, assistant chief $1,400, 5 at $1,200 each, 6 at $1,000 each, 5 at $900 each; chemist, $2,000; assistant chemist, $1,200; assistant bacteriologist, $1,200; serologist, $2,500; scientific assistant, $1,200; skilled laborers—1 $720, 1 $600, 2 messengers at $600 each; driver, $600; poundmaster, $1,400; watchman, $600; laborers, at not exceeding $50 per month each, $2,400; in all, $77,740.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 4, after the word "machine," to insert "to be immediately available," so as to make the clause read:

For new refrigerating machine, to be immediately available, $500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 5, to insert:

Apparatus, equipment, cost of installation, supplies, and other expenses incidental to the biological and serological diagnosis of disease, $1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 18, after the word "maintenance," to strike out "$7,000" and insert "$10,000"; in line 19, before the word "respectively," to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$6,500"; and in line 20, after the words "in all," to strike out "$12,000" and insert "$16,500," so as to make the clause read:

Garfield and Providence Hospitals: For isolating wards for minor contagious diseases at Garfield Memorial and Providence Hospitals, maintenance, $10,000 and $6,500, respectively, or so much thereof as in the opinion of the commissioners may be necessary; in all, $16,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, after line 10, to insert:

For repairs and alterations to the building located on lot 10, square 228, formerly occupied as an emergency hospital, and now the property of the United States, in order to make it available for use as a laboratory for the Health Department of the District of Columbia, and for other uses of said District of Columbia: *Provided*, That authority to occupy said building is granted to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia by the Secretary of the Treasury, to be immediately available, $4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Courts," on page 77, line 7, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$500" and insert "$650," and in the same line, after the words "in all," to strike out "$7,200" and insert "$7,350," so as to make the clause read:

Probation system: Probation officer, supreme court, $2,000; assistant probation officer, $1,200; stenographer and typewriter and assistant, $800; police court—probation officer $1,500, assistant probation officer $1,200; contingent expenses, $650; in all, $7,350.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 4 on page 80.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. On page 79, lines 24 and 25, I move to strike out the words "Government Hospital for the Insane" and insert "St. Elizabeth's Hospital." That is the name of the hospital by law. It was a mistake to put in the other name.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Interest and sinking fund," on page 80, line 9, after "$975,408," to insert: "*Provided*, That any balances of revenue of the District of Columbia remaining to its credit after its share of the appropriations contained herein has been paid, and after its share of any other appropriations to which it is required to contribute on account of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1916, and June 30, 1917, has been paid, shall be credited to interest and sinking fund for application to the funded debt of the District of Columbia," so as to make the clause read:

For interest and sinking fund on the funded debt, payable one-half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and one-half out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $975,408: *Provided*, That any balances of revenue of the District of Columbia remaining to its credit after its share of the appropriations contained herein has been paid, and after its share of any other appropriations to which it is required to contribute on account of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1916, and June 30, 1917, has been paid, shall be credited to interest and sinking fund for application to the funded debt of the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Just one word, Mr. President. This amendment provides "and after its share of any other appropriations to which it is required to contribute on account of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1916, and June 30, 1917." Does the Senator believe that we can now adopt an amendment to an appropriation bill affecting an appropriation which has already been expended and ended on June 30 of last year?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that the money herein referred to has not been expended, but that it lies in the Treasury. We, therefore, felt that, inasmuch as the money has been collected from the revenues of the District of Columbia, it ought to belong to the District and should be credited to the District and used to pay off the District's debt.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. SMOOT. Then, if we may go back to the fiscal year of 1916, why can we not as well go back for 10 or 12 years and apply the same principle to appropriations which have been made for that length of time?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. In reply to that, I wish to suggest——

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to state to the Senator from Maryland that I am in full accord with the object of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Permit me to suggest to the Senator that until a few years ago there was no such balance, but, on the contrary, the District was then indebted to the Government, and the Government loaned the District money at a certain rate of interest. It has only been within a few years that there has been any balance at all due the District.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand that for quite a number of years past there has been such a balance.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No; I think the Senator from Utah is mistaken about that. It has been only during a few years that there has been a balance at all.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, was the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, the first year in which the District has had a balance?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No; that was not the first year, but there has been such a balance only for a few years.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, I think, the amendment ought to apply in all cases where there has been a balance to the credit of the District.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If I understand the Senator from Utah, he is willing that whatever balance the District has should accrue to it. I have no objection to that.

Mr. SMOOT. I really think that should be done, because when the people in the District pay taxes which amount to more than the half which is required by the Government, they ought to be credited with whatever excess there is.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If there is any improper language in the amendment or if the amendment requires any further amendment, we shall take the matter up in the conference committee and arrange it there. I entirely agree with the Senator from Utah that if there is any balance it ought to go to the credit of the District; and we shall endeavor to so provide.

Mr. SMOOT. With that understanding, I have no objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the committee was, under the head of "Courts and prisons," on page 83, after line 2, to insert:

For such additional miscellaneous expenses as may be authorized by the Attorney General for the supreme court and its officers, made necessary by the occupancy of temporary quarters pending the reconstruction of the courthouse, Washington, D. C., including an electrician at the rate of $900 per annum and a laborer at the rate of $600 per annum, $3,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Charities and corrections," subhead "Medical charities," on page 88, after the word "exceed," at the end of line 8, to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$25,000," so as to make the clause read:

Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum: For care and treatment of indigent patients, under a contract to be made with Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum by the Board of Charities, not to exceed $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 12, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$16,000" and insert "$17,000," so as to make the clause read:

For care and treatment of indigent patients, under a contract to be made with Children's Hospital by the Board of Charities, not to exceed $17,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 19, after the words "Board of Charities," to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$26,000," so as to make the clause read:

For emergency care and treatment of, and free dispensary service to, indigent patients under a contract or agreement to be made with Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital by the Board of Charities, $26,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, after line 1, to insert:

Gallinger Municipal Hospital: Toward the construction of the Gallinger Municipal Hospital, including grading of the site, to be located on Reservation No. 13 in the District of Columbia, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared under the authority contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915, $150,000, and the limit of cost of the construction of said hospital and accessory buildings is hereby fixed at $500,000. Said hospital shall be constructed with a view to making such future additions as the exigencies may require, and the work herein authorized shall be so executed as not to interfere in any way with the future extension of Massachusetts Avenue: *Provided*, That the provision contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915 requiring that said hospital be located and erected at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Child-caring institutions," on page 90, line 25, after the word "officers," to strike out "1 $1,200" and insert "2 at $1,200 each"; on page 91, line 1, after "$1,000," to strike out "7" and insert "8"; and in line 2, after the words "in all," to strike out "$14,380" and insert "$16,480," so as to make the clause read:

For agent, $1,800; clerks—1 $1,200, 1 $900, 1 $720; placing and investigating officers—2 at $1,200 each, 1 $1,000, 8 at $900 each; record clerk, $900; messenger, $360; in all, $16,480.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 12, after the words "Board of Children's Guardians," to strike out "$124,880" and insert "$126,980," so as to make the clause read:

In all, Board of Children's Guardians, $126,980.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, line 19, after the word "cottage," to insert "to accommodate 25 or more boys," so as to make the clause read:

For the erection of one cottage to accommodate 25 or more boys, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, after line 23, to insert:

National Library for the Blind: For aid and support of the National Library for the Blind, located at 1729 H Street NW., to be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 95, after line 3, to insert:

Columbia Polytechnic Institute: To aid the Columbia Polytechnic Institute for the Blind, located at 1808 H Street NW., to be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, $1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Militia," on page 99, line 12, after the word "militia," to strike out "$16,900" and insert "$21,200: *Provided*, That the commanding general of the Militia of the District of Columbia is authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for the lease of an armory, stable, drill shed, and warehouse for Cavalry, Field Artillery, Signal Corps, and Hospital Corps troops in one building, or separately, for a period not to exceed five years, renewable at the option of the said commanding general for an additional period of not exceeding five years, at an annual rental not to exceed $10,000: *Provided further*, That the said commanding general may renew for the fiscal year 1918, or any portion thereof, the building known as 230 First Street NW., now occupied as an armory for mounted and other troops, at an annual rental of $3,900, and the buildings known as 1912 E Street NW., used as stables and warehouses, at an annual rental of $1,800, paying therefor a rental not in excess of the current rentals," so as to make the clause read:

For rent of armories, offices, storehouses, and stables, and quarters for noncommissioned officers of the Army detailed for duty with the militia, $21,200: *Provided*, That the commanding general of the Militia of the District of Columbia is authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for the lease of an armory, stable, drill shed, and warehouse for Cavalry, Field Artillery, Signal Corps, and Hospital Corps troops in one building, or separately, for a period not to exceed five years, renewable at the option of the said commanding general for an additional period of not exceeding five years, at an annual rental not to exceed $10,000: *Provided further*, That the said commanding general may renew for the fiscal year 1918, or any portion thereof, the building known as 230 First Street NW., now occupied as an armory for mounted and other troops, at an annual rental of $3,900, and the buildings known as 1912 E Street NW., used as stables and warehouses, at an annual rental of $1,800, paying therefor a rental not in excess of the current rentals.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read to line 11, on page 101, the last paragraph read being as follows:

ANACOSTIA RIVER AND FLATS.

For continuing the reclamation and development of the Anacostia River and Flats from the Anacostia Bridge northeast to the District line, to be expended for the purposes and under the conditions specified in the item for this improvement contained in the "District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915," $300,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it will be remembered by some Senators that this is an improvement in which I have taken a very great interest in past years and done what I could to secure an appropriation for this much-needed improvement. The work is going on satisfactorily, but my attention has been called by Col. Flagler, in charge of the work, to the fact that the War Department estimated $400,000 for the present year and the bill contains an appropriation of $300,000. I shall not take the time of the Senate, unless I am asked to do so, to read a letter from Col. Flagler touching this matter, in which he says that unless they get more than $300,000 a year it will take

over seven years to complete this improvement, in addition to the time which has already expired; and he makes an appeal, giving the items of expenditure that will be necessary during the current year, to have $400,000 inserted in place of $300,000.

I will ask the chairman of the committee if he sees any reason why the matter should not at least go to conference?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. As I understand, this is not an increase of an appropriation. It is to take $400,000 instead of $300,000 out of the lump appropriation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Out of the lump appropriation of something over $2,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I have no objection.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask, then, that the amendment be agreed to, as follows: On line 11, page 101, strike out "$300,000" and insert "$400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, in this connection I ask permission to insert in the RECORD a table prepared by Col. Flagler, showing the items of expenditure and also his reasons for asking for this added appropriation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, that may be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1917.

The estimate submitted by this office, which has charge of this improvement, for work during the fiscal year 1918 was as follows:

Dredging	$60,000
Retaining walls, including foundations for same	125,000
Trench and embankment work	20,500
Modifications of bridges	33,000
Purchase of land for park purposes	70,000
Care of property and upkeep of floating plant	14,000
Construction of gatehouses	50,000
Engineering, clerical, office rent, and contingencies	27,500
Total	400,000

This estimate was communicated by the War Department to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia unchanged, but was, I am informed, reduced by the commissioners to $300,000 when their estimates were presented to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

The reason for the increased size of the annual estimate for this work may be briefly explained, as follows:

The total estimated cost of the project (exclusive of the purchase of land) is $2,706,000. The work consists mainly in the construction of masonry sea walls along the lines of the land areas of the proposed park development and the dredging of the water areas and pumping the material behind these sea walls as a fill. It has been found necessary to allow the sea-wall foundations to settle for about 12 months before placing the masonry superstructure thereon, and for another 6 months before putting material immediately back of the sea wall. The valley of the upper Anacostia at the beginning of the project was simply a broad stretch of marshland, with many meandering channels. This condition made it difficult to reach all points of the work simultaneously, and the work was therefore progressive in addition to being delayed to allow for the settlement referred to above. These difficulties have been largely overcome, and the scheme of the work is now such that sea-wall construction, dredging, and filling can proceed at a rapid pace, which will permit the expenditure of practically all funds now available by June 30, 1917, and of the amount estimated, $400,000, by June 30, 1918. If it is desired that this project should be pushed to completion, sums should be provided as large as can be profitably expended in each fiscal year. If only $300,000 were to be appropriated each year, over seven years would be required for the completion of the project. In the above-itemized estimate the only items other than the dredging and sea-wall construction are one of $33,000 for modification of the Bennings Bridge and one of $50,000 for the construction of gate houses. Both of these items are included in the approved project, and it is advisable that they should be taken up at an early stage of its execution, in order that difficulties due to settlement of foundations, etc., may be met and overcome before they can interfere with the progress of the work in general.

C. A. F. FLAGLER,
Lieutenant Colonel, Corps of Engineers.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Anacostia River and Flats," on page 101, after line 11, to insert:

In connection with the said reclamation and development of the river and flats, the Secretary of War is authorized to acquire, for and on behalf of the United States, by purchase or by condemnation, for highway and park purposes, the fee simple and absolute title to all lands required for said objects and not now owned by the United States, in and along the Anacostia River from the Anacostia Bridge to the center line of East Capitol Street, embraced within the area lying between the lines, one on each side of the river, following approximately the contour of 10 feet elevation above the plane of mean low water at the United States navy yard; and the Secretary of War is further authorized to acquire for the United States, by purchase or by condemnation, for highway and park purposes, in connection with the said reclamation and development of the Anacostia River and Flats, the fee simple and absolute title to all lands required for said objects and not now owned by the United States, in and along the Anacostia River in the section thereof running from the center line of East Capitol Street to the northeast boundary line of the District of Columbia, embraced within the limits designated "taking line," one on each bank of the river in said section, as indicated on the map entitled "Reclamation Anacostia River Flats, District of Columbia, land map," approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and the Secretary of War, as attested and authenticated by their respective signatures and the seal of the War Department, bearing date the 24th day of May, 1916, recorded and filed in the Office of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, under Engineer Department file numbered 12968-525; and the appropriation herein made for the reclamation and development of the Anacostia River and Flats from the Anacostia Bridge northeast to the District line, and all appropriations heretofore made for said purpose are hereby made available for the purchase or condemnation of all of the said lands hereinbefore authorized to be acquired and for the payment of amounts awarded as damages for said lands and the costs and expenses of the condemnation proceedings in the event that it is necessary to institute such condemnation proceedings: *Provided*, That if said lands or any part thereof can not be acquired by purchase from the owners thereof at a price satisfactory to the Secretary of War, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, upon request of the Secretary of War, shall institute condemnation proceedings to acquire such lands under the provisions of chapter 15 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 103, after line 7, to insert:

The Secretary of War is authorized to effect an adjustment of boundaries and an exchange of lands in the District of Columbia with the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad, in accordance with the plat or drawing on file in the office of the Chief of Engineers and designated E. D. 12968-531, whereby on the left bank of the Anacostia River said railroad company shall release, quitclaim, and convey to the United States the certain lands along the Anacostia River riverward of the line shown on said plat and needed for the reclamation and development of the Anacostia River and Flats, and the United States shall release and quitclaim to said railroad company any right, title, interest, or claim in or to certain lands shoreward of said line, as shown on said plat, and will permit the extension of said company's right of way to include the triangle of land 262.10 feet on the hypotenuse lying at the junction of the railroad bridge and the original shore line of the said river, as shown on said plat, and whereby, on the right bank of the Anacostia River, the United States shall permit the rights of way of the said railroad company for its entrance into the city of Washington to be consolidated, between the bulkhead of the railroad bridge at the Anacostia River and the south line of L Street south, into one right of way of equal top width, according to the lines of said plat, and the United States and the said railroad company shall reciprocally release, quitclaim, and convey to each other the portions of square south of 1080, so called, and the accretions to the same lying respectively northward and southward of the division line shown on said plat, and the said railroad company shall release, quitclaim, and confirm to the United States the title to all land along and adjacent to the Anacostia River from the bulkhead of the present railroad bridge to Fifteenth Street east, exterior to the portion of square south of 1080 to be released to said railroad company as shown on said plat, together with all appurtenances and riparian rights, privileges, and advantages and subject only to the consolidated right of way as hereinbefore stated and delineated on said plat.

And the Secretary of War is further authorized and directed on behalf of the United States to make, execute, and deliver and to accept from said railroad company such deeds of conveyance or quitclaim or other assurances of title as in the opinion of the Attorney General may be necessary or appropriate to effect such adjustment of boundaries and exchange of lands: *Provided*, That all expenses of recording such deeds and other expenses incidental to the execution of such exchanges shall be borne by the said railroad company: *Provided further*, That upon the effectuation of the adjustment of boundaries and exchange of lands herein provided for the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to close that portion of L Street south lying between Water Street and the Commodore Barney Circle, and to permit the use and occupation of the same by the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. in connection with the consolidated right of way authorized by this act.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland whether there is any good reason for our failure to appropriate to the purpose originally planned by Congress the land in the vicinity of the Senate Office Building, now covered with old buildings? As my recollection goes, it is many years since authority was granted to acquire those lands, and I should like to know why it is that the work drags along here between the Capitol and the Union Station.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that that is a matter which will come up on the sundry civil bill.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I know it will; but I wanted to avail myself of this opportunity to make the inquiry, because it has occurred to me several times that there was very unnecessary delay there, and I wondered if the Senator from Maryland could give the reason for it.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is not a matter that pertains to this bill, and I can not tell why it has happened.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland will permit me, the property that the Government was to acquire was valued by a commission. The figures were considered excessive by a department of the Government, and the award was held up; the property was revalued, and the amounts were reduced to some extent. Private citizens, feeling that a great wrong had been done them—and they have asked, I think, in a bill to be reimbursed—had of necessity to yield to the Government and accept the lower amount. I always thought that a wrong had been done the citizens in that regard. I understand, and I think I am correctly informed, that the buildings to which the Senator from Michigan refers, except the stable, which is owned by the Government, and the old fire house, which has been deserted, belong to a railroad corporation—I think the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And all those houses down there.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; and they have contested it. They say that they are entitled to the amount found in the first in-

stance, and, as I understand, the matter is in the courts at the present time; and for that reason the work is halted.

I have greatly sympathized with the view that the Senator from Michigan expresses, and have much regretted that that work is not being completed in a more expeditious manner, but, of course, we can not interfere with the court proceedings.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. In connection with what the Senator from Michigan is talking about, I recall the fact that I brought up in the Senate some year or more ago a bill directing that the two parcels of land, that belonging to the corporation and that belonging to the individuals, should be separated, and the individuals be paid for their part, and they were paid. But this matter is in litigation, as the Senator from New Hampshire says, between the railroad company and the Government, as I understand.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. And, as I understand, the private parties have been paid. I remember that I urged the bill before the Senate, and it was passed.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; they were paid a reduced amount.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from Maryland and the Senator from New Hampshire take the same view that I do, that it is a very unsightly thing, and that it ought not to run on for a generation. I was a young man in the House of Representatives when this program was adopted by the Government, and it seems as though it is taking a long time to carry it out.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I think there is no difference of opinion between the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Maryland upon that point.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Parks," on page 105, after line 18, to insert:

For the acquisition for a public park of the tract of land known as the Dean tract, assessed on the records of the assessor of the District of Columbia as lots A, 818 and 819, in square 2535, containing 404,425 square feet, more or less, or so much thereof as may be necessary, $625,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Water service," subhead "Washington Aqueduct," on page 107, line 10, after the word "Aqueduct," to insert "to be immediately available and to remain available until expended," so as to make the clause read:

For completing purchase, installation, and maintenance of water meters, to be placed on the water services of the Treasury Building and the State, War, and Navy Department Building, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, said meters to be purchased, installed, and maintained by and remain under the observation of the officer in charge of the Washington Aqueduct, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, $3,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Water department," on page 108, line 5, after the word "mechanic," to strike out "(who shall also act as a member of the board of examiners of steam engineers, without additional compensation)," so as to make the clause read:

For distribution branch: Superintendent, $3,300; engineer, $2,400; assistant engineers—1 $1,800, 1 $1,700; master mechanic, $2,000; foreman, $1,800; assistant foremen—1 $1,275, 1 $1,200, 1 $1,125, 1 $900; steam engineers—chief $1,750, 2 at $1,100 each, 3 assistants at $1,000 each; chief inspector of valves, $1,600; leveler, $1,200; inspector, $1,200; draftsman, $1,050; clerks—1 $1,800, 1 $1,500, 4 at $1,200 each, stores clerk $1,500, 1 $1,000, 1 $900; timekeeper, $900; two rodmen at $900 each; 2 chainmen at $675 each; 4 oilers at $610 each; 3 firemen at $875 each; janitor, $900; watchmen—1 $875, 1 $700, 1 $610; drivers—1 $700, 1 $630; 2 messengers, at $600 each; in all, $91,030.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask the Senator having the bill in charge if striking out those words will have a tendency to increase the salary of the master mechanic?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say that there is no change in that paragraph.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; there is a change if the committee amendment is adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We put back a member of the board previously at a salary of $300 and left the law to remain just as it was.

Mr. SMOOT. In other words, the House provided that this master mechanic should be one of the board of examiners of steam engineers, and they provided salaries for only two instead of three members at $300 each, and by striking out, on page 108, "who shall also act as a member of the board of examiners of steam engineers, without additional compensation," as provided in the bill as passed by the House, it virtually gives the master mechanic $2,300.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No, sir.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the result of it, and I suppose, under existing law, he gets that to-day.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is not our understanding.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the only object of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. In the House it was stricken out on a point of order, and "$2,300" went back to "$2,000."

Mr. SMOOT. And we are putting it back to $2,300?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We are just striking out the language.

Mr. SMOOT. That makes the salary of the master mechanic $2,300.

Mr. ROBINSON. But the master mechanic does not act as a member of the board of examiners of steam engineers.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We put back the number to three instead of two. So he does not get $300.

Mr. ROBINSON. Under the provision as reported by the Senate committee the master mechanic contemplated in the bill will not act as a member of the board of examiners of steam engineers.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator will permit me, the House struck out the appropriation for the master mechanic and left the language authorizing him to act as a member of this board. The Senate committee simply struck out the language authorizing him to act as a member of the board and, on page 13, lines 17 and 18, restored the language of the existing law. This action was taken largely at the instance of representatives of the engineers, who appeared before the committee and urged its adoption.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask the Senator if it is not true that in the past the master mechanic has been a member of the board of examiners of steam engineers?

Mr. ROBINSON. In the past; but the double-salary law, I think, prevented that, and now under this provision——

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator know who are going to constitute the board of examiners of steam engineers?

Mr. ROBINSON. No; I do not.

Mr. SMOOT. Striking out the words in lines 5, 6, and 7, on page 108, will result in no increase to the master mechanic's salary if he only acts as a master mechanic, but if he acts as a member of the board of examiners of steam engineers, then, of course, he would draw $2,300.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; the provision is that he shall act without additional compensation.

Mr. SMOOT. That we are striking out.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. There will have to be appointed a man to act as a member instead of allowing him to act. That is it. The law is left just as it is.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to say a word, the point is that they have always had a board of three steam engineers and they have received the munificent sum of $300 each. The House in its wisdom struck out one of those, making a board of two, and made the master mechanic a member of that board. The steam engineers say they do not like to have it in that shape; that they have had a board; that they have performed their duties satisfactorily and everything has been harmonious; and they think that the old law had better be continued. That is exactly what the committee has done. It is true it perhaps results in the expenditure of $300 more than if the master mechanic worked without compensation, but a proposition to increase his compensation to $2,300 was debated in the House. So it may possibly result in the expenditure of $300 more, but it leaves a harmonious board instead of taking a man from another department of the Government and putting him into the board of steam engineers, when very likely he has not any qualifications for the place. That is the situation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 110, to insert:

For laying 16-inch trunk mains in Reservoir Street and New Cut Road to Conduit Road NW., $26,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 110, after line 2, to insert:

For the protection of the health of the residents of the District of Columbia and the employees of the United States Government residing in Maryland near the District of Columbia boundary the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, upon the request of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, a body corporate, established by chapter 313 of the acts of 1916 of the State of Maryland, or upon the request of its legally appointed successor, are hereby authorized to deliver water from the water-supply system of the District of Columbia to said Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission or its successor for distribution to territory in Maryland within the Washington suburban sanitary district as designated in the aforesaid act, and to connect District of Columbia water mains with water mains in the State of Maryland at the following points, namely, in the vicinity of Chevy Chase Circle, in the vicinity of the intersection of Georgia and Eastern Avenues, in the vicinity of the intersection of Rhode Island and Eastern Avenues, and in

the vicinity of the intersection of the Anacostia Road and Eastern Avenue, under the conditions hereinafter named, namely:

That before such connections shall be made the said Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission or its legally appointed successor shall secure authority from the Legislature of the State of Maryland to enter into an agreement with the said Commissioners of the District of Columbia outlining the conditions under which the service is to be rendered.

The agreement between the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the said Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission or its legally appointed successor shall provide, among other things:

First. That the meters on each of said connections shall be located within the District of Columbia and shall remain under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Second. The rates at which water will be furnished, said rates to be based on the actual cost to the United States and the District of Columbia of delivering water to the points designated above, including an interest charge at 4 per cent per annum and a suitable allowance for depreciation.

Third. That payments for water so furnished shall be made through the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia at such times as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may direct, said payments to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as other water rents now collected in the District of Columbia are deposited.

Fourth. That at no time shall the amount of water furnished the said Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission or its successors exceed the amount that can be spared without jeopardizing the interests of the United States or of the District of Columbia, and in no event shall it exceed in amount 3,000,000 gallons per day, measurement thereof to be made under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Fifth. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have at all times the right to investigate the distribution system in Maryland, and if in their opinion there is a wastage of water they shall have the right to curtail the supply to said sanitary district to the amount of such wastage.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, one page 113, after line 6, to insert:

All per diem employees and day laborers of the District of Columbia who have been continuously employed for five working days next preceding such days as are legal holidays in the District of Columbia, and whose employment continues through and beyond said legal holidays, shall be granted leave of absence with pay for said legal holidays.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask if it is not contrary to the practice of all the departments to grant this leave of absence? For instance, under this amendment if a per diem employee is employed five days before a legal holiday and works one day after the legal holiday he would be entitled to pay for the legal holiday.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Utah that it applies to men who are paid a per diem and are employed continuously, as much so as those who are paid salaries. There is no holiday given them, and they feel that they ought to have the same privileges, as they are employed in the same way and doing continuous work. Although paid a per diem they are continuously employed and have been for the last three or five years, I think, as much as the salaried people. We felt that they ought to have the same privilege as those who receive salaries.

Mr. SMOOT. This provision would pay a per diem employee for a legal holiday if such a condition existed as this: On the 16th day of this month if a snowstorm occurred and there were a lot of men employed for the five days before Washington's Birthday and they worked one day after, then under this provision they would be allowed pay for the holiday.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that this was put in by the committee of the House and went out on a point of order. Col. Kutz said:

Col. KUTZ. That is to cover five days in the year. Every per diem employee of the Federal Government receives these holidays, whereas the employees of the District of Columbia receive only one holiday in the whole year, and that is Labor Day. I think they at least ought to have the five holidays, Thanksgiving, Christmas, and New Year's etc.

Mr. SMOOT. I think so, too, where they are employed by the Government regularly.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The fact is that these people are employed as continuously as those who are on a regular salary.

Mr. SMOOT. Then do not limit it to five working days next preceding such days as are legal holidays. Why not provide that they shall continue in employment for at least 30 days?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We put in what was asked for by Col. Kutz.

Mr. SMOOT. I move, in line 8, to strike out "five" and insert "thirty" before the words "working days." I think if an employee is to be paid for a legal holiday he ought to be in the service of the Government at least 30 days preceding the legal holiday for which he is to be paid.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The Senator's amendment would compel every employee to work 30 days prior to a legal holiday?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; so that it would read—

All per diem employees and day laborers of the District of Columbia who have been continuously employed for 30 working days next preceding such days as are legal holidays in the District of Columbia, and whose employment continues through and beyond said legal holidays, shall be granted leave of absence with pay for said legal holidays.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is the Senator's idea that they shall prove that they were employed continuously by the Government 30 days preceding the holidays?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I have no objection to the amendment to the amendment.

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

The SECRETARY. In line 8, strike out "five" and insert "thirty" before the words "working days."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 116, after line 22, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 7. That to provide, during the fiscal year 1918, for increased compensation at the rate of 15 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate per annum of $480 or less, and for increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate of more than $480 per annum and not exceeding $1,000 per annum, so much as may be necessary is appropriated: *Provided*, That this section shall only apply to employees who are appropriated for in this act specifically and under lump sums, or whose employment is authorized herein, and that the increased compensation of teachers of the public schools shall be computed on their basic salaries: *Provided further*, That detailed reports shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next session showing the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided for herein.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 117, after line 14, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 8. That the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to grant permission to the Women's Titanic Memorial Association for the erection on public grounds of the United States in the city of Washington, D. C., other than those of the Capitol, the Library of Congress, and the White House, of a memorial appropriate as a lasting tribute to the heroes who sacrificed their lives, that women and children might be saved, in the tragic catastrophe of the sinking of the steamship *Titanic: Provided*, That the site chosen and the design of the memorial shall be approved by the Joint Library Committee of Congress and the Commission of Fine Arts, and that the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection of said memorial.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 118, after line 2, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 9. Hereafter when any piping or other household fixtures or secondhand goods of any description whatever have been stolen and sold to a dealer in junk, or secondhand dealer, in the District of Columbia, under such circumstances that the commissioners, after hearing granted, are satisfied that said dealer should have had reasonable ground to believe, or could have ascertained by reasonable inquiry or investigation, that the goods were stolen, and that the dealer did not make reasonable inquiry or investigation as to the title of the seller before making the purchase, the commissioners are authorized and directed to revoke the license of said dealer; and this action shall not be a bar to criminal prosecution for receiving stolen goods.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, before the amendment is agreed to I desire to ask a question in regard to it. While I am in entire sympathy with the amendment, and while I would not under any circumstances do anything which would prevent the enactment of the proper kind of law on that subject—and I think the amendment shows on its face that something of that kind ought to be done—it does seem to me that the amendment ought to contain a provision which would permit anyone who felt aggrieved on account of any order of the commissioners to have the right of appeal to the court. I can see how the commissioners might take action which would be more or less summary, that would perhaps interfere with a man's rights or with what he might claim as a right, to have the matter tried by a jury in a court, the same as every other similar proceeding affecting a man's liberty or his property is tried.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, the committee assumed that these people would receive proper treatment, and that the decisions would be fair. The fact is that there has been a great deal of stealing and pilfering in the District of Columbia which has been encouraged by people who receive stolen goods. There is an old saying that the man who receives stolen goods is worse than the thief. I am of that opinion myself, although I have no feeling in the matter. It was brought to our attention that there was a good deal of pilfering of this character going on. It does seem to me that any man who buys property of this kind should first acquaint himself, if there is any suspicion on his part, as to whether or not the property has been stolen. I do not think the power on the part of the commissioners to revoke such licenses without

further legal proceedings will work any hardship on parties who are engaged in this business.

Mr. NORRIS. I fully agree with the Senator from Maryland in his statement as to this practice. I have no doubt that there is a good deal of it going on.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will suggest that if the Senator from Nebraska desires to offer an amendment to the amendment I will accept it and let the matter go to conference, when we will further investigate it.

Mr. NORRIS. I have not prepared any amendment designed to cover the subject.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I want the law to be framed as perfectly as it can be. I do not want to work any hardship to anybody; but we felt that something ought to be done in regard to the matter.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree with the Senator from Maryland. I think something ought to be done.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I suggest that the matter be passed over for the present in order that the Senator from Nebraska may prepare his amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We will accept an amendment, and let the matter go to conference, and see what is best to be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, there is a matter to which I desire to call the attention of the chairman of the committee. I suggest to him that section 7, which provides for increased compensation to Government employees, be transferred to the end of the bill. The other legislative provisions would then precede it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to change "section 7" to read "section 9," to transfer it to the end of the bill, and to renumber the other sections to correspond.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to. There are amendments which have been passed over.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there are a number of Senators absent who are interested in amendments which have been passed over, and I therefore 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:

Beckham	Hollis	Overman	Smith, Md.
Borah	Husting	Owen	Smith, Mich.
Brady	Jones	Page	Smoot
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Penrose	Sterling
Chilton	La Follette	Phelan	Stone
Clapp	Lane	Pittman	Sutherland
Clark	Lea, Tenn.	Poindexter	Tillman
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Underwood
Fall	Lewis	Reed	Vardaman
Fletcher	Lodge	Robinson	Wadsworth
Gallinger	McLean	Saulsbury	Warren
Gronna	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Watson
Harding	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Williams
Hitchcock	Norris	Sherman	

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] is detained on important committee work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will state the first amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. The first amendment passed over, having been passed over at the instance of Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey, is on page 28, after line 15, to insert:

That part of the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1917 providing to "Repave with asphalt the roadway of Fourteenth Street NW., from Pennsylvania Avenue to F Street, 70 feet wide, $7,500," is hereby suspended until further action of Congress.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I make the point of order against that amendment on the ground that it is new legislation.

Let me state that I have no desire to be ungenerous, and God knows I have no desire to be unjust to anybody, but there is a very peculiar condition existing on that street right in the heart of the city which, to my mind, seems an abomination and a wrong, and I think it should be corrected.

My attention was directed to this matter last year by petition, letter, and personal solicitation on the part of very many citizens of the District of Columbia. Congress enacted legislation providing for the repaving and widening of that street between Pennsylvania Avenue and F Street, but through some process, I can not understand what or how it was done, the whole matter has been held up, and we now find an amendment in the pending bill providing that the action taken by Congress last year shall be suspended.

Briefly the effect of the previous legislation is this: The whole length of Fourteenth Street north of F Street and south of Pennsylvania Avenue has a width between curbs of 75 feet. I paced it this morning and ascertained that to be the width, but the portion of Fourteenth Street between F Street and Pennsylvania Avenue is but 48 feet wide. That portion of the street is on quite a severe incline, and within the last two years trolley tracks have been placed on it, with the result that the street car traffic and the ordinary vehicle traffic have made a condition that is absolutely dangerous; but, aside from that, it is unfair and unjust to the rest of Fourteenth Street that that one block should not be widened.

On February 7 I went there to view the situation again, thinking I might be wrong, having been advised by members of the committee that I was wrong, and that I was pressing an arbitrary provision. On that portion of Fourteenth Street between Pennsylvania Avenue and F Street, which abuts the Willard Hotel property on one side and the Willard estate on the other, the Ebbitt Hotel property, I found a condition of congestion thus: Opposite the doorway and opposite the Willard Hotel I found five taxicabs installed. Then coming up on that same sidewalk a little farther I found a great vault about 5 feet square, with an iron rack and framework, occupying that portion of the sidewalk. Up a little farther—this was on the 7th day of February—I found one great empty gondola coal cart standing there; right next to it another gondola coal cart, loaded. A little way above that, about 50 feet from F Street, there was another auto standing out at an angle in the street.

Two car tracks, as I say, were there. There was a trolley car on each track. On the opposite side, down toward Pennsylvania Avenue, is another standing place for sight-seeing automobiles. At that time I saw a buggy, the driver of which was trying to wend his way through, but finally everything came to a stagnation and a standstill.

This condition exists right in the heart of the city, and this proposition as proposed by the committee will perpetuate and maintain this 48 feet of distance between the curb lines, while on the other side it is 75 feet, and on this side it is 75 feet.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainly, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. In regard to the delivery of coal, is it not necessary? It does not matter what the conditions may be, coal has to be delivered to hotels and the carts have to stand somewhere for delivery. I submit that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair get in. This is a point of order.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I realize that, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But the argument is with reference to the advisability or nonadvisability of the Senate adopting the amendment.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes, sir; I realize that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now, the Chair wants to rule on the point of order.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I shall be pleased to have the ruling.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the discussion may go forward. The Chair thinks this is not general legislation at all.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I made the point of order that it was new legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is not any rule of the Senate prohibiting new legislation. It is not general; it applies only to one block. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if there was not a provision in the bill we passed last year to end and stop this matter?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. We thought so. The Senate passed it, and we thought so. But, as I said at the outset, through some strange proceeding—I can not understand just what—this thing seems to have bobbed up like a cork at sea. No work was done to satisfy the legislation that was passed by the Senate, and the result is that the conditions of that street remain the same to-day as when we agitated the matter last year.

In answer to the Senator from Maryland, I want to say that, of course, I am practical enough to know that we, in a frigid climate, have to have coal for domestic purposes, heating and otherwise, but this is a peculiar situation. Mayhap in front of the Senator's own door, or yours, Mr. President, a simple coal hole and a chute stand, but in this particular case there are two vaults, two openings 5 feet square, and an iron framework 5 or 7 feet high, existing on the sidewalk perpetually. Sometimes a canopy is thrown over it. The fact is that this one with the framework is not for coal, but it is an air duct to let air down to the machinery of the hotel. The coal vault is above. Now, this bars and makes impossible the passage of pedestrians

on that space of about 10 feet of sidewalk. All the pedestrian travel is between that point and up toward the hotel. Protests have come to me from property holders on Fourteenth Street farther up asking why this condition should prevail.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask who owns the Willard Hotel?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It is owned by the Willard estate or the Willard family, I think.

Mr. KENYON. Are any such concessions granted to any other property owners in the city?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have made inquiry in that neighborhood, and I find none whatever.

Mr. KENYON. How was this condition ever established? How was it brought about?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have made diligent inquiry about that. I will say that a gentleman representing the hotel company rang me up, and since that time has called upon me. His statement was that they were there by right. He is the manager of the hotel. He said that they were there by right; that they were granted the right by the Secretary of War, I believe. I told him that I did not believe that the Secretary of War had any more right to grant such a privilege than I had, and that I thought the Commissioners of the District had charge of that; but he said they were granted that right by the Secretary of War.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I asked this gentleman if that privilege or pretended right was granted for any particular specified length of time. He said he did not know about that, but they were there; and then they further extended it so that it really occupies——

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the Senator how much, if any, of the public street has been taken by these people?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Taking the line, as the commissioners insist, on both sides, 30 feet has been taken out of the roadway.

Mr. NORRIS. Thirty feet?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Twenty-five feet, at least—12 feet on each side of the roadway. The Ebbitt property has the same encroachment, though with no vaults under it. The Willard property has the encroachment with vaults.

Mr. NORRIS. May I ask the Senator whether that means that they have extended the sidewalk out 12 feet into the street?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes, sir. I mean they are out from 12 to 15 feet in the street beyond the average line of the sidewalk upon either side.

Mr. NORRIS. The building, of course, is not?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. The building line? No; that is all in harmony.

Mr. NORRIS. Have they excavated, and are they using this space under the sidewalk?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes, sir; they have excavated and are using the vaulted space beneath. It is a veritable machine shop, as I have been assured by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, and from my own looking down the shaft I know that to be the case.

Mr. NORRIS. This extends one block, does it?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes, sir; one block, comprising the distance between Pennsylvania Avenue and F Street.

Mr. NORRIS. Between F Street and Pennsylvania Avenue on Fourteenth Street?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. On Fourteenth Street. Now, it does seem to me that it is a manifest bit of injustice and unfairness. I have no feeling against the Willard people. Great God! I do not know them, or would not know them if I fell over them; but I do say that there is no reason why we should make fish of one and fowl of the other. Now, they say it will cost $5,000 or more to make this alteration. I am very sorry for that; but all I want is——

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator means $50,000.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Fifty thousand dollars? Well, I can not imagine that. I think I am prepared to say no, that can not be true. I have been a builder all my life, as well as a farmer, and I know better than that. It will not cost $50,000.

Mr. ROBINSON. Has the Senator been in the vaults? Has he visited them and inspected them?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have looked down in them. I saw them taking machinery down there about a year ago; but I have talked with Commissioner Newman——

Mr. ROBINSON. I will ask the Senator if he knows that all the machinery that operates the hotel, including the laundry, the boilers, engines, ice plant, and dynamo, are in these vaults?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I know that there is a very considerable amount of machinery there. It is a good deal of a machine shop. But, great Heavens, if that argument is sound, suppose they located it out in the middle of the highway! They come to the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue. Why did they not locate it out in the middle of Pennsylvania Avenue or the middle of Fourteenth Street? I say it is an abomination; it is a utilization of the public highway for private purposes, and it is a manifest wrong.

I do not want to do these people any harm. I talked to-day with Commissioner Newman, and he said that the public felt that it was wrong, and he said the commissioners felt that there should be a correction. As I said to Mr. Haight, the gentleman who represented the hotel company, who came to me to-day very solicitous about it, "I do not want to unreasonably disturb you, but you pay nothing for this." They have never paid a sou marqué.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I want to say to the Senator that they have to pay a license fee.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. There has never been a license fee. No license ordinance ever had been enacted until the last year.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is true.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. And I do not think they have paid that.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not know about that, either.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I told Mr. Haight that.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. But I will say to the Senator that they are subject to a license.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I want to say, further, that while in the past they may not have paid a license fee, property is assessed according to its value, and the value of property is made up by the improvements, and by——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. By what they steal from the public?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No; but the value of the property is made up by the accommodations on that property. There is no question but that the fact that this vault is under there, affording them conveniences and means of using their machinery, adds to the value of that hotel.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. But it is not their property.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. And undoubtedly that hotel is assessed for more money than it would be assessed for if that were not there. Now, however, there is a law assessing vaults.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That has only come about within a year.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. True; but it is a law, nevertheless, and ought to be enforced, I think.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will say, in answer to that, that they have never paid a sou marqué of vaultage rental to the city; and that law has only been passed within a year. I mentioned that fact to Mr. Haight, and he did not know, but he rather tacitly admitted that they had not paid anything. Well, of course they would. Of course they could not get out of it if we have passed it. All I say is that they have no right, pay or otherwise, to have this supreme advantage over their neighbors. I said to Mr. Haight that five or six thousand dollars was all it would cost—and I think it would be within that limit—but that I would let them stay if I could do so without interfering with the public, taxing them vaultage rent.

The thought has occurred to me—I suggested this to Mr. Newman and Mr. Newman acquiesced in the matter—that they might keep their machinery there, but let them with a system of iron girders and trusses, maintain a roadway, cutting back the sidewalk so that the traveling public and the vehicles should have the privilege of using the whole portion of the street. It could be vaulted back; it could be carried back on girders. It would not displace their machinery, but would give the appearance of the same width of street the whole line through, and would give the public the right to travel, and then assess them vaultage rent. I do not believe in the assessment of the square feet of property. It should be assessed, I believe, both ways; first on the value of the land——

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. Does the existing provision of law, which this amendment is designed to suspend temporarily, authorize the arrangement which he himself has just suggested?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. No; that is my suggestion.

Mr. ROBINSON. Then it would be necessary to suspend this provision or to enact an amendment authorizing the arrangement which the Senator has suggested.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. To carry that out, it would; but I say this: Defeat this proposition, put it back as it stands to-day on the statute books, that this sidewalk shall be widened, and then provide that the Commissioners shall arrange as they may beneath.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator sees the difficulty about that. If the improvement which has been authorized proceeds, then the opportunity to afford to the hotel company the relief which he has suggested will not exist.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. No.

Mr. ROBINSON. So that it is necessary to effectuate the arrangement which the Senator from New Jersey has suggested, and which it seems to me from a casual consideration is not an unfair one, to insert this provision in the bill, or some other provision which will for the present suspend the improvement that has been authorized.

Mr. President, I lived for five years at the Ebbitt Hotel in the early part of my service in Congress, and I am familiar with the conditions as they exist in that locality. Fourteenth Street between F Street and Pennsylvania Avenue is a very steep one. It is paved, as every one now knows, with rough stone, called Belgian block; and the principal traffic on that street is heavy wagons. There is no great amount of other traffic there, for the reason, in part, that the street is very steep. If that street were paved with asphalt it would be impossible, in my judgment, for wagons heavily loaded to ascend it. It would be quite difficult for the public to carry on traffic there; and I sincerely doubt whether it is advisable, discussing the merits of the proposition——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Let me say, Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. Just a moment. I sincerely doubt whether it is advisable to pave that street with asphalt.

As to the proposition of compelling the hotel company to remove its machinery and abandon the vaults that have been constructed there under some sort of public authority, I want to point out this fact: It has been proceeding for a great many years. Any person who visits and observes the excavation that has been made there and the works that are now operated there will realize that it will entail a very large expense upon the hotel company. In passing upon this proposition, I think it is fair that the equities of the hotel company, if I may so express it, should be considered. The public interest is, of course, the paramount interest; and I, for my part, would be willing to have a provision similar to that which has been suggested by the Senator from New Jersey. If it appears right that the hotel company should pay a tax—and the suggestion seems fair to me—upon the private property that they are using in these vaults, let them pay a tax; but I do think that before requiring them to abandon those vaults and to incur the expense that is incident to that, after having at first permitted them to establish and operate these vaults, we should afford some such relief as the Senator from New Jersey has suggested; and in order to do that he himself admits that this provision which the committee has written into the bill, or some similar provision, must be enacted. Otherwise, the improvement that has been authorized will proceed and it would be impossible to effectuate the relief.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEA of Tennessee in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas who is the owner of the Willard Hotel?

Mr. ROBINSON. I have not the slightest idea. I do not know personally anybody connected with the Willard Hotel; and it does not make any difference to me that I know of. It is simply a question of what is right and fair, considering the public interest and the equities, if I may term them such, that have been vested in the hotel company by the public consent.

Mr. KENYON. Whoever is owner of the Willard Hotel is certainly receiving a concession here which other hotels do not receive.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is true; and I think, as suggested by the Senator from New Jersey, that they should be required to pay for it.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. They never have before.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have not anything further to state concerning the subject, Mr. President. It seems to me that the argument which the Senator from New Jersey had made is the soundest argument that can be made for retaining in the bill the provision which the committee has reported.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senator refers to the matter of asphalt. If the Senator will recall, last year when this matter was up I raised the point that it would be a disaster to pave that street with asphalt; and I thought there was incorporated in the bill a provision that it should be paved with cobblestone instead of asphalt. Asphalt on that declivity or that incline would not be very easy and practicable for horses and machines, and it would be better that it should be cobblestone. I thought that cobblestone had been put in. But I want to know how it comes that a year has elapsed and no effort has been made in this direction; and if, in accordance with the suggestion of the committee, this thing is stricken out and left out entirely, what assurance have you that any effort whatever will be made?

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator will excuse an interruption, the committee does not repeal the existing law. It simply suspends it until further action by Congress.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I know; but it amounts to an indefinite extension and laying aside. Let us maintain the present law, and suggest, if you choose, by amendment that the commissioners shall confer with the owner of this property in carrying out the improvement.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me? The Senator, I presume, is aware of the fact that paving the street with asphalt was upon the recommendation and somewhat persistence of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That might be.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is true. It was in the estimate.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I think it very unfortunate——

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me one other suggestion, I am not going to argue the desirability of continuing the existing system beyond this point. It has been stated here that this corporation is not paying anything for that accommodation. I chance to know it is the rule in this District to assess the value of that and add it to the assessed valuation of the property. Last evening I was talking with the editor of the Evening Star and large owner of the Evening Star Building, and this very matter came up. I said to him, "You have accommodations under the sidewalk, have you not?" He said, "Yes." "Do you pay anything for them?" He said, "It is assessed and added to the value of the property." I do not think that this is an exceptional case in that respect. I have no means of knowing what they have paid in the past; but if the commissioners are doing their duty, and the assessors appointed by the commissioners are doing their duty, this concession would be valued and its value added to the building and grounds and the taxes paid. So if there is any laches in the matter it easily goes back to the commissioners themselves.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I trust there may be some way of assessing for these privileges properly; but I doubt very much whether adequate recompense is received for that valuable privilege. But I say it would be really dangerous, it would be unfortunate, it would be ungenerous and unfair to me and every other property owner in the District of Columbia to acquiesce in the suggestions made by the committee. If you strike this out, it is admitted, as it seems to me, the most manifest wrong, impartiality, and unfairness of maintaining in force a situation of this kind. Pass a resolution, if you choose, advising the commissioners to confer with the owners of this affected property in a way that shall grant the public their rights and at the same time not operate unjustly on them.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from New Jersey permit one other remark, which I intended to make while on my feet?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator says that a year has elapsed and nothing has been done to carry out the law enacted a year ago. Of course, the proprietor of that hotel can not be charged with neglect.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Oh——

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will allow me, if there has been any neglect, it is the neglect of the District Commissioners; but, of course, they can not do everything in a year. I do not think anybody ought to be blamed for that.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am not charging anything on the Willard Hotel owners. They are human. They are like the rest of us. I know they want to retain this privilege; but

it does seem that the many property holders on the same street above F Street and the property holders on the other side below Pennsylvania Avenue have some rights that should be considered. We should obey their behest and listen to their plea.

I hope the Senate will not adopt this amendment as proposed by the committee. I will willingly join with you in any effort after that to have the District Commissioners confer with the owners of this affected property that the matter may be settled upon some plan that shall be equitable and just to all interests.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. May I ask the Senator if he knows who owns this property?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. One gentleman by the name of Stellwagen. I have heard a number of names. It is known as the Willard Hotel Co., I understand.

Mr. NORRIS. I asked the question because I am trying to get at the facts. I want to get information. I have heard it said—and I want to know whether it is true or not—that it is owned or a great part of it, at least, by some one connected with the Government; that he was an ambassador or some other official.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am unable to answer as to that. I do not know whether it is true or not. I feel seriously that we can not as impartial legislators vote to grant this privilege. You grant it away temporarily, you say; but it may be for all time. Some of us who are here will not be here another year. I will not; and I feel I will not be doing justice to myself, justice to my constituency, or justice to the taxpayers of the District of Columbia, unless some action should be taken upon it.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, notwithstanding the special pleading of the Senator from New Jersey, I do not think that this committee amendment should be stricken out. I think it should remain in the bill.

I agree in the main with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. There is every reason why this should be suspended, when after a year the commissioners have not thought it proper to commence it. This item is not the only appropriation in this bill, or, rather, in its predecessors, for work that the commissioners have omitted to commence during last year. There is every reason why this should be further examined before one particular building should be picked out in this city to submit to a loss amounting to very many thousands of dollars; in fact, to submit to a loss in amount that would build complete an ordinary hotel in an ordinary size town.

Every modern building of consequence in Washington, so far as I know, has utilized the vault room under sidewalks.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. Evidently the Senator has given some study to this matter, and I am trying to get the real facts.

Mr. WARREN. I shall be glad to give the information.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree that from the observation of at least a great many people they have excavated under the sidewalk. I am not finding fault with that. I think that is a general custom. But is it true that under the sidewalk, which extends about 12 feet into the street, they have excavated?

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator it is not true, so far as I know, and I have known more or less of that street for the last 30 or more years.

Mr. NORRIS. It is a very wide sidewalk.

Mr. WARREN. I have never observed the taking of any distance out of the street in the vicinity under discussion. Both sides of the street have had wide parking space ever since the street was laid out, as I remember it.

Mr. NORRIS. If under the sidewalk they have not excavated beyond the usual width of a sidewalk, then the cutting off of some of the sidewalk and leaving it in the street proper would not injure the hotel very much.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that my information, so far as the space under the sidewalk is concerned, is that it is excavated very nearly out to the gutter.

Mr. OVERMAN. And on the opposite side of the street, where the Ebbitt is. It is done on both sides not by the New Willard but the Ebbitt.

Mr. NORRIS. And the New Willard, I understand.

Mr. OVERMAN. It makes a very narrow street.

Mr. NORRIS. The Ebbitt is on one side and the New Willard is on the other. I know the sidewalk is very wide.

Mr. WARREN. On both sides it is wide.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me ask the Senator about the law we passed that this amendment seeks to suspend. Did that propose to cut that sidewalk down and make the street through that block just as wide as it is farther up?

Mr. WARREN. I assume that is the presumption.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to read what the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia said. He came before our committee last year and recommended that this street be widened. They wanted to extend the car line down Fourteenth Street so that employees could go with convenience to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and to the Department of Agriculture. Two tracks there would make the street too narrow. So they sent in a report which I have here. The engineers of the city themselves recommended that this should be done.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will allow me now before answering further. The street grade, as the Senator probably knows, is quite steep from Pennsylvania Avenue to F Street. You see there very few automobiles or carriages—in fact, I might say almost none at all going up and down that street. It is only a very short detour to go out around by the Treasury Building. So the travel, except the trucking or something that is to be delivered on either side of the street and the taxicabs that wait at the doors of the hotels, uses that street very little; but as to pedestrians there is a great flood of people going back and forth, up and down, and the same is true as to the street cars. The car tracks have already been put in there and the street cars have been running for a long time.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; since we enacted the law I understand there have been street cars there.

Mr. WARREN. It did not require the enactment of the law for them to run street cars over that route.

Mr. NORRIS. At least the street cars are operating up and down through that block. I wish to ask the Senator if one reason why there is not more traffic over that block is the fact that it is hardly a full block, as I remember it, between F Street and Pennsylvania Avenue?

Mr. WARREN. It is not a long block because——

Mr. NORRIS. It is probably a little over half a block on account of Pennsylvania Avenue running diagonally there. Would there not be more traffic if the street was wide enough to have it?

Mr. WARREN. I dislike to project my personality into this matter. I have, of course, no interest in the hotel and no interest in anybody connected with it. I do not know very much of the ownership and I do not care, but I lived in the hotel from the time it was rebuilt until three years ago, and my room opened out upon this part of the street about which we are talking. There has been to my knowledge no increase, but a decrease rather than an increase, so far as horse-drawn or motor-propelled transportation is concerned over that street, because, as I said, it is steep and it is rough, paved with cobblestones, and it is not much farther around the swing from Pennsylvania Avenue to Fifteenth Street and back via F Street. Teams avoided it before just as they do now. To put asphalt paving there would be to make it nearly or quite impossible to drive a horse over it if it were at all wet or if there were snow or sleet upon it, and, in fact, I doubt whether they could drive safely over it with loaded teams even when perfectly dry. Automobile grease would make further difficulty.

The amount of money expended under the sidewalk in question can only be appreciated by one who visits it. Last year when the matter was up I took it upon myself to go through it. The machinery there is two stories high. It would cost the hotel, I should estimate, nearly $100,000 to reconstruct and cover the machinery in providing other space.

Mr. OVERMAN. May I ask the Senator a question? I live in what is known as the Cochran Hotel. All their machinery and plant are under the pavement. Does the Senator know that they have had plenty of room for machinery there without extending the sidewalk? Does the Senator know that this width of the sidewalk can not be lessened and not disturb the machinery? As far as I can see, the machinery does not extend on the Ebbitt side, and to make it uniform with the balance of that great street the Willard Hotel would not be disturbed a particle there. I am asking the Senator if he knows if that can be done.

Mr. WARREN. The conditions are not entirely similar. The Willard Hotel on the north end, facing on F Street, is, I might say, three stories below the sidewalk. The consequence is that first there has to be a distance outside of the house taken to allow air and light to go down. But portions of it are in use for other purposes than storage and machinery. That narrows it to some extent. Then the balance, I think, is in use for machinery that is fitted in there, and the uses made for it are such that if it is restricted it simply means that they will have to

shut down the work as it is now conducted and commence anew with much new machinery.

I doubt very much whether they would not have to ask permission to go out under the street. It is not at all strange that hotel buildings should use the space under sidewalks, and not only under the sidewalk, but under the street. Take the Congress Hotel in Chicago. It uses space under the street as well as under the sidewalk. Other hotels do the same. If it is proper to tax more on this hotel than on the others, then it ought to be taxed more. If it is subject to a license, let it be licensed. But this hotel was built under the proper authority. The commissioners have allowed it to be constructed and continued. They were there where they could see it every day; the District Building is located right near it. It has been carried on with the consent of everybody. The hotel has been to this great expense.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator from Wyoming will allow me, I will say whether right or wrong they were granted this permit by the Secretary of War. I do not say whether he had a right to do it or not, but they presumed he did have the right, and upon the authority given them they proceeded to spend an enormous amount of money. I must say I was utterly surprised when I went down into those vaults to see the extensive amount of machinery that is there.

Mr. WARREN. So would anyone be surprised.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I had not the slightest idea of it before, and I believe if Members of the Senate would go there and see it they would immediately find out whether there ought not to be some time allowed. I do not say forever, but their engines are under there, their boilers are under there, their dynamos are under there, their ice plant is under there, and the whole machinery of that hotel is under there. As to the expense, I am unable to state it; it would probably cost them from thirty to fifty thousand dollars to remedy it. Before we interrupt things of that kind we ought to be very careful and consider the matter thoroughly.

Mr NORRIS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WARREN. Just a moment. What the Senator from Maryland says is absolutely true. I have such confidence in the fairness of the Senate that if Senators will take the pains to look in there I doubt if there is anyone who, after looking over the situation, will say that it is the right thing for this District, first, to give permission; second, to allow the construction to go on and to see how it is done; and third, to demand that the street shall be widened regardless of these great losses. We are only asking in this amendment that the matter may be suspended until the Senate does know more about it. I would be glad to see the street widened, if it could be done reasonably. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. This is the question I want to ask the Senator. It is proposed that the law shall be suspended until further action by Congress?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. It strikes me if we suspend the law we ought in the law making the suspension fix the time of suspension. Does it not really amount to a repeal of the law?

Mr. WARREN. No; I do not believe so.

Mr. NORRIS. Then ought there not to be a limit at least in the amendment, say one year or two years.

Mr. WARREN. That might be, I will say to the Senator; but the Committee on Appropriations should have the opportunity to look into all these matters. I dare say very few members of the Committee on Appropriations have inspected this underground space and its contents, and few, if any, of the Senators not on that committee have ever inspected the underground premises at all. The most valuable machinery of that entire structure is located under the sidewalk. As I have said, in the world over spaces under sidewalks and streets even are used, and why select this particular building at this particular time and then force this through without having proper time granted to investigate it thoroughly?

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit me, it seems if there is machinery or other property put in there lawfully, we ought to take it out, if we think it ought to be taken out lawfully, and if they suffer any damages we ought to pay for it, but, as I understand the situation, the sidewalk goes beyond the limits of a sidewalk. I do not know what the facts were when the machinery was put in there, but the very fact that somebody put machinery on public property and keeps it there for 25 years and has the privilege all that time ought not to be offered as an argument why he should keep it there continually.

Mr. WARREN. It was put there by consent and by arrangement.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President——

Mr. WARREN. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. I merely wanted to call attention to the fact that last year the District of Columbia appropriation act contained this language:

> That hereafter the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to assess and collect rent from all users of space occupied under the sidewalks and streets in the District of Columbia, which said space is occupied or used in connection with the business of said users.

So that under the laws that now exist the hotel company would be compelled to pay a rental for use of lands under the sidewalk.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I desire to say a word on this amendment. Like the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], I have resided at the New Willard for 15 or 20 years, or since the structure was put up, and I think I can claim considerable familiarity with the particular neighborhood, more perhaps than almost any other Member of this body, except it be the Senator from Wyoming, who until recently likewise resided there.

This hotel, in my opinion, is in the nature of a great public improvement for the city of Washington and should be recognized as such. It is using the space under the sidewalk in precisely the same way that such space is being used all over the city of Washington, in Philadelphia, New York, Chicago, and every other great city in the world.

The point is raised that the sidewalk abuts 12 feet or more into the street upon each side. My recollection is that that condition of the sidewalk existed before the Willard Hotel was constructed. It is not peculiar to this hotel, because it prevails on the opposite side of the street in front of the Ebbitt Hotel, which is an old structure.

The Willard Hotel took advantage, in the same manner as every other hotel, of the space under the sidewalk. A hotel requires more space than a private dwelling or an ordinary store, and we should recognize that such is the fact. When they did that they were simply taking advantage of existing conditions, with the acquiescence of the District Commissioners, with the consent of the Secretary of War, and, as far as they knew, without objection on the part of anyone.

When the hotel was finished, I am one of those who are of the opinion that it was a distinct addition to the accommodation in the Capital of the Nation.

Now, about the street. The street is quite precipitous. I venture to say that there is not an automobile or a vehicle of any kind that goes through that street which can avoid it. About the only conveyances that I have observed in my many years frequenting the neighborhood are the taxicabs which stand in front of either hotel or in the neighborhood of the Ebbitt House and the New Willard. It is not a street that vehicles use at all. I have been frequently impressed with the fact that day after day has elapsed and I have not seen a vehicle of any kind go down or up that street. I never thought it was necessary to extend the car tracks on the street, but it was done, and I have been frequently impressed with the fact that the cars are few and far between that travel over Fourteenth Street between F Street and Pennsylvania Avenue.

The hotel, as I am informed, is one of the largest taxpayers in the District of Columbia. I hesitate to say how many thousand dollars are paid in taxes; I have been told some $30,000. I may be wrong. Anyhow, it is a very large sum of money. If the commissioners or the taxing authorities believe that on account of these abutments and privileges the property is increasing in value and they should pay larger taxes, I have no doubt the hotel people would cheerfully do so.

I do not know who owns the hotel, Mr. President. I am acquainted, of course, with the manager and the officials of the company who conduct the hotel. I have always had the impression that it was a corporation largely owned by a number of citizens of the District of Columbia, but as to their names I have never even taken the trouble to inquire. However, the hotel is there in good faith. This question about the sidewalk abutting beyond the line of the edge of the street is a condition which existed before the hotel was built. The abutment on this part of Fourteenth Street is, in my opinion, not one that causes any inconvenience, because the street is not used. When Fourteenth Street strikes F Street traffic is stopped on account of the hill. There is no travel on the street of any account, because one side of it is occupied entirely by the Willard Hotel from F Street to Pennsylvania Avenue, and the other side three-quarters the length of the block by the Ebbitt Hotel. I believe that a very great injustice and a very great hardship would be put upon the management of the hotel, and incidentally upon the thousands of people who use the hotel during the year, if they

were subjected to what, in my opinion, is an entirely unnecessary action at this time.

At least, Mr. President, it can well be suspended, as the amendment provides. It is within the province of any Senator next winter, if complaints continue to come in, if they do—I certainly never heard of any—to revive this matter after full investigation in some way that will be equitable to those concerned.

It is, as I understand it, not merely a question of expense to the hotel; that, perhaps, could be overcome; but I doubt if they are compelled to recede to the extent of 12 or 15 feet of space that they already have under the sidewalk whether it will be physically possible for them to secure sufficient space for the machinery essential for the conduct of that great structure, and on that account the conduct of the hotel would be seriously curtailed and hampered and greatly interfered with.

As one having great familiarity with that section of the city and having spent so many years in Washington, interested in seeing ample accommodations for the thousands of people who naturally come to the Capital of the Nation, in view of the insufficient information which unquestionably exists, because few Senators in this body have any idea of the geography or topography or character of this proposition, I earnestly hope that we will at least suspend the law until those who are disposed to agitate the matter or to inquire into it can familiarize themselves with it, and at the next Congress any Senator can bring it up again.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, if an amendment was proposed, like the Senator from Nebraska has suggested, to suspend it until a certain time instead of suspending it indefinitely, I think we might agree to that. I do not intend now to make any fight against this or against my committee. I took part in the debate two years ago. I want to say now I know nothing about who owns that hotel, but what governs me in my course as a member of the committee is not what Tom, Dick, or Harry or even a Senator might say, unless the Senator has investigated the matter. I am governed by the city engineers, by the Commissioners of the District, by the Secretary of the Treasury; and when those men whose duty it is to investigate and inform the Senate come before my committee and tell us that it ought to be done, I know what the city engineers think about it, I know what the Commissioners of the District think about it, and I know what the Secretary of the Treasury thinks about it. If the Senator will accept the amendment, I shall not go on any further, although I can, if it be deemed necessary, read what the officials to whom I have referred have said regarding this matter.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have investigated this subject very thoroughly, and I, too, have felt that some relief ought to be given to those people; but very likely the proposed amendment goes too far, and so I will offer as a substitute for the amendment of the committee what I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The SECRETARY. As a substitute for the committee amendment, from line 16 to line 21, inclusive, on page 28, it is proposed to insert the following:

Such part of the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1917 providing to "repave with asphalt the roadway of Fourteenth Street NW., from Pennsylvania Avenue to F Street, 70 feet wide, $7,500," is hereby suspended until March 1, 1918.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That is extending it for a year.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the chairman of the committee will accept that, I shall have nothing more to say.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That, it seems to me, is an unreasonable extension. The same arguments were used last year, that these people were located there and that we must not disturb them.

Mr. GALLINGER. This matter can not be adjusted in a day.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I realize that. I do not want to be unreasonable.

Mr. GALLINGER. This proposed relief is only for a year, and during that time conferences can be held and very likely an adjustment can be agreed upon.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will make no objection to that.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I think the amendment to the amendment ought to be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, is the bill now open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is one more committee amendment which was passed over.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that there is one more committee amendment which was passed over that has not yet been disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment passed over will now be stated.

The SECRETARY. The last committee amendment passed over was, on page 118, after line 2, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 8. Hereafter when any piping or other household fixtures or secondhand goods of any description whatever have been stolen and sold to a dealer in junk, or secondhand dealer, in the District of Columbia, under such circumstances that the commissioners, after hearing granted, are satisfied that said dealer should have had reasonable ground to believe, or could have ascertained by reasonable inquiry or investigation, that the goods were stolen, and that the dealer did not make reasonable inquiry or investigation as to the title of the seller before making the purchase, the commissioners are authorized and directed to revoke the license of said dealer; and this action shall not be a bar to criminal prosecution for receiving stolen goods.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I understand that the Senator from Nebraska has withdrawn his objection to that committee amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have talked with a number of Senators about the amendment, who have investigated the subject somewhat; and, so far as I am concerned, while I drew an amendment to the amendment with the intention of offering it, I have made up my mind that, as the committee amendment is satisfactory to everyone else, I shall not offer my amendment at this time. If the law does not work properly we can amend it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "each," at the end of line 7, page 56, it is proposed to insert:

One hundred additional privates of class 1, at $900 each, to be employed on or after March 1, 1917, $120,000; $30,000 of which shall be immediately available.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, this amendment is strongly urged by the District Commissioners, and especially by Mr. Commissioner Brownlow, who has supervision of the city police. The provision is more in the nature of an emergency act. The police force now has 715 men; 10 years ago it had 718 men; and in 1912 its total strength was 735 men. The force was decreased by Congress, together with the direction to remove a number of the men then stationed at the White House. In the last two years it has become necessary for the protection of the White House to restore these men to duty there, so that instead of 26 policemen at the White House four years ago there are now 49. Extra men detailed on duty at the White House and the various embassies number 62. There are other special points that require to be more closely watched, and this increase of a hundred privates to be made available upon the approval of the act is an imperative need.

These policemen, as I presume every one here understands, work in three shifts; so that, if the amendment is agreed to, it means approximately an increase in the number of policemen of 33. I do not think it is necessary to make a further statement in reference to the amendment, and I submit it to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems to me that there was nothing presented to the committee, unless it was presented to the subcommittee, to justify the employment of a hundred additional privates of class 1 on the police force.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Utah that Commissioner Brownlow had a talk with me about the matter. The policemen work in three shifts, as the Senator from Utah understands, and the amendment really only means an increase of 33 policemen on each shift. It is stated that a great many of these men have to be detailed on account of emergencies here to do certain work, which has placed the authorities in a very awkward situation. Commissioner Brownlow came to see me about the matter this morning. I suggested that they be put on the force temporarily, but his reply to that suggestion was that it would be pretty hard to get men at $900 a year to perform such service temporarily; that we had better arrange it in this way, and whenever the emergency ceased to exist they could discharge these men as they have heretofore done in similar cases.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. If my recollection serves me correctly, the number of Capitol policemen was recently increased by 100. This proposed increase for the entire city, relating to all public buildings in the city as well as to the property of the city and of citizens generally, is by the same number that we increased the Capitol police.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas does not mean that the Capitol police have been increased by 100? That is a larger number than we now have.

Mr. SMOOT. Or than we ever have had.

Mr. ROBINSON. What was the number by which the Capitol police were increased?

Mr. OVERMAN. They were increased by 70.

Mr. ROBINSON. By 70.

Mr. SMOOT. We have not a hundred Capitol policemen now.

Mr. ROBINSON. I did not mean to say they have been increased by 100, but I was speaking relatively.

Mr. OVERMAN. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to say that the Committee on Rules this morning held a meeting to consider the question of an increase in the number of policemen in the Capitol, which is now about 69; but not more than half of the force is constantly available. The Committee on Rules think that the Capitol police force ought to be increased by 50; and I have been authorized and instructed to offer a resolution providing such increase for the protection of the Capitol Building and of the House and Senate Office Buildings during the sessions of Congress. I shall prepare an amendment to that effect, if the Senator will accept it, and will offer it to this bill, requiring the entire payment to be made out of the Treasury instead of out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Of course, the Senator from North Carolina recognizes the fact that the Capitol police have nothing to do with the Metropolitan police; that is an entirely different proposition.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is the reason why I said that I would only offer such an amendment if the Senator would accept it. If it should not be placed on this bill, it would be necessary to have passed through Congress a joint resolution to increase the number of the Capitol police force.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. But, if the Senator will excuse me, I merely wished to give him the information he desired, while I was on my feet.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, my memory has been refreshed since the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] has made the statement which he has submitted to the Senate. Mr. Commissioner Brownlow did state to me and to the chairman of the committee this morning that the Capitol police force had been increased or would be increased by approximately 100. The Senator from North Carolina says that it is his purpose to increase the number by 50. For the purposes of this argument the conclusion is inevitable that if it is necessary under the emergency conditions which now exist, and with which every Senator is familiar, and which I do not think it necessary to go into in detail, to increase the Capitol police force by 50, it certainly is apparent that to increase the Metropolitan police force by 100 is entirely justifiable.

As I have already stated, these men work in three shifts a day, and the adoption of the amendment means the increase, approximately, of 33 on the force working during the entire time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I notice the Senator's amendment provides for an appropriation of $120,000 with which to pay the Metropolitan police force, and then it provides that $30,000 of that sum is to be immediately available.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; it is intended to put this force on not later than the 1st of March in order that they may serve during the inauguration.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is desired to have them at once.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, I know that if the money is not made immediately available these men can not be employed until July 1 of this year. I simply wanted to know what was the idea of the Senator offering the amendment to make $30,000, or one-fourth of the money, immediately available.

Mr. ROBINSON. The amendment is in the form in which it was presented by the commissioners. The purpose of making the fund immediately available is to enable them to employ and pay these additional policemen before the beginning of the new fiscal year.

Mr. SMOOT. In other words, it is proposed that the 100 extra policemen shall begin duty on the 1st day of March.

Mr. ROBINSON. On the 1st day of March, or just as soon as they can be appointed.

Mr. SMOOT. The amendment can go to conference. I shall not object to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have another amendment to offer.

Mr. PENROSE. I inquire if the Senator has many more amendments, as I have to take a train in a few moments? Otherwise I would defer to the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well; I will yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. PENROSE. I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 66, after line 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

> That all the employees of the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia shall receive 30 days' annual and 30 days' sick leave, with pay, in any one calendar year: *Provided*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, on the recommendation of the police surgeon, extend such sick leave as in their judgment is warranted by the circumstances of the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will not take the time of the Senate by asking to have the amendment again read if the Senator will explain it. I gathered from the reading that it proposes to give all members of the Metropolitan police force 30 days' leave of absence and 30 days' sick leave, and, then, in the judgment of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the sick leave can be extended beyond the 30 days. No Government employee has any such privilege as that now.

Mr. PENROSE. That was not contemplated, and I am obliged to the Senator for calling my attention to it. The amendment is designed simply to place the police force of the city on a parity with the other employees of the District. If the Senator will let it go to conference, it can be properly adjusted there, or the provision to which he calls attention can be stricken out.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will not object to the amendment, but will let it go to conference.

Mr. PENROSE. That is all I ask.

Mr. SMOOT. There is another consideration involved in the amendment, Mr. President. I do not want the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia to be put upon a better footing than all other Government employees.

Mr. PENROSE. Neither do I.

Mr. SMOOT. But this amendment does that, I will say to the Senator, even with the proviso stricken out, for it says:

> That all the employees of the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia shall receive 30 days' annual and 30 days' sick leave, with pay, in any one calendar year.

In all of the other departments and in the case of all other Government employees they may receive 30 days' sick leave, but they must actually be sick in order to receive that sick leave. Under this provision, however, members of the police department would receive it whether they were sick or whether they were not. In other words, the Metropolitan police force is to work 10 months instead of 12. That is not fair to the other employees of the Government, and I think a change should be made in the amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, just at that point I will ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if there is any more reason why this privilege should be extended to the police force than to the members of the fire department? If we are going into this matter wholesale, I think we ought to take in everybody who is entitled to consideration, and certainly the firemen are entitled to consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I recognize that the ramifications of an amendment of this kind would be very extensive, and I do not object to it, merely that it may go to conference. Of course I do not want the Senator to understand that I altogether agree with him.

Mr. PENROSE. I understand that. I only want to have the amendment considered in conference on its merits. I am willing to stand in that position. I ask in this connection to have inserted in the RECORD——

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I think it but fair to the Senator from Pennsylvania to say, as this amendment is going into conference, that we must not be expected to uphold it unless we felt after investigation that it was proper to do so.

Mr. PENROSE. Of course.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. When a matter goes to conference the conferees on the part of the Senate are naturaly expected to stand by it; but I assume the Senator from Pennsylvania does not demand that of the conferees of the Senate in this case.

Mr. PENROSE. I do not. I appreciate the courtesy of the chairman of the committee. It is obvious there are not many Senators present to listen to a discussion of the matter, and I will be content to let it go to conference for such consideration as can consistently be extended to it.

In that connection, for the information of the conferees, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a brief statement entitled "Reasons for asking for proposed amendment to House bill 19119 relative to the Metropolitan Police Department." I call the attention of the chairman of the committee and the conferees to the statement, which will appear in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter referred to will be inserted in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

REASONS FOR ASKING FOR PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H. R. 19119.

With the price of foodstuffs and other necessities of life constantly increasing, the bare necessities being almost beyond the reach of the average layman, with most of the large corporations in the United States recognizing the need of giving their employees a living wage, with 13 cities having a population ranging from 452,255 down to 32,906 giving their patrolmen salaries ranging from $1,464 down to $1,300 per annum, their percentage of patrolmen being about the same as Washington, D. C., namely, one to each 600 inhabitants, we respectfully ask that our plea for a living wage be considered. Following is a list of statistics as compiled from records of Department of Commerce for year of 1915:

City.	Population.	Number patrol.	Salary (maximum).	Years to attain maximum grade.
San Francisco, Cal	452,235	765	$1,464	(1)
Newark, N. J	389,106	568	1,300	3
Jersey City, N. J	293,403	414	1,300	4
Yonkers, N. Y	193,231	139	1,300	3
Memphis, Tenn	143,231	144	1,300	4
Butte, Mont	42,497	52	1,380	(1)
Mount Vernon, N. Y	35,374	40	1,300	3
Shreveport, La	32,906	25	1,320	4
Bayonne, N. J	66,041	62	1,300	4
Oakland, Cal	186,902	.....	1,400	3
Portland, Oreg	259,582	.....	1,320	3
Hoboken, N. J	75,364	.....	1,300	3
Indianapolis, Ind	282,877	.....	1,260	4
Washington, D. C	356,028	650	1,200	8
New York, N. Y	5,333,539	.....	1,400	5
Chicago, Ill	2,397,600	.....	1,300	2
Boston, Mass.[2]	734,747	1,059	1,400	4

[1] Not graded.
[2] Given 15 days leave, in addition 1 day off in 8; a total of 45 days leave in each year.

In Washington the patrolmen have to purchase their own uniform, this, when the inspector for clothing of the department thinks they need new ones, an average expense of about $50 per annum; in addition an average of $15 per annum is deducted for the pension fund.

In Washington, D. C., the situation of the members of the Metropolitan police force is somewhat different as compared to the patrolmen of other cities, and even to the clerks of the Federal and District departments, the city proper covering a radius of 70 square miles, the precinct station houses being in a radius of about 20 square miles, the members of the department going on and off duty at all hours of the day or night are compelled to live as near the station houses as possible, this where the rents are excessively high, all members are forbidden by the act of 1876, relating to the Metropolitan police department, to reside outside of the District limits. A police officer is expected to keep up a fair scale of respectability in the section in which he resides. At the present time it is an extreme hardship to do so; it can hardly be seen how the patrolman having an average of $825 left to support his family can live.

Every department attached to the District of Columbia receives 30 days annual leave, with the exception of the police department, civilian employees of the police department, namely, patrol drivers and janitors receiving 30 days. The fire department employees receive but 20 days annual leave, but in addition to that are allowed every fifth day off. Policemen working 345 days in each year, with the exception of about an average of 10 days for sick leave taken, it would seem were entitled to 30 days annual and 30 days sick leave with pay, especially when many are using the major portion of their leave each year to acquire extra compensation; this so that the balance sheet will not be too much on the wrong side.

If the proposed increases were granted it would require additional appropriation of $61,680 for privates receiving $1,200 per annum; $9,180 for privates receiving $1,080 per annum; $4,590 for privates receiving $900 per annum, the same being an increase of 10 per cent in all existing grades of $1,200 and under. After careful investigation we find that a member of the police department, with a family of at least four, can not live under an expense of $97 a month. This for the bare necessities of life. It can be readily seen that the $900 and $1,080 grades are going into debt each month, and that the $1,200 grade is barely able to meet current expenses. The expense account of $97 submitted does not include any money for laundry, recreation, or the many other expenses which present themselves from time to time. It is hoped that consideration will be given the $900 grade at least. In regard to the increased leave, we are only asking that which every other employee of the District receives with the sole exception of the police and fire departments. This for a class of employees who work 345 days of the year.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to this amendment by inserting after the words "District of Columbia," in the second line, the words "and the employees of the fire department of the District of Columbia."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the members of the fire department now have a leave of absence of 20 days.

Mr. GALLINGER. But they have not 30 days, and they do not have sick leave, do they?

Mr. SMOOT. They have, in addition to the 20 days, one day layoff out of every five days. So they virtually have the same thing as 30 days.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very well. If that be so, I will not offer the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that that is the case.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move to strike out of the amendment the words:

Provided, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, on the recommendation of the police surgeon, extend such sick leave as in their judgment is warranted by the circumstances of the case.

I think those words would prejudice the amendment, and I move to strike them out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I have one more amendment, and then I am done. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The SECRETARY. On page 116, after line 23, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 7. That until otherwise provided for, the wages, salaries, or compensation of all persons provided for herein, carried on per diem or annual rolls, shall be increased according to the following schedule:

First. Every employee now receiving $1,200 per annum or less shall receive an increase in wages, salary, or compensation of 20 per cent.

Second. Every employee now receiving over $1,200 and less than $2,600 per annum shall receive an increase in wages, salary, or compensation of 10 per cent.

That a sufficient sum to provide for the above increases in wages, salary, or compensation is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That detailed reports shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next session showing the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided for herein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether this amendment was considered by the committee? It provides a more liberal schedule of advance than that contained in the bill as reported.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that it was, and that the consensus of opinion of the committee was that increases should be given to the employees of the District in proportion whether they received under a thousand or over a thousand dollars a year; that is, that they should receive the same increase that is given to other Government employees.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will permit me, there is this to be said about the matter, that we have already inserted in the bill an amendment taking care of all employees of classifications by a certain schedule of increases. If this amendment goes in, we shall have two provisions in the bill in conflict with each other. I really think the Senator from Pennsylvania ought to be content with what the committee has put in the bill and what the Senate has agreed to to-day, which is an increase of 15 per cent to the lowest paid employees and 10 per cent to those receiving up to $1,000. It is exactly the provision that went into the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and which we hope to hold in all the bills; but even that is being contested by some people.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I recognize the difficulties and the complications surrounding legislation of this character. I do not want to withdraw the amendment, but I will ask to have it lie on the table, and will ask the conferees, if they can, to adopt a somewhat more liberal schedule than is now contained in the bill as reported.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. At the end of line 18, on page 105, it is proposed to insert the following:

For the acquisition of a park in Klingle Valley, from Woodley Road to Connecticut Avenue, near the Zoological Park, in general accordance with the map on file in the office of the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, dated February 10, 1916, with an area of approximately 8¾ acres, $87,000, the same to become a part of the park system of the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, while the District Committee had under consideration an amendment relating to this subject, I was authorized to submit that amendment and the following:

For the construction of a culvert to carry Klingle Valley Creek underneath Connecticut Avenue, in order to enable adjoining property owners to make an earth viaduct on the line of Connecticut Avenue where it crosses said valley, $15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no part of this money shall be available until the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have secured satisfactory guarantee of sufficient fill and base to bring said area up to the proper level of Connecticut Avenue.

The first amendment is in compliance with the estimates submitted by the District Commissioners. The amendment which I have just read was submitted to the District Commissioners by the Committee on the District of Columbia, but before their report was received the bill was reported to the Senate. They report adversely on the second amendment, but strongly recommend the first amendment. The first amendment is in substantial compliance with a report made by Col. Harts on July 19, 1916. In that report, however, it was recommended that certain other areas be also acquired. This amendment relates to the one area embraced in Col. Hart's report, which he said in the report he thought it most desirable to secure at this time.

My desire is to have both of these amendments included in the bill, so that the entire subject matter may go to conference and the conferees may have the privilege of selecting either of the amendments. The District Commissioners have very earnestly for some six or seven years advocated the adoption of the first amendment. They say that there is no suitable approach to Rock Creek Park at that point and that the acquisition of this area ought to be accomplished now, or otherwise it may pass from the power of Congress to obtain it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to get the location of this proposed addition to the park as provided in the first amendment, which, as I understand, is the only amendment the Senator has formally offered. Does the amendment now pending relate to the area contiguous to the bridge just north of the Connecticut Avenue entrance to the Zoological Park?

Mr. ROBINSON. That is the location of the land.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well; I have the location in mind, then.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, as chairman of the committee I accept the amendment and will let it go to conference.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator accept both amendments?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will accept both amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, which amendment is that?

Mr. ROBINSON. The amendment read at the desk. I shall offer the other amendment after that is disposed of, for the reasons I have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, as stated by the Secretary.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to that amendment, but I want to be heard on the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON. I now offer the second amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. Following the amendment just agreed to, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

For the construction of a culvert to carry Klingle Valley Creek underneath Connecticut Avenue, in order to enable adjoining property owners to make an earth viaduct on the line of Connecticut Avenue where it crosses said valley, $15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no part of this money shall be available until the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have secured satisfactory guaranty of sufficient fill and base to bring said area up to the proper level of Connecticut Avenue.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I explained a moment ago—probably the Senator from Nebraska did not hear me—that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia had been urging the first amendment, the one which has already been agreed to, for a number of years, but it has not been authorized, and there is in another body very serious opposition, I think, to the amendment. The second amendment is not inconsistent with the first amendment, but in all probability if the first amendment is agreed to the second amendment might not be retained by the conferees.

It is desirable that some action be taken at the place indicated. If the property is not to be acquired, then the fill-in should be permitted. I therefore ask that the Senate permit the amendment to be agreed to in order that the whole subject matter may be considered in conference.

In that connection, I desire to insert in the RECORD the letter of the District Commissioners, signed by the president of the Board of Commissioners, Mr. Newman. Some of the objections made in their letter have been met in the amendment which I have submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, February 2, 1917.

Hon. JOHN WALTER SMITH,
Chairman Subcommittee on Appropriations,
District of Columbia, United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit the following on the draft of a proposed amendment to the pending District appropriation bill, as follows:

"For the construction of a culvert to carry Klingle Valley Creek underneath Connecticut Avenue in order to enable adjoining property owners to make an earth viaduct on the line of Connecticut Avenue where it crosses said valley, $15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no part of this money shall be available until the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have secured satisfactory guaranty of sufficient fill to bring said area up to the proper level of Connecticut Avenue," which you referred to them for information and for opinion as to its merits.

The substitution of an earth viaduct for the bridge which now carries Connecticut Avenue over Klingle Valley will necessitate the eventual filling of the greater part of Klingle Valley west of Connecticut Avenue, thus destroying one of the most beautiful approaches to Rock Creek Park. For many years the commissioners have advocated the retention of this valley in its natural condition, and about a year ago held a public hearing at which the proper treatment of this valley was the principal subject of discussion. The hearing was largely attended and, except for the representations of one or two holders of vacant land who were desirous of finding a convenient dumping ground for surplus earth, the opinion of those present was unanimously in favor of the preservation of this valley. Renewed efforts were made to secure an appropriation for the acquisition of this valley as a part of the park system, and condemnation proceedings have recently been instituted to acquire a short connecting roadway between Macomb Street and Klingle Valley—a roadway which will be wholly unnecessary if the valley is filled as is contemplated by the proposed amendment. It will doubtless be cheaper to permit adjacent property owners to construct an earth viaduct than to rebuild the bridge at this point—an item of work that will probably have to be done within the next five years. But cost alone should not be the determining factor in a matter of this kind, as the filling of this valley will destroy an important connecting link in the parkway system of the District. It is objectionable to every member of the Fine Arts Commission with whom the subject has been discussed and it is decidedly detrimental to the interests of a large number of home owners in Cleveland Park and vicinity.

As to the details of the proposed legislation it has not been possible, in the limited time available, to give them the consideration they deserve if the legislation is to be seriously considered. It is apparent, however, that an earth viaduct can not be constructed at this point within the limiting lines of Connecticut Avenue—that is to say, the width of Connecticut Avenue at this point, 130 feet, is not sufficient for the construction of such a viaduct without constructing retaining walls or encroaching on adjacent property, which the commissioners have no right to do. Some provision would therefore be necessary for the construction of such walls, for the acquisition of such land, or for securing the consent of the owners, and in view of the known attitude of a large number of the owners the commissioners feel safe in saying that their cooperation could not be had in any scheme which contemplated the destruction of this beautiful valley. As to the amount proposed to be appropriated for the culvert itself the commissioners are unable to say, without further study, whether it would be sufficient to accomplish the purpose intended. It would depend in part upon the distance to which the fill extended up the valley.

For the reasons above given the commissioners are unanimous in recommending that the proposed amendment be not adopted.

Very respectfully,
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
By OLIVER P. NEWMAN, *President.*

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I shall not object to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas, but will let it go to conference.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to be heard on the amendment. I have not read, of course, the commissioner's letter which the Senator has just asked to have printed in the RECORD. I do not know what the letter contains, and had no idea that this amendment was to be offered to this bill. I am perfectly familiar with this location, and I believe that the first amendment ought to be agreed to, and have no objection to it, except that the price named in it, in my judgment, is more than we ought to pay for that land. As I recall, the amount to be paid will approximate $10,000 an acre. I think it is not worth more than $1,000 an acre, because it is on two side hills, and for building purposes it is practically useless. It ought to be a part of the park. I pass it every day when I come to the Sen-

ate and when I go home; and if I go home before it is dark I see it.

Under the bridge on Connecticut Avenue which crosses the ravine there is a little creek—I will ask the Senator from Arkansas the name of it?

Mr. ROBINSON. Klingle Valley Creek.

Mr. NORRIS. Klingle Valley Creek. The bridge over that ravine is just north of the Connecticut Avenue entrance to Rock Creek Park. There are slopes on each side, an angle in some instances of more than 45°, running down to a deep valley that is wooded, its sides being covered with very heavy timber. The land on the north side of that ravine or canyon is not far from Macomb Street, which is the only street there. There are lots and buildings facing on Macomb Street. Part of this land to be purchased on the north side of the ravine is owned by the people who laid out Cleveland Park, as I understand; that is, they laid out the lots fronting along Macomb Street, most of which they have sold, although I presume there are some few that they still own. The slope of the valley on the north comes up to the rear of those lots and buildings, from which it slants down to an angle of at least 45° to the bottom of the valley, where there is already a road. That is an entrance to Rock Creek Park; and you can also go into the Zoological Park in that way.

Mr. President, this land, at least on the side that is to be purchased under this amendment, as far as I can see, is of very little use. It has no outlet, in the first place, to any street that is inhabited or that could be inhabited. It ought to be a part of the park. It is covered with heavy timber. For that very reason, Mr. President, we never ought to adopt the second amendment that is proposed. As I look at it, these amendments are absolutely inconsistent with each other.

The proposition of the second amendment is that the Government shall pay $15,000, as I remember the amount from hearing it read, to make an archway for this small creek to flow under this bridge, and then permit the property owners to fill up that ravine even with the present street where the bridge crosses the ravine. That would mean that all this timber would be destroyed. That would mean that this slope that is nice to look at and is nice as part of the park would be of no value, of course, for park purposes. The timber would be destroyed and the beauty of the scenery absolutely ruined. It does not seem to me that that ought to be done. There is only one object in doing it, and that is to make valuable private property, at least on the north side of the ravine, where the people have already received ample compensation for their property by selling all that was good.

I hope, therefore, that the Senator from Arkansas will not insist on this amendment. I do not know how familiar he is with the subject, but I should like to go with him and show him the ground. If the first amendment is adopted, and we acquire this land for park purposes, then we do not want to destroy the timber or to fill up this ravine. It would certainly ruin it. It would be of no value for park purposes. If you should fill that up and have the street run over the top instead of the bottom of that ravine the people who own the land could build houses on it, and the lots would be valuable. But, Mr. President, that will be at the expense of ruining all the beauty there is there. That will have the effect of ruining the land entirely for the purposes of a park.

I understand that some of the land to be acquired by the first amendment is on the other side of this ravine. What I have said about the north side applies to the other side as far as the slope of the ground is concerned and as far as trees are concerned, but there are no buildings farther out. That is owned, as I understand, by the Chevy Chase Land Co., and if it were filled up it would make their property more valuable, it is true. But if the first amendment is agreed to, as I understand, it is the purpose to purchase the sloping part of that side of the ravine, and I think that ought to be done. They ought to get whatever the property is worth. My own idea, however, is that it is not worth, and that anybody who will look at it would say that it is not worth, nearly the amount of money that is carried by this amendment.

Mr. BRADY. There is no question that it was proper to adopt the first amendment; but I should like to ask the Senator whether or not this last amendment is recommended by the Commissioners of the District?

Mr. ROBINSON. No. I stated, Mr. President, that the first amendment was strongly urged by the District Commissioners, and the second amendment was not recommended, and that if the first amendment stays in the bill the second amendment in all probability will go out; but if the property is not to be acquired for a park, all objections to the second amendment cease. The objections which the Senator from Nebraska has offered to the second amendment are substantially those stated by the District Commissioners; that is to say that they want this land for a park, that it ought to be a part of the park system, and that the second amendment ought not to be agreed to for that reason alone, that it will mar the beauty of the park by having a fill there instead of leaving a natural valley.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President, I can not quite agree with the Senator as to what the conditions will be if the first amendment shall go out and the last amendment remain. If the first amendment should go out and the last amendment be adopted, it would forever stop the building of a park in that part of the city.

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not think that is true.

Mr. BRADY. And it is very essential that the first amendment be adopted.

Mr. ROBINSON. The first amendment has been adopted already.

Mr. BRADY. I mean, by the conference report. I think that is a very important amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON. Here is the thought, if the Senator pleases: The matter ought to be determined soon. It has been under consideration now for nearly 10 years. If we are going to acquire this as a part of the park, it will be accomplished under the first amendment; and in all probability the second amendment, if agreed to here, would go out in conference. But if the first amendment goes out, there is no reason in the world why the fill which is authorized under the second amendment should not be made.

As to the cost of the property, I know nothing about that except that the District Commissioners estimated that amount, and Col. Harts's report is substantially in compliance with that estimate.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, permit me to say a little further—and I thank the Senator from Arkansas for suggesting it to me—that if this fill is made, as contemplated by the pending amendment——

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator will permit me, I think I can make the matter clear in one sentence. This proposition, if agreed to, will give the conferees complete choice between the two amendments.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. One side favors one amendment and the other side has insisted upon the other amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me proceed with the proposition now the same as though this amendment were agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well.

Mr. NORRIS. If this amendment is agreed to and remains in the bill, and that ravine is filled, then it will have to be filled farther on beyond that bridge. The gully—the ravine—is just as deep on the east side of that bridge as it is on the west side.

Mr. SMOOT. Deeper.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; deeper, the Senator from Utah reminds me. That will have to be filled. That runs through the tract that we passed a law a year or two ago to purchase as an addition to the Zoological Park. That bridge is right on the line. I will ask the Senator from Utah if I am not right about that?

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is.

Mr. NORRIS. When you get east of the bridge that ravine is part of the land that we have already passed a law to acquire as an addition to the Zoological Park. If you fill it up on the other side you must fill it on the east of the bridge, or you can not have a street there coming down in the place of the one that is now in the bottom of the ravine. So that we will be destroying the scenery, the timber, and the usefulness for park purposes of the part that we have already passed a law to purchase as an addition to the Zoological Park.

I am satisfied that Senators would not be for the second amendment under any circumstances if they could see and were acquainted with the situation and the lay of the ground. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] lives not so very far from this locality, and I presume he is as familiar with it as I am. If I am not getting the facts right, I shall be glad to be corrected by him or any other Senator who knows the conditions.

Suppose this middle aisle here were Connecticut Avenue, and up there, about to the door, going in that way, were the entrance to the present Zoological Park. We are all familiar with that. Pass right on until you get north and west, and you come to a bridge going over a ravine that is 50, 75, or 100 feet deep. That is the place where this fill is to take place. At the end of that bridge is this street or road, known as Klingle Valley. It runs right under it, running east and west, mainly. It goes a little bit west of the bridge, and then angles up and comes out on Woodley Road, and comes down here and passes under this bridge. Now, if we fill this ravine, say 100 feet deep, we destroy

that road. We put the road up here on top, instead of 100 feet down. We have got to fill it clear on here. Just as soon as we come to the bridge, we come then to the line of the property that we have passed a law to purchase as an addition to the Zoological Park. That has the same ravine in it, excepting that it gets a little wider and a little deeper and goes on down.

Now, there is a driveway in there. I believe there is no more beautiful driveway anywhere in any of the parks of the city of Washington than that is as it goes under that bridge. If the pending amendment is adopted, that will be obliterated entirely. The Government owns the road there. They can not destroy that. The only benefit will come to the owners of the property on each side, through enabling them to tear down the hill and fill up this ravine and make their property more valuable.

If the amendment that has already been agreed to remains in the bill, this is what happens: It takes both sides here as an addition to the park, and then these property owners are disposing to the Government of the only part of their property that is useless for residential purposes. The Government is getting it for park purposes. It is good for park purposes, and for nothing else, unless it is filled up.

That is the proposition, Senators. I believe that if you could see the lay of the land, no one would support the second amendment. I can not see anything in it excepting, it is true, that it would enable the owners of the property on each side of this ravine to fill up the ravine, and have the property then for whatever purposes they might wish to use it for, and it would probably make it more valuable for the purpose of speculation and sale; but for park purposes it would ruin it. Nobody except the Government owns the road; at least, that has to remain as it is; and this side, at least on the north side, can not be filled up unless the Government takes action and permits it to be done, because it would destroy public property to do it.

Mr. BRADY. Private property.

Mr. NORRIS. If it is filled up, it will destroy the road, of course. It can not be filled up without an act of Congress, as I understand, permitting it to be done. Now, it seems to me that that ought not to be done; and, at all events, before it is done I wish Senators would go out and look at it. If you walk across that bridge, you will see it, as I walk across it twice nearly every day.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I hope the Government will purchase the 8¾ acres provided for in the first amendment. That matter has been presented to the Senate time and time again. I think it has been adopted in the Senate and always has gone out in conference. But the price I consider exceedingly high, and I might say exorbitant. The amendment carries an appropriation of $87,000 for the 8¾ acres, which would be $10,000 an acre. I believe if any Senator would go out and look over the land, if he would just walk across the bridge and have pointed out to him where the 8¾ acres of land is located, and see the character and situation of the land, he would immediately say that $10,000 an acre is altogether too much to pay for the land.

I say what I say at this time because if this matter goes into conference and the House conferees seriously consider purchasing this 8¾ acres of land this year, and yet do not feel that they can pay $10,000 an acre for it, I should like very well to have the amendment agreed to at a reasonable rate and allow the 8¾ acres of land to be purchased.

Mr. ROBINSON. Of course I should be glad to see the Government get the property as cheaply as possible.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. I simply submit the amendment in the form in which it was suggested by the District Commissioners. The Senator understands that. Of course he understands also that if it can be obtained much cheaper than that I shall be highly gratified.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course the Senator knows that I was not reflecting upon his judgment in any way.

Mr. ROBINSON. Oh, I understand that.

Mr. SMOOT. Because I knew very well how the amendment came here, and I knew why the Senator offered it.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has well stated that the Senate has repeatedly put in the bill this first amendment, which has already been agreed to, or substantially that amendment, and that it has gone out, in conference or otherwise, year after year. If this land is not to become a part of the park is there, in the Senator's opinion, any reason why the second amendment should not be——

Mr. SMOOT. The second amendment need not be considered for a minute if the first amendment is agreed to; and I want to say to the Senator frankly that even if they disagree to the first amendment, providing for the purchase of the 8¾ acres of land, I sincerely hope that the Senate conferees will not agree to the fill as provided for in that amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I just suggested that if they did agree to the first amendment, in all probability the second amendment——

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator interrupted me before I got through.

Mr. ROBINSON. All right.

Mr. SMOOT. Even if they do not agree to the first amendment, and do not purchase the 8¾ acres, then I sincerely hope, as the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] said, that we will not provide for the fill at this time. I think it would be unwise. I think it would destroy the beauty of the road that the Government has already provided, and I believe it would be an unsightly piece of work that we never could get rid of in the future.

Mr. BRADY. And it would utterly spoil the prospect of securing a park.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt of it at all in my mind.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I hope this mooted or controverted question may be settled this year. I have been instrumental several times in putting an amendment in the District of Columbia appropriation bill for the purchase of this bit of land for park purposes; but, as has been stated, we have always lost it. Now, last year we were confronted with this proposition: The bridge over this ravine is unsafe. The authorities have forbidden two cars to pass over that bridge at the same time. There was a proposition to make an appropriation for plans for a new bridge over Calvert Street, and also for a new bridge there. But while that was under consideration the question of making a fill came up, and the committee had not time to make careful inquiry, so we dropped out the proposed appropriation for that new bridge, which will cost $250,000 at least, waiting until this matter was more carefully considered. We did make an appropriation for plans for the Calvert Street bridge, which is that bridge that stands so high in the air as you pass along Calvert Street.

Mr. SMOOT. And which is very unsafe.

Mr. GALLINGER. That bridge is very unsafe, also; and I feel very sure that we will have a new bridge there in the near future.

The question as to whether we shall have a new bridge there, or whether that ravine shall be filled, is a question that may well be considered. I feel sure that the amendment that has been suggested by the Senator from Arkansas, when it goes to conference, will enable the conferees to work out this proposition so that we will have a question settled which has been a disturbing thing for a good many years.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, long before I entered public life I acquired some interests in the District of Columbia, and among them an interest in the Chevy Chase Land Co., which owns a part of the area affected; and I feel, as I am present at this discussion, that I ought to make some statement regarding it. It is not my intention, of course, to vote upon this matter or to take any part in it beyond a candid statement with reference to the situation.

You all know the western entrance to the Zoo Park on Connecticut Avenue, and you know the bridge just beyond it to the north, between the Zoo Park and Chevy Chase; and you know the valley underneath that bridge, called Klingle Valley, which commences at Woodley Lane, on the west, and runs easterly under Klingle Bridge into both the Zoo Park and the National Park. As the Senator from Nebraska has stated, Connecticut Avenue at the entrance to the Zoo Park is a very unsightly development. There are high clay banks upon both sides there that ought to be cut down. The property owners to the west of Connecticut Avenue and south of Klingle Bridge, owning an area of about 30 acres, of which Mrs. Von Hammert, a lady living in Paris, owns a strip of 7 acres immediately adjoining Connecticut Avenue, and the Chevy Chase Land Co. owns the balance, have been desirous for years of cutting down that hill and taking the surplus earth and filling Klingle Valley, which the owners of the land above own. The Government has no interest at all there except in Connecticut Avenue, and that it acquired by the gift of the Chevy Chase Land Co., which not only dedicated the avenue itself for a space of 3 miles but also without public aid expended about $250,000 in grading the avenue—a thing that I think is unexampled in the history of the District of Columbia.

The owners of the Chevy Chase company also built the bridge across the Klingle Valley at an expenditure of about $150,000, no portion of which was contributed by the Government; and also built the Calvert Street Bridge across Rock Creek without any contribution by the Government. So that the owners of this property to the west of the Zoo Park entrance, partly the Chevy Chase Land Co. and partly Mrs. Von Hammert, have the entire ownership of the valley. The only interest that the Gov-

ernment has in the valley itself is in a road, called Klingle Road, that passes through it, and that road was the result of the grant of a mere right of way by the owners of the property.

Now, let us see how the powers of the Government are being used to the hardship of these proprietors. That bridge is becoming unsafe. It is necessary, therefore, to make a viaduct across Klingle Valley, either of earth or of stone. If the property owners are permitted to make it of earth, it will cost the Government nothing. If the Government constructs a bridge there, as it has over Sixteenth Street, it will cost the Government $250,000. So that the development that the property owners have considered for years, consisting of scraping off the top of this hill and filling in the valley, would save the Government $250,000 in the construction of a bridge. Then it would make every inch of that valley as profitable and as valuable as the upland at present, for it would all then be upland. This valley itself has a great value as a fill for the surplus soil on the upland, and if the owners do not utilize it, it means that at great expense they will have to grade their hills and transport the material elsewhere.

The purpose of the property owners was to grade that land, to put that entire region in a beautiful and attractive condition, and not to permit it to remain, as it has been for years past, the most unsightly part of Washington. They found, however, that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Art Commission were desirous of preserving this valley as a picturesque approach to the park and of maintaining it in its natural condition. Col. Judson, then engineer commissioner, informed me of that some 10 years ago, when the land company was proposing to level the hills and fill Klingle Valley. I told him what the plans of the company were, but he insisted upon it that this was a place of great natural beauty, and that public spirit ought to prompt me to postpone the execution of these plans until the Government could act.

It was entirely within our power to shave off those hills and to fill up that valley and end it, but I did not think that it would be a becoming thing to do. I thought it would hardly be a public-spirited thing to do until Congress should have an opportunity of acting upon the subject. Now, Congress has had that opportunity for 10 years, and for 10 years the District Commissioners—with the approval of the Art Commission, I think—have been seeking the condemnation of this valley; but as yet, while I believe it has had the approval of the Senate, it has not had the approval of the House.

I am told that there are those in the House who think that as a matter of economy a viaduct of earth ought to be built across there, and save the Government the expenditure of $250,000, and that when filled, after four of five years, it will be as attractive as it is now in its natural condition. I am assured by landscape architects that it can be made nearly as attractive when filled in as now, and that the approach to the national park can be made as effective as it could be if this natural beauty were availed of.

Now, meanwhile that land, which was acquired at a large cost by the Chevy Chase company 27 years ago, has been lying undeveloped, the owners feeling that they ought not to act arbitrarily in the matter, and, waiting for the Government to act, content that the Government abandon the acquisition of the parkway, desirous even that they should do so. So far as I am concerned, I do not wish the Government to acquire an inch of the land in which I have any interest. It is a matter of delicacy with me, as a Member of this body, and I would much prefer that I should have no dealings whatever with the Government with reference to any land in which I am interested.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PHELAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I want to fortify what the Senator has just said. When I was chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the committee took the matter up in the first place, the Senator opposed the project, saying that he preferred to retain the holdings he had there rather than to have them sold to the Government at any price. I recall that very distinctly as having occurred on two different occasions.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I may say that it interferes very materially with the plans of the owners of that property, and if the owners of the property had been allowed to go on there would not have been during these 10 years this unsightly approach to the Zoological Park and the unfinished appearance that now presents itself.

Now, as to the value, I will state that that land cost 27 years ago $5,000 an acre, if my recollection is right. The addition of interest and taxes for this period would bring its cost to the present proprietors to twelve or fifteen thousand dollars an acre. I call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to this——

Mr. NORRIS. I was engaged and did not hear the Senator.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The land, as I stated, cost 27 years ago, if I recollect aright, $5,000 an acre, valley and upland. The cost would amount now, I imagine, to $12,000 or $15,000 an acre with interest and taxes added. The land to which the Senator from Nebraska refers has been appraised by the assessors for purposes of taxation at the amount recommended by the District Commissioners for purchase. The $87,000 recommended by the District Commissioners as their estimate of value is the amount at which the assessors of the District have appraised it for assessment and taxation.

The valley land has much greater value than the Senator attributes to it. It is easy to see if the surplus of the upland is cut off and put in this valley all will be equally valuable, and developed land around there sells for from fifty to seventy-five cents a square foot. Fifty cents a square foot would be over $20,000 an acre and 60 cents a square foot would mean over $25,000 an acre. This, of course, would be the value after a considerable expenditure in leveling, grading, and constructing street and other improvements. It must be recollected also that the loss of this valley by governmental purchase will mean an injury to the uplands, whose value depends on a near-by fill for the excess earth.

Mr. President, I am indifferent as to what is done. Indeed, I would much prefer individually that the Government should not take this valley and let the property owners go along and make that fill and earthen viaduct in Connecticut Avenue and save the Government an expenditure of $250,000 in the construction of the future bridge. The property owners will deal with that land in such a way as to make it infinitely more attractive than it is now. But we have a right to ask that the Government should come to some conclusion about the matter. It seems to me that the members of the committee have acted wisely in so shaping these matters that in conference the whole thing can be settled one way or the other, either to provide for a viaduct of concrete or earth or have the Government take the valley now or not at all. Whatever course the Government sees wise to pursue in this matter, I am content, but I do think that fair dealing between the Government and its citizens requires prompt and decisive action.

Mr. SMOOT. May I ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat? Can the Senator state where the east line is to Klingle Valley between the park and the land owned by the Chevy Chase Real Estate Co.?

Mr. NEWLANDS. The easterly line of the valley sought to be acquired by this amendment is Connecticut Avenue.

Mr. SMOOT. I know what is the eastern line provided for by the amendment, but what I wanted to know is whether the Senator can describe to us the easterly line between the park and the land owned by the Chevy Chase Real Estate Co. How far down the valley eastward is the line from the bridge on Connecticut Avenue?

Mr. NEWLANDS. The Chevy Chase Land Co.'s land runs right under the bridge.

Mr. SMOOT. Does it stop at the bridge?

Mr. NEWLANDS. It stops just about at the bridge. Mrs. Von Hammert's land, the lady living in Paris, who owns the big bluff just opposite the Zoo Park entrance, also comes down to the bridge. She owns about 7 acres of this elevated plateau and the Chevy Chase Land Co. owns about 23 acres.

Mr. SMOOT. Is it the idea to fill the whole valley?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to say to that, no. The idea is that filling in the viaduct would only result in spreading out by a slope of 2 to 1 or 3 to 1 on each side toward the east and the west, and that that fill would run out on the west within, say, four or five hundred feet of the Connecticut Avenue Bridge, thus leaving a large portion of the valley in its natural state, not interfering at all with the beautiful residence of Mr. Parmelee, of Cleveland, who has built in that vicinity. I wish to say that we are very solicitous of the feelings and rights of everybody in that neighborhood and are desirous of making an attractive development.

Mr. SMOOT. If the contemplated work was done then the bottom of the valley on the road up where the valley now is would be level with the present railroad bridge on Connecticut Avenue, would it not?

Mr. NEWLANDS. No; I think it is contemplated that there should be a slope from the Connecticut Avenue bridge toward the west.

Mr. SMOOT. And toward the east?

Mr. NEWLANDS. And toward the east, and that the fill will run out about 500 feet to the west of Connecticut Avenue bridge. The whole valley is about 1,500 feet long.

Mr. SMOOT. That is about one-third of the distance.

Mr. NEWLANDS. About one-third of the whole distance.

Mr. SMOTT. Is it the idea, then, where that slope runs down dwellings will be put along by the road on the level of the valley?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I can not say as to that. The views of the landscape architect would control as to that. I will state that in all our development out there we have secured such men as Frederic L. Olmstead and other men of that character to give us their views regarding the most pleasing development of the property affected.

Mr. SMOOT. Your idea, then, is to put a drainage system to carry off the water that runs down that street into the valley?

Mr. NEWLANDS. That is it.

Mr. SMOOT. After the work is completed the valley, as far as its original beauty is concerned, as nature provided it, would be virtually destroyed.

Mr. NEWLANDS. No; I do not think so because this fill would only run to the west a distance of about 500 feet and leave about 1,000 feet of the valley unaffected. I mean that it could be so done. In conference I imagine that the conferees would be certain to have the views of the Senator from Nebraska and all parties interested there—the Senator lives in that neighborhood—as to what is the wisest and best course to pursue, but I submit it is time for the Government to act in some decisive way. Connecticut Avenue was given to it by the very company that wants to fill under it. The very bridge you have there was the gift I may say of this company. The very right of ways that it has through Klingle Valley was the grant of the proprietors of the soil. There was no interest in anybody except those proprietors apparent there, and yet their interests have not been considered at all with reference to the development of that region, and I think they have been very unjustly tied up. I do not mean that it has been intentional. Such delay seems inseparable from Government enterprise.

I wish to say further, as there is this misunderstanding in reference to the Chevy Chase enterprise, many people assume that these streets that have been developed along the line of Connecticut Avenue running east and west from that line have been developed by Government funds. I wish to say that so far as the lands of this company are concerned the street improvements have been made at their expense, and I know of little that has been contributed by the Government. The company might well insist that the large taxes it pays should be expended in large part at least in public improvements within its own boundaries, but this has not been the case.

Mr. BRADY. I should like to ask the Senator a question relative to the filling of the valley. I did not understand until the present moment that it was the intent to fill the valley the entire width there.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state right here that I think it is quite practicable to fill it in possibly only two-thirds across, and then have a short bridge with a big arch that would enable the people to pass through below in their accustomed way over this road. All those things can be considered in the committee of conference, and I have no doubt that plans will be presented there regarding the matter.

Mr. BRADY. If they fill up the full width of the valley, I understand the Senator to say that it would extend the fill about 500 feet both east and west.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. BRADY. Would that fill go up to Mr. Parmalee's property?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Oh, no. The aim would be to avoid an interference with Mr. Parmalee's property.

Mr. BRADY. Do you leave that valley open?

Mr. NEWLANDS. The roadway will continue as it is in front of Mr. Parmalee's property.

Mr. BRADY. If the whole valley is filled?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes; the fill of Connecticut Avenue will not reach Mr. Parmalee's property.

Mr. BRADY. I was under the impression that it would cover part of his property, and it would spoil the scenic beauty of it very much, indeed.

Just a word, Mr. President, relative to this amendment. It is of such vast importance that if the Senator insists on its adoption this afternoon I shall ask to have the amendment go over until to-morrow, to give us sufficient time to show the importance of the defeat of the measure.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I hope the Senator will not make a proposition to detain final action on the bill until to-morrow. We can dispose of it to-day. If this matter can be taken in conference we will give the Senator a hearing there regarding it. The bill is about ready to pass now, and I think that the Post Office appropriation bill will be ready for consideration to-morrow.

This is a matter that was up before, and it did not get into conference simply because we delayed the bill several days day after day. I think it would be decidedly ineffective to consider the matter longer before the Senate, but let us take it into conference. I have no objection to its going into conference.

Mr. BRADY. I think it entirely of too much importance to be permitted to go to conference without full discussion in the Senate. I am so thoroughly convinced along those lines that I believe it would be better for the District to pay $250,000 for the construction of that bridge, if it did cost that much, and $87,000 for this land, if that is the price to be paid, rather than to disfigure that part of the city where the Art Commission and the District Commissioners have for 10 years been endeavoring to get a proper entrance to the valley.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator I do not think there is any disposition to suppress any argument in regard to this proposition. We have been discussing it for about two hours, and if the Senator wants to discuss it, keep on at it, I have no objection, but do not take it over until to-morrow. Let us dispose of the bill to-day, even if you want to discuss it further.

Mr. BRADY. I do not wish to be misunderstood about my position relative to the bill. I am very much in favor of the first amendment. I can not quite agree with the Senator from Utah as to the value of the land. I think the statement of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] relative to that matter should be given consideration, for in appraising the land they have a certain system of doing so, based upon the taxes that they have been paying for 27 years. It seems to me that part of it can easily be decided by the commission that will condemn the land, and it would be much better for us to pay these property owners $87,000 and permit this improvement to go on, rather than to pass the second amendment and forever stop our prospects of securing a park in that beautiful valley.

It seems to me that what we should do is to send the bill to the conference committee with this amendment in it with instructions, and with the understanding that we are not going to recede from our position, and in that way we will get this park. After the park is secured I do not believe there will be very much trouble in having a compromise made as to the amount of fill that should be made. If we purchase the 8 acres from the private owners we would do away with the necessity of making any fill in order to increase the value of that property. On the other hand, if we should reject the first amendment and the conference committee should agree upon the second amendment, it for all time prevents our securing a park in that part of the city. For that reason I sincerely hope that the amendment will be rejected and that the conference committee will insist upon retaining the first amendment that we have just adopted.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I do not know anything about the merits of these two amendments. It would seem proper that the taking for the park should be adopted, but the two amendments would present to the conference a chance to settle this question definitely and for all time.

Now, what I want to call attention to is that the taxpayers have some rights. Take it or leave it. There is a lot of property here in the District of Columbia simply being held up in the air, so to speak. It is not taken. It is indicated possibly for park or some other public purpose and nothing is done through a long series of years.

Mr. President, I happen to know of an illustration that strikes me as one of the most remarkable cases of hardship under the government of this District that I have ever come across. Take the Patterson tract on New York Avenue extended across the terminal-station property. There is a tract of 80 acres. It is being assessed at a high rate. New York Avenue was laid off and condemned through it and assessed upon it. Undoubtedly that piece of property, which is mentioned from time to time and appears here in the District bill at every other session as to be condemned, is being assessed and taxed on the theory that the New York Avenue Bridge is coming to it. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the New York Avenue Bridge was built in 1908. It cost $440,000. It was a part of the terminal system. A river of railroad tracks pass under it. It has been there in the air ever since and neither approach to that bridge has ever been filled or graded, and it is absolutely of no use to the public because Congress does not make the necessary appropriation to make that bridge available for public uses. It is there in the air and has been there in the air since 1908.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. Why does not the Senator offer an amendment right now to this bill to do that very thing?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I just want to call attention to such a situation. It looks to me as though there was a settled policy on some one's part to hold that bridge up in the air and to tax these owners until they have got to take some small price for their valuable property for a park. Of course that may not be so. It may be just the drift of what is everybody's business and nobody's business. This bill has $20,000 in it to grade New York Avenue. The amount will not begin to fix that bridge and avenue situation. And there is that bridge all the time unused and costing in interest and deterioration every year since 1908 more than the small beginning amount this bill carries to cure the omission in so many years.

Mr. BRADY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. BRADY. Does the Senator not understand that we have already agreed to an appropriation to purchase this property?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I understand that.

Mr. BRADY. I am very much in favor of that. I am in favor of buying this property and paying $87,000 for it.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. It is intimated that it will not pass in conference, but will simply result in the continued suspension through another term of years.

Mr. BRADY. But if this other amendment is adopted it is settled forever.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. It settles it in one way or the other.

Mr. BRADY. I believe if our committee would insist upon holding in the bill the amendment we have adopted it would be retained there, and this matter would be settled, which ought to be done.

There is no question that the Senator from Nevada has made citizens of this District every proposition a man could make that was fair and equitable relative to that property, but they have not accepted it. I want to be understood now as realizing that he has never attempted to do anything in this matter that he did not believe was for the best interest of the community, as well as himself and his associates.

On the other hand, I do believe that the scenic beauty of that valley should be retained. I do believe that we are making a fatal mistake if we permit a fill to go in there at this time. If these two amendments go to conference, the conferees will throw out the first, likely, and agree to the second.

Now, $15,000 will not build a structure there that will leave enough ground for a road. It is just a start. It would take from $50,000 to $75,000 to fill it properly the way it ought to be done.

The way that valley should be improved is for the Government to buy these 8 acres, or whatever the amount is, and then agree with the people who own the adjoining property to fill that valley halfway across, if necessary. They could then leave the balance of the valley, so that you could drive through there very nicely; but if we put in this small appropriation now, it simply means to delay the matter for years to come, for they can never put a structure in there that can be approved by the Art Commission of the District, with the appropriation that we have, and they will have to come back here to get an additional appropriation.

Now, let us do business along business lines and follow business principles. Let us purchase this land, pay these owners what they ought to have, and what it is worth, and then at another time consider the matter of the improvement of Connecticut Avenue.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, the Senator is consistent. He wants to provide for taking the property and settle the question that way. If he proposes to insist upon the amendment of the Senate to that effect, of course, his position would be unassailable. But I am simply talking about a vacillating policy with reference to these large pieces of property, most of them very much larger and more valuable than in the particular instance under discussion, where there does seem to be the most uncertain attitude on the part of Congress and the District Commissioners with reference to what is going to be done.

It seems to me that this New York Avenue and bridge situation ought to have enough money appropriated to grade to that bridge and start that street across the $440,000 bridge structure which has been standing there idle in the air ever since 1908, and which, by the way, was improperly charged under the terminal construction against the stock of the State of Maryland in the Washington Branch of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. I happened to take part in the investigation made in the Legislature of Maryland into the affairs of the Washington Branch of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. I learned in that way at the time the bridge was built what it cost, and I have been more or less watching it with amazement through the years that have succeeded to see it standing there and never used by reason of the lack of appropriation to fill in the approaches. The cost is now half a million dollars or more, with accumulated interest and deterioration, that this bridge represents, and I must say, Mr. President, that I could not help thinking of it as an illustration in connection with the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, and of the necessity of adopting some settled and decisive policy with reference to the treatment of the various properties in the District of Columbia that have been indicated by their position or by artistic recommendation for condemnation for park purposes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the bridge that the Senator is talking about along New York Avenue, of course, has nothing to do with the question here, but it is a good illustration of the way business is sometimes transacted. I do not think that is any argument why we should do something here if the Senate agrees with my idea, and I think most of those who have seen the property do, that it would be considered very unwise.

The Senator from Nevada has made a very good statement of the case. I want to call attention to one or two things that he has referred to. He has called attention to the fact that he and his associates donated the land constituting Connecticut Avenue and that they constructed this bridge and one other bridge. Of course, it is to their praise, perhaps, that all that has been done, although I think it ought to be said that they probably were not moved entirely by philanthropic ideas when they did so. They have developed their property in Chevy Chase and away beyond. It has become a very beautiful and attractive residence section, and they have disposed of lots and lots and lots.

The Senator says that for this land they paid $5,000 an acre 27 years ago. I am not saying, because I am not an expert on values in the District, that that was not a fair price. I presume the Senator from Nevada, when this land was purchased, supposed it was fair, and his judgment on that would be much better than mine. Assume that it is fair, does it follow that to take the few acres that it is proposed to take from it would be the same as they paid for the whole tract? Here we have a tract of land in which I think he said there were 23 acres. It runs up over a hill very slightly. It is not exactly across the street from the entrance to the park, for some woman owns a little strip in there, but it is just beyond that; a beautiful piece of land. It runs down into this ravine at its north line. When it reaches the hill there is a slope of at least 45° on the average; sometimes more and sometimes less. That sidehill is wooded. That is the part that it is proposed in the amendment which we have adopted to buy from the Chevy Chase Land Co. That sidehill is not of any use, unless the timber is taken off. In that case it might be useful when there was snow in the winter as a place to slide down hill; but it is not fit to build on; it is the lowest land in value of any of the tract. So it does not follow, because the old tract had a certain value, that this is of an equal value. That, however, is a matter, Mr. President, about which I am not particularly concerned.

I should like the Government to buy that sidehill for a park, and pay for it what it is worth to the Government. I am willing that the amount should be left to be determined in the usual and legal way. But the Government is under no obligation to adopt this provision and to permit the filling of this ravine and thus spoil this beautiful park.

Senators argue here as though the Government was to blame because the Chevy Chase Land Co. happens to own a piece of property on a sidehill that is not valuable unless they can fill up that ravine. God made that ravine and the sidehill; the Government owns the road that runs through the bottom of the ravine, and I do not suppose the owners of this property could fill up that ravine without the consent of the Government on account of the public highway down there. If the Government wants to give its consent to have it filled up, that of course would be all right. It would be very profitable not only to the Chevy Chase Co. but to the people who own the land on the other side. I am not finding fault with them for wanting it filled up, but I am a little surprised that the man who has always been a leader in the movement for beautifying and decorating the city of Washington and its parks, as the Senator from Nevada has been, would want to mar the natural beauties, destroy the magnificent trees there, and fill up this beautiful ravine with a lot of unsightly dirt.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. Has this proposition had the approval of the Fine Arts Commission?

Mr. NORRIS. I think not; and the commissioners, as I understand, are opposed to it. I have not read the letter, which I understand is on file, but that, I think, will appear in the letter. I do not believe that the proposition will receive the approval of any disinterested person who will investigate it, though my judgment may be wrong.

I referred a while ago to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who lives in the vicinity. I asked him about it, and I found when he took the floor later that he agreed with me. I now see the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] here. He lives a little farther beyond that place than I do, and passes over it nearly every day. I should like to have him tell the Senate whether, in his judgment, this ravine ought to be filled.

Mr. LANE. The Senator desires me to tell the Senate what?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not care to have the Senator do so now, but I should like later to have the Senator state to the Senate whether the bridge across the ravine ought to be taken away, the ravine filled up, the scenery there destroyed, and the timber cut down.

Mr. LANE. Is it proposed to build a viaduct of earth in place of a bridge, and then have a roadway under that?

Mr. NORRIS. No; but to just fill it up; to dig off the top of the hill and to put it in the valley, so as to make it all level.

Mr. LANE. I do come up that roadway many times, and I enjoy the scenery and the beauty of it, more particularly in the hot weather of summer time. I know that entrance into the park, and I admire it. I think it is one of the most beautiful places in Washington. We have just such another gulch in my State, which we have turned into one of our city parks. We have done nothing there to mar the work of nature, not even cutting the trees or trimming the brush. A creek meanders through that park, as one does through this. They are both beautiful. That is the finest park we have. We have left conditions which are natural and unusually attractive. The park is used by countless hundreds of people, for the reason that it is not an artificial park. I should look upon this as the same.

Still I can see and realize the injustice it does to property owners alongside the cut through Connecticut Avenue, and can understand how it might wrong the property owners. An earth fill is more permanent and better than any bridge which can be built, as it will last for all time.

Mr. NORRIS. But the proposition is to fill it up.

Mr. LANE. If they fill it up, they will merely plug it at both ends, so that it will not be a park.

Mr. NORRIS. It will fill the whole valley.

Mr. LANE. If they fill the whole valley, that is still another question.

I was going to say that if they put a filled viaduct across it would not harm it much, and it would give them a chance to get rid of the surplus dirt, which is injuring part of their property to a considerable extent; so that injustice is being done them. If they filled it up in such a manner as to make it attractive, it would not be good for park purposes. It would then become residence property.

Mr. NORRIS. That is my understanding.

Mr. LANE. With a "jump-off" of perhaps 100 to 150 feet in depth, the people who wish to get into the park would have a hard time, although a graded roadway might be made to it.

So there are two sides to the question. In fairness to the property holders, I can realize that their equities should be considered. The land should be purchased on each side of that gulch so far back that it would not interfere. Then it would be the duty of the District to pay enough money to help them get their dirt elsewhere in order that they might utilize their property. That would call for still larger appropriations; and if you are going to continue it as a park, as ought to be done, the property owners should receive such compensation as they would be properly entitled to. I will vote for a proposition of that kind at any time.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Government is under no obligation to any property owners to haul their dirt away because there happens to be a hill there. I would be glad to give them an opportunity to put it somewhere else if it would not interfere with what I believe to be the beauty of the valley, which ought to be kept as it now is.

There is not any law, of course, that would prevent the owners of property, for instance, from taking the timber off of it if they desired to do so. They would have a right to do that, and nobody would complain.

Mr. LANE. At this time?

Mr. NORRIS. At this time. They have a right to cut the timber on whatever land they own, but that would ruin it, and, of course, it ought not to be done. The right thing to do, I believe—and, in my judgment, it is the only thing to do, and it is to the interests both of the property owners and of the Government—is to let the Government buy both sides of this gulch for park purposes.

I have had a good deal to say about what I thought the property was worth, and the Senator from Utah agreed with me, that it was not worth the value placed on it, but, of course, that is a matter as to which men's judgments will differ. We ought to pay what the property is worth; we ought to pay its value. Any method that will determine its fair value by men competent to judge I am willing to accept, whether their award agrees with my judgment or not.

Mr. LANE. There is one other equity involved, growing out of the condition of the cut along Connecticut Avenue, which leaves this property on both sides practically marooned from any use, either by the owners or anyone else. They ought to be allowed an equitable compensation for the expense to which they would be put in order to bring their property into suitable condition.

Mr. NORRIS. That has not anything to do with the question that is now pending here, as I understand.

Mr. LANE. It may not have; I am not familiar with that.

Mr. NORRIS. Congress has already passed a law to purchase one side of Connecticut Avenue as an addition to the Zoological Park. The property which is just beyond, on the west side of Connecticut Avenue opposite the entrance of the park, is owned by a lady who, as I understand, lives in Europe.

Mr. LANE. She may get submarined on her way home.

Mr. NORRIS. As to whether she ought to be given money to dig that hill away or not is a question on which we are not now passing. Personally I do not believe she ought to be compensated, but men may disagree as to that. However that may be, it does not have anything to do, as I look at it, with this proposition.

We have put into the bill a provision to buy this land. Certainly the appropriation provided is ample. The property ought to be bought for what it is worth, and we ought to be willing to pay what it is worth. Now, to put in another provision that is entirely inconsistent with it, with the understanding that it will stay in if the other goes out in conference, and with the idea of giving the conferees power to adjust the whole matter, is, to my mind, unjust. I am afraid, as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] has said, that when it comes back out of the conference it may be that the good amendment will be out and the other amendment left in on the theory that some Senators have advanced, that we ought to do something on the subject.

We are under no obligation to do anything, so far as that is concerned. Neither are the property owners. The rights of no one are being injured even though nothing should be done. They have the same rights as any other property owners, and the Government has the right to take any property it wants to, even by condemnation. I think we ought to take it, but nobody can charge injustice against us if we do not take it. We are not to blame that it is there or that anyone owns it; and, even though the proposition is rejected and nothing is done, while I think that would be poor policy from the standpoint of the Government, at the same time the property owners can not justly complain that we have not provided for the purchase of their land or that we have not made appropriations to conduct this stream under the embankment that we are going to permit them to erect in the public highway.

Now, one word more. It has been argued here by one Senator—I think the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS]—that possibly this fill at Connecticut Avenue would slope down east and slope down west. This entire gulch there is about 1,500 feet long, and if filled for 500 feet on each side there would be a slope down from the fill.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. NORRIS. If that is done, then we will certainly have gotten into a position, as it seems to me, a great deal worse than though we filled up the whole thing, because we will have left a hole at that end out of which there will be no way to get, except by climbing up a steep hill to the bridge or go out the other way by another steep hill. In other words, in the middle of this gulch you would put a hill and you would then have to go down on either side to get into a gulch, when now you can go along the bottom of it. I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LANE. I do not understand the Senator's statement about that gulch or ravine being only 1,500 feet wide from Woodley Road to the entrance of the park.

Mr. NORRIS. I say, from the statement of the Senator from Nevada, that I think that is the idea the Senator meant to convey.

Mr. LANE. It is more than 1,500 feet from the Woodley Road entrance to that gulch to the outlet to the park.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I think it is about 1,500 feet from Woodley Road down to the Connecticut Avenue bridge.

Mr. LANE. But not to the park?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Oh, no; to the Connecticut Avenue bridge.

Mr. NORRIS. That is, on an air line?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I think winding with the road.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator is only estimating it, is he not?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes; but I think that is approximately correct.

Mr. NORRIS. It is not very far from 1,500 feet. My own idea would be that it would be a little less than that, but it may be as much as 1,500 feet.

Mr. LANE. It is all of that, and more than that.

Mr. NORRIS. If we made a fill there 500 feet wide from the base of the present Connecticut Avenue bridge it would leave a thousand feet of gulch west of the bridge. There would be nothing but a hole with a steep grade in any direction you might go; and if you were at the other end and wanted to go into the valley you would have to go clear out and clear down again in order to get into it. It would spoil the entire thing. I would a great deal rather fill it up from one end to the other and let the houses and residences be built.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas. [Putting the question.] By the sound the ayes seem to have it.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

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

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent to-day on account of illness, and I am paired with him for to-day. Therefore I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE. I have a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], and therefore withhold my vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (when Mr. SAULSBURY's name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GALLINGER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], but I am privileged to vote on questions of this kind, and I vote "yea."

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. CHILTON. I have a pair with the Senator, which I transfer to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WALSH. I inquire if the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. WALSH. I have a pair with that Senator, and as he is absent I withhold my vote.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

I have been requested also to announce the following pairs:

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

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]; and

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. I notice he is not present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] and will let my vote stand.

The result was announced—yeas, 27, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Broussard	Hardwick	Phelan	Simmons
Bryan	Hitchcock	Pomerene	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Ransdell	Smith, S. C.
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Reed	Stone
Clark	Lewis	Robinson	Warren
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Williams
Gallinger	Overman	Shafroth	

NAYS—33.

Borah	James	Norris	Townsend
Brady	Kenyon	Page	Vardaman
Culberson	Kirby	Poindexter	Wadsworth
Cummins	La Follette	Sheppard	Watson
Curtis	Lane	Smith, Mich.	Weeks
Fernald	Lea, Tenn.	Smoot	Works
Gronna	McCumber	Sterling	
Hollis	Martine, N. J.	Sutherland	
Husting	Nelson	Thomas	

NOT VOTING—36.

Ashurst	Fall	Lodge	Sherman
Bankhead	Goff	McLean	Shields
Beckham	Gore	Myers	Smith, Ariz.
Brandegee	Harding	Newlands	Smith, Ga.
Catron	Hughes	O'Gorman	Swanson
Clapp	Johnson, S. Dak.	Oliver	Thompson
Colt	Jones	Owen	Tillman
Dillingham	Kern	Penrose	Underwood
du Pont	Lippitt	Pittman	Walsh.

So Mr. ROBINSON's amendment was rejected.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be designated as section 10, to come in at the end of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, to be known as section 10, as follows:

SEC. 10. That where any lot, parcel, or tract of land in the District of Columbia has been or may be assessed for general or special taxes, and the owner or other person having control over the same desires to sell, or has sold, a part of the same, or to subdivide, he or the purchaser may, upon application to the assessor of the District of Columbia, have a redistribution of such tax or assessment adjusted to the new subdivision or parcel. The assessor shall have full power to make such redistribution of such tax or assessment, having regard to the frontage of such property upon a public highway, the values of different sections of such land, and such other elements as in his judgment should be considered by him in making such redistribution; and such redistribution shall be as valid and effectual upon the various parts of the property in the same manner and to the same extent as if the tax or assessment had been laid originally thereon under the various laws appertaining thereto. No payment or failure to pay a tax or assessment upon any such part shall change or affect the liability of the other parts of such property for any tax or assessment so redistributed, provided all parties in interest request said assessment and agree to abide by the decision of the assessor.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. POMERENE. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. Since the assessment of the District of Columbia has been changed so as to make it biennial, does the Senator think the amendment is now necessary?

Mr. POMERENE. I was just about to explain the amendment. It was originally introduced as a bill by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] and was referred to a subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee, who favored its adoptiton. It is to meet this situation: We have been informed by lawyers and others here in the city that if I, for instance, owned a tract of land and sold a portion of it to the Senator from Utah, and I should refuse or neglect to pay the taxes on that portion which I still retained, the Senator from Utah could not pay his taxes, and the taxes would not be received at the Treasury Department, so he would be compelled to pay the taxes on the full tract or his land would become delinquent, as mine would be. The purpose of the amendment is to authorize any owner of any portion of land to go before the assessor and ask for a redistribution of the tax upon that land so that if, for instance, I were negligent in the payment of my tax the Senator from Utah could pay the tax upon his portion, and thus avoid the penalty for delinquency.

Mr. SMOOT. That is as I understood the amendment. I think that such a provision ought to have been in the law of the District of Columbia for some years past, particularly when we had an assessment once every third year. I believe that it would perhaps be a good thing to adopt the amendment now, even with biennial assessments, and I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I take it that the adoption of the amendment would not interfere in any way with the payment of the taxes on any portion of the land.

Mr. POMERENE. Not in the least.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Then, I will offer no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Ohio if he will kindly let that be numbered section 9?

Mr. POMERENE. I have no objection to that.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want the provision for the salary increase to go at the end of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the change will be made as suggested. The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I offer the following new amendment: On page 24, line 20, after the word "hereunder," I move to insert the matter which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 24, line 20, after the word "hereunder," the last word in the paragraph, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That motor vehicles, owned or operated by persons not legal residents of the District of Columbia, but who shall have complied with the laws of the State of their legal residence requiring the registration of motor vehicles or licensing of operators thereof and the display of identification or registration numbers on such vehicles, and which identification numbers shall be displayed on such motor vehicles as provided by the laws and regulations of the District of Columbia, while used or operated within the District, shall not be required to be licensed or registered or bear other identification numbers under the laws and regulations of the District, if the State in which the owner or operator of such motor vehicles has his legal residence extends the same privilege to the motor vehicles owned or operated by legal residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, a word of explanation of the amendment.

The pending bill provides a tax upon all motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, as follows: Five dollars for each vehicle of more than 24 horsepower, $3 for each vehicle of 24 horsepower or less, and $2 for each motorcycle or similar vehicle. It then proceeds to give a definition of the term "motor vehicle." This amendment provides, for instance, that if the State of Maryland charges a tax for a license upon a motor vehicle if Maryland autos come into the District they shall also pay a license to the District as long as there is not reciprocity between the District and the State of Maryland. This question was discussed in the Committee on Appropriations, but was not acted upon, and I reserved the right to offer this amendment on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. JONES. The Senator's remark might create a wrong impression. The matter was not voted upon in the committee. There was no amendment submitted to the committee, so that the question really was not passed upon.

Mr. SMOOT. The amendment was not voted on, because no amendment was offered. The Senator is right that there was no vote taken on it.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] directed a letter to the commissioner of motor vehicles at Baltimore, Md., asking what the Maryland law was, and if a resident of any State temporarily residing in the District of Columbia, and carrying a license from that State, was entitled to travel in Maryland without a Maryland license.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that the license of any State in the United States is good in the State of Maryland.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, I want the commissioner of motor vehicles to answer the question.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. There is no question about that. Any Member of this Senate who has a license from another State is entitled to go into the State of Maryland without paying any additional license fee.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, Mr. President, here is what the commissioner says——

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I have taken the trouble to investigate the matter, and I received a letter last June—probably I have it in my pocket—from the road commissioner of the State of Maryland to that effect, that the license of any State is accepted in the State of Maryland.

Mr. SMOOT. Providing there is not a District number or District license tag upon the auto.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. They have to carry something to indicate that they have that license. That is all that is necessary.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows this, does he not? For instance, I may have a Utah license tag upon my auto, and under this bill I have got to have a District license tag. If I go into the State of Maryland with a District license tag on my machine, I have got to have a Maryland license.

Mr. REED. Even though the Senator has a license from the State of Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. Even though I have a license from the State of Utah.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No; all you have to have is the Utah license.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah is entirely wrong about that.

Mr. SMOOT. Let us see what the commissioner says.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to read the letter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. SMOOT. This is not a letter written last June by some road supervisor of Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I want to say to the Senator that I not only have a letter, but I have a thorough statement in regard to the matter. I would not state upon the floor of the Senate anything that I did not think was correct, and I want to say to the Senator that I would not do anything that would lead the Senate to get a wrong impression from anything I might say.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not imputing to the Senator any such thought or idea. I have a letter here signed by Mr. E. Austin Baughman, commissioner of motor vehicles, 11 East Lexington Street, Baltimore, Md., dated February 5, 1917. The letter reads as follows:

Replying to your letter of the 2d instant, I beg to advise that an automobile from another State, if it is not being used for hire, and is properly licensed in its home State, need not be registered in Maryland if it is here temporarily for a period not exceeding three months. If the car in question, however, displays, a District of Columbia license, it is also necessary to have a Maryland license.

I am inclosing copy of our latest automobile law.

Very truly, yours,

E. AUSTIN BAUGHMAN,
Commissioner.

Now, Mr. President, I want to read the law.

Mr. ROBINSON. Read the law.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let us have the law.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in the laws of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland, chapter 687, act of 1916, I find, on page 6, a definition of the term "State." This is what it says:

The term "State" as used in the subtitle—

Now, notice—

except where otherwise expressly provided, and except in section 146, shall also include the Territories and Federal Districts of the United States.

Now I want to read section 146 of the law:

Any person or operator not a resident of this State who shall have complied with the laws of the State in which he resides, requiring the registration of motor vehicles or licensing of operators thereof, and the display of identification or registration numbers on such vehicles and who shall cause the identification number of such State, in accordance with the laws thereof and none other, together with the initial letter or letters of said State to be displayed on his motor vehicle as in this subtitle provided, while used or operated upon the public highways of this State, may use the highways of this State without obtaining a registration certificate or operator's license from the commissioner of motor vehicles as hereinbefore prescribed: *Provided*, The State of which he is a resident and the registration certificate of which he displays shall extend the same privilege to residents of this State: *Provided*, That if any nonresident be convicted of violating any provision of this subtitle he shall thereafter be subject to and required to comply with all the provisions of this subtitle relating to the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of operators thereof; and the governor of this State is hereby authorized and empowered to confer and advise with the proper officers and legislative bodies of other States of the Union and enter into reciprocal agreements under which the registration of motor vehicles owned by the residents of this State will be recognized by such other States, and he is further authorized and empowered from time to time to grant to residents of other States the privilege of using the roads of this State as in this section provided in return for similar privileges granted residents of this State by such other States.

The foregoing exemption of nonresidents shall not apply to operators of motor vehicles or motorcycles who are residents of States which do not require the display of identification markers on the same, nor shall it apply to nonresidents of this State who have temporary residences in this State for periods in excess of three months in any year, or to nonresidents engaged regularly in the transportation of passengers or freight for hire wholly or partly in this State.

Any nonresident operating a motor vehicle in this State contrary to the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of displaying a fictitious marker or operating without a license, and subject to the penalties prescribed elsewhere in this subtitle for such offenses in the case of residents.

Mr. President, that is section 146. It does not mention the District of Columbia in any way, shape, or form. The amendment that I offer——

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator let me interrupt him?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. There never has been any reciprocity between Maryland and the District of Columbia; there could not be, and there is no statement that there is.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, there ought to be reciprocity between Maryland and the District of Columbia as there is between Maryland and other States.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. But, on the other hand, the Senator goes away beyond the mark when he says that the citizen of Utah who happens to come through the District of Columbia and get a District of Columbia tag ceases to be a citizen of the State of Utah and ceases to get the benefit of the Maryland statute in favor of that State.

Mr. SMOOT. I never made any such statement.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. That is the inference from the statement the Senator makes, that because the citizen of Utah picks up a District license he has lost his status as a citizen of the State of Utah.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator claim that the commissioner makes a false statement in his letter?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. SMOOT. Wait just a moment. I am asking the junior Senator from Maryland a question.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I should simply say that the commissioner had misconstrued the law most egregiously.

Mr. SMOOT. I do know this, Mr. President——

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. JONES. I want to call the Senator's attention to the particular language here which says that they must have that tag and no other.

Mr. SMOOT. No other.

Mr. JONES. The law says that; so that if the Senator from Utah, having a Utah tag on his machine, got a license here in the District of Columbia and put a District of Columbia tag on it the State of Maryland would not recognize the Utah license.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The Senator will acknowledge that if a man has a license granted in another State, and gives evidence of that license by having a tag on his machine, he has a perfect right to go into the State of Maryland.

Mr. SMOOT. Not under the Maryland law. I will read the law again to the Senator. Not only that, Mr. President, but if he has a tag from his own State on his auto, and then he has a District tag upon it, he has to pay from $20 to $30 for a license in the State of Maryland.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I do not understand why the Senator chooses to confuse with the District of Columbia a plain provision of the Maryland law that is aimed at everybody who runs an automobile, namely, that you must not have a whole lot of numbers plastered over your machine. The necessity of having single numbers to deal with, for police purposes, is absolutely evident, and to have a confusion of numbers flashed before the eye of the officer is objectionable. There is no discrimination there against the District. You simply have to take off your extra tag to prevent confusion in the administration of the law.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, under the provisions of this bill every person operating an automobile in the District from now on, and in the past, too, has been compelled to get a District license; and as long as he is compelled to have the District license, of course he can not go into Maryland without paying for a license there. If I drove from Utah and temporarily came into the District of Columbia I would not have to have a license. I could go over to Maryland if I only had the Utah license on my machine. But if I am temporarily residing in the District of Columbia and have a Utah license upon the car I am also compelled to have the District license on it, and under those conditions I am compelled to pay a license in the State of Maryland.

Now, if there is going to be any reciprocity, why not have it between the District of Columbia and Maryland? That is all the amendment I have offered proposes.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I want to say that the State of Maryland has spent $25,000,000 in making good roads. So far as reciprocity is concerned, it is the intention of Maryland to have reciprocity with every State in the Union; but in one instance a gentleman told me that in Montgomery County, the county of my colleague [Mr. LEE], three-fourths of the use of that road is by the people of the District of Columbia. We are taxing our people from $750,000 to $1,000,000 a year in order to keep up those roads. Now, it is not fair that we should have reciprocity with the District of Columbia when the District of Columbia have nothing to offer to us except the right to go through the streets of their city when we come from the State of Maryland to do business with them. It is unfair to ask us to keep up roads at a large expense, amounting this year to $800,000, and allow the people of the District of Columbia to use those roads without compensation. On the other hand, the District of Columbia offers nothing to the State of Maryland in the way of reciprocity in the use of roads.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator and I disagree upon that point. When I drive through the Washington parks on a Sunday afternoon, or any other day, but particularly on Sunday, I find Maryland citizens enjoying an auto ride over the roads of the parks, and upon every single day of the week Maryland people come into the District of Columbia to do business with the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. They have a Maryland tag on their machine, then.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; that may be; but have they got a District tag on their machine?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Yes; they have a District tag.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but they do not pay an annual license for it.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We do, sir.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Every Maryland machine has to have a District license to run in the District.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, well, they got it how many years ago?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. But under the present law we are to be taxed every year, and in a greater proportion than the amount we pay is as compared to the amount that you pay in Maryland.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what the Senator says, but I do not think there is any comparison in the amounts paid.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We pay $5 a year. That is the law—$5 a year—and our license fee is from $10, I think, up to $25.

Mr. SMOOT. The District license is not paid yearly. The Maryland license is more than $25 in many cases.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. How much did the Senator pay?

Mr. REED. I understand it is $15 for a Ford. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know what the charge is for a Ford.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The average is not $20, so far as that is concerned. The license we pay here is $5, and I am sure that the roads of our State are used ten times as much as the Marylanders use the roads of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMOOT. That, of course, I doubt very much, Mr. President. On Sunday there are a good many automobiles that go into Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. And every other day.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, not so very many.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Yes, sir; a great many of them.

Mr. SMOOT. Not many.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will give the name of the gentleman to whom I refer. I do not suppose he has any objection to my stating it. Judge Peter, of Rockville, told me that three-fourths of the usage of that road in Montgomery County, from here to Baltimore, was by people residing in the District of Columbia.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. He has taken a great deal of notice of it, and I think his statement would be accurate.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I am making no statement here that is not accurate.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I did not say the Senator did; but I stated that Judge Peter's statement was accurate, in my judgment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, some Senator said, in effect, that he challenged the letter read by the Senator from Utah; that it was a misinterpretation of the law. It may be; but it does not compare with the misinterpretation of the law, if the Senator is correct, which is put upon it by the constables who hang around the edges of the District to grab the unwary who happen to cross the line.

I know of an instance where a man had a Missouri license; he was a resident of Missouri, but he was in the District of Columbia; and he also had a District of Columbia license on his car. They arrested him, although he had his Missouri license. You are put to the difficulty of satisfying the local constable that your State has reciprocity with Maryland, in the first instance; and then, as I understand their construction—the constable law, if you please—if you happen to have a District license that bars you from the privilege which otherwise would be conferred by your State license.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Does the Senator mean to say that if a man has a State license, by virtue of the fact of having a District license the State license is not good?

Mr. REED. I say that that is the construction that the constable puts upon it.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is not the case.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, that is exactly what the law says.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not think the law states that.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President——

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

Mr. REED. Let me conclude what I was saying.

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator. Then I want to read the law.

Mr. REED. The junior Senator from Maryland stated, in substance, that that was the rule; but he gave as a reason that the existence of so many license tags might confuse.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I did not state that. The Senator misunderstood me.

Mr. REED. I say, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] said that.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Pardon me; I understand that. I did not mean to say that there was any confusion of the two licenses, but I do say that if a man's tag is properly applied, it does not matter whether he has a District license or not; if he has a license of another State on his automobile, he is entitled to the privileges of the roads of Maryland.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not understand the law, then, nor the enforcement of the law; and I want to read it.

Mr. REED. The junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] made that statement.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If there are two tags of the same kind——

Mr. REED. The junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] stated, in effect, that there was such a rule, namely, a rule whereby a man having a State license and a District license would be barred from the benefit of the State license, because the existence of so many tags on the car might confuse the officer. Now, of course there is nothing in that. The constable can always stop a machine, and he can always ascertain whether there is, in good faith, a Maryland license; and under the Maryland law you have to have them both in front and behind.

The fact is, now, regardless of what the law may be when strictly construed, that the construction that has been given to this law by the constables and justices of the peace who immediately environ the city of Washington—the constable lying in wait always far enough back of the line so that you have violated the law if you go into the State, never at the line to warn you back—the construction they have put upon the law has been that if you have no Maryland license, although you have a State license, you have frequently been haled up and fined; but that where you have a State license and a District license you are thereby barred from the benefits of your State license. Now, I question whether that is the law of Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is not the law.

Mr. REED. But that is the construction that is put upon it.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the law of Maryland.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. In just a moment.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri if, by any chance, the citizen of Missouri to whom he referred happened to be a Senator? [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. The one that I spoke of was not.

Mr. SMOOT. This is what the law says:

> Any person or operator not a resident of this State who shall have complied with the laws of the State in which he resides requiring the registration of motor vehicles or licensing of operators thereof and the display of identification or registration numbers on such vehicles, and who shall cause the identification number of such State, in accordance with the laws thereof, *and none other*——

Mr. LEE of Maryland. There is nothing about the District of Columbia in that, is there?

Mr. SMOOT. Why, no.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly not.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course there is not, and that is what I want to call attention to—that the only way a car can go into the State of Maryland is by carrying one State license, and no other.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the junior Senator from Maryland if that is not correct?

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

Mr. SMOOT. In just a moment; just as soon as I get an answer.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I wish the Senator from Utah would listen to the Senator from Delaware, because he has had an experience which will disprove what is stated by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Perhaps the Senator may have had an experience of one kind, while some of us have had different experiences.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Well, let the Senator from Delaware state his experience.

Mr. SMOOT. The senior Senator from Maryland and the junior Senator from Maryland do not agree as to what the law of Maryland is, and I agree with the commissioner.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not know whether the Senator has a right to make that statement or not.

Mr. SMOOT. This is what the commissioner says:

> If the car in question, however, displays a District of Columbia license, it is also necessary to have a Maryland license.

There is not any question about the law. It specifically states so.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. Wait a moment. If a citizen of the District of Columbia has a license for the District of Columbia, he is not entitled to go into Maryland. The District of Columbia is not treated like all of the States are treated.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. And the Maryland law specifically eliminates the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, we do not profess to have reciprocity with the District of Columbia, because there is no reciprocity between the District of Columbia and Maryland. Maryland has spent $25,000,000, as I previously said, in building roads. She is to-day taxing her people in the State of Maryland about $800,000 a year to keep up these roads. It is unfair, when we tax our people to this extent, for the people of the District of Columbia, who can not give us reciprocity, to expect us to keep up those roads for them to use and to destroy. As I said just now, Judge Peter, of Montgomery County, told me that three-fourths of the usage of the roads of Montgomery County was by the people of the District of Columbia; and it is unfair to ask us to keep up these roads and not tax the people of the District of Columbia as we tax our own people.

In regard to the District of Columbia, they charge a tax of $5, which, I think, is more than proportionate to the amount of roads we use in the District of Columbia, which we pay yearly, according to the tax. We pay their tax, and we ask them to pay ours.

Mr. SMOOT. I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I thought possibly I might throw a little water on the fire that seems to be getting up on this subject by relating the experience I have had, which extends now for the four years past.

In the summer time I go into Maryland every day, because I usually live out toward Chevy Chase. During the whole year I go from here to my home in Delaware, and I suppose I have traveled ten or twenty thousand miles on the Maryland roads.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have been waiting now for half an hour to make this statement.

Mr. THOMAS. I was simply going to ask how the Senator could keep out of Maryland if there was high tide in his State. [Laughter.]

Mr. SAULSBURY. The question of tide seems to have troubled a good many minds, but it does not trouble those in our State. The land under water at high tide we catch very good terrapin on, when the water is low, which you all enjoy so much. But now we will get away from the question of tide. I have never been questioned, having both a Delaware and a District of Columbia tag on that machine. In the last four years I have been warned several times by the——

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator say that he has not a Maryland license?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have not a Maryland license. I have a Delaware license.

Mr. SMOOT. I can not cross the line from Chevy Chase Circle into Maryland without being arrested, if I were without a Maryland license.

Mr. SAULSBURY. They may not like the Senator's looks.

Mr. SMOOT. That may be true.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have never had the slightest trouble about it, and during the summer time for months I have used the roads of Maryland with absolute reciprocity. The Senator misconstrues what I said. There is absolute reciprocity between Maryland and every other State in the Union. There may not be between Maryland and the District of Columbia, and a license in the District of Columbia costs very little in comparison to a State license.

Mr. SMOOT. If a man has a State license, he can go into Maryland, and if in connection with the State license he has upon his car a District license tag, then he is arrested.

Mr. SAULSBURY. That is exactly what I have done for four years. The Senator misunderstood me.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator escaped because he was a United States Senator. He is the only person I ever heard of being so favored.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have just heard from another Senator the same.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Here is another Senator who has not had that same experience. A Maryland constable has $5 of mine now. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. There is not a Senator who does not know that he can take his automobile and pass through Virginia and never be disturbed if he has a District license, no matter whether he has a Virginia license or not; and it is also known that with the exception of the Senator from Delaware, and probably one other, as he says, they can not go into Maryland without a Maryland license unless they are arrested.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

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

Mr. JONES. Right in connection with that I want to say a Member of the House has told me that he had an experience like this: That he had the tag of his State and he got the District of Columbia tag and went over into Maryland, and he had such an experience there as compelled him to come back and take off the District of Columbia tag and put it away, so as to have nothing but the State tag.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I want to say in regard to the State of Virginia——

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will just withhold for a moment, I will be through, because I do not want to take any further time.

Mr. President, there is not a Senator present who does not know that there has been a regular business on the part of certain officials in Maryland to hold up and arrest people of the District of Columbia who happen to pass over the District line. That is understood by everybody, and particularly on Sundays, when they are stationed at every place where a road leads into Maryland from the District of Columbia, and they hide behind trees until you pass and give no warning not to cross the line. I do not know why it should be. I think whatever is right in this matter ought to prevail. The amendment I have offered to the bill will make reciprocity between the District of Columbia and Maryland, and I think that ought to be done.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Of course whatever is right ought to prevail, and I assume the Senator from Utah thinks that other Senators feel the same way. I contend that reciprocity with the District of Columbia is not right. I do not mean to say that the officers of the law in our State have always done what they should have done; I suspect they have violated the law; but I do say that the people of the State of Maryland do not feel that they ought to be taxed to build roads and keep them up at a heavy expense of from $800,000 to $1,000,000 a year and that the District of Columbia, which can not give reciprocity, should be exempted from paying a proportion of that tax. We tax ourselves and we propose to pay the District of Columbia what their tax is, but it certainly should not be expected of us that we should give them the same right and privilege that we give the States that have roads through the States.

I wish to say in regard to Virginia—I am not sure of what I say, but I have been told that they have two periods in which you can use the roads of Virginia of a week each. I got that from a gentleman who has been there. If you stay there longer than that you have to procure a local license. Without meaning to reflect upon the roads of Virginia, they have not spent money for roads in Virginia as we have done in Maryland, and the people of the District of Columbia do not go there to use those roads. Besides that, they have heavy tolls. A gentleman told me that he was in Virginia three or four days and the tolls amounted to from $13 to $14.

In our State we have bought up the roads that had tolls in order that we might get rid of tolls, and we have no such tax as that upon the people who travel in our State. I say it would be absolutely wrong. The Senator from Utah says he wants to do right. We all want to do right, but I do not think it is right that we should tax ourselves to build roads and they should be used by the people of the District of Columbia, who can not give us reciprocity.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator recognizes the fact, does he not, that the people of the District of Columbia are taxed to build roads and the Maryland people use the roads?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Not in Maryland.

Mr. SMOOT. Not in Maryland, but in the District.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. But the use of roads in the District of Columbia by the people of Maryland amounts to little when compared with the use of roads in Maryland by people from the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the proposition seems to be that the people of the District of Columbia ought to pay for the Maryland roads. I can not understand why that should be the case at all.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator will pardon me, that is not my idea about it.

Mr. LODGE. I summed it up briefly.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We ourselves pay something for the use of the Maryland roads.

Mr. LODGE. We pay an unusually high license to have the use of Maryland roads.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is only what we pay ourselves.

Mr. LODGE. New England has unusually good roads; the States there have spent enormous sums of money. It costs us a good deal more than $800,000 to keep our mileage in Massachusetts in repair. In the summer New England is filled with people from other States who use the roads. Quantities of automobiles are there. Massachusetts draws no line on the District of Columbia. We interfere with no State and we do not interfere with the District of Columbia. We do not expect to have other people pay for our roads. I do not think any State does except Maryland, as far as I know.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator will pardon me, the State of Massachusetts is not situated as the State of Maryland is in regard to the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE. That is perfectly true.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. There probably would not be a hundred people in the District of Columbia who would use the roads in Massachusetts, but they use our roads every day and use a part of them a great deal more than the people of Maryland themselves use them.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think it ought to be reciprocal. If Maryland is going to charge a high license to everybody in the District of Columbia who crosses the line—personally I have never been interfered with, but I know of such cases where there were posted men around the Chevy Chase Club and they grabbed them one after another as they came out and fined them, and it is only a little over the border—if Maryland is going to do that I think the District ought to put an equal tax on every Maryland automobile that comes into the District.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Does the Senator understand that it is reciprocal in that the District automobile owner gets a license when he goes to Maryland and the Maryland automobile owner when he comes to the District gets a license?

Mr. LODGE. I understand that it is reciprocal. I would put on the same tax they levy on us.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. That would not be reciprocity.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely, it is reciprocal; but to charge $40 in Maryland and $10 in the District of Columbia is not reciprocal.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We do not charge $40——

Mr. LODGE. On some the charge is $30.

Mr. SMOOT. I know they charge $30.

Mr. LODGE. I know they charge $30, and I was told that they charge $40. The charge on the motor I happen to have is exactly double what is charged in Massachusetts.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. They charge the same price——

Mr. LODGE. I am not quarreling with that. You have a right to charge anything you choose.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No State has better roads.

Mr. LODGE. There should be the same charge on Maryland people as on District people.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It costs money to build the roads; it costs money to keep them up; and we tax ourselves for it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I am going to wait until I get the floor in my own right. The vehemence of the attack has been so great that the defense has hardly a chance to utter a word.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator from Massachusetts will allow me, I wish to give the law with reference to charges in Maryland:

Class A. Fifty cents per horsepower or fraction thereof in the case of all motor vehicles having pneumatic tires, with a minimum charge of $5 for any motor vehicle.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me that it should be adjusted in this way. The streets of Washington cost a great deal of money. The parkways of Washington cost a great deal of money. It is paid exclusively by the inhabitants of the District and by the Government. The charge for a motor license in the District is very moderate. That is for them to settle, of course. But Maryland has undertaken, in my judgment, to squeeze the people of the District and make them pay out of all proportion. What I would like to see would be precisely the same charge placed on a Maryland motor when you enter the District as is placed on the District motors in Maryland, and vice versa. They should place the same on us if they insist on having it, but if a man has a motor license on his car, whether he has a State license or not, he is likely to get into trouble when he goes into Maryland. I think it ought to be put on an equality. It has become an intolerable annoyance. There is no such annoyance from Virginia, but I do not suppose they go there quite as much. It has become an annoyance, and I think a very unjust one. I hope something will be done to equalize it and put them both on the same level, that is all.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I am very sorry the Senator from Massachusetts is annoyed.

Mr. LODGE. I said explicitly I personally had never been annoyed.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The Senator said it was an annoyance.

Mr. LODGE. It is an annoyance; a public annoyance. I am not speaking of myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I only wanted to object to being misquoted. I said specifically that I personally had never been annoyed. I say it is a public annoyance, a public nuisance, and it is a very small way to squeeze the people of the District.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, this question has been pending for some years. On one occasion I happened to meet the then senior Senator from Delaware, Mr. Bayard, on the train. He said he was going to make a visit to the coast of Massachusetts—Nahant was the end of his pilgrimage. He said he never went up there along that coast and through Boston and saw the magnificent villas and display of wealth that Massachusetts gives to the eyes of the relatively impoverished from other States that he did not realize with what injustice the tariff laws had been operating through so many years, how tremendously they had operated to shake all the plums into one end of the pudding, and the New England end of it had gotten the plums.

Mr. President, in our way we have been struggling in Maryland to build up a road system and we have some of the best roads in the United States. We have had a great many practical difficulties in building that road system, but we have managed to do it and managed to keep it up. Every cent of this license business goes to the maintenance of the road service in Maryland, and the maintenance is more important than construction.

Our situation with reference to the District of Columbia is rather a peculiar one. Here is the District of Columbia like three-quarters of a postage stamp stuck right into our State, 350,000 people in a city topographically within Maryland, and it is impossible to treat that city within Maryland in any other way than we treat our own people.

The District of Columbia population is, generally speaking, a wealthy and well-to-do population. As my colleague has just said, they use the Maryland roads to a great extent. It has been impossible to establish a relationship and reciprocity between two-thirds of 10 miles square and a whole State, the two-thirds of the 10 miles square being a city of 350,000 population stuck right into our State.

There have been other difficulties besides the physical one. The District of Columbia up to date has had no license tax of an annual nature. How could we reciprocate with people who pay a tax of four or five dollars and get a perpetual license for the life of a car when our people pay $20 a year and more for a license for a car annually? Reciprocity under those circumstances would be utterly ridiculous and absolutely impracticable.

But the real thing that we are asking is not that other people build our roads, as the Senator from Massachusetts in effect suggested, with perhaps somewhat of the unconscious insolence of conscious sectional wealth, but we are asking that other people contribute a part at least of what is due in proportion to their uses of our roads. Our roads are run out by miles and hundreds of miles, compared with the relatively short mileage and limited area of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to ask the Senator if he is going to return to the tariff argument? If he is, I want to be present. Otherwise, I am going out for a little while.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I just repeated the statement of the late Mr. Bayard, who was a philosopher, and commented upon the relative splendor and magnificence of Massachusetts.

Mr. GALLINGER. I believe he was a rather rich man himself, was he not?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I do not think so.

Mr. President, this thing has been agitated for some years. Every human being naturally wants to use something that he does not have to pay for. It has been an irresistible temptation to some people here in the District of Columbia, paying an average charge of a dollar a year for the license of their machines, to go out into Maryland on the dollar that they have paid the District and have the same privileges that a citizen of Maryland has for $20, that he has to pay annually. Mr. President, that, as reciprocity, is an utterly absurd proposition. I want to suggest that is a very easy thing for city people to ride out in the country and say, "Why do not these farmers have better roads?" It is a very easy thing for a gentleman riding along in a rich, commodious, and easy-going automobile to look out upon the acres the farmer tills and the muddy roads he has to use and say, "Why do not these people have better roads?" But it is going a long way farther for gentlemen with big automobiles to come out and say, "We will use these roads just as much as we please and we will not pay anything for the use of them."

Mr. President, an illustration has been used in comparing Maryland with Virginia. I am sorry to say that if a man goes into Virginia he will not find very many good roads; but the very minute Virginia undertakes to tackle this road question with the same resolution and practical industry that we have in Maryland the Virginia people will have to make their charges just the same there against those who use and wear their roads in large numbers and through long spaces of time. In Maryland we only ask the District of Columbia people to pay for what they use as much or more than we on the same annual basis for maintenance that we pay. They have had to bear none of the high taxes we pay for the original building of the roads.

There has been a good deal of confusion thrown into this debate by the Senator from Utah on this subject as to having a number of tags on a car. Mr. President, the police requirement of the State of Maryland that an automobile should only come into the State with one tag on is a reasonable requirement. If a man comes in from Delaware or Pennsylvania, he must have a Delaware or a Pennsylvania tag on his car. If he has one more tag or two more tags and kills somebody, how can the constable tell where the murderer came from? In such a case the constable would have to look up the license lists and go through the numbers of two or three State automobile license systems to come to a conclusion and endeavor to catch the criminal.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator——

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The Senator knows that every tag on the back of an automobile is usually covered with dust or a certain amount of mud, so that differentiation in color is of very little use to the constabulary.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator mentioned the fact that the laws of Maryland required nonresidents to have but one tag. There is such a law, is there?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Yes; as to an automobile coming into the State. The provision of the Maryland law has been read by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. NORRIS. I was not in when the amendment was offered. I desire to ask the Senator another question. Suppose, for instance, the Senator from Utah goes into Maryland with a Utah tag on his automobile and also a District tag?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Then he would have offended against that statute.

Mr. NORRIS. How, if he went in there with only a Utah tag on his automobile?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. He would be all right.

Mr. NORRIS. He would be all right?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Yes, sir.

Mr. NORRIS. No matter how long he might be in the District and how often he might go into Maryland?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Precisely.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator, then, if that car had also a District tag on it when it went to Maryland, would not the driver of the car have to stop at the line and take the District tag off?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. For illustration, suppose a gentleman from another State stays in Massachusetts for a longer time than the Massachusetts laws of reciprocity allow and he gets a Massachusetts tag; then he goes to New York and stays there longer than their reciprocity laws allow, and he gets a New York tag; then he goes to Pennsylvania and stays there more than three weeks, or whatever the reciprocity period is, and gets a Pennsylvania tag; and finally he runs over into the Maryland line with three tags on his machine. That is what our law is aimed at. We simply want the gentleman to come into our State under one flag and not under two flags. Let us know where you come from. That is all we ask; but do not come into the State saying you come from here or you come from there if you come from some other place. There is a great deal of necessity under modern police conditions for regulating and observing automobile traffic.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland another question for information.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to conclude the question I desire to ask?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am a little bit troubled about this. I go into Maryland very little——

Mr. LEE of Maryland. We will be glad to have the Senator come as often as he likes.

Mr. GALLINGER. But I have a couple of grandchildren at school in Maryland, whom I should like to visit. Now I have a New Hampshire tag on my car, but I can not get to the Maryland line without having a District of Columbia tag on my car also. Must I stop at the line and take the District tag off, so as to have but one tag on my car in Maryland? I am asking the question for information.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I am very glad the Senator has asked me that question, because it would take him a very little while when he gets to the District line to take one tag off. Then there would be no complexity about it. The New Hampshire tag would be good in Maryland. There is no occasion for using two tags, except to confuse the numbers, and it is a very small thing to ask the Senator to take off his New Hampshire tag. He is nowhere near New Hampshire, so what is the occasion for using the New Hampshire tag?

Mr. GALLINGER. There is occasion for using it, because certain States recognize it.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. If you are going into another State, then put it on.

Mr. SMOOT. Is it not true that if the New Hampshire license tag was taken off and the District license tag was put on he could not go into Maryland then unless he paid the Maryland license?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield to me for another question?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I am asking my question entirely for information. I have a good deal of sympathy, I want to say from what I have heard of the argument, for the position the two Maryland Senators have taken. It seems to me that the District of Columbia, occupying the position it does, with such a large population and such a small area, and Maryland having the beautiful roads that she has, it is not unfair that she should be compensated in some way for the very large use the people of the District make of the Maryland roads; but I want to ask the Senator this question: Suppose the Senator from Utah, for instance, being here during the sessions of Congress—and that means most of the time—has a Utah tag on his car in the District. Is there anything in the law here that will protect him or would he be required to get a District license and put a District tag on his car?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I presume that after being here a certain length of time he would have to get a license. I do not know how long the reciprocity period is between Utah and the District of Columbia. Ordinarily the reciprocity period between States is for a period of a month or three weeks.

Mr. NORRIS. How long is it in Maryland?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. About three weeks, if I remember correctly, or a month.

Mr. NORRIS. That is, he could stay in the State that long with his car, but if he went out and came back again, would it count from the time he came in again?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. It is practically unlimited, because it is impossible to spot a man when he goes out and when he comes in. That is why such an arrangement between Maryland and the District can not be worked. If we gave the District a three weeks' reciprocity period, we would never find the time when that period was ended, so far as a District car was concerned.

Mr. NORRIS. The idea that impressed me, however, was this: If Maryland is giving other States the proper reciprocity, as I understand the Senator to claim she is, in case of some one, like a Member of Congress or a Cabinet officer, from some State, residing in the District during the sessions of Congress, if the laws of the District make it necessary for him to get a District tag, then in order to comply with the law of the District, he would in reality offend against the laws of Maryland if he crossed the line. So there is a sort of discrepancy there.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. If he carries two tags over the District line.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; in other words, in the little territory of the District he would be required to have two tags, and when he crossed the line into Maryland he would not dare to have but one. If we could have a law that would harmonize that discrepancy, it seems to me, it would be very desirable.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the argument on which the junior Senator from Maryland seems to rely more than anything else is, it seems to me, contrary to the actual requirement of the Maryland law. He says the purpose is to keep a number of tags off the machine to prevent that practice. The Maryland law requires two tags on an automobile coming from the District of Columbia. There must be two tags—a District of Columbia tag and a Maryland tag. So that I do not see very much force in that argument. The amendment proposed, if carried out, would meet that situation.

Mr. NORRIS. What does the amendment that is now pending purport to do?

Mr. JONES. As I remember the amendment, it provides that any person who is not a legal resident of the District of Columbia in bringing an automobile in here shall pay the license charge fixed for motor vehicles of legal residents of the District of Columbia if the State from which he comes or in which he has his legal residence does not recognize the District of Columbia license tax.

Mr. NORRIS. Then it would not apply to residents of the District at all, and would have no application to them?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Not in the slightest.

Mr. JONES. Except that it is hoped that it would work out reciprocity between Maryland and the District of Columbia.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand, then—and I want to get a right understanding of it—it would only apply to people in the District who are legal residents outside of the District. Is that right? In other words, it only applies to nonresidents of the District who are in the District.

Mr. JONES. I suggest that the amendment be again read. That will be the best way to determine the matter.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, before we go any further I claim——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. JONES. I do not yield just now.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I claim that this is general legislation, and I make the point of order against it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, it certainly is in order with reference to the provision of the bill as it came here from the House. The House provision might have been subject to a point of order in the House, but it is not subject to a point of order here, and any amendment that is germane to that proposed legislation is in order. I, of course, recognize that the Senator from Maryland has the right to interrupt me to make a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is not familiar with the proposal to which this is an amendment, and would

like to have the amendment returned to the Secretary's desk, so that it may be read. The Secretary will first state the proposed amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 24, after the word "hereunder," in line 20, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That motor vehicles, owned or operated by persons not legal residents of the District of Columbia, but who shall have complied with the laws of the State of their legal residence requiring the registration of motor vehicles or licensing of operators thereof and the display of identification or registration numbers on such vehicles, and which identification number shall be displayed on such motor vehicles as provided by the laws and regulations of the District of Columbia while used or operated within the District, shall not be required to be licensed or registered or bear other identification numbers, under the laws and regulations of the District, if the State in which the owner or operator of such motor vehicle has his legal residence extends the same privilege to the motor vehicles owned or operated by legal residents of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is clearly of the opinion——

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will hear the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The provision in the bill to which this is an amendment is the House text, and not the Senate text. This is absolutely new legislation. Whilst there was some provision in the House text regarding this matter, the amendment is not applicable in this case.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not hold that the Senate has not the right to amend the House text?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair is compelled to overrule the point of order made by the Senator from Maryland, as the proposition is an amendment to language on a cognate subject in the bill.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington still has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, just a moment. We really have been rather resenting the aspersions cast upon our State in this matter of licenses more than we have been debating the amendment of the Senator from Utah. The amendment of the Senator from Utah simply has two effects. It does not affect the Maryland people in the slightest, as I read it. It has no effect on us at all. We simply come into the District and get a license, as we always have done and probably always will do; but it has this effect: It excuses the Senator from Utah from paying license on his car in the District of Columbia and excuses every other Senator in this body from paying a license on his car in the District of Columbia. That is rather a small procedure. I think, gentlemen, you ought to pay licenses.

There is another thing the amendment does that is bad, and that other thing is that the name of the owner of the car is not registered in the District of Columbia, no matter how long the owner of the car may be here during the year with the license of a distant State. I think it is bad policy from a police standpoint not to have the operator or owner of a car register his name and be accessible to the police by registering his name when he comes into the District of Columbia. I think it is a very bad proposition to admit anyone here from a distant State, with the license tag of that State on his car, with liberty to operate as long as he likes in the District, without making any police report or having any police surveillance.

Mr. NORRIS. With the permission of the Senator from Washington, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland another question.

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Maryland says it would only relieve the Senator from Utah and other Senators from procuring licenses in the District?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. That is about what it amounts to.

Mr. NORRIS. That would depend altogether, as I understood the reading of the amendment, as to whether the State of Utah or any State from which a Senator might come, and of which he was a legal resident, had a law that extended the same privilege to the citizens of Utah.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. There are very few of them that do not have such laws.

Mr. SMOOT. The State of Maryland does not.

Mr. NORRIS. There is not any State that I know of—I am not familiar with the laws of many of the States in this particular—that extends to nonresidents of the State the right to remain in the State as long as the citizens of the various States have to stay here in Washington if they are attending Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator from Nebraska——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. That does not apply to Utah to any extent. The only exception in the entire United States is Maryland, and there they discriminate against the District of Columbia, and this amendment simply seeks to remedy that.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, I do not understand the amendment. I do not see how it does that.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will further indulge me——

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. This amendment does not remedy that at all. A Senator can not come into our State with an automobile without a license. I may prophesy that he is not going to come into that State without a license and without paying for it; and for that reason he sees fit to introduce an amendment here that excuses him from getting a license from the District of Columbia. That does not hurt us any.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not the amendment.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. That is what the amendment means; it does not mean anything else; and it has the further evil effect of not requiring a foreign car, running under a foreign name and number, from reporting to the police and having the name of the owner at least set down on the records of the police jurisdiction.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the Senate committee amendment simply follows the Maryland law. It is designed to secure reciprocity. The operations of the Maryland law to secure reciprocity in the State of Maryland and in the other States of the Union is almost word for word with this amendment. The sole purpose of this amendment is to secure, if possible, reciprocity between the District of Columbia and the State of Maryland, or any other State, for that matter that does not recognize a District license or tag.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. How does it secure reciprocity?

Mr. JONES. It secures reciprocity exactly in the same way that the law of the State of Maryland secures reciprocity; that is all.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. We do not secure reciprocity.

Mr. JONES. If you do not, then this will not secure it.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly not.

Mr. JONES. But you secure it with the State of the Union?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. That is just what I say. You do not secure reciprocity, but you simply dodge a legal tax.

Mr. JONES. No, Mr. President.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems to me, as I heard the amendment read, that it does not apply to residents in the District at all; it applies only to nonresidents. Is not that true? I may be mistaken.

Mr. JONES. That is true.

Mr. NORRIS. Then how does it affect a man who is a permanent resident of the District of Columbia?

Mr. JONES. It does not affect him unless the State of Maryland will reciprocate, because their citizens must pay the tax in the District of Columbia, and their citizens would not have to pay the tax in the District if they would recognize the citizens of the District of Columbia in their State. That is the way it helps the people of the District.

Mr. NORRIS. If the provisions of this amendment do not apply to residents of the District of Columbia, I do not myself see how they will be affected.

Mr. JONES. It applies in this way: I will call the attention of the Senator to the fact that it says to Maryland, for instance—and I use Maryland merely as an example—it says to Maryland, "Your citizens will have to pay the tax in the District of Columbia if you fix a tax upon the residents of the District of Columbia in your State; but if you relieve the people of the District of Columbia, if they have complied with their law, from paying a license tax in your State, your citizens will be relieved from paying the tax in the District of Columbia." That is the way it affects them.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator has the amendment there, I wish he would read the first part of it.

Mr. JONES. I will do so. It reads as follows:

Provided further, That motor vehicles, owned or operated by persons not legal residents of the District of Columbia, but who shall have complied with the laws of the State of their legal residence requiring the registration of motor vehicles or licensing of operators thereof and the display of identification or registration numbers on such vehicles, and which identification number shall be displayed on such motor vehicles as provided by the laws and regulations of the District of Columbia, while used or operated within the District, shall not be required to be licensed or registered or bear other identification numbers under the laws and regulations of the District if the State in which the owner or operator of such motor vehicle has his legal residence extends the same privilege to the motor vehicles owned or operated by legal residents of the District of Columbia.

That is the way it affects the people of the District of Columbia, and that is the way the State of Maryland brings about reciprocity between that State and the other States of the Union, and that is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. President, we are the only body that can legislate for the people of the District of Columbia. We are the only body that can protect them in any way or provide any way by which they may not be discriminated against by other States in this country. This is about the only method, as I take it, that can be pursued with reference to this particular subject to secure reciprocity between them and the State of Maryland.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

Mr. JONES. I will.

Mr. GALLINGER. As this seems to be a matter which affects the entire country, does not the Senator think that the Committee on Interstate Commerce ought to deal with it?

Mr. JONES. Well——

Mr. GALLINGER. I am serious about that.

Mr. JONES. I think that whole matter should be considered in that way. I understand that a bill has been introduced in another body covering the whole United States, and I think it would be well if that bill could be passed.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think that would be wise legislation. Then we would get rid of these controversies.

Mr. JONES. But until that time comes I think that we, as the lawmaking body of the District of Columbia, ought to do what we can to put the citizens here upon an equality with other citizens.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. The junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] says that this will relieve the Senator from Utah from paying a tax in the District of Columbia. It will do no such thing unless there is reciprocity between the District of Columbia and the State of Utah.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Well, there is.

Mr. SMOOT. And I may say there ought to be the same thing with regard to Maryland.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. There is, is there not? Does the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. Just wait until I get through with the statement.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. That is the very point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] has the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not trying to get away from the point, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator never does.

Mr. SMOOT. What we want to do is this: We know that the people of the District of Columbia have had no reciprocity with Maryland. We know that Maryland is not going to give them reciprocity, because both the Senators from Maryland state right here that they will not do it.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. We can not afford it.

Mr. SMOOT. The idea of attempting to make it appear that I am interested in the amendment for the purpose of getting rid of paying $5 a year to the District of Columbia is ridiculous. Mr. President, that has never entered my mind. I never thought of it at all until the junior Senator from Maryland mentioned it.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I will acquit the Senator of having any such purpose; but that is exactly what his amendment accomplishes, and nothing else.

Mr. SMOOT. I say, Mr. President, that that is not what the amendment accomplishes. The amendment proposes this: That if there is reciprocity between Maryland and the District of Columbia, then it will be just the same as any other State of the Union, and there will be no more rights granted between the people of the District and the citizens of Maryland than between the citizens of Utah and the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. He pays a license fee in the District of Columbia now, does he not?

Mr. SMOOT. I paid it, I think, about 12 years ago. I think I paid $5.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I think I will say what I intended to say.

Mr. NORRIS. Otherwise, the Senator from Washington will forget that he has the floor. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JONES. No; I do not yield just now. I have just a word or two more to say.

I just want to call attention to the fact to which attention has already been called by the Senator from Utah that the State of Maryland directly discriminates against the people of the District of Columbia in their law and by the very terms of their law. Apparently they have framed the law for the specific purpose of discriminating against the people of the District of Columbia. The senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] admits this discrimination; and I want to call the attention of those who are here and who probably did not hear the Senator from Utah to the language of the Maryland law itself. They define the word "State" here. They say:

> The term "State" as used in the subtitle, except where otherwise expressly provided, *and except in section 146*, shall also include the Territories and Federal Districts of the United States.

In other words, the word "State" in this act includes the District of Columbia, except where expressly excluded, and except in section 146; and section 146 is the section that levies the tax and requires the tag. The District of Columbia, as a Territory of the United States, is expressly excepted from the provisions of that section, which provides that where another State reciprocates with Maryland that State's license is good in the State of Maryland. So it is expressly provided by this law of Maryland that the tag of the District of Columbia shall not be good under any circumstances in the State of Maryland. So all District of Columbia motor vehicles must have two tags, no matter how confusing it may be.

Of course this provision will not do away with that unless the State of Maryland sees fit to reciprocate. She has seen fit to reciprocate with reference to other States in the Union. If there is a State in the Union that requires a tax of $3 for automobiles, she makes no question about that; she lets that automobile go through her territory. But if a person in the District of Columbia owns a vehicle and goes there with it he must pay. Now, then, she may not see fit to reciprocate with reference to the District of Columbia. She may say, "Our citizens must pay in the District of Columbia the $5, or whatever is required there, and the people of the District must pay in the State of Maryland." If she does, of course, this will not bring about reciprocity.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question for information?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Under the present law of the State of Maryland can a resident of the District of Columbia owning and operating, say, a 40-horse power machine, go through the State of Maryland without paying $30 for the privilege of going through it just once?

Mr. JONES. He can not go through without paying whatever tax is imposed under that law.

Mr. McCUMBER. That tax is $30 under the present system.

Mr. JONES. It is 50 cents a horsepower, measured according to their system of measurement.

Mr. McCUMBER. But you can not even drive once as far as the Chevy Chase Club, three blocks into Maryland, under the present law, without having to pay from thirty to forty dollars for that privilege?

Mr. JONES. That is right.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think we really do need some kind of a change, as long as they can drive with impunity over every road in the District of Columbia. Another thing that the Senator has not mentioned is this: Unless it has been done away with very recently, in addition to paying $30 to go across the State, every few miles you have got to go into your pocket and pay another quarter for traveling upon that road, under a toll system that they have.

SEVERAL SENATORS. That has been abolished.

Mr. McCUMBER. I hope it has been abolished.

Mr. SMOOT. That is in Virginia.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; in Maryland. I drove from here over to Gettysburg but a few years ago, and there was one of these bars across the road every few miles.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. We have bought all those pikes.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the Senator from North Dakota has the floor. To whom does he yield, if to anyone?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Washington first.

Mr. JONES. I just want to say, with reference to this toll matter, that I have not been around over the roads of Maryland very much; but just four or five months ago I went up to Gettysburg, and I had to pay tolls coming back. I started to

go down to Harpers Ferry, and I ran onto a little road going across and had to pay tolls every 5 miles, in the State of Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I think the Senator is right in saying that that condition exists in one portion of our State.

Mr. JONES. That may be the portion I got into.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. There may be some tollgates there, but we have been and are buying up all the toll roads in the State in order to abolish tolls. Of course, we can not do it all at once, but I do not think you will find many tollgates in our State. There may be some in that section of the State. Otherwise there are none.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not know the extent of the toll roads in Maryland now. Of course, I never heard of tolls until I came down into this section of the country. You can drive over any place in the Northwest without being held up for toll. If, however, I go down through this beautiful valley in Virginia, made famous by Sheridan's ride, I find that it costs me at least 5 cents a mile just for tolls alone to drive through that valley, in addition to whatever other expenses there may be.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that I do not believe there are any toll roads in our State except in this very section of which he speaks. I want to say that I have been through the State, and I do not know that I have ever paid a toll in the last three or four years. There may be one or two roads of that kind.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me ask the Senator a question. If I want to drive over to Baltimore once a year at the present time, or on beyond Chevy Chase Circle, with a 40-horsepower machine, I have to pay $30 for that privilege, though I go only once. Now, does not the Senator think that there ought to be some kind of a change so that that injustice would not be imposed upon me?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Well, the Senator has the privilege of going every day in the year.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; but I do not want to go every day in the year. I might want, as many people from the District might want, to cross the State of Maryland once a year. Does the Senator think it is fair that for that little privilege a citizen of the District of Columbia must pay from thirty to forty dollars?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say that that is a pretty excessive price to pay, but it is pretty hard to know how to regulate a matter of that kind. If you have a license, you have the license for a year, and you are entitled to go as many times in the year as you please. I will say to the Senator that, so far as he is concerned, if his car is licensed in his own State, it is not necessary for him to pay anything.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, Mr. President, I am not speaking for my State. Has not the resident of the District of Columbia the same right, and ought he not to be accorded the same right, to cross your State that the resident of the State of North Dakota would have? Why should you make a distinction between the two?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Because there is reciprocity with all other States.

Mr. McCUMBER. Why should not Maryland have reciprocity with the District, then?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Because the District has not the same privilege to give us. It has a very contracted area, with very short mileage. The District of Columbia has a population of about 350,000 people that use our roads, which we have spent $25,000,000 in building, and which we are now taxing ourselves to the amount of $800,000 to $1,000,000 a year in keeping up. We feel that if the people of the District of Columbia use those roads as we use them, which they do to a very great extent—probably you in Washington, in proportion to your population, use the road between here and Baltimore as much as Baltimore does itself—if they abuse those roads and tear them up, they ought to help pay for them, as we do.

Mr. McCUMBER. Right here, Mr. President, may I not make the same answer that the Senator made to me a moment ago, when he said that I could travel there all the year?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. So can a resident of Maryland, if he wishes to do so, travel every day in the year in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Yes; but there is not much road here to travel over. There is a very short mileage here, and there is not much to travel over.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am afraid that if we should take all of the streets here that we are paying for we would find quite a little mileage.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Yes; but we are not likely to travel over all of the streets. Probably the residents of Maryland that come here have an objective point to which they want to go, and they probably would not go 2 miles in the whole District.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then it seems to be a case of this kind: The people of the State of Maryland see an opportunity whereby, out of the necessities of the case, they can get a very large sum of money from the residents of the District of Columbia, whether they want to go across the State once or a dozen times a year; and they purpose to take advantage of that, and therefore they except the District of Columbia from the general law.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not think anybody who wanted to go from the District of Columbia into Maryland one time in a year would get a license at all.

Mr. SMOOT. He would get arrested.

Mr. STERLING obtained the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, what became of the amendment I offered?

Mr. NORRIS. I want to make a few remarks on the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Utah is still pending.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I thought.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have been somewhat impressed with the argument made in favor of Maryland in this controversy, although there may be extreme cases where hardship would arise from the enforcement of that law. To pay the price that would be necessary to go once through the State, or a little way in the State and out, would be a hardship. I presume that is true, and must necessarily be true, of every license in every State. If you are required to buy a license that will last a year and you only use your car one day you are paying a pretty high price for it; or if you are unfortunate, as I was, and get an Overland, you can not use it at all; it breaks down every time you get out.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator does not get over land with it, does he? [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. I do not get over land with it; no. That is pretty good.

Mr. President, I can see a reason that appeals to me as being fairly just why the people of Maryland made an exception in their law with regard to the people of the District of Columbia. Here is the District of Columbia, with a very small mileage and a very large population living right at the edge of the State of Maryland. I presume that many miles of some of Maryland's fine roads are used more by the people of the District of Columbia than they are used by the residents of the State of Maryland. Reciprocity is based on the theory that people coming from one State and going to another are doing that for temporary purposes, but it is different with the use of the Maryland roads by a large number at least of the population of the District of Columbia. It is a permanent thing. On the other hand, they pay but very little for a license in the District of Columbia. I do not know how much, but for a small amount one gets a license for a car that will last during the life of the car.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will state that we have amended that.

Mr. NORRIS. This bill makes it annual, I understand, and that will be a change of the law. So it would not be much of a hardship for the people of Maryland to pay that little license in the District of Columbia, and the people of the District of Columbia who live here permanently, it seems to me, ought not to object to paying something toward the upkeep of roads in Maryland. The justice is not all on one side, as I look at it.

I should like to have some law of reciprocity. I dislike to go as far as this amendment would go. It does not seem to me to be quite fair. It is hardly applicable to any other case that I know of where a large city is just at the edge of a State whose population use the roads of the State more than the people themselves who build the roads.

The Maryland people have to pay the taxes, and enormous taxes, to keep up the good roads they have. They have been doing wonderfully well, it seems to me, on the good-roads proposition in Maryland. It would hardly be right to allow the 350,000 people who live right at the edge of Maryland continually to use the roads day after day, not for temporary purposes but permanently, without requiring them to pay something toward the upkeep of those roads.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word about the amendment. My colleague and I are the only Members of the Senate who own machines that can vote on this

amendment in the affirmative without excusing ourselves as license taxpayers. We are going to pay the license in the District anyhow; we always pay that and always will; but every other Member owning a machine who votes for this amendment, without realizing it, I believe, is simply excusing himself from obtaining a license for an automobile in the District of Columbia while he is here, and at the same time increasing that tax for machine owners in the District and for Maryland.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I call the Senator to order. It is not in order to make an accusation of that kind.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I did not reflect upon the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. I am not talking about reflection upon me, but upon all the balance of the Senate who do not vote with the Senators from Maryland—because it excuses them from some financial obligation. It is, in my judgment, stepping across and over the rules.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks the point of order made by the Senator from Wyoming is correct, but the Chair did not understand the language of the Senator from Maryland to mean that.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. No; there was no invidious reflection in my remarks. I was speaking to the Senator from Utah just now, and I said he was unconscious of that, which was perfectly proper.

Mr. WARREN. I speak of it as a reflection upon the entire Senate, except the Senator and his colleague, and I think I am justified in making the complaint. The record of the report of the remarks of the Senator will show. But I do not care to pursue the subject.

Mr. SMOOT. As far as I am concerned, I will state——

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland will proceed.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I should like to go on and make a statement of what I propose to say.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say that "the Senator from Utah" is not unconscious of what the amendment provides. I do not put the same construction on the amendment that the Senator from Maryland does. He must be mistaken as to what the object is.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I will ask the Senator now if he pays a license tax in the District of Columbia on his automobile?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will pardon a further interruption, I ask him now——

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I have asked the Senator a question.

Mr. SMOOT. Wait until I anwer that, because the Senator in a few minutes will say I did not answer it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. To answer the question.

Mr. SMOOT. I started to tell the Senator before that some 10 or 12 years ago I secured a license tax in the District of Columbia for my automobile.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The same machine the Senator is using now?

Mr. SMOOT. No; not the same machine.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The Senator is running an automobile with a license he did not get for it.

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President, I am not. The Senator from Utah is doing exactly the same as any other citizen of the District of Columbia and every other Senator who resides in the District of Columbia; but the bill provides that hereafter there shall be an annual tax. The Senator from Utah does not expect to avoid paying that tax. He has no intention of avoiding the payment of the tax.

The amendment which I have offered proposes that whatever treatment the other States give to the District of Columbia they shall have the same treatment given. That is all there is to it. I do not expect to get rid of paying any tax. I am glad to pay the tax. In fact, I want to say to the Senator that some four or five years ago the Commissioners of the District of Columbia thought there ought to be an annual tax, and that under the law they could collect an annual tax. I was asked to pay an annual tax and paid for that year. The question was taken to the court and decided that the payment of an annual tax was not required under the law. This bill, if it becomes a law, with the amendment will provide for an annual tax. The Senator from Utah expects to pay any tax imposed the same as the Senator from Maryland will have to.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I do not reflect upon the Senator from Utah or the Senator from Wyoming in the slightest degree or upon any Senator who votes for this amendment. It is simply an awkward piece of legislation. The alleged object is to produce complete State reciprocity between the District of Columbia and Maryland. It has no effect on that situation whatever, not the slightest. We pay our license tax when we come into the District as we pay our Maryland license, and that is all, so far as the Maryland people and the District people are concerned.

The proposed amendment is absolutely reciprocal, so far as we are concerned; but the effect it has is that it excuses every Member of the Senate or anybody else in the District of Columbia from paying an annual automobile license tax if he has an automobile license in some other State. That is all it does.

The Senator says he wants to produce a State reciprocity situation between Maryland and the District. This amendment has no effect of that kind. It leaves things as they are now, save the increase, which is objectionable. The amendment is simply an awkward piece of legislation in that it is alleged to accomplish one result and actually accomplishes another. The only reflection that I make on this occasion is not that the Senators are desirous of escaping this small license fee; I excuse them entirely from any such small object. The amendment simply proposes an awkward piece of legislation which does not accomplish what the proposer seems to have in mind.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the thought has occurred to me that it is passing strange that all these travelers want to go to Maryland. I have not heard anybody suggest going to Virginia or West Virginia. What may be the reason or the cause I do not know. There must be a reason, God knows.

Mr. GALLINGER. We have to go through Maryland to get to New Jersey.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It is worth going through Maryland to get to New Jersey. Then you go to God's country. But there must be some reason. I have racked my brain for half an hour to find out why it was that what these distinguished gentlemen say in this body all tends one way, to Maryland. Finally the thought came across my mind that Maryland is wet and the arid portions of our immediate neighborhood are in Virginia and West Virginia. As much as I love Virginians and West Virginians, I think the gentlemen here are justified in bearing for Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that we have such good roads they can get to their destination very quickly.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Good roads in Maryland, good whisky, and beautiful women.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. On that 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). I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL].

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. Not knowing how he would vote on this amendment I will withhold my vote.

Mr. HARDING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. I do not see him in the Chamber, and I withhold my vote.

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I am paired for the day with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], who is absent on account of illness. Therefore I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (when Mr. SAULSBURY's name was called). Making the same transfer as announced on the last vote, I vote "nay."

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He has not.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Then I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. HUSTING] and vote "yea."

Mr. VARDAMAN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. JAMES (after having voted in the negative). I transfer the general pair I have with the junior Senator from Massachu-

setts [Mr. WEEKS] to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WALSH. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] and vote "yea."

Mr. CHILTON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] and vote "yea."

Mr. JONES. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and vote "yea."

Mr. STONE. I have a pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and will let my vote stand.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Borah	Kenyon	Poindexter	Thomas
Brandegee	La Follette	Reed	Thompson
Broussard	Lodge	Sherman	Townsend
Chamberlain	McCumber	Shields	Vardaman
Clark	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	Walsh
Cummins	Nelson	Smith, Mich.	Warren
Curtis	Page	Smoot	Watson
Jones	Pittman	Sterling	Works

NAYS—21.

Chilton	Lea, Tenn.	Overman	Simmons
Fletcher	Lee, Md.	Pomerene	Smith, Md.
Hitchcock	Lewis	Ransdell	Williams
Hollis	McLean	Robinson	
James	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	
Kirby	Norris	Sheppard	

NOT VOTING—43.

Ashurst	Fall	Johnson, S. Dak.	Shafroth
Bankhead	Fernald	Kern	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Gallinger	Lane	Smith, S. C.
Brady	Goff	Lippitt	Stone
Bryan	Gore	Myers	Sutherland
Catron	Gronna	Newlands	Swanson
Clapp	Harding	O'Gorman	Tillman
Colt	Hardwick	Oliver	Underwood
Culberson	Hughes	Owen	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Husting	Penrose	Weeks
du Pont	Johnson, Me.	Phelan	

So Mr. SMOOT's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following as a new section:

SEC. —. That section 11 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," approved September 1, 1916, be amended so that the same shall read as follows:

"SEC. 11. Section 6 of the act of July 1, 1902, entitled 'An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes,' is hereby amended by adding, after paragraph 2 of said section:

"'That the moneys and credits, including moneys loaned and invested, bonds and shares of stock (except the stock of banks and other corporations within the District of Columbia, the taxation of which banks and corporations is herein provided for) of any person, firm, association, or corporation resident or engaged in business within said District shall be scheduled and appraised in the manner provided by paragraph 1 of said section 6 for listing and appraisal of tangible personal property and assessed at their fair cash value, and as taxes on said moneys and credits there shall be paid to the tax collector of said District three-tenths of 1 per cent of the value thereof: *Provided*, That savings deposits of individuals in a sum not in excess of $500 deposited in banks, trust companies, or building associations, subject to notice of withdrawal and not subject to check, shall be exempt from this tax: *Provided further*, That such tax on moneys and credits shall not apply to bank notes or notes discounted or negotiated by any bank or banking institution, savings institution, or trust company, nor to savings institutions having no capital stock, building associations, firemen's relief associations, secret and beneficial societies, labor unions, and labor-union relief associations, nor to beneficial organizations paying sick or death benefits, or either or both, from funds received from voluntary contributions or assessments upon members of such associations, societies, or unions; nor shall the provisions of this act apply to life or fire inurance companies having no capital stock, nor to the shares of stock of business companies which by reason of or in addition to incorporation receive no special franchise or privilege, but all such corporations shall be rated, assessed, and taxed as individuals conducting business in similar lines are rated, assessed, and taxed: *And provided further*, That corporations, limited partnerships, and joint-stock associations within said District liable to tax under the laws of said District on earnings or capital stock shall not be required to make any report or pay any further tax under this section on the mortgages, bonds, and other securities owned by them in their own right, but such corporations, partnerships, and associations holding such securities as trustees, executors, administrators, guardians, or in any other manner shall return and pay the tax imposed by this section upon all securities so held by them as in the case of individuals: *And provided further*, That a joint committee consisting of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate and the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives is hereby appointed to make, by subcommittee or otherwise, a careful and exhaustive study of the tax laws of the District of Columbia, including license taxes, with a view of recommending such changes in the laws as the joint committee may deem fair and equitable, report to be made to the Congress during the next session.'"

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I make no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota is accepted by the chairman.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as agreed to.

Mr. BRADY. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to be inserted at the proper place in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert in the proper place in the bill the following:

Two thousand dollars for plans for a bridge to be built across Klingle Valley on Connecticut Avenue.

Mr. BRADY. If the amendment which we adopted to-day relative to the purchase of a park site is retained in the bill, it is very essential that this amendment should be adopted. If that amendment is not retained, the conference committee can, of course, reject this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I make no objection to that amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment to the pending bill, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, after line 18, it is proposed to insert the following:

Enforcement of child-labor law: For the enforcement of the provisions of the act to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia, approved May 28, 1908, namely, for two inspectors at $1,200 each, $2,400: *Provided*, That existing provision of law requiring the detail of two privates of the Metropolitan police force for the enforcement of said act is hereby repealed.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I think this item is estimated for, and I shall make no objection to it. Let it go to conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHILTON. I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After line 25, on page 105, it is proposed to insert the following as a new paragraph:

For the acquisition, for a public park, of the tract of land known as the Patterson tract, assessed on the records of the assessor of the District of Columbia as parcel 129–2, lying north of Florida Avenue northeast and bounded on the east by the grounds of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, on the west by New York Avenue and the tracks of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., and on the north by Fairview Avenue, containing 81 acres, more or less, $500,000 (or so much thereof as may be necessary): *Provided*, That said tract of land shall not be acquired by condemnation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I shall make no objection to the amendment, and it may go to conference so far as I am concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hope that amendment will not be adopted. It does not strike me that this is a very apt time to be purchasing half-million dollar parks in the District. We are needing about all the money we have. The Federal Government is needing its half of it, and that matter can easily go over to some more convenient season, as was suggested by Saint Paul upon an occasion when the remark was not quite so apropos as it now is.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, I expected some opposition to this amendment. It is a result of the system that we have had in dealing with the District of Columbia, and to which I, at the last session of Congress, briefly called the attention of the Senate. So long as we have the half-and-half system we shall have a half-and-half government of the city of Washington and of the District of Columbia.

What are we doing here to-day? We are putting into effect in part what has been talked about in the city for years. Everybody knows that there has been a contest in this city whether we should buy what is known as the Patterson tract in the northeast or whether we should buy the Dean tract in the northwest. The committee has decided to buy the Dean tract of about 9 acres for $625,000, instead of buying the 83½ acres of the other tract for $500,000. I want them both to go in, and let us further limp along in this uncertain way that we are governing this city, but with all sections fairly dealt with. I suppose that one or the other, possibly both, will be knocked out in conference. It does seem to me, however, that this great northeast section of the city should have some consideration. Here is a tract of land that has been, practically by unanimous consent, dedicated to park purposes. It is in a section where a park is needed, but is rejected; while the Dean tract is to be taken, in a section where a park is not needed. I should like to have the amendment adopted now, and let it go to conference. Let us get that composite judgment of the committee of conference as to which section of the city shall be favored, or which plan seems to be just and right for the public good.

Of course, the sensible thing would be for the United States to get away from the old system of gauging its plans in this city by the amount of money which the city can raise. The sensible thing would be to appropriate forty or fifty or one hundred million dollars, whatever is necessary, to carry out your park system at once, and not take the childish system of gauging our work in this city by the narrow ideas of a few people in the city of Washington as to what they or we are able to do and what we ought to do. That would be the broad way. Of course, the Senate is not now going to do that; but it is going to keep on in the old-fashioned way with as many things as it can, and the half-and-half system is one of them. It is going to keep on in the little, narrow, impractical way of doing a few things this year and a few things next year. Of course, the property is going to get more valuable from year to year; more and more people are going to suffer because they do not know what to do with their property; and this great northeast section will be more and more neglected, as it has been in the past.

But I thought there might come a sense of justice across the Senate that would induce it at least to let these propositions go to the committee of conference side by side, and let somebody think of them both at once and decide in some, as I think, sensible—not meaning to reflect upon anybody—some sensible way the great question of the park system and the development of this great Capital City.

I have no personal interest in the world in this matter. Some citizens over in the northeast, people whom I know, amongst them the chairman of the citizens' committee of the northeast, and Dr. Hall, of the Columbia Institution, out there, called my attention to it. I agreed to offer this amendment. I know nothing about who owns the property or anything about the matter other than what I have stated. I only know that we are again up against the proposition of the old half-and-half system that is holding down the development of the city of Washington simply because a few people who are in the habit of governing the city and trying to govern the United States have decided long ago that this Government should not have any other system.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the old-fashioned plan of cutting your cloak according to your cloth is not a foolish one, but a very sensible one. It is pretty good common sense for anybody, an individual, the Nation, the State, the District, or any other entity, not to spend any money that they have not got, and it is a very good idea for us not to allow the District of Columbia to run into debt to the Federal Government any more. It is already very heavily in debt, and we are going to have a pretty hard time in getting the money back. There is a good deal of local feeling against ever paying it, and a very great effort will be made to have them excused from paying that part of the half of past expenditures which they now owe to the Federal Treasury.

This is an appropriation of not to exceed $500,000. That means $500,000, if I understood the amendment aright that the property shall not be condemned. I will ask the Senator from West Virginia if that is not correct?

Mr. CHILTON. That is a provision of the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Therefore, of course, the man who has the property for sale is not going to take less than $500,000 when Congress says the amount to be paid is not to exceed that.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi would have been much more in point, I think, if he had been here and said something about the item of $625,000 for the purchase of the Dean tract. The Senator is eminently correct when he says that this Government should not spend more than it has; but we passed that point a good while ago, and that question does not arise here now. The question confronting us in this instance is whether we are going to adopt the little, cheeseparing policy of developing only a part of the park system this year; that is all.

I want to call the attention of the Senator to the remark he made that the Government ought not to allow the District to become further indebted to it. He might as well say that the left hand should not be indebted to the right hand. By that very remark he condemns what we are doing. We are here keeping up the fiction of a District government. I do not want to argue that question now; but it arises in connection with everything we do affecting the District of Columbia, and it constantly will arise until we go at this subject in a commonsense way and recognize that the government here in the District of Columbia is the great United States, and that it is trying to develop a great capital. We are not going about it in the right way.

I do not expect this amendment to go through in the final wind-up, in which event neither ought the Dean tract amendment to go through; but there is a probability that one or the other of them will go through, and I should like for this amendment to go alongside of the Dean tract amendment, which provides for the purchase of 9½ acres, at a cost of $625,000, in a rich, well taken care of portion of the city, where the great homes are located and in close proximity to another fine park. I should like to have the committee of conference consider this proposal to acquire eighty-odd acres of land in the neglected northeastern portion of the city in conjunction with the amendment providing for the purchase of the Dean tract.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I said to the Senator a while ago that we would consider the matter in conference, and that I did not object to the amendment.

Mr. CHILTON. But another Senator objected for the Senator. I am not now answering anything that the Senator from Maryland said or did, nor am I taking exception to the manner in which he looked at me, but I was answering what was said upon the floor of the Senate. I shall be glad to have the Senator allow the amendment to go to conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from Mississippi made objection to this amendment. This is a simple little appropriation of half a million dollars for the purpose of buying some land for a public park in the city of Washington. It might be a very wise appropriation to make, but the Senate has no information upon which it can authorize the expenditure of such an enormous amount of money for that purpose at this time.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. CHILTON. Does not the Senator know that this item has been recommended by the District Commissioners; that it has been estimated for, and has in every way been considered; and does he not know that what I said in the beginning of my remarks is true, that the question has been as to whether or not this year we would buy the Dean tract for $625,000, or the 80-odd acres in the Patterson tract in the northeast section of the city for $500,000?

Mr. WALSH. Unfortunately, I do not know anything about it.

Mr. CHILTON. I was informing the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. I remember very definitely that at the last session of Congress, when the District appropriation bill was under consideration, the matter was agitated of buying three or four different tracts, including the Dean tract.

About the merits of it I have not any idea at all, and I do not know; but I do know that this bill was reported to the Senate without this appropriation of $500,000 in it; and now, when the usual hour for adjournment is reached, we are supposed to vote in an appropriation of $500,000 in a kind of hope or expectation that the conference committee will take care of it and just cut it out.

That is not a commendable way to legislate, as it seems to me. We certainly ought to have some basis upon which we can act. For my own part, I do not think this is a time when we ought to be spending such enormous sums of money for the purpose of buying lands for parks in the city of Washington. I do not mean to condemn the policy at all; but there is an appropriate and an opportune time for these things, and at the present time, when we are pushed to the limit to raise funds to meet the tremendous expenditures which are actually forced upon us, it does seem to me that we can not justify ourselves in making this expenditure, and we certainly can not justify ourselves in

voting in favor of the appropriation on the meager information that has been afforded to the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. JONES. I also want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that we have in this bill already a provision appropriating $625,000 for the purchase of a tract out here for park purposes.

Mr. WALSH. So I understand; and this would be a mere matter of making the appropriation for park purposes for the city of Washington something over a million dollars.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise simply to say that I agree very cordially with the sentiments expressed by the Senators from Mississippi and Montana. I do not think we should load up a conference committee with items which do not receive our approval to the extent that we expect the members of the conference committee to stand for the proposed amendments.

I have every desire to comply, where I can, with the wishes and desires of the Senator from West Virginia; but I certainly hope that some evidences of economy, somewhere, will be manifested in this session of Congress before we adjourn.

The Finance Committee is busily engaged in an effort to formulate a revenue measure. Every interest which is sought to be taxed is protesting against being compelled to contribute to our expenditures. That is perfectly natural; that is only human, in fact; but those of us who have the task of providing revenue for these enormous appropriations have some little appreciation of what the task means.

If it be true that $625,000 has been appropriated by this bill for the purchase of park land elsewhere, then I am very sorry. I do not think this is the time for the expenditure of money for any such purposes anywhere. They can wait. We are upon the brink, possibly, of a situation that will require tremendous expenditures, and that ought to bring to us, to some extent at least, a sober realization of our financial responsibilities.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, from local knowledge of this piece of property it is my judgment that it would be an excellent purchase for the Government at this figure. It is next to 100 acres that is now owned by the Government as part of the deaf and dumb institution; and the whole 180-acre tract would be practically a part of a great terminal area that could be used by the Government in connection with any terminal purposes that hereafter might be needed.

My judgment is that it is not to the interest of the owners of this property to accept this price. I do not know what they would do. But this morning we had this matter up, and I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Colorado both to what I had to say this morning about this very property.

There is a bridge over New York Avenue that cost $440,000. It was built as part of the arrangement of this terminal system, and it points right into this Patterson tract. That bridge was built in 1908, and ever since that time that $440,000 of expenditure has been up in the air, because the District of Columbia would never appropriate the money to put in the fills and use the bridge. These people have had New York Avenue condemned through their property, and they are being assessed and taxed to-day on the theory that they practically have this great thoroughfare, New York Avenue, coming at their property and going through it; and yet for all this period that $440,000 structure has been up in the air, and no provision whatever has been made to make it available for the benefit of the public at large or the development of this tract and other real estate to which this bridge would give immediate access across the river of railroad tracks that run into the Union Station.

Here is a very good illustration of what we were talking about this morning. Either "take it or leave it," so to speak. Let these streets go out, and let these people develop their land according to the natural conditions, or take it, if you are going to take it—whichever you are really going to do. But to hold these people up for eight years and tax them at a high rate, with a bridge suspended in the air that cost $440,000, and not be willing to appropriate the little money that is necessary to fill in and continue that highway, seems to me to be practically a sort of municipal highway robbery.

Under the circumstances, Mr. President, if the Senate see fit to vote down this purchase, I am going to ask them to double the amount of money that is in this bill to put that street out. There is $20,000 carried in this bill to extend New York Avenue and fill in the approaches to that bridge, and it will not do more than a little of the work—hardly any of it. If the Senate see fit to vote down the proposal to take this land, then, for goodness sake, let these people alone and let them have the street. Do not stay here any more in this dog-in-the-manger attitude of having a bridge there, right next to them, that cost this great sum of money without permitting them to use it as access to their land. Over half a million dollars of money has gone into that bridge—half a million dollars of expenditure to build it, with accrued interest at a low rate.

The positions are absolutely inconsistent. Congress ought not to be guilty of that sort of treatment of any of our citizens. So, if the Senate see fit to vote down this amendment to take this property, then I think they ought to be consistent and at least give $40,000 to let that street go out over that bridge that has already cost $500,000, and is now and has been for eight years of no use to anybody.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, as I said, I do not know all of the details of this matter, but I do know that the people who have had it in charge understand all about it. The committees understand the different arguments in favor of these different parks. I send to the desk and ask to have read a letter from Dr. Hall and Mr. Tucker to me on this subject. Then, as far as I am concerned, the vote may be taken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the letter, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 8, 1917.*

Hon. WILLIAM E. CHILTON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I beg leave to call your attention to the inclosed amendment which I feel should be made to House bill 19119, commonly known as the District of Columbia bill, now pending before the Senate. This amendment I hope you will be willing to propose when this bill is finally considered.

The citizens of the northeast have approved of the purchase of large tracts for the benefit of all parts of the city. They are especially interested at the present time in having provided for the northeast section a park much needed for the use of people from their own locality. The tract they desire, which is known as the "Patterson tract," has the following points to recommend it:

1. Great need. The section in which it lies is being built up rapidly. It has no public park, with the exception of one-half of Lincoln Square and all of Stanton Square, both together representing a few acres of formal parking.

2. The Patterson tract is already being used extensively as a park, showing the need of securing it as public property.

3. The tract is included in the park commissioner's plans.

4. The purchase of this tract has been recommended year after year by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as the most desirable park project in contemplation.

5. It is not an expensive tract, comparatively speaking. The 81 acres of which it is comprised can probably be bought for $500,000. Comparing this with the 9½ acres of the Dean tract for $625,000, makes the desirability of the price more evident.

This tract, once acquired, will not require much further expense. Part of it is already level, another part consists of open hillside, and the remainder a high wooded hill containing a splendid oak woods. No tract within the city can be so easily and quickly made into a beautiful park at small expense.

The tract in question is directly on a car line, easily accessible from all parts of the northeast, as well as many parts of the northwest. It is within 20 minutes' ride from the present Eastern, Technical, Business, and Central High Schools.

I believe without question that the acquisition of this tract is one of the most important matters in connection with the improvement of Washington, and I hope that it will receive your careful consideration. I also hope that you can see your way clear to introduce the amendment suggested.

Yours, very respectfully,

EVAN H. TUCKER.
PERCIVAL HALL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, about a year or so ago the Senate passed an act to exempt from taxation certain property in this city belonging to the Daughters of the American Revolution, and made an appropriation to reimburse the tax they had paid. Since then the association have bought some more property, which they are occupying. Some time ago I introduced a bill to exempt it from taxation; but, in view of the work that devolved upon the members of the committee, instead of pressing the matter before the committee, I let the matter go, with the thought of offering it as an amendment to this bill. I understand that the chairman of the committee will not object; and so, at the proper place, I ask to have inserted the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question. Of course, the propriety of exempting this property from taxation depends altogether upon how it is to be used. The Senator would not exempt it merely because of the people who own it, merely because it is this association, because it is conceivable that they might invest in property which was to be used for purposes of profit. How is the property to be used?

Mr. CLAPP. This is used for their building and their grounds. They have purchased this additional ground and expect to enlarge the use of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It can not be used for commercial purposes or other purposes of profit?

Mr. CLAPP. Oh, no.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is merely to extend the ground around their buildings?

Mr. CLAPP. Yes; it is simply a part of their plan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert, on page 17, after line 7, the following:

That the property situated in square 173 in the city of Washington, D. C., described as lots 4, 5, 6, 7, and 11, inclusive, occupied by the Daughters of the American Revolution, be, and the same is hereby, exempt from and after February 23, 1916, from all taxation so long as the same is so occupied and used, subject to the provisions of section 8 of the act approved March 3, 1877, providing for exemptions of church and school property, and acts amendatory thereof, and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $99.19, the proportion of taxes upon said lots since February 23, 1916, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to pay said sum of $99.19 to the treasurer of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, this amendment is in entire harmony with one that we adopted some time ago, and I shall not object to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLAPP. In that connection I should like to have inserted in the RECORD the paper which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, that may be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 18, 1917.*

DEAR SENATOR CLAPP: I am inclosing the statement in regard to the taxes on the last lots purchased by the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Thanking you very much for what you have and are doing, with much appreciation,

Very truly,

EMMA HAVEN DAVIS.

LOTS 4, 5, 6, 7, AND 11, SQUARE 173.

Taxes due May, 1916	$282.99
Pro rata taxes, at $282.99 from July 1, 1915, to Feb. 23, 1916 (paid by White heirs in adjustment of land purchased)	183.80
Amount paid by society	99.19

$282.99 will be due May, 1917.

[From page 13822 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Aug. 1, 1916.]

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator in charge of the bill we have lately passed a law which exempted from taxation some property the Daughters of the American Revolution had bought here subsequent to the original purchase. In the interim, rather than to explain why they did not pay their taxes, it was suggested that they pay their taxes, and if the bill became a law it would be a very easy matter to have a bill passed to reimburse them for the taxes. The taxes which they paid amounted to $271. I have the tax certificate here, if there is any question raised as to that. It is a small matter. I realize that probably it would be subject to a point of order, but it is one of those things that nobody in particular has to look after. To save them the bother of trying to get the bill passed through both Houses, if it is agreeable to the Senator in charge of the bill, I offer the following amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 122, after line 16, insert:

"That the sum of $271.76 is hereby appropriated to repay the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution the taxes paid by said society upon lots 23, 24, 25, 27, and 28, square 173, in the District of Columbia, as follows: $143.78 as per receipt for taxes paid March 14, 1916; $127.98 as per receipt for taxes paid March 31, 1916; in all, $271.76; said sum to be paid upon the presentation of said receipts by the treasurer general of said society."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I make no objection to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, the Senate having just rejected the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] to purchase the Patterson property, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. CHILTON. I simply wish to serve notice, Mr. President, in view of the action of the Senate regarding the Patterson tract, that I want to reserve for a separate vote in the Senate, when the bill comes to the Senate, the amendment putting in the purchase of the 9½ acres at $625,000. I am glad to see this wholesome idea of economy, and I want to see if it goes to the bone or if it is just skin deep.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, the Senate having just refused to purchase the Patterson tract, I want to offer an amendment that represents the converse proposition. As I said just now, this New York Avenue Bridge, standing there in the air, without any ends to it, is costing the public $20,000 a year in loss of interest. Now, is that to go on? Are we to hold these people up with one hand and threaten them with the other? Or will Congress simply and candidly go ahead and let these people have the street and get the advantage of the commercial value of their land?

Mr. President, in order to test that situation, in line 14, page 34, I move to strike out "$20,000"—a wholly inadequate sum—and insert "and improve, $40,000," making the amendment read:

Northeast. New York Avenue and U Streets, Florida Avenue to Bladensburg Road, grade and improve, $40,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 34, lone 13, it is proposed to strike out "$20,000" and insert "and improve, $40,000."

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland has not been estimated for and is plainly out of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Can the Senator from Maryland say that it has been estimated for?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, the greatest latitude has been shown here to-day on the subject of amendments. This is an amendment dealing with a proposition that is in the bill, and the gate has practically been thrown open, as I understand the rulings of the Vice President, to the discretion of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is compelled to sustain the point of order on the ground that the item has not been estimated for.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I am going to offer an amendment. I will simply state its effect, and then let it be voted on.

I do not think the license tax on motor vehicles provided in this bill is large enough, so I am going to offer an amendment to it. The provision in the bill at present is $5 for each vehicle over 24 horsepower, and $3 for each vehicle of less than 24 horsepower. I am going to offer an amendment that will make it $5 for each vehicle over 24 horsepower and up to 30 horsepower, and $10 for each vehicle over 30 horsepower.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 24, after the word "power" in line 6, it is proposed to insert:

And not exceeding 30 horsepower, $10 for each vehicle of more than 30 horsepower.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. On what page is that?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On page 24, line 6. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to what I have been told is a mistake in the bill as it passed the House. My attention has been called to this matter by a member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia. He thinks it is a mistake, and he thinks it ought to be rectified. I do not know anything about it myself, except what he has said about it.

I wish the chairman of the committee would take the bill and turn to page 66, commencing with the last word of line 17, and he will find these words:

Five police matrons, at $720 each, to possess police powers of arrest.

On page 68, under the heading "House of detention," line 20, we find this language: "Three matrons, at $600 each, to possess police powers of arrest." A member of the House committee tells me that the last three are getting only $600 a year for the same work in performing the duties that are performed by the others who are paid $720.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I grant there is a discrimination, but they will all get an increase under the amendment we put on of 10 or 15 per cent. We started to increase some of these salaries, but the entire committee cut them out and would not put them in.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course under that amendment we could increase the salaries, but there would still be a discrepancy just the same as now.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I grant that.

Mr. NORRIS. I can not see why there should be any difference. On one page there is an item for five police matrons at $720 and on page 68 there are three matrons at $600 each, each one having as far as I can see the same power of arrest to act as policemen. There may be some reason for that, although the Member of the House who called it to my attention thought that the hard work was to be done by those who are getting only a salary of $600.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say there are others who are receiving salaries probably not commensurate with the service rendered and probably discriminatory, but when the subcommittee started to make increases the committee deter-

mined to make no increases whatever; but we have agreed to one amendment, the Senator will notice.

Mr. NORRIS. I noticed that.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We have depended upon the increase made by the SMOOT amendment. We hope after a little while to be able to remedy these discrepancies. I am not going to argue with the Senator that it is exactly fair, but these things will creep in, and it takes a little time to eliminate them.

Mr. NORRIS. Since these police women have the same duty to perform, and as far as the work is concerned it is exactly alike, as far as I can see, would the Senator object to putting in an amendment equalizing them and let it go to conference, and if there is any difference the conferees of course could recede. If we do that there is not anything here with which we can equalize the salary.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I have admitted to the Senator that there is a discrepancy, but there are other discrepancies probably similar to this, and we felt if we started to put up salaries there was no telling where it would end. The entire committee determined that they would not increase any salaries, and let them be subject to an increase by the Smoot amendment. We will probably get it in the next time. I think the Senator from Nebraska is right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent is asked that the clerks be authorized to correct the totals in the bill. The Chair hears no objection, and it is granted.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, if I may disturb the conversation of Senators I wish to offer an amendment and give fairly good reason for its presentation at this time.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, it is impossible to hear.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators will resume their seats and preserve order.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say that we wish to finish the bill to-night, and I hope the Senate will pardon us for taking a few minutes more in order to get it through.

Mr. LANE. Anyone who has visited the Zoological Park will notice a thing which will, perhaps, appeal to not many which can be easily remedied and which I may say is inhuman and ought to be stopped.

We have a large collection of animals there, and it is most unfortunate for them to be deprived of their liberty. They are animals that love their liberty, and they ought to have as good treatment as we can give them, plenty of ground to range in, proper food, and so forth.

So I make an appeal for those particularly interesting animals such as deer and elk. They are confined in small paddocks on barren hillsides, and the feed during the winter and probably the greater part of the summer is dry feed, such as hay and oats. A deer does not eat grass in its native haunts unless under such circumstances that it can not secure anything else. They browse——

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator will pardon me, the Zoological Garden is provided for in the sundry civil bill, and there is no estimate made for it here.

Mr. LANE. Then I should like to inquire of the Senator from Maryland about the provision on page 48 for the Rock Creek Park. I think the committee has charge of those matters.

Mr. STONE. The Zoological Garden is under the control of the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. LANE. Then there is no place for it here, but here is an item put in this bill to which I wish to call attention. I consider it to be a part of the duty of this body. It would cost but a few dollars to in part feed those animals properly some green stuff, kale, turnips, and so forth, which can be raised on farms, all of which can be produced for little money.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say the matter the Senator speaks of is under the entire control of the National Zoological Park, and we have nothing whatever to do with it, and we have no right to consider the matter at all on that bill.

Mr. LANE. If there is no opportunity for them to have green food they are surely confronted with continued hard times.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. There is $100,000 appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. LANE. Not in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Not in this bill, because it does not come in this bill. One hundred thousand dollars is appropriated for the National Zoological Park and that which pertains to it.

Mr. LANE. Then I withdraw that part of my amendment and suggest the other part, which has to do with conditions outside of the park as well as in the park, and it belongs on this bill.

It is a bill pertaining to the District of Columbia, said to be the most beautiful Capital City in the world, and one which we are trying to improve in every way.

If you will go to that park at this time of the day, or a little earlier, you will find all the buzzards from Virginia and Delaware, and I assume clear down to Florida, roosting in the trees, and all transient buzzards in their travels between the southern part of this country and the North Pole, stop off and congregate there to roost and enjoy its fragrance. They do that for the reason that the odor arising from the captive animals' houses smells so good to them that they by hundreds and hundreds roost there and in an ecstacy of delight inhale it all night and get up in the morning much refreshed, I have no doubt. Then they strike out across the sky in great circles, hunting for something more substantial, though not so odorous, to eat and sometimes get it and sometimes they do not. Then, although miles away, they get a whiff of the park and back they come with the fixed conviction that surely there must be something where the indications are so strong. Either that or they use it as a kind of bracer, as some do who take a cocktail before dinner, intoxicated with the fragrance and elated with the hope of getting something to eat before they go to roost.

It is not a fair way to treat scavenger birds or stray and unsuspecting birds; it is a kind of bunco game which they are put up against, and should be stopped.

So I offer an amendment here for an appropriation of $500 with which to buy Chinese "joss" or "punk" sticks to burn in front of the cages and menageries to dilute and modify the air about the park, so that these God-fearing birds may get a chance to go about their business of making an honest living without being deluded and flimflammed into thinking they have struck a bonanza, and also that pleasure seekers may make a tour of it without having to suffer nausea while doing so.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say that the amount has not been estimated for, and I make a point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole, except the one reserved, pertaining to the Dean tract. Without objection, the amendments other than the one referred to will be held to be concurred in. They are concurred in. The question now is on concurring in the amendment which was reserved.

Mr. STONE. That is the amendment proposing to expend $625,000 to buy the Dean tract.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the amendment which was reserved for a separate vote.

Mr. STONE. I hope, and very much hope, that it will not be concurred in.

Mr. THOMAS. So do I. Let us strike it out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I shall not urge this matter at all. I merely want to state the reasons why the committee put it in the bill. The tract has been held for about a million dollars for many years. It is now assessed at $625,000. Within two blocks of the Dean tract there are 49 apartment houses and it is one of the most thickly populated sections of the city. It is costing the parties who hold the property about $30,000 a year.

I do not hesitate to say that if we could buy it in a year hence or two years hence I would say not to take it now, but from what I can learn I fear that the opportunity for buying the property will not long be had by the Government of the United States and the District of Columbia. That was our reason for putting it in. Of course if the Senate feels that they are willing to take the chance and knock it out it is for them to determine.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was nonconcurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8492) to restore homestead rights in certain cases.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 7757) authorizing a further extension of time to pur-

chasers of land in the former Cheyenne and Arapahoe Indian Reservation, Okla., within which to make payment, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to 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, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, Mr. SISSON, and Mr. GOOD managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 14074. An act granting the consent of Congress to the village of Fox Lake, in the county of Lake, State of Illinois, to construct a bridge across both arms of the Fox River where it connects Pistakee Lake and Nippersink Lake, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in the county of Lake, State of Illinois;

H. R. 17602. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Polk County, Minn., and Grand Forks County, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across Red River of the North on the boundary line between said States;

H. R. 17710. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Tallapoosa River, separating the counties of Montgomery and Elmore, in the State of Alabama, at a point somewhere between Judkin Ferry and Hughes Ferry;

H. R. 18529. An act granting the consent of Congress to the police jury of Rapides Parish, La., to construct a bridge across Red River at or near Boyce, La.;

H. R. 18534. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the St. Francis River, at or near Parkin, Ark.;

H. R. 18550. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Montgomery, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River;

H. R. 18551. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Montgomery, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River;

H. R. 18720. An act permitting the building of a railroad bridge across the Mississippi River at Bemidji, in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 18725. An act granting the consent of Congress to Kratka Township, Pennington County, Minn., to construct a bridge across Red Lake River;

H. R. 19239. An act 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.;

H. R. 19298. An act authorizing the Western New York & Pennsylvania Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River in the town of Allegany, county of Cattaraugus, N. Y.; and

H. R. 20574. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Decatur County, Ga., to reconstruct a bridge across the Flint River at Bainbridge, Ga.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

S. 3699. An act to donate to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., for park purposes, the tract of land known as the powder-house lot;

H. R. 13831. An act to amend section 4464 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to number of passengers to be stated in certificates of inspection of passenger vessels, and section 4465 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, prescribing penalty for carrying excessive number of passengers on passenger vessels, and section 4466 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to special permits for excursions on passenger steamers;

H. R. 15314. An act to punish persons who make threats against the President of the United States; and

H. R. 20453. An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the National Dairy Council, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the proposed change in the tax on oleomargarine, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Gainesville, N. Y., praying for national prohibition, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Westchester County, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to found the Government of the United States on Christianity, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Boosters Club, of Atascadero, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement and development of the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a memorial of the conservation department of the California Federation of Women's Clubs, of Los Angeles, Cal., remonstrating against the so-called Mondell amendment to the game sanctuary bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CLAPP presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from Oscar Arneson, chief clerk of the house of representatives of the Legislature of Minnesota, transmitting a resolution of that body remonstrating against the proposed reduction of the tax on oleomargarine, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COLT presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Rhode Island State Grange, remonstrating against the proposed change in the tax on oleomargarine, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine presented a memorial of the Portland (Me.) Typothetae, remonstrating against a change in second-class postal rates, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. PAGE (for Mr. DILLINGHAM) presented telegrams in the nature of memorials from the Vermont State Grange, of Middlebury Grange, of Sudbury Grange, and of Pomona Grange, No. 13, of Sudbury, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Vermont, remonstrating against the proposed change in the tax on oleomargarine, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. From the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 19410) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes. I desire to say that I shall submit a report (No. 1021) to accompany the bill at a later day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3771) for the relief of Alfred Cluff, Orson Cluff, Henry E. Norton, William B. Ballard, Elijah Hancock, Susan R. Saline, Oscar Mann, Celia Thayne, William Cox, Theodore Farley, Adelaide Laxton, Clara L. Tenney, George M. Adams, Charlotte Jensen, and Sophia Huff, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1022) thereon.

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 8044) providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1023) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 8192) for the relief of Charles S. Fries (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUSTING:

A bill (S. 8193) for the relief of Rufus Meyers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 8194) for the relief of W. F. Tomlinson, administrator of Samuel Tomlinson, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

A bill (S. 8195) granting an increase of pension to Frank D. Brown (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 8196) granting a pension to Jennie L. Sidelinger (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 8197) granting an increase of pension to Horace A. Wright (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 8198) granting a pension to William Gilmour (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 8199) granting a pension to Martha Holt (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 8200) granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Ricketts; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEWLANDS:

A bill (S. 8201) to amend an act providing mediation, conciliation, etc., approved July 15, 1913; to authorize the President to protect the operation of trains in time of peace, and to take possession of the common carriers and draft their crews and officials in time of war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 8202) granting an increase of pension to Henry Smith;

A bill (S. 8203) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Blankenship;

A bill (S. 8204) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Combs;

A bill (S. 8205) granting an increase of pension to John W. Roberson;

A bill (S. 8206) granting an increase of pension to Minatree Turner;

A bill (S. 8207) granting an increase of pension to George S. Robinson; and

A bill (S. 8208) granting an increase of pension to William M. Helvy; to the Committee on Pensions.

EXPORT TRADE.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 17350) to promote export trade, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.

COMMISSION ON NAVY YARDS AND NAVAL STATIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, Report No. 3 of the Commission on Navy Yards and Naval Stations, dated January 31, 1917.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 9, 1917.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the report accompanying the message will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs in confidence, as was done with previous reports from the same commission.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. ASHURST. I submit the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill, and ask that it be received and printed.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18453) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 55, 58, 62, 65, 73, 74, 76, 82, 88, 96, 100, 103, 106, and 112.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 15, 17, 18, 23, 25, 37, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 61, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 77, 78, 79, 81, 83, 86, 89, 91, 94, 97, 98, 99, 101, 102, 104, 105, 107, 108, and 109, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "*Provided further*, That $5,000 of the above amount shall be used for an investigation and report on the merits of the claim of the Indians of the Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon to additional land arising from alleged erroneous surveys of the north and west boundaries of their reservation as defined in the treaty concluded June 25, 1855 (12 Stat. L., p. 963), and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make such survey or resurveys as may be necessary to complete said investigation and report"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "*Provided*, That automobiles or any other vehicles or conveyances used in introducing, or attempting to introduce, intoxicants into the Indian country, where the introduction is prohibited by treaty or Federal statute, whether used by the owner thereof or other person, shall be subject to the seizure, libel, and forfeiture provided in section 2140 of the Revised Statutes of the United States"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"For construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings, including the purchase of necessary lands and the installation, repair, and improvement of heating, lighting, power, and sewerage and water systems in connection therewith, $400,000: *Provided*, That of this amount $300 may be expended for the purchase of a perpetual water right and right of way across the lands of private individuals, for the purpose of running a pipe line from a certain spring or springs located near the Sisseton Indian Agency buildings, South Dakota, to said buildings, the purchase of such water right to include sufficient land for the construction of a small cement reservoir near such spring or springs for the purpose of storing the water so acquired: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $500 of the amount herein appropriated may be used for the acquisition on behalf of the United States, by purchase or otherwise, of land for a site for the Mesquakie Day School, Sac and Fox, Iowa: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to allow employees in the Indian Service who are furnished quarters necessary heat and light for such quarters without charge, such heat and light to be paid for out of the fund chargeable with the cost of heating and lighting other buildings at the same place: *And provided further*, That the amount so expended for agency purposes shall not be included in the maximum amounts for compensation of employees prescribed by section 1, act of August 24, 1912."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "*Provided further*, That where practicable the transportation and expenses so paid shall be refunded and shall be returned to the appropriation from which paid"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "$475,000, of which sum not less than $75,000 shall be used for the employment of additional field matrons:"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of said amendment strike out the figures "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in line 1 of said amendment insert: "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment numbered 24, and the following language appearing in lines 10 to 14, inclusive, on page 13 of the bill:

"That from and after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Interior shall have the power to authorize any superintendent, clerk, or other employee in the Indian field service to administer oaths and take acknowledgments in connection with matters pertaining to their official duties."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the amendment proposed, after the word "Interior," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "reimbursable to the United States from

any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of the Navajo Indians in Arizona, to remain a charge and lien upon the lands and funds of said tribe of Indians until paid."; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"That section 3 of the act of January 12, 1891 (26 Stat. L., p. 712), entitled 'An act for the relief of Mission Indians in the State of California,' be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to authorize the President, in his discretion and whenever he shall deem it for the interests of the Indians affected thereby, to extend the trust period for such time as may be advisable on the lands held in trust for the use and benefit of the Mission Bands or villages of Indians in California."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"IOWA.

"SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to pay to the enrolled members of the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi Tribe of Indians of the State of Iowa, entitled under existing law to share in the funds of said tribe, or to their lawful heirs, the sum of $10,334.96, together with the interest which has or may hereafter accrue thereon, remaining in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi Tribe of Indians of the State of Iowa, from the sum of $42,893.25 transferred to the credit of those Indians under the provisions of the act of June 10, 1896, said sum of $10,334.96 to be apportioned per capita among the enrolled members of said tribe."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 6 of the amendment strike out the following: "for setting out trees, $500"; and in line 7 of the amendment strike out the figures "$75,175" and in lieu thereof insert the figures "$74,675"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the amendment strike out the word "on," after the word "bridge," and insert the following: "across the Mississippi River on the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the amendment, after the word "been," strike out the words "omitted erroneously from the rolls" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "heretofore erroneously stricken from the rolls and reinstated prior to the passage of this act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "Washington," in lines 21 and 22 of the amendment, insert the following: "and other Chippewa Indians visiting said city"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 3 and 4 of the amendment strike out the following: "for the purchase of additional land, $41,600; in all, $129,920," and insert the following: "in all, $88,320"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the amendment strike out the figures "$52,100" and in lieu thereof insert the figures "$50,430"; and in line 4 of the amendment strike out the figures "$99,100" and in lieu thereof insert "$97,430"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"For the construction of a steel bridge across the San Juan River in San Juan County, State of New Mexico, at the best and most available location west or southwest and near to the town of Farmington, in said county and State, $25,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, and to be reimbursable from any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of the Navajo Indians in the State of New Mexico."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"That the sum of $5,000, to be immediately available, be, and the same is hereby appropriated, out of any funds of the Chickasaw Nation, not otherwise appropriated, to reimburse Douglas H. Johnston, governor of the Chickasaw Nation, for extra expenses incurred in the performance of his duty as chief executive of the Chickasaw Nation and principal chief of the Chickasaw Tribe of Indians during the period covered between the years 1907 and 1912, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make such payment from the funds of said nation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the proposed amendment, after the word "Congress," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to pay each and every duly enrolled citizen of the Creek Nation who has not been allotted lands in said nation and who is not included in Senate Document No. 478, Sixty-third Congress, second session, the sum of $1,040 in lieu of an allotment of land in said nation. Said sum of $1,040 to be paid to each and every person out of the funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Muskogee Creek Nation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 7 of the amendment strike out the following: "$40,000; in all, $162,200" and insert "$30,000; in all, $152,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 12 of the amendment, after the word "prescribe," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided*, That the application of this provision shall not interfere with any rights guaranteed by treaty to any allotted Umatilla Indian or Indians"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following:

"SEC. 21. For support and education of 365 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Flandreau, S. Dak., and for pay of superintendent, $62,955; for general repairs and improvements, $8,000; for new barn, $3,000; in all, $73,955."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "in all, $53,750." On page 40, line 1, of the bill, after the figures "$43,750," insert the following: "of which amount not exceeding $900 may be expended for the purchase of two new busses"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"SEC. 26. That until the meeting of the Sixty-fifth Congress those members of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives, not less than five in number, who are Members elect to the Sixty-fifth Congress, are authorized to conduct hearings and investigate the conduct of the Indian Service, at Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, and the sum of $15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available and remain available until expended, is hereby appropriated for expenses incident thereto. The said committee is hereby authorized and empowered to examine into the conduct and management of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and all its branches and agencies, their organization and administration, to examine all books, documents, and papers in the said Bureau of Indian Affairs, its branches or agencies, relating to the administration of the business of said bureau, and shall have, and is hereby granted, authority to subpœna witnesses, compel their attendance, administer oaths, and to demand any and all books, documents, and papers of whatever nature relating to

the affairs of Indians as conducted by said bureau, its branches and agencies. Said committee is hereby authorized to employ such clerical and other assistance, including stenographers, as said committee may deem necessary in the proper prosecution of its work: *Provided*, That stenographers so employed shall not receive for their services exceeding $1 per printed page."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 48, 80, 95, and 111.

HENRY F. ASHURST,
H. L. MYERS,
MOSES E. CLAPP,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOHN H. STEPHENS,
C. D. CARTER,
P. D. NORTON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I wish to say that the conferees have not agreed on all the amendments. There are four amendments which are still in dispute.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to make a suggestion to the Senator from Arizona. He does not intend, I presume, to ask that the conference report be printed as a Senate document, but that it be printed for the use of the committee and to be placed on the desks for the information of the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. That is satisfactory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 14074. An act granting the consent of Congress to the village of Fox Lake, in the county of Lake, State of Illinois, to construct a bridge across both arms of the Fox River where it connects Pistakee Lake and Nippersink Lake, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in the county of Lake, State of Illinois;

H. R. 17602. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Polk County, Minn., and Grand Forks County, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across Red River of the North on the boundary line between said States;

H. R. 17710. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Tallapoosa River, separating the counties of Montgomery and Elmore, in the State of Alabama, at a point somewhere between Judkin Ferry and Hughes Ferry;

H. R. 18529. An act granting the consent of Congress to the police jury of Rapides Parish, La., to construct a bridge across Red River at or near Boyce, La.;

H. R. 18534. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the St. Francis River at or near Parkin, Ark.;

H. R. 18550. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Montgomery, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River;

H. R. 18551. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Montgomery, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River;

H. R. 18720. An act permitting the building of a railroad bridge across the Mississippi River at Bemidji, in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 18725. An act granting the consent of Congress to Kratka Township, Pennington County, Minn., to construct a bridge across Red Lake River;

H. R. 19239. An act 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.;

H. R. 19298. An act authorizing the Western New York & Pennsylvania Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River, in the town of Allegany, county of Cattaraugus, N. Y.; and

H. R. 20574. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Decatur County, Ga., to reconstruct a bridge across the Flint River at Bainbridge, Ga.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RANSDELL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14777) to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, Cal., and for other purposes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement regarding the railroad legislation. There are three bills to which the President has called special attention in a message. One is the bill enlarging the Interstate Commerce Commission from seven to nine members, and providing that it shall be divided into three divisions, each of which will have jurisdiction over the subjects that now belong to the entire commission.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. OVERMAN. I will state to the Senator if he yields to me I shall move to adjourn or to take a recess, because I know the Senator can not get his bill up this afternoon. I move that we take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. RANSDELL. I hope the Senator will not insist on that motion. We can get the bill up, and then I propose to ask that it be laid aside and that the Senate proceed with the consideration of these emergency measures.

Mr. OVERMAN. I know the Senator can not possibly get the bill up this afternoon.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Certainly we can not get it up if the Senate will not permit it to be taken up, but I do not think the mere statement of the Senator from North Carolina settles the question.

Mr. OVERMAN. All right; I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana yielded to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], and he now has the floor. Does the Senator from Nevada now yield to some other Senator; and if so, to whom?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I propose to continue the remarks I was making.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. THOMAS. My understanding is that the so-called water-power bill is the unfinished business. I have no desire to retain that bill before the Senate, but I am a member of the Committee on Public Lands, and the chairman of the committee is not here. In his behalf I make the inquiry.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. RANSDELL. I hope the Senator will not make that motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina moves that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. RANSDELL. I ask the Senator to withdraw the motion and move a recess. I will accept that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m., Friday, February 9, 1917) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 10, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *February 9, 1917.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

O Thou, who art supremely wise, all-powerful, the essence of whose being is love, quicken all that is purest, noblest, best in us, and help us to eliminate the evil tendencies which lie in wait to destroy; that the trend of our life may be forward not backward, upward not downward, heavenward not hellward; that we may build for ourselves from within a character which shall be an everlasting memorial to our Maker, through Him who taught us the way and the truth and the life. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LANGLEY rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LANGLEY. To ask unanimous consent to address the House for not exceeding five minutes in order that I may explain and modify a statement I made in debate yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to address the House for not exceeding five minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is pension day, and I ask unanimous consent that two pension bills on the Private Calendar, one a Senate bill from the Committee on Invalid Pensions and one a House bill from the Committee on Pensions, be considered in order and taken up following the completion of the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that a Senate private pension bill from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and also a House bill from the Committee on Pensions, be taken up immediately following the conclusion of the consideration of the naval appropriation bill. Is there objection?

Mr. KITCHIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Missouri that it was understood the other day, or rather the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. RAUCH] gave notice, that immediately after the conclusion of the naval appropriation bill he would ask for the consideration of the pension appropriation bill. It will take not more than an hour and a half or two hours, if that. I suggest that the gentleman from Missouri make his request to follow that bill. I understand the gentleman from Missouri thinks it will take only half an hour to dispose of his bills.

Mr. SHERWOOD. It will take about 22 minutes to pass the two bills.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, we can stay here an hour later if necessary.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Well, I will change the request and ask that these private pension bills be taken up following the consideration of the pension appropriation bill.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Missouri, as well as to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], that there is no objection to the consideration of these bills, but there is some difficulty in making an agreement in advance. It is just as easy to take up these bills after the pension appropriation bill is passed or after the naval appropriation bill is passed as it is now, but why make this advance agreement?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Because this is pension day, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. They are in order at any time.

Mr. GARNER. I know they are in order.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think there will be no objection. We can stay here an hour or two later if necessary.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman believe that in spite of the effort of any man it would take more than half a day?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; and it will not take half a night.

Mr. MANN. They could be considered now while waiting for Members to come in.

Mr. GARNER. I have no objection.

Mr. MANN. Why not read them now?

Mr. KITCHIN. That would be perfectly satisfactory to me. If the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] in charge of the naval appropriation bill would prefer that course, all right. But if he prefers to go on with the naval bill, very well.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would prefer that the matter be disposed of now rather than to break into it at 5 o'clock this afternoon, because I can not forecast as to the time. If it will not take more than 20 minutes I shall not object.

Mr. MANN. It will be in order at any time to move to defer it. I suggest that the gentleman from Missouri ask to consider those bills in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] asked unanimous consent to proceed for not exceeding five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for five minutes.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, acting wholly upon my own initiative and in obedience to a sense of justice, I am making this statement for the RECORD.

Yesterday while the House was debating some of the Senate amendments to the legislative bill I had an understanding with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], who had charge of the time, that I was to have five minutes in opposition to the amendment proposing to classify postmasters. I hurriedly proceeded to arrange in my mind the points I would endeavor to cover in that time. At the last moment the gentleman from Tennessee informed me that owing to encroachments upon his time by those who had preceded me he could only yield me a minute and a half and I then had less time than that remaining in which to think of something to say in that minute and a half. [Laughter.]

It occurred to me that I could cite my experience as appointment clerk of the Census Office in helping to organize that office independent of the civil service as an illustration of how easily a high standard of efficiency can be obtained without competitive examination. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] had both just spoken in support of the Senate amendment. I recalled that they had both submitted, along with other Members of Congress, their recommendations to fill the quotas allotted to them in that office; and, speaking in a spirit of badinage and, of course, hastily, I used language which was calculated to place those two gentlemen in a false position. The reporters' notes, which are usually correct, show that I said these two gentlemen were among those who made the most consistent appeals for patronage. After thinking the matter over I regretted that I used the language that I did, and would gladly have recalled it. The facts are that we made an allotment of Census Office appointments to each Senator and Representative and notified each of the number allotted to him and requested him to submit a list of recommendations. Both of the gentlemen named did this and my recollection is that the quota allotted in each instance was filled, but if I am in error as to that the records of the Census Office will show it. However, that is neither here nor there. I want to frankly, and in this public manner, say that as I now recall it there was no effort whatever on the part of either gentleman named to get more appointments than the bureau had requested them to ask for, and both of them were always courteous and considerate in their dealing with the bureau in these matters.

During my 10 years of service in this body I have never intentionally misrepresented or otherwise done an injustice to any of my fellow Members. I have always been scrupulously careful on that point, and I can not, in justice to my own sense of fairness and in justice to the two gentlemen referred to, permit this incident to pass without putting this statement in the RECORD. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit me to say what I said to him privately yesterday, but not publicly, that he did not hurt my feelings any? [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. I am very glad, indeed, to have my friend say that publicly.

Mr. Speaker, having made this explanation and not having had the opportunity to express myself fully yesterday on the question, I ask unanimous consent that I may state briefly in the RECORD my reasons for opposing the proposition to classify postmasters and my views on civil service.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Niagara power bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Niagara power bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had, on February 8, 1917, approved and signed bills of the following titles:

H. R. 1024. An act for the relief of Allen M. Hiller;

H. R. 6145. An act for the relief of Edward F. McDermott, alias James Williams;

H. R. 8057. An act for the relief of the legal representatives of Napoleon B. Giddings;

H. R. 8267. An act to place Bernard A. Schaaf on the retired list of the Army;

H. R. 217. An act to authorize the sale of school property in the city of Denver, Colo., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3238. An act for the relief of Sarah E. Elliott;

H. R. 8452. An act for the relief of Charles L. Moore;

H. R. 9547. An act authorizing the acceptance by the United States Government from the Kenesaw Memorial Association of Illinois of a proposed gift of land on the Kenesaw battle field in the State of Georgia;

H. R. 12240. An act for the relief of John Brodie;

H. R. 12742. An act for the relief of Gottlob Schlect and Maurice D. Higgins and for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Valentine Brasch;

H. R. 13106. An act for the relief of the trustee and parties who are now or who may hereafter become interested in the estate of James A. Chamberlain under the terms of his will;

H. R. 13820. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Buttner;

H. R. 14572. An act for the relief of Gertie Foss;

H. R. 14645. An act for the relief of the legal representative of P. H. Aylett;

H. R. 14822. An act to prevent and punish the desecration, mutilation, or improper use, within the District of Columbia, of the flag of the United States of America; and

H. R. 14978. An act for the relief of Ida Turner.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 7833. An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 7433. An act for the relief of Winfield S. Solomon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 7598. An act for the relief of John H. Kidd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 6430. An act directing the reexamination of the accounts of the late Peter G. S. Ten Broeck; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6251. An act for the relief of John F. Kelly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 5648. An act for the relief of Fast Walker, D. K. How, and Not Afraid of Bear; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 5768. An act for the relief of Frank Carpenter; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5617. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States district court for the district of Minnesota to hear, try, and determine the value of certain pine timber; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3180. An act to authorize the appointment of Clarence C. Kress to the grade of captain, United States Army Medical Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 747. An act for the relief of Wilbur F. Lawton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3507. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Marsh Watkins; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6854. An act to repeal the last proviso of section 4 of an act to establish the Rocky Mountain National Park, in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, approved January 26, 1915; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 378. An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge in the middle and eastern judicial districts in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5632) for the relief of Aquila Nebeker.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 19359. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 378. An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge in the middle and eastern judicial districts in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes.

GUILFORD COURTHOUSE BATTLE FIELD.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8229) to establish a national military park at the battle field of Guilford Courthouse with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8229) to establish a national military park at the battle field of Guilford Courthouse.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to take the bill from the Speaker's table, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. DENT, Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina, and Mr. KAHN.

PENSIONS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up pension bills on the Private Calendar and consider first the bill S. 7486 in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to take up pension bills on the Private Calendar and take up first the bill S. 7486 and consider the same in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (S. 7486) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Celia A. Blodgett, widow of Benjamin F. Blodgett, late of Company F, First Regiment United States Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William W. Olmsted, late of Company K, Twenty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Hendrickson, late of Independent Battery H, Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, and Company C, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aaron C. Rodocker, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Schliessmann, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Mitchell, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Blanche F. Nash, widow of Guy T. Nash, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Vermont Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Mayfield, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Prine, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Jarrett, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Richey, late of Company M, Twenty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary P. Ross, widow of Henry S. Ross, late of Company E, Eighty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Isaac R. Johnson, late of Company B, Thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Columbus Walton, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sada Gleeson, widow of William J. Gleeson, late of Company C, Fortieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Severn L. Parks, late of Company A, Eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month, the same to be paid him without deduction or rebate on account of former alleged erroneous payments or overpayments of pension.

The name of Ellen Rush, widow of Ebenezer C. Rush, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of George A. Blose, late of Company C, Second Battalion Pennsylvania Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Lander, widow of David D. Lander, late of Company H, Forty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George D. Smith, late of Company K, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Crocker, late of Company A, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and Seventh Independent Battery Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Sheplar, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of La Fayette Platt, late of Company H, One hundred and Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cornelius T. Ham, late of Seventh Company, unassigned, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph C. Patterson, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mathias Eyer, late of Company D, Two hundred and tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emily P. Hubbard, widow of George M. Hubbard, late first lieutenant and quartermaster, Seventy-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William H. Cleland, late of Company F, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James K. Wesley, late of Company I, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry M. Bryant, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel D. Sherman, late of Company K, Ninety-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elmore Y. Chase, late surgeon United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John E. Madison, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment, and Company K, Second Regiment, New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Elliott, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Pope, late of Company B, Twenty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leona B. Haucke, widow of Albert Haucke, late of Company D, Fifty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jacob W Perkins, alias William West, late of Company L, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi J. Richardson, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and Company B, First Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Niels Attleson, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick A. Churchill, late topographical engineer, captain, and volunteer aid-de-camp to Gen. McClellan and Gen. A. E. Burnside, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of James B. Thornton, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John N. McClure, late of Company A, Eighty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James T. Piggott, late of Company F, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Harrison, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry H. Niles, late of U. S. S. *Moose*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ephraim Smith, late of Company I, Two hundred and seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edgar P. Lewis, late of Company K, Sixty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Solomon Terpenning, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Reed, late of Company A, Thirty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Cook, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph A. Miller, late of Company D, Third Regiment, Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Stouffer, late of Capt. Sanno's independent company, Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James S. Sisson, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Unferfate, late of Company B, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George R. Gibney, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George M. Kimble, late of Company K, Sixty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles N. Chatto, late of U. S. S. *Nipsic*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wylie Brown, late of Company A, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles Asa Clark, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edwin D. Sweet, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George O. Whitman, late of Company K, Twenty-second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander Faries, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Seventh Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $21 per month.

The name of Thomas B. Williams, late of Company K, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lemuel Evans, late of Company D, First Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Walker, late of Company G, Twenty-second Regiment, and Company G, Twenty-ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Bradley, late of Company G, First Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and medical cadet, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles R. Stuart, late of Company H, Sixtieth Regiment Massachusetts Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliakim Byard, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jasper Trimble, late of Company A, Nineteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George G. Tuell, late of Company A, First Battalion Maine Volunteer Sharpshooters, and Company A, Twentieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Matilda A. Bickford, widow of George H. Bickford, late of Company K, Twentieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Twenty-third Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Bailey Mitchell, late of U. S. S. *Huron*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert H. Keller, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sylvester Clark, late of the Seventh Battery Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Ward, late of Company D, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis J. Cousens, late of Companies H and F, Thirtieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Simon Ridenour, late of Company G, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jefferson Foncannon, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Angelia T. Mosier, widow of Byron Mosier, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nathan J. Way, late of Company I, Engineers of the West, Missouri Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Enoch Jones, late of the United States Marine Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Torrance, late of Companies F and D, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Gilmore, late of Company A, Seventy-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Love, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin Tackitt, late of Company B, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Grace Elizabeth Brown, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas E. Brown, late of U. S. S. *Vermont*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Boadicea T. Dinsmore, former widow of Sewell C. Gray, late captain Company A, Sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry B. Burgh, late lieutenant colonel Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ephraim J. Allen, late of Company C, Seventy-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edwin Rogers, late of Company G, Fortieth Regiment, and Company A, First Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Banghart, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucy E. Sturdevant, widow of Marcus Sturdevant, late of Company I, Nineteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Toyger Peterson, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Royal E. Dake, late commissary sergeant First Regiment New York Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick W. Mase, late of Company D, Thirty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ruth A. McMillan, widow of Jonathan H. McMillan, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment, and captain Company K, Twenty-third Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Wright, widow of William H. Wright, late captain Company C, Fifth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Lamberson, late of Company D, Twenty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank T. Bolton, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frances I. Wallace, widow of William A. Wallace, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment New York State Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Edward Neugent, late captain Company A, One hundred and seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jeremiah B. Davis, late of Company E, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. Stearns, late of Companies D and B, Forty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry W. Gash, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ferdinand Davis, late of Company K, First Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Cooper, late of Company D, One hundred and fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Hudson, late of Company E, Twenty-third Regiment, and unassigned, Twenty-ninth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Dalton Selby, late of Company E, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John L. Fisher, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew M. Vanover, late of Company H, Sixty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis Mensch, late of Company G, One hundred and seventy-second Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Holliday, late of Company I, Thirty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Horace N. Holbrook, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert F. Hedrick, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Calvin Sharpnack, late of Company C, First Battalion Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles E. Collins, late of Company D, Twenty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Sparrow, late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Reynold D. W. Campbell, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Treat, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving

The name of Louisa A. Atherton, widow of Daniel W. Atherton, late of Company B, Ninety-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ezekiel P. Rowell, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aura V. Thurston, widow of James H. Thurston, late of Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry G. Mitchell, late of Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Sperry, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Luther B. Johnson, late of Company C, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward F. Griswold, late captain Company F, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry H. Frampton, late of Company I, Sixty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Wilson, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Edgar Mason, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jonas H. Upton, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Galbreath, late of Company K, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Cook, late of Battery B, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $21 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph S. Morgan, late of Company B, Twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Watkin Countryman, late of Company A, Thirty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna E. Tenney, helpless and dependent daughter of Samuel Tenney, late of Company D, Maine Volunteer Coast Guards, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Theodore Gerrish, late of Company H, Twentieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles P. Betts, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William R. Browning, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jennie Jamison, now Beamer, late nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and widow of Marion Beamer, late of Company A, Forty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Crandell, widow of David Crandell, late of Company K, Thirty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles Washington, late of Company K, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hugh Stevens, late of Company D, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adna H. Bowen, late second lieutenant Company F, Fifteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and major, Sixth Regiment, United States Colored Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Paul Strause, late of Company K, Forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John L. Skinner, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Nally, late of Company C, Sixth Battalion District of Columbia Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $21 per month.

The name of Andrew Goodwin, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Thompson, late of Company H, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob R. Stillwagon, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William S. Rowe, late of Company D, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas L. Irwin, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of $21 per month.

The name of Maurice M. Kaighn, late of Company F, One hundred and ninety-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen P. Colby, late second lieutenant Company F, Fifteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Job Wilbur, late of Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Minnie J. Hodge, widow of Allen T. Hodge, late of Company C, First Battalion Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Martin Pool, late of Company C, Forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Stevenson, widow of Grandson F. Stevenson, late of Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Samuel C. Clossin, late of Company B, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac R. Atlee, late of Company E, Forty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Brown, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Simpson, late of Company G, First Regiment New York Volunteer Marine Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theodore Longfellow, late of Company G, Fifty-seventh Regiment, and Company G, Fifty-ninth Regiment, Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Kate M. White, widow of Henry A. White, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and

pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joseph C. Predmore, late of Company G, Eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James S. White, late of Company H, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josephine E. Ure, widow of William Ure, late of Company H, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Beauchamp, late unassigned, Thirty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mettie Sanders, widow of Henry Sanders, late of Company H, Forty-second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sidney M. Smith, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Chapman, late of Company C, Forty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Mayer, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Wahl, late of Company G, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Stevens, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Timothy Welch, late of Company H, Thirtieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. Smith, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Maybury, late of Company D, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Moses E. Lowell, late of Company A, Twenty-seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Battery E, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi G. Foss, late of Company G, Thirty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ida M. Paine, widow of Joseph C. Paine, late of Company B, First Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of George F. Boothby, late of Company E, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas King, late first lieutenant Company F, Ninety-second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna C. Stahel, widow of John Stahel, late captain Company K, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Reason D. Evensizer, late of Company G, One hundred and ninety-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. Penley, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Barber B. Durgin, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following bills reported from the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

S. 365. Celia A. Blodgett.
S. 1190. William W. Olmsted.
S. 1629. John W. Hendrickson.
S. 1754. Aaron C. Rodocker.
S. 1761. John J. Schliessmann.
S. 1762. Richard Mitchell.
S. 2210. Blanche F. Nash.
S. 2280. John Mayfield.
S. 2571. William W. Prine.
S. 2572. John H. Jarrett.
S. 2616. William Richey.
S. 2739. Mary P. Ross.
S. 2942. Isaac R. Johnson.
S. 2946. Columbus Walton.
S. 3014. Sada Gleeson.
S. 3123. Severn L. Parks.
S. 3204. Ellen Rush.
S. 3282. George A. Blose.
S. 3300. Elizabeth Lander.
S. 3321. George D. Smith.
S. 3326. William J. Crocker.
S. 3576. Peter Sheplar.
S. 3632. La Fayette Piatt.
S. 3688. Cornelius T. Ham.
S. 3725. Joseph C. Patterson.
S. 3914. Mathias Eyer.
S. 4005. Emily P. Hubbard.
S. 4150. William H. Cleland.
S. 4291. James K. Wesley.
S. 4393. Henry M. Bryant.
S. 4395. Samuel D. Sherman.
S. 4652. Elmore Y. Chase.
S. 4678. John E. Madison.
S. 4685. John Elliott.
S. 4696. William C. Pope.
S. 4714. Leona B. Haucke.
S. 4734. Jacob W. Perkins.
S. 4747. Levi J. Richardson.
S. 4753. Nels Attleson.
S. 4847. Frederick A. Churchill.
S. 4904. James B. Thornton.
S. 4959. John N. McClure.
S. 4994. James T. Piggott.
S. 5034. Thomas J. Harrison.
S. 5154. Henry H. Niles.
S. 5252. Ephraim Smith.
S. 5357. Edgar P. Lewis.
S. 5363. Solomon Terpenning.
S. 5409. Charles Reed.
S. 5530. John C. Cook.
S. 5557. Joseph A. Miller.
S. 5662. John Stouffer.
S. 5714. James S. Sisson.
S. 5804. John Unferfate.
S. 5812. George R. Gibney.
S. 5877. George M. Kimble.
S. 5997. Charles N. Chatto.
S. 6003. Wylie Brown.
S. 6060. Charles Asa Clark.
S. 6064. Louis A. Allor.
S. 6171. Edwin D. Sweet.
S. 6173. George O. Whitman.
S. 6174. Alexander Faries.
S. 6175. Thomas B. Williams.
S. 6196. Lemuel Evans.
S. 6238. John Walker.
S. 6253. William H. Bradley.
S. 6268. Charles R. Stuart.
S. 6271. Eliakim Byard.
S. 6307. Jasper Trimble.
S. 6340. George G. Tuell.
S. 6341. Matilda A. Bickford.
S. 6345. Bailey Mitchell.
S. 6365. Robert H. Keller.
S. 6367. Sylvester Clark.
S. 6386. George W. Ward.
S. 6394. Francis J. Cousens.
S. 6399. Simon Ridenour.
S. 6403. Jefferson Foncannon.
S. 6413. Angelia T. Mosier.
S. 6418. Nathan J. Way.
S. 6419. Enoch Jones.
S. 6420. John W. Torrance.
S. 6438. Charles Ainsworth.
S. 6442. Charles Gilmore.
S. 6456. William J. Love.
S. 6457. Benjamin Tackitt.
S. 6458. Grace Elizabeth Brown.
S. 6474. Boadicea E. Dinsmore.
S. 6480. Henry B. Burgh.
S. 6490. Henry C. Tulleys.
S. 6500. Ephraim J. Allen.
S. 6527. Edwin Rogers.
S. 6530. George Banghart.
S. 6534. Lucy E. Sturdevant.
S. 6535. Toyger Peterson.
S. 6536. Royal E. Dake.
S. 6537. Frederick W. Mase.
S. 6539. Ruth A. McMillan.
S. 6565. Sarah Wright.
S. 6591. John Lamberson.
S. 6597. Frank T. Bolton.
S. 6600. Frances I. Wallace.
S. 6607. Edward Neugent.
S. 6611. Jeremiah B. Davis.
S. 6620. John S. Stearns.
S. 6640. Henry W. Gash.
S. 6660. Ferdinand Davis.
S. 6663. John Cooper.
S. 6694. John Hudson.
S. 6695. Henry Dalton Selby.
S. 6700. John L. Fisher.
S. 6706. Andrew M. Vanover.
S. 6713. Lewis Mensch.
S. 6728. Samuel Holliday.
S. 6732. Horace N. Holbrook.
S. 6741. John K. Mayo.
S. 6742. Robert F. Hedrick.
S. 6743. Calvin Sharpnack.
S. 6756. Charles E. Collins.
S. 6759. John R. Sparrow.
S. 6761. Reynold D. W. Campbell.
S. 6762. James M. Treat.
S. 6763. Louisa A. Atherton.
S. 6764. Ezekial P. Rowell.
S. 6766. Aura V. Thurston.
S. 6767. Henry G. Mitchell.
S. 6779. John W. Sperry.
S. 6780. Luther B. Johnson.
S. 6784. Edward F. Griswold.
S. 6787. Henry H. Frampton.
S. 6809. William F. Wilson.
S. 6838. Charles Edgar Mason.
S. 6860. Jonas H. Upton.
S. 6861. David Galbreath.
S. 6871. John Cook.
S. 6876. Joseph S. Morgan.
S. 6879. Watkin Countryman.
S. 6899. Anna E. Tenney.
S. 6907. Theodore Gerrish.
S. 6915. Charles P. Betts.
S. 6940. William R. Browning.
S. 6945. Jennie Jamison Beamer.
S. 6959. Mary J. Crandell.
S. 6967. Charles Washington.
S. 6984. Hugh Stevens.
S. 6987. Adna H. Bowen.
S. 6997. Paul Strause.
S. 7010. John L. Skinner.
S. 7012. William W. Nally.
S. 7018. Andrew Goodwin.
S. 7021. Henry Thompson.
S. 7024. Jacob R. Stillwagon.
S. 7025. William S. Rowe.
S. 7030. Thomas L. Irwin.
S. 7033. Maurice M. Kaighn.
S. 7034. Stephen P. Colby.
S. 7044. Job Wilbur.
S. 7050. Minnie J. Hodge.
S. 7053. Martin Pool.
S. 7059. Margaret Stevenson.
S. 7060. Samuel C. Clossin.
S. 7061. Isaac R. Atlee.
S. 7062. Thomas Brown.
S. 7064. John R. Simpson.
S. 7093. Theodore Longfellow.
S. 7096. Kate M. White.
S. 7100. Joseph C. Predmore.
S. 7101. James S. White.
S. 7144. Josephine E. Ure.
S. 7145. William Beauchamp.
S. 7153. Mettie Sanders.
S. 7158. Sidney M. Smith.
S. 7162. Joseph Chapman.
S. 7181. John C. Mayer.
S. 7182. William F. Wahl.
S. 7188. John Stevens.
S. 7212. Timothy Welch.
S. 7213. Charles F. Smith.
S. 7214. George Maybury.
S. 7216. Moses E. Lowell.
S. 7218. Levi G. Foss.
S. 7227. Ida M. Paine.
S. 7233. George F. Boothby.
S. 7235. Thomas King.
S. 7237. Anna C. Stahel.
S. 7250. Reason D. Evensizer.
S. 7277. Charles F. Penley.
S. 7284. Barber B. Durgin.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

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

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 20827) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up House bill 20827, and asks that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of John M. Cornelison, late of Company C, Third Regiment Texas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles A. Holmes, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of George M. Thompson, late of Company C, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Wirt V. Libby, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William Merritt, late of Company H, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Herbert Green, late of Company C, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Frank E. Conkling, late of Company B, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a

pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Arthur L. Perry, late of Troop F, First Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Jerome J. Miller, late of Company G, Fifty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Henry S. Robert, late of Companies E and F, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Abraham H. Barnes, late of Company E, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Jasper Johnson, late of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Duval Johnson, late of Company M, Thirty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Frank P. Collins, late of Company M, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Ernest J. Patton, late of Company G, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Eron B. Wallace, late of Company M, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josephine Burnett, widow of Richard Burnett, late of Company E, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William Rohder, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Carl J. Domrose, late of Company L, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John G. Fehrle, late of Company I, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Joseph Tanco, jr., late of Company I, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Clifford T. Ham, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Virginia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles A. Vanatta, late of Company M, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Willie E. Terry, late of Company G, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Joseph A. M. Johnson, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Roy W. Noe, late of Company H, Signal Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Gideon B. Marshall, late of Company K, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Martha A. Knapp, dependent mother of Forrest W. Durant, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William D. Edwards, late of Company A, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William B. McCarthy, late of Company D, Third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John P. Burrow, jr., late of United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $8 per month.

The name of Jacob Tull, late of Troop E, Ninth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Allen P. Gabbard, late of Sixty-sixth Company United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles L. McClure, late of Company M, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Daniel F. French, late of Fifteenth Battery, United States Field Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Luke R. Ford, late of Troop L, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert B. Hawkins, late of Company G, Second Regiment United States Infantry, and Company C, Second Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Louisa Wilson, dependent mother of Michael B. Wilson, late of Troop L, Fourteenth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Willis P. McCampbell, late of Company A, General Service United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Joseph Canton, late of Company L, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles B. Reid, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Ida Bill, widow of William Bill, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William J. Givens, late of Company C, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month.

The name of James F. Cummins, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Twenty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Kush, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John E. Packard, late of Company B, Eighteenth United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles M. Baughman, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Whitson, late captain of Company L, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of George R. Weight, late a member of Company B, Fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Snyder, late of Company L, Fortieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Edward G. Fetsch, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles Gilford, late of Company F, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Lawrence P. Williams, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Walter C. C. Jennings, late of Troop D, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Frank Riska, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John L. Barber, late of Company D, Second Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Arthur B. Clark, late of Company K, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Benjamin Harrison, late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph P. Riley, helpless and dependent child of Joseph V. Riley, late of Troop A, Fifth United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William J. Riley, helpless and dependent child of Joseph V. Riley, late of Troop A, Fifth United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Patrick McDonald, late of Company A, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Howard M. Greenwald, late of Company L, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Hood Sikes, late of Company B, First Territorial United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Edward Evans, late of Company E, Thirtieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harry W. Feldman, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month

The name of William A. Ritter, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Herbert W. Barnhart, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louis F. Ursenbach, late of band, First Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank A. Smith, of detachment of Engineers, United States Military Academy, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William M. Davis, late of Battery B, Georgia Light Artillery, and Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John Johnson, late of Company G, Second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Orin Marshall, late of Company A, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John F. Chamberlain, late of Company B, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Harry L. Peebles, late unassigned recruit Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Robert T. Rowland, late of Companies B and D, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $8 per month.

The name of Thomas Horan, late of United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Herbert S. Coheley, late of Troop A, First United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Lewis L. Cummings, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marie G. Harding, widow of Arthur E. Harding, late captain, Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Arthur Patten, late of Company B, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Robert L. Crook, jr., late major, Third Regiment Mississippi Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of James F. Coakley, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louis S. Harris, late of Battery A, Third Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Richard Thrash, late of Troop A, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles L. Thompson, late of Company G, (Burnett's) New York Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin Williams, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret A. Wells, widow of Martin C. Wells, late of Capt. Morgan's company of Iowa Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Alfred J. Yarber, late of Company M, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Frank M. Clark, late of Company M, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas M. Rodgers, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Martin L. Thomas, late of Company I, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Augustus Light, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Justus W. Swanberg, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Fred Angelo, late of Troop C, Thirteenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Arthur Plank, late of Troop K, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of James W. Lathrop, late of United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lily D. Murphy, widow of Frank T. Murphy, late of Battery K, Third Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles V. Grogan, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Robert J. Clement, dependent father of Ira C. Clement, late of Company G, First Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ida M. Zimmerman, widow of Charles A. Zimmerman, late leader of the Naval Academy Band, Regular Establishment, with the rank of lieutenant, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of James L. McDougall, late of Company K, Thirty-first Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Michael J. Rowland, late of Company H, First Regiment Wyoming Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James E. Braddock, late of Company F, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Henry B. Gaylor, late of One hundred and sixty-ninth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph R. Hunter, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Ingabow Falls, widow of John M. Falls, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George W. Paul, late of Company D, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Frank L. Schaarman, alias Frank L. Sherman, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month.

The name of George Parliament, late of Company C, Second Regiment Louisiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Thirty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month

The name of George Wiszneauckas, late of the Forty-second Company, United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Clara D. Peterson, widow of Henry Peterson, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month and $2 per month additional on account of each of the two minor children of the said Henry Peterson until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Martha E. Wardlaw, widow of John B. Wardlaw, late of Capt. Tally's company, First Georgia Drafted Militia, Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Caroline Philpot, widow of Allen Philpot, alias William Philpot, late of Capt. John Witcher's company, Georgia Mounted Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Otto H. Staron, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Polly Tipton, widow of Gutch T. Tipton, late of Company H, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, and $2 per month additional on account of each of the four minor children of the said Gutch T. Tipton until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Murray H. Lewis, late of Company C, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of David S. Harrison, late of United States Navy, Regular Establishment and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Louis M. Rheaume, late of Company E, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Rebecca Morris, widow of James E. Morris, late of Capt. W. H. Kendrick's company, Florida Mounted Volunteers, Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma F. Buchanan, widow of Francis A. Buchanan, late of Capt. Childs's company, South Carolina Mounted Volunteers, Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie N. Sullivan, widow of Calvin Sullivan, late of Capt. Yoakum's Tennessee Volunteers, Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret R. Brevard, widow of Zebulon Brevard, late of Capt. McLin's company, Tennessee Volunteers, Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 1107. John M. Cornelison.
H. R. 1304. Charles A. Holmes.
H. R. 1640. George M. Thompson.
H. R. 2091. Wirt V. Libby.
H. R. 2360. William Merritt.
H. R. 2586. Herbert Green.
H. R. 2631. Frank E. Conkling.
H. R. 2754. Arthur L. Perry.
H. R. 2982. Jerome J. Miller.
H. R. 3831. Hebry S. Robert.
H. R. 4022. Abraham H. Barnes.
H. R. 4641. Jasper Johnson.
H. R. 5067. Duval Johnson.
H. R. 5325. Frank P. Collins.
H. R. 6002. Ernest J. Patton.
H. R. 6149. Eron B. Wallace.
H. R. 6411. Josephine Burnett.
H. R. 7044. William Rohder.
H. R. 7414. Carl J. Domrose.
H. R. 7519. John G. Fehrle.
H. R. 7717. Joseph Tanco.
H. R. 7814. Clifford T. Ham.
H. R. 7875. Charles A. Vanatta.
H. R. 7892. Willie E. Terry.
H. R. 8055. Joseph A. M. Johnson.
H. R. 8799. Roy W. Noe.
H. R. 8833. Gideon B. Marshall.
H. R. 9185. Martha A. Knapp.
H. R. 9496. William D. Edwards.
H. R. 9497. William B. McCarthy.
H. R. 9753. John F. Burrow, jr.
H. R. 10172. Jacob Tull.
H. R. 10449. Allen P. Gabbard.
H. R. 10634. Charles L. McClure.
H. R. 10714. Daniel F. French.
H. R. 10793. Luke R. Ford.
H. R. 10825. Robert B. Hawkins.
H. R. 10962. Louisa Wilson.
H. R. 11013. Willis P. McCampbell.
H. R. 11508. Joseph Canton.
H. R. 11573. Charles B. Reid.
H. R. 11655. Ida Bill.
H. R. 12097. William J. Givens.
H. R. 12141. James F. Cummins.
H. R. 12393. William A. Kush.
H. R. 12622. John E. Packard.
H. R. 12698. Charles M. Baughman.
H. R. 12861. Thomas Whitson.
H. R. 12896. George R. Weight.
H. R. 12957. John Snyder.
H. R. 13157. Edward G. Fetsch.
H. R. 13172. Charles Gilford.
H. R. 13202. Lawrence P. Williams.
H. R. 13209. Walter C. C. Jennings.
H. R. 13235. Frank Riska.
H. R. 13256. John L. Barber.
H. R. 13302. Arthur B. Clark.
H. R. 14141. Benjamin Harrison.
H. R. 14284. Joseph P. Riley.
H. R. 14285. William J. Riley.
H. R. 14311. Patrick McDonald.
H. R. 14513. Howard M. Greenwald.
H. R. 14591. Hood Sikes.
H. R. 14681. Edward Evans.
H. R. 14760. Harry W. Feldman.
H. R. 14764. William A. Ritter.
H. R. 15355. Herbert W. Barnhart.
H. R. 15422. Louis F. Ursenback.
H. R. 15669. Frank A. Smith.
H. R. 15773. William M. Davis.
H. R. 15854. John Johnson.
H. R. 16001. Orin Marshall.
H. R. 16370. John F. Chamberlain.
H. R. 16378. Harry L. Peebles.
H. R. 16636. Robert T. Rowland.
H. R. 16698. Thomas Horan.
H. R. 17093. Herbert S. Coheley.
H. R. 17108. Lewis L. Cummings.
H. R. 17209. Marie G. Harding.
H. R. 17358. Arthur Patten.
H. R. 17359. Robert L. Crook.
H. R. 17559. James F. Coakley.
H. R. 17673. Louis S. Harris.
H. R. 17929. Richard Thrash.
H. R. 18066. Charles L. Thompson.
H. R. 18264. Franklin Williams.
H. R. 18276. Margaret A. Wells.
H. R. 18344. Alfred J. Yarber.
H. R. 18423. Frank M. Clark.
H. R. 18467. Thomas M. Rodgers.
H. R. 18525. Martin L. Thomas.
H. R. 18628. Augustus Light.
H. R. 18645. Justus W. Swanberg.
H. R. 18662. Fred Angelo.
H. R. 18857. Arthur Plank.
H. R. 18870. James W. Lathrop.
H. R. 19017. Lily D. Murphy.
H. R. 19035. Charles V. Grogan.
H. R. 19133. Robert J. Clement.
H. R. 19157. Ida M. Zimmerman.
H. R. 19250. James L. McDougall.
H. R. 19370. Michael J. Rowland.
H. R. 19673. James E. Braddock.
H. R. 19818. Henry B. Gaylor.
H. R. 20127. Joseph R. Hunter.
H. R. 20227. Ingabow Falls.
H. R. 20247. George W. Paul.
H. R. 20260. Frank L. Schaarman, alias Frank L. Sherman.
H. R. 20299. George Parliament.
H. R. 20305. George Wiszneauckas.
H. R. 20343. Clara D. Peterson.
H. R. 20372. Martha E. Wardlaw.
H. R. 20389. Caroline Philpot.
H. R. 20392. Otto H. Staron.
H. R. 20491. Polly Tipton.
H. R. 20586. Murray H. Lewis.
H. R. 20623. David S. Harrison.
H. R. 20701. Louis M. Rheaume.
H. R. 20715. Rebecca Morris.
H. R. 20731. Emma F. Buchanan.
H. R. 20740. Annie N. Sullivan.
H. R. 20741. Margaret R. Brevard.

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

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

NAVY YARDS AND NAVAL STATIONS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, Report No. 3 of the Commission on Navy Yards and Naval Stations, dated January 31, 1917.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 9, 1917.*

OUR RIGHTS ON THE SEAS.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing documents relating to our rights upon the seas.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of his remarks documents concerning our rights upon the seas. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Ohio what is the nature of these documents, and what is the extent of them.

Mr. FESS. Yesterday I placed in the RECORD the documents pertaining to our controversy with Germany on the submarine question. Now I should like to print the documents relating to our controversy with Great Britain on the question of contraband, blockades, and so forth, separate from the German controversy.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; but what I inquired or tried to inquire was——

Mr. FESS. How extensive the documents are?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. First, how extensive, and, secondly, do these documents come from the State Department?

Mr. FESS. I got a good many from the State Department, but there are some which I get from the New York Times.

Mr. BARNHART. Does the gentleman think newspaper reports are sufficiently reliable? Might they not be colored so as to be misleading?

Mr. FESS. My intention is to print nothing except official documents. I do not print opinions or newspaper comments, but simply the documents themselves.

Mr. TOWNER. Let me say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] that these documents are exceedingly valuable to Members of Congress, and it is desirable to have them in a form in which they may be available, and not in scattered newspaper articles, which, as the gentleman says, are very often unreliable. But I take it the gentleman is perhaps aware that the New York Times is publishing these documents, and publishing also a current history of the war which is supposed to be as nearly official and as reliable as anything that can be procured. I am sure Dr. FESS will not put in anything that is not desirable and reliable.

Mr. FESS. I will not print any opinions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DIGEST OF CONTESTED-ELECTION CASES (H. REPT. 1445).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit a privileged resolution, which I ask to have read and considered at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana submits a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 70.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 5,000 copies, bound in buckram, for the use of the House of Representatives, of the manuscript prepared by Hon. MERRILL MOORES, being a digest of contested-election cases in the House of Representatives from 1901 to 1917, together with laws relating to contested elections in the House of Representatives and campaign contributions and expenditures.

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

Mr. BARNHART. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. How are these copies to be distributed?

Mr. BARNHART. Through the folding room.

Mr. STAFFORD. The resolution does not make any such provision.

Mr. BARNHART. They go to the folding room unless the resolution provides otherwise.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought perhaps the Committees on Elections might desire some copies of this document.

Mr. BARNHART. There are 5,000 copies. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is the author of the resolution, and I heartily concur in it. At this time, when so many election cases are coming up, I think it is important that this digest be brought down to date.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not wish it to be understood that I am opposing the resolution. I am only inquiring as to the method of distribution.

Mr. MANN. That will be through the folding room.

Mr. BARNHART. If there is no other provision in a resolution of this sort, the documents go to the folding room.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is there any necessity for binding all these copies in buckram? I should think you could have a given number bound in buckram for the individual Members, and the rest could be bound in paper.

Mr. BARNHART. The difference in cost between buckram and paper is less than $500. If we should have a part of them bound in buckram and the rest in paper, the difference in cost would be so slight that it was the opinion of the committee that we had better bind them all in buckram, the volume being an important one.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

FOX RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Fox River Bridge bill, which was passed by the House yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the Fox River Bridge bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MOORE'S DIGEST OF INTERNATIONAL LAW (H. REPT. 1447).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution which I ask to have considered at the present time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana sends up a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 31.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That 1,000 copies of Moore's Digest of International Law of the House of Representatives be printed, 700 for use of the folding room of the House and 300 for use of the folding room of the Senate, and the superintendents of the said folding rooms are hereby authorized to deliver not more than one copy to each Member of the Senate and each Member of the House on request of the Member desiring same.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. What will be done with the balance of the volumes? There will be only one, you say, for each Member, and there are but 435 Members.

Mr. BARNHART. They will be held in the folding room until our successors come in and take them up, one by one.

Mr. LANGLEY. I wish the gentleman would make it enough so as to give each Member two sets.

Mr. BARNHART. The difficulty is in the expense, and the extra set would hardly be worth while. Unless we had enough to distribute to those who are asking for them, we would be in a worse situation than if we could say we did not have any for free distribution.

Mr. LANGLEY. The reason that I make the suggestion is that I have in mind one very urgent request from my district for a copy, and I need one myself.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman, being familiar with international law, can give his copy to him.

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, as a matter of fact, I did take a three years' course in international law in the George Washington University, and I have a diploma for that course, with the names of several distinguished authorities signed to it, including such men as the late Justices Harlan and Brewer, of the Supreme Court, and David Jayne Hill. [Applause.] Apparently the gentleman from Indiana did not know that.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I think there is no authority under existing law for documents to be held in the folding room and delivered to Members who come into the House hereafter. Has the committee jurisdiction over that matter? The law requires equal distribution between the districts, and the extra numbers go to the superintendent of documents for sale.

Mr. BARNHART. Does the gentleman think that the balance would go to the superintendent of documents after the enactment of this resolution?

Mr. MANN. I do not know; probably the gentleman knows more about it than I do; but under the present law, where documents go to the folding room, there is an equal distribution between the districts, and the extra numbers go to the superintendent of documents for sale.

Mr. BARNHART. That is where there are a few extra numbers left over after an equal apportionment to Members.

Mr. MANN. If there is a vacancy in my district and that vacancy is filled, there is no law that gives preference to that district in the distribution of documents in preference to another district represented by a Member who remains here.

Mr. BARNHART. The committee had that situation under consideration, and we have specifically enacted that these shall be sent to the folding room and not more than one set be given

to each Member, and the folding room thereby will hold the balance until they are taken up.

Mr. MANN. The folding room will have to hold them; but can they ever do anything with them?

Mr. BARNHART. They can give them out in accordance with this resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Has the printing of the Moores's International Digest been heretofore authorized?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Then this involves a duplication or an extension.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are the plates in existence?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why does the committee provide a larger surplus for the Senate than for the House? The Senate does not change as often as the House.

Mr. BARNHART. The experience of the committee has been that unless we give to the Senators a proportion of one-third, which they claim as their share, they do not play ball; they let the resolution die, and we need these books.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then it is in consonance with the rule rather than the harmony of the two bodies.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. I do not want to make any statement about the other body that will have to be stricken from the RECORD, as sometimes happens.

The resolution was agreed to.

JOURNAL OF THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC (H. REPT. 1446).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 65.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed as a House document 1,500 copies of the journal of the fifty-first national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, for the year 1917, not to exceed $1,700 in cost, with illustrations, 1,000 copies of which shall be for the use of the House and 500 for the use of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20632, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. PAGE of North Carolina in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter all laws relating to the examination of officers of the Navy for promotion shall be construed to apply to the regular advancement of staff officers to higher ranks on the active list, the same as though such advancements in rank were promotions to higher grades: *Provided*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as in any way affecting the original appointment of officers to the Dental Corps as provided in the act approved August 29, 1916, making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would like to ask what is the meaning of this?

Mr. PADGETT. In the last naval appropriation bill, in the legislation reorganizing the personnel of the Navy, there was inserted a provision known as the running-mate provision for the Staff Corps—where a man on the Staff Corps would go up with his running mate in the line, the man next after whom he holds his commission. It appears that there is another statute passed some years ago requiring all the officers promoted from one grade to a higher grade to pass an examination—mental, physical, moral, and professional—in order to go up to the higher grade. With reference to the running-mate provision he might go up in rank and receive pay, but be held down in the original grade without passing the examination. This simply provides that he shall pass the examination which is now provided by law in the grade before he goes up in the rank and receives the advance pay.

Mr. MANN. Let me see if I understand the gentleman. An officer of the line is promoted, and that would give automatic promotion to his running mate on the staff, and under existing law the officer on the staff is not required to take an examination, but he gets increased pay?

Mr. PADGETT. He would go up under the running-mate provision without examination in rank, but would not in grade.

Mr. MANN. I say under existing law he would get increase in pay without taking an examination.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. This is to require him to take th examination before he gets an increase in rank or pay.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The other day the gentleman had an amendment read for information enabling the President to commandeer the various activities of the Government. I believe that the chairman stated that he was going to call the committee together to consider that provision, as well as——

Mr. PADGETT. Two others.

Mr. STAFFORD. As well as the Government purchasing the rights to patents in aviation.

Mr. PADGETT. And also expediting appropriations.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to inquire whether the committee has made any formal report upon the respective measures, and whether they are in print, so that the Members of the House can have them before they are submitted?

Mr. PADGETT. No. I have a draft of it here, and I can tell the gentleman what it is. If the gentleman will take the bill H. R. 20779 I can explain it. All of paragraph (d) is eliminated. That is the paragraph that authorizes the commandeering of labor. Then, on page 4, line 2, the language "at such reasonable price as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy" is changed by inserting the word "President" instead of the words "Secretary of the Navy," so that it would be determined by the President. The other changes are simply verbal and do not change the meaning in substance.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I inquire what is the purpose of the chairman as to the two other proposals?

Mr. PADGETT. There was no change made except that with reference to aviation there was an additional proviso added, as follows:

Provided further, That in the event there shall be pending in court litigation involving the validity of said patent or patents bond with good and approved securities in an amount sufficient to indemnify the United States shall be required, payable to the United States, conditioned to repay to the United States the amount paid for said patent or patents in the event said patent or patents are finally adjudged invalid.

That was added for the reason that there is now pending litigation in the courts. The Curtiss Co., that manufactures aeroplanes, proceeded, so it is contended by the Wright Co., to infringe upon the Wright Co. patents.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not wish to enter into a discussion of the merits of the respective propositions.

Mr. PADGETT. I was just giving the reasons.

Mr. STAFFORD. I merely want to have for the benefit of the House the action of the committee, so that the House can consider the respective proposals before they are offered formally for consideration.

Mr. PADGETT. Because of that pending litigation we inserted this proviso requiring a bond to indemnify in case that finally the patent should be adjudged an invalid patent. In other words, we do not want to buy a patent that is not any good.

Mr. STAFFORD. As to the third proposal, House bill 20781, providing for the expeditious delivery, has there been any change in that?

Mr. PADGETT. The committee inserted the words "in his discretion," so that it would read:

That to enable the President in his discretion, etc.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am much obliged to the gentleman for his information.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This section relates to the personnel of the Navy, and the personnel is more important than the matériel.

Mr. PADGETT. I think they go together.

Mr. FOSS. I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he thinks they have made ample provision here for the personnel of the Navy? That is to say, for the increase in officers and the increase in the number of men.

Mr. PADGETT. I think so. That is all provided for in the act of August 29, so far as the officers are concerned. We base it for the first time on a percentage of the enlisted strength, and that authorized a total commissioned strength in the line of 2,988, as I remember, and at that time we had 2,130, and odd. We also provided for additional appointments to Annapolis, which made the increase of 531, running the total appointments up to about 1,800 from about 1,300.

Mr. FOSS. I want to state to the gentleman that I was particularly struck by the testimony of Admiral Palmer, to be found on page 599, in which he stated that if we should mobilize to-day we would be about 938 officers short; that is, by put-

ting all of the ships into commission, which we have never yet been able to do.

Mr. PADGETT. In explanation of that, I can state that we have about 700 officers available from the Naval Militia, and then we have all of the retired officers, and that would more than fill it up, so that the whole 938 could be made up from the Naval Militia and retired officers and still leave a surplus.

Mr. FOSS. I would like to ask the gentleman in reference to the enlisted force. We provide in this bill for 68,000. Is that correct?

Mr. PADGETT. The authorized strength of the Navy, I think, is 78,000 and something, and the appropriation is made in this bill to take care of an increase up to 70,000 during the fiscal year.

Mr. FOSS. I want to call the gentleman's attention to what Admiral Palmer said on the same page, 599. He said, in speaking of mobilization, if that should occur—and, of course, that is the first thing that will occur if we should get into trouble with any foreign power, which I trust we will not do—we would be short about 8,049 Regulars and 23,330 reserves, after using 9,000 militia and 463 fleet reserves, and that the shortage would increase for each new ship commissioned in 1917 and 1918, and the three-year program alone would require 29,127 men. Then, over on page 601, there is a preliminary estimate of the personnel required for mobilization plan for July, 1916, which calls for enlisted men, Regulars, to the number of 99,809, and reserves, 45,870. How near do we approach at the present time, or under the provisions of this bill, to these requirements stated by Admiral Palmer, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation?

Mr. PADGETT. The President is authorized in time of emergency to increase to, I believe, 88,000 in the bill of last year, and then we have between nine and ten thousand in the Naval Militia.

Then we have the reserve that was provided and created by the act of August 29—845—a few days ago. Then the others would have to be enlistments which would come in from the 30,000 or 35,000 of ex-enlisted men who were out in civil life, who have gone out of the service and——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I renew my motion to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes additional. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PADGETT. And, as the gentleman is aware, there is a large number of ex-enlisted men in civil life; and Admiral Blue stated to the committee, I think last year it was, that the department had a mailing list of addresses in which they could be in touch with a large number of those men.

Mr. FOSS. Will all of these men which the gentlemen has spoken of, some——

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman will permit me for just a moment. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] asked me if the ex-enlisted men can be forced back in time of war, and I said to him, no; but that needs some qualification. Prior to two years ago all those who went out of the service prior to that time could not, but in the act of two years ago we had inserted a provision so that ex-enlisted men can be called back into the service.

Mr. HAMLIN. I thought so.

Mr. PADGETT. Where they retire, where they are on the retired list, they can be called back.

Mr. HAMLIN. I thought there was such a provision in a recent bill.

Mr. PADGETT. That is true in reference to the retired list. Now, that does not apply to where a man enlists and serves out his service and goes completely out of the service and severs all connection with the service.

Mr. FOSS. I would like to ask the gentleman, summing up all these different bodies of men to which the gentleman has referred, what would that make as our total of enlisted force if they should come in?

Mr. PADGETT. With ex-enlisted men?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. One hundred and twenty-five thousand; something like that, or possibly 130,000. I do not know the exact number.

Mr. FOSS. That would leave, then, a shortage of about 25,000 in case of a mobilization of our naval forces, according to this statement?

Mr. PADGETT. Taking that statement for the full completion of the three-year program of all ships under construction and those which are authorized for the third year of this three-year program, but you see their third-year program would take several years to be completed.

Mr. FOSS. We are speeding up on the program, and it is necessary to train men in advance. They ought to have at least a full year's training before going on these big ships, and if they had two years it would be all the better.

Mr. PADGETT. It would be impossible to complete these big ships that take 1,200 and 1,300 men much short of 30 months under any circumstances.

Mr. FOSS. Then the gentleman feels we have made ample provision in this bill for the personnel in view of the circumstances?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think we need to make more at this time; if an emergency arises, we could authorize.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Considerable has been said——

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment? I desire to ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes, to ask some questions.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I would want five minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Well, I will say 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, considerable has been said in the last two or three days with a view of comparison between what transpired under the Taft administration and what occurred under the present administration in the way of shipbuilding as well as to personnel, and it has been repeatedly stated on the floor of the House that the enlisted personnel under the Taft administration was 51,500, and that the enlisted personnel under the present administration is 77,956——

Mr. PADGETT. That was authorized; neither one of them were up to their full limit.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is just the very point I am coming to, Mr. Chairman. Attempt has been made continually to convey the impression that the Navy to-day was 26,000 better supplied with ordinary seamen than under the Taft administration, referring always to the authorization, when the truth of the matter is——

Mr. PADGETT. But let me say to the gentleman I have stated time and again to the contrary of that, and I think the House understands that that refers to authorizations——

Mr. BRITTEN. If the gentleman will permit me——

Mr. PADGETT. And not to the actual enlistments.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am just elucidating, not asking the gentleman a question at this particular moment. I am simply using five minutes of time in making a statement.

Mr. PADGETT. Then, I will not take up the gentleman's time; I thought he was addressing a question to me.

Mr. BRITTEN. No, sir. I want to call attention to the fact that under the Taft administration the enlisted personnel of the Navy was recruited up to 92 per cent of the authorization, and I also want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the enlisted personnel of the Navy to-day, after three years of world unrest, is recruited only 68 per cent of its authorization.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BRITTEN. I can not yield inasmuch as I have only a few minutes.

Notwithstanding the fact, as I said before I was interrupted by my good friend from Texas, that the world has been at unrest for more than three years, and the need for men in the service has been evident everywhere but in the Navy Department, on February 1 we are recruited only 68 per cent of the authorization of 77,956, exclusive of 2,313 men with the Militia or on probation. And I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Navy is worse off to-day by 3,024 than it was four years ago in the matter of enlisted personnel. In the last four years we have commissioned the *Arizona*, the *Nevada*, the *New York*, the *Oklahoma*, the *Pennsylvania*, and the *Texas*, all dreadnaughts, taking practically a thousand men apiece, or a total of 5,640 ordinary seamen. We have commissioned 24 destroyers, and we have two more, the *Shaw* and the *Allen*, over 95 per cent completed, which will require 2,600 men. We have commissioned 20 submarines, requiring 630 men, and 3 little gunboats requiring 237 men. The total requirement of the enlisted personnel of the ships commissioned during the Wilson administration is 9,107. With a positive increase of but 6,083 men in the last four years, it will be seen that the actual additional requirement on account of new ships makes us just 3,024 enlisted men worse off than when the present administration came into power.

Now, the idea of talking about the Taft administration and referring to the authorization to-day in comparison with what it was four years ago is all poppycock. You can not get away from a deficiency to-day of 24,500 men in the ordinary seamen of the service. So the Navy is worse off to-day in the point of shortage than it was four years ago. And I want to say further that this accentuates, if it is possible for anything to accentuate it, the lack of business administration in the Navy Department under the present administration. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. He said in answer to an inquiry by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss], as I understood him, that there was no expectation of filling the necessary complement for vessels already in commission until, as he expressed it, some necessity arose. Is that true?

Mr. PADGETT. I did not say that.

Mr. TOWNER. I hope I misunderstood the chairman——

Mr. PADGETT. You did if that was your understanding. I said that the three-year program would require for the construction of the big ships, the battle cruisers and the battleships, at least 30 months for construction, even if expedited. The time that the contractors offered was, first, 48 months and 51 months, and the lowest they have up to the present time indicated was 40 months. But assuming that they should speed up to 30 months, I said for those ships provision could be made as they came into commission.

Mr. TOWNER. Let me ask the gentleman this question: As I understand it, the department says they are doing all that they can to fill the deficiencies in the personnel of the Navy under existing law?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. And yet notwithstanding that fact there is existing a large deficiency now. Will the gentleman tell us what efforts are being made, and especially what provisions are made in this bill or any other, to fill the personnel of the Navy, at least to the extent of manning the ships that are now in commission?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir. The Navy Department is using every effort and energy. They are advertising, they are establishing recruiting stations throughout the country, and they have been publishing and circulating, so as to get in touch with the public, the provisions of the law of August 29, 1916, reorganizing the personnel of the Navy, the enlisted personnel, whereby we gave very substantial advantages and benefits to the enlisted men. And as that is getting out and they are becoming acquainted with it, the enlistments are proceeding with much more satisfaction than heretofore. For instance, I had the statement here, which I read on a former day, but I now call attention to it merely, that in January, 1914, the net gain in enlistments was 793 for the month. They do not go back of that time. They have no record kept before that time. That was in January, 1914. In January, 1915, the net gain was 375; in January, 1916, the gain was 576; in January, 1917, just past, under the operation of this new legislation that I stated, which information has just been scattered abroad and made known to the public, the net gain was 1,344.

Mr. TOWNER. Well, but does the gentleman believe that within a reasonable time we can fill the complement of the ships in commission?

Mr. PADGETT. The chief of the bureau, Admiral Palmer, informed me that he expected, and he based his expectations upon an investigation into the working of the plan, and believed that during the fiscal year for which this legislation is passed he would have the enlistments up to 70,000.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that the country will not be satisfied with that. I believe that at present, and under existing circumstances, the people will demand that the ships that we have in commission be fully manned. They will demand that our Navy be ready for any emergency. They will demand that anything that is necessary to be done to secure a full complement for the ships now in commission should be done. And it occurs to me that it is the duty of this committee, and it is the duty of the administration, to take immediate steps to see that this be done.

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

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words for the purpose of referring to what occurred yesterday when several distinguished gentlemen, members of the Committee on Military Affairs, found it necessary to defend themselves against an attack contained in a newspaper published in the city of Chicago. What I deplore is not the attack contained in the paper. I do not care who the editor of the paper is. I do not know whether he writes his own opinions, or whether he is just an ordinary hireling, taking orders. I do not know whether he believed in what he said or whether he said it because he was ordered to say it. What I regret is that the Members of the House find it necessary to defend themselves against meaningless attacks of this kind. I look upon the news items and the editorial complained of as an attempt to intimidate Members of the House from giving expression to their honest opinion and from acting in accordance with their honest conviction. Only a few days ago we heard abuse heaped from the floor of this House upon one of the most distinguished statesmen that the country has produced, William Jennings Bryan [applause], and all because he dared advise against war. The Constitution has given Congress the power to declare war. Does it mean that Congress is merely to act as a rubber-stamp clerk, obeying the orders of an individual, or does it mean that every Member of Congress is conscience bound as a man and as a Representative of a free people to search his own soul and to utilize all the power of his brain in determining the gravest question that can present itself in the life of a man? And shall Members of Congress permit themselves to be frightened, to be intimidated by bullies, by lip patriots, by ignoramuses, who would terrorize those they can not control? I protest, Mr. Chairman, against this attempt to intimidate the free Representatives of a free people from acting as free men. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provisions, Navy: For provisions and commuted rations for the seamen and marines, which commuted rations may be paid to caterers of messes, in case of death or desertion, upon orders of the commanding officers, commuted rations for officers on sea duty (other than commissioned officers of the line, Medical and Pay Corps, chaplains, chief boatswains, chief gunners, chief carpenters, chief machinists, chief pay clerks, and chief sailmakers) and midshipmen, and commuted rations stopped on account of sick in hospital and credited at the rate of 50 cents per ration to the naval hospital fund; subsistence of officers and men unavoidably detained or absent from vessels to which attached under orders (during which subsistence rations to be stopped on board ship and no credit for commutation therefor to be given); subsistence of men on detached duty; subsistence of members of the Naval Reserve force during period of active service; and for subsistence of female nurses and Navy and Marine Corps general courts-martial prisoners undergoing imprisonment with sentences of dishonorable discharge from the service at the expiration of such confinement: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to commute rations for such general courts-martial prisoners in such amounts as seem to him proper, which may vary in accordance with the location of the naval prison, but which shall in no case exceed 30 cents per diem for each ration so commuted; and for the purchase of United States Army emergency rations as required; in all, $10,144,943.40, to be available until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

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

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

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, in no spirit of criticism of the Committee on Naval Affairs, or of any of the Members of this House, I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that last year we passed a naval bill and this year we will pass a naval bill, and yet apparently no attention has been given to the number of retired officers that this Government is now supporting.

I have no disposition to criticize these officers, because under the law, as provided by Congress and as I understand it, they have to be retired whenever the plucking board desires to retire them, or when they reach the age of 64, and therefore they are not to blame; but I thought it might be interesting to the country to know that there are to-day 900 retired naval officers, men the majority of whom I am satisfied are in perfect physical and mental condition, and who would object to being called "old men" or "broken-down horses," who are receiving from the taxpayers of the country three-quarters of their salary and for which they give nothing in return. In the present bill there is provided for the purpose of paying these gentlemen the sum of $2,940,368.72.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the present war across the waters has demonstrated that gray-haired men and men beyond the age of 64, as leaders, are waging the successful battles, and that the United States might well learn something from that demonstration and retain in the service longer than the age of 64 is reached, these men who are so anxious to remain in the service.

The present bill provides for the promotion and retirement of naval officers, and this will continue until the people begin to understand that in the Army and Navy bills we have passed and to-day will pass paying approximately $7,000,000 for retired Army and Navy officers.

I say, Mr. Chairman, if some reasonable law should be passed, and one that would not impose a hardship upon these, that would let these patriotic officers, whom we have educated at great expense, continue to serve the Government, and thereby save this Government the larger part of this $7,000,000, we

could use it in increased pay for the ordinary seamen who serve on the battleships, and then, perhaps, the shortage of men that the gentleman from Illinois just complained of would not exist.

I simply make these observations——

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

Mr. SEARS. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. What percentage of these retired officers of the Army and Navy are under 64 years—that is, victims of the plucking board?

Mr. SEARS. I have tried to secure the information, but I am unable to tell the gentleman. I understand that some as young as 45 or 50 years of age were plucked because the plucking board said they were temperamentally not fit to continue longer in the service.

Now, Mr. Chairman, at the Naval Academy, which is one of the best academies in the country—and I desire at a later time to discuss that proposition—these distinguished, able, patriotic men could be used for the purpose of teaching the young men that we send there for instruction from our various districts. By so doing, Mr. Chairman, they would not only give to these young men the benefit of their knowledge, but also their varied experience. It seems to me that a man who holds a degree from the Annapolis Naval Academy and has had 20 years or more actual experience in the service, as these young men that we are sending there are expected to have, could better instruct these young men than could civilians who know nothing of the service and are simply selected because they are able to undergo a mental examination.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the time is coming when the people of the United States will demand that they be informed as to how and why their money is spent, and that this $7,000,000—a paltry sum to some, it may be—will cease to be appropriated by Congress to support people on the retired list who are anxious to serve the Government actively and who now return no service for value received. [Applause.]

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

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the opinion of the gentleman [Mr. SEARS] who has just taken his seat on this matter of retired officers of the Navy. I know of instances, as do other Members of this House, of men who have been retired from the naval service and who have been granted the regular retired pay, but who are just as active to-day as they ever were, except for the few years that have been added to their lives.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are in the service to-day men who are on the retired list who are acting in the capacity of captains and are receiving only retired officers' pay; in other words, they are receiving lieutenant commander's pay. As I understand it, there is nothing in the law that permits the Secretary of the Navy to draft an officer back into the service and give him the same rate of pay that he received before he was retired.

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

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Do I understand the gentleman to say there is no authority for the department to call men from the retired list and put them on the active list?

Mr. TAGUE. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman; the Secretary of the Navy or the President, I believe, can call in any retired officer. But, as I understand it, if a retired officer is called into the service he can be paid only the amount of wage that he received as a retired officer, no matter what he was getting before.

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

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman is mistaken in that. If he is called to active duty, he gets his full pay and allowances. There is another provision to the effect that if a retired officer requests shore duty he can, at his request, be assigned to some shore duty and get the pay and allowances of a lieutenant commander. But if he is called to active duty he gets his full pay and allowances of his grade; and in time of war every retired officer is subject to be called to active duty.

Mr. BUTLER. In case of an emergency?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. I want to state another thing in that connection. Last year Congress increased the retiring age from 62 to 64 years; and the retiring age is greater in the Army and in the Navy of the United States—and I am speaking especially of the Navy—than it is in the navy of England or France.

Now, with reference to the pay. Up until the bill of August 29, 1916, they received three-fourths of the active pay which they were receiving at the time of retirement. Now that has been changed, and for a service of 30 years they get 2½ per cent for each year, which would be three-quarters pay, but for every year of service less than that the amount is reduced 2½ per cent, so that a man has to serve 30 years in order to get three-quarters pay. That was the law of August 29, 1916, and it is no longer based upon the full three-fourths retired pay.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask an extension of my time for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts, having now one minute remaining, asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS. On page 49 there is appropriated, in addition to the amount I gave, $198,307.50 for the increased pay of retired officers regularly assigned to active duty. I do not know whether that is in addition to their retired pay, or extra pay, or what it is, but it adds $198,000 to the amount.

Mr. PADGETT. Let me correct the statement of the gentleman. The $198,000 is for the entire pay of all the retired officers of the Marine Corps.

Mr. TAGUE. While the chairman of the committee is of course better informed on this subject than most of us, still my contention is this: If a retired officer is active enough to perform service for the Government, and does so at his own request, then he is entitled to the remuneration that he received while in active service. Now, for instance, we have in the navy yard at Boston a commandant who, until last October, was rated as a captain. He went before the plucking board for advancement to rear admiral——

Mr. PADGETT. Not the plucking board.

Mr. TAGUE. Whatever you want to call it.

Mr. PADGETT. It is the examining board.

Mr. TAGUE. The examining board. He was examined and found to be physically and mentally sound, but for some slight and trivial matter he was not allowed his promotion, but was retired with a lieutenant commander's pay. Now, that man is to-day doing the same service for the Government that he has done in that yard for three years. He is commandant of the yard, and he is receiving in return the pay of a lieutenant commander. I do not know just how much, but much less than he received as a captain. He is performing good service for the Government. He is physically and mentally able to perform that service. He has a record in the Navy as good as that of any man who ever served in it, and was honored by receiving a medal for bravery from Congress. Yet for a trifling matter this man is compelled to be retired against his own wish and against the wish of those who know him. He is working to-day for the Government. He is performing the full duty of a commandant and captain and is receiving a lieutenant commander's pay. There is no provision in the law, and there is no provision in this bill, that permits the Secretary of the Navy or the President of the United States to give this man one single cent more than the pay of a lieutenant commander. I think this is unfair. I do not believe the law was ever intended to do this. I believe it was intended that when a man is performing Government service with a certain rank he shall receive the pay of that rank. Why this should be as it is I do not know. I have tried to find some way out of it, but I know of no way except to amend the law, and if I offer an amendment to do that a point of order will lie against it under the rule. So, Mr. Chairman, I think it is one of the many unfair things imposed upon officers in the Navy, many times creating hardships and leaving them no opportunity of redress.

They have spent the best years of their lives in the service of their country, and when they have grown old, too late to begin life over again, although in perfect health, the cruel red-tape methods of this department must be inflicted upon them.

It has been decided by the board that the brave officer must go, no matter how it affects him, but it is decreed, and go, go he must to the scrap heap of humanity. [Applause.]

It is an easy matter to smirch the name and reputation of any man, but I am willing to judge a man upon his performance of duty; and when a man with such a brilliant record for faithful performance of duty and for bravery is treated in this manner it is time to modify the law. Mr. Chairman, it is in keeping with what I said on the floor of this House yesterday. Some of the officers in the Navy whom this Government has educated, supported, protected, and pensioned, have not only abused the privileges that have been given them, but they have driven from the service of this Government men with reputation and character superior to theirs.

I have in mind many cases of young men discharged from the Navy whose reputations have been ruined by charges of intoxication, and these men who had been driven out were obliged only a night or two before to take the same officer who had preferred the charges and put the officer into bed.

I am speaking as a matter of justice to men who have served their country faithfully. The Lord knows that we all have our weaknesses. There is no man perfect, and men should be judged on the good things that they do and not always by their weaknesses.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. The commandant of the navy yard is a line officer, and because of his age has served through probably 12 or 15 different sittings of the plucking board, which would indicate that his character and ability must have been very good.

Mr. TAGUE. Yes; and I want to say that I am not here to eulogize anybody, but I have met a great many men in the naval service. I have met many splendid officers, and no one will go further to say a good word for them than I will; but I never met in the service of the Navy a man whose heart was as big as is that of this man, or one who would go further to help his fellow man. There has never been a man, to my mind at least, since I have had the honor to represent the navy-yard district, to whom you could go and who would so willingly help some unfortunate fellow. I know of no man during my time who has served in the Navy of the United States and who has done more to build up the navy yard.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, now that the House is about to complete the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, I take this opportunity to commend and indorse the great work of the popular, faithful, and efficient chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] [applause], and the members of that committee who have acted and cooperated with him in the preparation of this important and far-reaching measure providing for an adequate navy for the defense of the honor, the rights, and the interests of the American people. This bill and the amendments which have been adopted since the President delivered his address to both Houses of Congress last Saturday is the highest and best evidence of the fact that the Members of Congress have laid aside partisan bias, captious objections, and differences of opinion, and are a unit for the proper defense of our common country—are in line and fully determined to aid the President of the United States in his patriotic stand to maintain, uphold, and safeguard the rights of American citizens on the high seas. While I represent a district intensely Republican—not having elected a Democrat to Congress in 60 years [applause]—I am sure I voice the sentiments of Republicans and Democrats in that district in saying they will loyally support the President and the American Congress in maintaining the honor of the Nation, and in protecting the lives and property of American citizens on the high seas, in Mexico, or in any country on the face of the earth.

East Tennessee now and in the future will do her full patriotic duty as she has ever done in the glorious past. She is loyal and ready to answer her country's call. [Applause.]

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I always yield to my handsome friend from Illinois.

Mr. BRITTEN. Referring to the last sentence of the gentleman, wherein he says that Tennessee will always come to the call——

Mr. PADGETT. I want to say that there is no question about that.

Mr. BRITTEN. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact and ask the gentleman whether Tennessee has not contributed one of the most able young officers in the American Navy to-day, in the person of Lieut. Charles M. Austin, son of the distinguished gentleman now on the floor?

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, the gentleman embarrasses me. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] move me to say that, along with him and my other colleagues, I hope to see the President sustained in all proper efforts to maintain the honor and dignity of this country. We are considering now one of the great war bills, and the most of us will vote for it even to the limit of those things asked for to sustain the President. While doing that and considering other war bills, it seems to me that we might say to ourselves—whether it is carried over the telegraphic lines to the people of the country or not—that there are many disturbing and conflicting rumors concerning war conditions which are asserted to-day and denied to-morrow. Yesterday we were informed that an American had been killed on the wrecked steamer *Turino*. His name was George Washington, and, of course, it would occasion a patriotic thrill the whole length and breadth of the country if it was true that George Washington had gone down at the hands of an enemy in foreign waters. But the newspapers had their say yesterday, and they had it again this morning, that this sure-enough American was killed, and therefore we ought to go to war with Germany.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Did this man have any number?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not know. He was an individual of color, but his taking off was supposed to be reason to cause war. Efforts have been made, desperate efforts have been made, since the President was here on Saturday last, to prove that we must go to war. The coasts of the world seem to have been raked to find some overt act to force the President to come in here and ask us to declare war. We have had very little but rumors, but we have had headlines galore, all with a view of stampeding the House and stampeding the country into an act of war. [Applause.] I rose to make this very brief statement because I do not want the people of this country to be deceived. I am satisfied that most of the people of the country want peace; peace with honor, of course. [Applause.] But they do not want to go into a dishonorable war, and they ought not to be forced into a war by the munition makers or the munition users of this or any other land. [Applause.]

Most of the dispatch headlines declaring that American ships have gone down, that American lives have been lost, that international laws have been violated have come from London, and London has been crazy with delight since it heard the glad tidings on Saturday last that the President had severed diplomatic relations with Germany. Coming from the Liberty Bell and Independence Hall district of the United States, I can not forget that we had trouble with London in 1776, and that we had trouble with London in 1812. I am not quite ready to accept all of these rumors that come out of London now without a grain of salt. London is a little more in need of American help just now than we are in need of the advice of London. I am not quite ready, therefore, to believe every damnable, pernicious, and lying report that comes out of London, or to accept it as an inducement to declare my country in a state of war. [Applause.]

On the night of the day that the President appeared here and informed the Congress of the fact that he had severed diplomatic relations with Germany, we had newspaper "extras" announcing in startling headlines that the *Housatonic* had gone down in violation of international law; there were great scare heads, and boys on the streets shouting it aloud. It was declared that American rights had been violated by a country with which we were on friendly terms up to that time. Yet the next day's newspapers announced in smaller type that the *Housatonic* was loaded with contraband, and even our State Department declared that there was no occasion for any warlike declaration in consequence of her sinking.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Is it the contention of the gentleman that because a ship is loaded with contraband, Germany has the right to destroy the lives of passengers and crew?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I made the statement that after all these headlines the State Department declared that there was no breach of international law. The people were being inflamed——

Mr. GORDON. But they did not say it was because the ship was loaded with contraband.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I stated what the gentleman's own Secretary of State announced to the public—he was not as anxious as some newspaper editors are to rush into war.

Mr. GORDON. I agree with much of what the gentleman has said; but——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not arguing the point of contraband at all. The gentleman is merely taking my time. I am trying to make a plain statement to the House as to the truth and the facts. The gentleman may be stampeded because certain things appear in the newspapers, but——

Mr. GORDON. Oh, don't you worry about my being stampeded. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am making the statement that we see alarming headlines to-day indicating that we are on the verge of war because some "overt act" has been committed, and the next day the whole thing is denied.

Mr. GORDON. I agree with the gentleman about that.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman tell me what he thinks the duty of this Government ought to be if the German Government has taken charge of and forcibly restrained by order our ambassador in that country?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is carried away with the headlines.

Mr. RAGSDALE. No; he is not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will listen, I will demonstrate what fools some men are—not like the gentleman from South Carolina, of course—who believe everything they read. I was coming to that very point. For three days we have heard that our American ambassador, who was on excellent terms with everyone in high life in Germany, has "been in captivity" and held for exchange. The gentleman believes that statement.

Mr. RAGSDALE. No; the gentleman does not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is absurd upon its face. Though we have had it for three days, this morning's newspapers announce that Berlin is in conference with the American ambassador, that conferences have been going on in Berlin, and that the ambassador will be safeguarded out of Germany just as we are going to safeguard the German ambassador out of the United States. Oh, how easy it is for you to rush into war upon the say so of somebody who is interested in having war.

Mr. DYER. His passports have been issued to him.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The ambassador is going to get out safely. Somebody wanted to inflame the American people by declaring that the American ambassador had been held in captivity. Absurd! We have given safe conduct to the German ambassador and are sending him home, and the Germans have been decent with the American ambassador. But at least 2 college professors and about 150 editors, more or less, yesterday declared—not that they were willing to enlist, for the barracks down here are waiting for men like them to come forward and enlist—but they declared in effect that they were willing to involve their country in war because "the American ambassador was held in bondage in Berlin." This morning the newspapers show that those editors and those college professors did not know what they were talking about, and that is what I am trying to say to the gentleman from South Carolina. The plain people should not be fooled. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. One minute.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In that one minute let me say, and I hope not to be interrupted again, that the *Housatonic* alarm has gone glimmering. The State Department seems to concede that the Germans were within their rights and that the *Housatonic* presents no casus belli. The next day we had the *California* sensation. Because this ship bore a good old American name everybody was made to suspect that it was an American ship, and that the Germans had perpetrated such an outrage as would force us to go to war. After the sensation had thrilled the country we were quietly informed that the *California* was a British ship, sailing under the British flag, and that she had been given the warning required by international law. But a great deal is made of the fact that one American was aboard that ship. He may have been planted there to protect the cargo and to involve this country in an international warfare; I do not know, but the next day after the newspapers had worked the story of the American passenger to the limit, it developed that he was taken off the ship to a place of safety. It matters not that he was a colored man.

Mr. BRITTEN. And the ship was armed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then, again, Mr. Chairman, the report went broadcast over the United States on the day after the President addressed Congress, that this Government had seized all the interned German ships. These reports were tempered here and there with the suggestion that the German sailors were endeavoring to destroy the property of their own country, but nevertheless it was broadly announced that our naval officers had seized this German property. I will not stop to discuss the moral aspect of this seizure except to say that there had been no declaration of war and that it was not clear why we should deliberately take this German property and appropriate it to the United States. Within a day or two the answer came from both the State Department and the White House that these German ships had not been seized, and that while this Government was taking certain precautions with respect to possible impediments to navigation, every courtesy was being shown the officers and men in charge of these German vessels. It was evident that some tall lying was done in this instance for the purpose of irritating Germany under very aggravating circumstances. Somebody evidently wanted Germany to commit an "overt act" that would bring on a war. We ought to be on our guard against this dangerous "rumor" business, whether it originates in London or the United States.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts: For fuel; the removal and transportation of ashes and garbage from ships of war; books, blanks, and stationery, including stationery for commanding and navigating officers of ships, chaplains on shore and afloat, and for the use of courts-martial on board ships; purchase, repair, and exchange of typewriters for ships; packing boxes and materials; interior fittings for general storehouses, pay offices, and accounting offices in navy yards; expenses of disbursing officers; coffee mills and repairs thereto; expenses of naval clothing factory and machinery for the same; laboratory equipment; purchase of articles of equipage at home and abroad under the cognizance of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, and for the payment of labor in equipping vessels therewith, and the manufacture of such articles in the several navy yards; musical instruments and music; mess outfits; soap on board naval vessels; athletic outfits; tolls, ferriages, yeomen's stores, safes, and other incidental expenses; labor in general storehouses, paymasters' offices, and accounting offices in navy yards and naval stations, including naval stations maintained in island possessions under the control of the United States, and expenses in handling stores purchased and manufactured under "General account of advances"; and reimbursement to appropriations of the Department of Agriculture of cost of inspection of meats and meat food products for the Navy Department: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for chemists and for clerical, inspection, storeman, store laborer, and messenger service in the supply and accounting departments of the navy yards and naval stations and disbursing offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, shall not exceed $1,400,000; in all, $2,750,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAGSDALE, and Mr. CALLAWAY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement that I have of how the newspapers of this country have been handled by the munition manufacturers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting a certain statement. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask whether it is the gentleman's purpose to insert a long list of extracts from newspapers?

Mr. CALLAWAY. No; it will be a little, short statement, not over 2½ inches in length in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD at this point a statement showing the newspaper combination, which explains their activity in this war matter, just discussed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]:

"In March, 1915, the J. P. Morgan interests, the steel, shipbuilding, and powder interests, and their subsidiary organizations, got together 12 men high up in the newspaper world and employed them to select the most influential newspapers in the United States and sufficient number of them to control generally the policy of the daily press of the United States.

"These 12 men worked the problem out by selecting 179 newspapers, and then began, by an elimination process, to retain only those necessary for the purpose of controlling the general policy of the daily press throughout the country. They found it was only necessary to purchase the control of 25 of the greatest papers. The 25 papers were agreed upon; emissaries were sent to purchase the policy, national and international, of these papers; an agreement was reached; the policy of the papers was bought, to be paid for by the month; an editor was furnished for each paper to properly supervise and edit information regarding the questions of preparedness, militarism, financial policies, and other things of national and international nature considered vital to the interests of the purchasers.

"This contract is in existence at the present time, and it accounts for the news columns of the daily press of the country

being filled with all sorts of preparedness arguments and misrepresentations as to the present condition of the United States Army and Navy, and the possibility and probability of the United States being attacked by foreign foes.

"This policy also included the suppression of everything in opposition to the wishes of the interests served. The effectiveness of this scheme has been conclusively demonstrated by the character of stuff carried in the daily press throughout the country since March, 1915. They have resorted to anything necessary to commercialize public sentiment and sandbag the National Congress into making extravagant and wasteful appropriations for the Army and Navy under the false pretense that it was necessary. Their stock argument is that it is 'patriotism.' They are playing on every prejudice and passion of the American people."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am in favor of this paragraph in the Navy appropriation bill, because I think the country ought to be fully prepared for any possible invasion; but I think the Congress ought to be careful about encouraging "rumors of war" when war has not actually been declared. Perhaps it would be safe to leave this matter to the President of the United States and to those who have direct knowledge upon the subject. I call attention, however, not only to these false reports of the *Housatonic* and about the *California*, but the steamship *Philadelphia* was reported sunk since the President was here, and yet the next day, after these reports had gone over the country like wildfire and everybody got excited about the *Philadelphia*, which naturally attracted interest in that great city and in the State of Pennsylvania, we found the *Philadelphia* had safely arrived in port, so that report was also in error. Now, whether by design or not I do not know, but it seems that most of these false reports come from London. There seems to be an intense desire there to tell us about German outrages and about American blood shed on foreign ships or to find that some American ship has been shot up. This colored man, George Washington——

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BARKLEY. But was not there a statement in the morning paper that the colored man on that ship was a British subject?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am coming to that. The dispatches have made it appear that because of the loss of George Washington, an alleged American citizen, we are now in position to declare war against Germany. This morning's papers have headlines something like this: "Death of American on wrecked *Turino* reported to London. An American negro fireman, George Washington was killed, according to a report received to-day when the British steamship *Turino* was sunk by a German U boat in the war zone."

Now, that is enough to inflame every American——

Mr. FOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield.

Mr. FOSS. I am very much interested in what the gentleman says, but how will the gentleman provide a remedy to stop these international thrills which we are receiving, which the publishers of these newspapers place in their headlines? Would he provide for a censorship of the press?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not at this time. I simply urge that the true facts and only the true facts be reported at this time when we are at the verge of an outbreak with a foreign country. [Applause.] I think it would be better for some of the editors to "shut up" when they do not know what they are talking about. [Applause.] I think it would be better for some of these professional patriots who have determined our international relations in advance, and who insist upon adjusting our diplomatic affairs in this crisis, to not only "shut up," but go tie a rope around their necks, attach an anchor to it, and jump into the sea. We could better afford to dispense with their meddlesome services than to plunge the people of this country into a foreign war. I think it would be far better for this country. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I regret to say it, but we are gradually turning over the business of Congress, turning over all our constitutional rights, turning over our powers delegated by the people, to a lot of editors, theorists, and college professors who are not capable of conducting our affairs and to whom we should not abdicate.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts after I have disposed of George Washington. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. All I can say then is that the papers report this afternoon that George Washington, the so-called American, is a British subject; that is all. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend I wish to say that so many rumors and reports of an exaggerated character have appeared during the last few days that even the President, who certainly is as much concerned as any other citizen over the situation that confronts us, should take notice. We are dealing with a serious problem that invites the greatest deliberation. We ought not to be made the pawns of designing men in our own country or of any foreign power that would drag us into a war for selfish purposes. When our President has made up his mind that American honor is at stake and that we must enter upon a war to uphold it, I have no doubt he will find cordial support in the Congress of the United States, but the President has not yet indicated to Congress that the point has been reached where a declaration of war has become necessary. Until the President does come to this body with such information and facts as may warrant further action by Congress, it may not be well to aggravate the situation by giving too much credence to the untruthful rumors that have been bandied about with the evident purpose of finding some reason for provoking a declaration of war. At another time I shall extend in the RECORD, under permission granted to me, certain observations of Mr. Lincoln when he was a Member of the House, with respect to our Mexican complications in 1848. At present I shall content myself by quoting a single sentence from the speech made by Mr. Lincoln January 12 of that year, when he said:

> When the war began it was my opinion that all those who, because of knowing too little, or because of knowing too much, could not conscientiously approve the conduct of the President (in the beginning of it) should, nevertheless, as good citizens and patriots remain silent on that point, at least till the war should be ended.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman that there is too much noise and that the editors of this country may make too much noise. Fortunately the sound of their voices does not penetrate this Hall, while some of the noises which get in here might be suddenly ceased with a great deal of pleasure to some of us who have to stay here.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Illinois said he, the gentleman from Illinois, had sense enough to keep still.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I know what he said, but he did not disclose the fact that he had politeness enough, while keeping still, to abide by the rules of the House in undertaking to chide me. That is for the gentleman's information, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MANN. I am abiding by the rules of the House.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is undertaking to lecture me.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, no. I have been lecturing the great editors and the political college professors. I did not have the gentleman in mind at all. [Applause.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. The gentleman's mind is rather limited in its memory.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Surely my mind is not limited when I refer to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RAGSDALE. The gentleman says so little on the floor of this House that he ought to be given an opportunity in everybody's time to be recognized. May I yield further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I merely wish to say that when I speak to the gentleman from South Carolina my mind is unlimited.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I am quite sure that is true. There are a great many things the gentleman possesses that are unlimited. His nerve is one of them. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Chairman, undertakes here to tell us about getting excited over the newspapers, and he undertakes to read from the newspapers, then proving that the conditions in Germany are not what they are reported to be in other newspapers. Now, why should we accept the statement from the newspapers selected by the gentleman any more than he would accept the statements made by other newspapers which he has not selected? I say to the gentleman that I quite agree with him that the people of our country ought not to be excited or hurried into war, but I say to the gentleman, sympathetic as I am with the people who want to preserve peace here, that if Germany has placed a restraining hand upon our ambassador, who went there in good faith to represent this Government, as a Representative of my people I wish to exhaust every power within our command to bring him back here without regard to cost.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Certainly.

Mr. DYER. I will state to the gentleman that the Washington Times of to-day states that the ambassador has been given his passports and that he has never been detained at all.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to my friend that he ought to take advice from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and not be misled by the newspaper headlines.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To both at one time. Let us have a "talk-fest." Go to it.

Mr. DYER. He has been furnished a special train to Switzerland by the German Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that the Washington Post, a very reliable newspaper, states that there was a conference yesterday on this subject in Berlin? Now, possibly the gentleman is the spokesman of the Department of State, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is the spokesman of the White House. I would like him to say whether or not he knows that this conference took place in Berlin yesterday, in which the American ambassador bore an honorable part.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that my information does not come solely from the newspapers. And I did not say that I was the spokesman of anybody or any thing except the people of the sixth district of South Carolina.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Now we are getting the news.

Mr. RAGSDALE. And I say that what I stated is true, and it can not be disproven.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Improvement of construction plants: For repairs and improvements of machinery and implements at construction plants at navy yards at Portsmouth, N. H., $10,000; Boston, Mass., $25,000; New York, N. Y., $35,000; Philadelphia, Pa., $25,000; Norfolk, Va., $35,000; Charleston, S. C., $10,000; Mare Island, Cal., $35,000; Puget Sound, Wash., $25,000; in all, $200,000.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. Under the improvement of construction plants just read, $200,000, on page 41, there is an appropriation for Boston, Mass., of $25,000, and approximately the same appropriation is made for Boston, on page 44, under machinery plants. What is the condition?

Mr. PADGETT. They are in different bureaus or departments. One is in the Bureau of Construction and Repair, and deals with the hulls, and the other is in the Steam Engineering Department, that deals with the machinery and implements, and so forth, inside of the shops.

Mr. SEARS. The appropriations are so nearly similar that——

Mr. PADGETT. One relates to hulls. They are in different bureaus.

Mr. FOSS. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question in regard to Coast Guard cutters. Where are they being built now?

Mr. PADGETT. They are not being built at all. They could not get a bid within the limit of cost.

Mr. FOSS. Are they going to be built in navy yards or by private contract?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. The award is to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MANN. I believe you called these navy-yard plants construction plants before.

Mr. PADGETT. I will say to the gentleman that the only difference is that we have grouped it all into one paragraph. Heretofore we referred to it as repairs and improvements of machinery and implements at navy yards.

Mr. MANN. You did not use the word "construction" heretofore.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; it is the same language, and then it was repeated in reference to every yard.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is in error, but I do not know that it makes any great difference.

The Clerk read as follows:

The limit of cost of one steam Coast Guard cutter for service as anchorage patrol boat in New York Harbor, authorized by the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," approved August 29, 1916, to be, and hereby is, increased from $125,000 to $185,000.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a point of order on the paragraph relating to Coast Guard cutters.

Mr. PADGETT. That increases the limit of cost.

Mr. MANN. It is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. That is the limit of cost. We provided for that last year.

Mr. MANN. I understand the situation. The Navy Department has no business to interfere with these matters. Of course, you put it in the naval bill last year, and you had no business to do that. You brought in a rule that covered it. The Committee on Naval Affairs does not have jurisdiction of it.

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman makes a point of order, I will say that it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. Does the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois begin at line 11?

Mr. MANN. It commences with line 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MANN. I also make a point of order on the rest of the page.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understood the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, while we are considering this section, in reference to the Bureau of Construction and Repair, I think it not inappropriate to call the attention of the committee to the naval disasters which have been suffered by this country in the past year. As near as I can ascertain, we have lost more ships, in number, by accident—that is, by accident pure and simple—in the last year than Great Britain, although she has been engaged in a war, in the course of the operations of which it was necessary to navigate long and unlighted coasts, among the great dangers resulting therefrom.

Probably all the Members of the House remember the recent accident to the *U-3*, one of our submarines, which went ashore on the Pacific coast, at the entrance of Humboldt Bay, Cal. That accident seems to have been caused either by poor seamanship or negligence. A still worse accident soon followed, when the cruiser *Milwaukee*, in attempting to pull out the submarine, was trapped in some way by the tidal currents and drawn on one of the treacherous shoals of that coast, so that a fine vessel, a fine cruiser of nearly 10,000 tons, costing almost $4,000,000—in fact, one of the most useful cruisers that our Navy possesses—is now, as I understand it, a total wreck.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Does not the gentleman think the department was at fault rather than the officers in ordering a ship like the *Milwaukee* to do that kind of work, when an ordinary salvage company would have undertaken that work for about $18,000?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think there is so much fault to be imputed to the navigating officer of the *Milwaukee* as there is to the department or the higher official that ordered a vessel of this class to attempt that kind of work. A vessel of the cruiser class was entirely unfitted for such work. The vessel drew over 22 feet of water. It was on a treacherous coast, full of shoals, where strong currents endangered it. A powerful tug that did not require much more than half the depth of water would have done better work. The expense, as the gentleman from Delaware says, would not have been great, and we would have preserved a much-needed vessel.

But this is not the only accident our Navy has suffered recently. The cruiser *Memphis* was sunk in the harbor of Santo Domingo, with a loss of 40 lives. That accident was probably without any fault on the part of the officers controlling the vessel or navigating it; but we lost a powerful armored cruiser of 14,500 tons—more powerful probably than any cruiser of its class in any navy, which cost over $6,000,000.

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

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; always to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PADGETT. I am told that that was caused by an upheaval, perhaps a submarine volcano, that just rose right up under it and tore the ship in twain, and landed lava and other stuff right in the ship.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think there was no fault to be attached to the management of the vessel at that time. But about a month prior to that we lost a fuel ship, the *Hector*, off the coast of Charleston, S. C. I am informed that the *Hector* at that time was in charge of a civilian crew, but I assume, although I am not informed as to that matter, that it was commanded by a naval officer.

In May, 1916, the mine planter *San Francisco* struck a shoal near Chatham Light, and was laid up for repairs for several months, and last summer the destroyer *Terry* struck a reef off Puerta Plata, Santo Domingo, and was beached. Her commander was tried for negligence, but was acquitted.

Last fall the fuel ship *Jupiter* got into collision with an Italian bark, and I believe the commander was court-martialed and acquitted. Last year, in March, the destroyer *Monaghan* was rammed by the destroyer *Roe*, at Key West. The commander of the *Roe* was tried and reduced three numbers in his grade.

The American Navy has had a proud record in the past. The officers have been noted for their gallantry and seamanship, and it is peculiarly unfortunate, it seems to me, that at this particular time we shou'd have to chronicle the loss of so many vessels, with so many disasters. Some of them, unfortunately, can not be attributed to anything else but negligence or bad seamanship. We would prefer to turn from such a record to that which was made in past years; to recall those commanders of American ships who distinguished themselves as the captain of the *Constitution* did, when he escaped by clever seamanship from a British ship; to return to the time when the gallantry was so distinguished, as it was when a commander of a vessel sinking under the enemy's fire preferred to go down with his ship to being saved with the rest of his crew. It is to be hoped that the department will take notice of the condition of affairs, and that a discipline more strict, and a greater efficiency will prevail.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of professors and others, Naval Academy: Pay of professors and instructors, including one professor as librarian, $175,000.

No part of any sum in this act appropriated shall be expended in the pay or allowances of any commissioned officer of the Navy detailed for duty as an instructor at the United States Naval Academy to perform duties which were performed by civilian instructors on January 1, 1913——

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman——

The Clerk continued to read as follows:

One sword master, $1,600; 1 assistant, $1,400; and 1 assistant, $1,200; 1 headmaster in physical training, $1,700; 1 instructor in physical training, $1,700; and 2 instructors in physical training, at $1,400 each; 3 instructors in physical training, at $1,200 each; 1 assistant librarian, $2,400; 1 cataloguer, $1,500; and 1 shelf assistant, $1,100, 1 shelf assistant, $900; 1 secretary of the Naval Academy, $2,400; 2 clerks, at $1,700 each; 4 clerks, at $1,400 each; 4 clerks, at $1,100 each; 4 clerks, at $1,000 each; 7 clerks, at $1,000 each; 1 clerk, $900; 6 clerks, at $840 each; 1 draftsman, $1,400; 1 surveyor, $1,400; services of organist at chapel, $300; 1 captain of the watch, $1,100; 1 second captain of the watch, $1,000; 22 watchmen, at $900 each; 3 telephone switchboard operators, at $600 each; 1 mail messenger, $1,000. In all, pay of professors and others, Naval Academy, $255,440.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order or reserve it?

Mr. MANN. I reserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves the point of order.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, are we treating this bill by sections or by paragraphs?

The CHAIRMAN. By paragraphs.

Mr. SEARS. I asked for the recognition of the Chair before.

The CHAIRMAN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not understand that the gentleman wanted recognition until the end of the paragraph.

Mr. SEARS. Yes; I wanted to speak under the item of pay of professors. That is a paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I notice this carries quite a number of increases of salaries.

Mr. SEARS. Then I thought I would wait until we got to that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair noticed the gentleman rise.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SEARS. I tried to get recognition for the purpose of discussing the first paragraph.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Florida is slightly in error. He rose. I saw him rise, and then I saw him sit down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to make this statement: The gentleman from Florida did rise and address the Chair.

Mr. SEARS. I said "Mr. Chairman." I do not know how else I could have done.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman took his seat, and the Chair thought he did not want recognition at that time. I am sorry the Chair did not recognize the gentleman when he rose.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether there is any intention to have a general provision in this bill in reference to increased salaries or not. I do not think it is quite fair to give specific increases and then give the same party the benefit of a general increase where that was not the thought of the committee originally.

Mr. PADGETT. There is no thought of offering any other amendment than what is in the bill with reference to any increases of any kind. We have reported the specific ones here. In the reorganization of the Navy under the provisions of the act of August 29 it involved——

Mr. MANN. There was a sort of understanding in the House when we passed the legislative bill that any increase finally agreed upon in that law would probably be carried in other bills, at least as to the same classes of employees.

Mr. PADGETT. Under the Naval Academy appropriation here——

Mr. MANN. Of course almost everything in this bill is in the regular Naval Establishment.

Mr. PADGETT. It is in here, and we have taken care of those specifically.

Mr. TALBOTT. The Secretary recommended the increases.

Mr. MANN. So far as the gentleman knows, there is no intention of making a percentage increase in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir.

Mr. MANN. I suppose this increase in the number of employees over there is necessary by reason of the increase in the number of midshipmen.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] insist on his point of order?

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I trust the few remarks I shall make will not be misunderstood. It is only in the hope that at some future time some reform may be obtained. I do not care to get in this House the title of watchdog of the Treasury; on the contrary, I desire to assure you I will go to the fullest extent in making any appropriation that is necessary. I am for preparedness when I think preparedness is necessary. As my State extends out into the ocean and the gulf, our citizens realize perhaps more than the citizens of any other State the importance of naval preparedness. But a few moments ago I called attention to the fact that there were 900 retired military officers in this country, and that I did not believe those gentlemen would care to be referred to as old, worn-out, broken-down horses.

When I look over this Chamber and see the activity of my young colleague, Uncle JOE CANNON, of Illinois, and my good friend Gen. SHERWOOD, of Ohio, it seems to me that these retired naval officers, who have been trained in an open-air life, should at least be active enough at 45 to 64 to keep them at the Naval Academy at Annapolis as instructors. By the report which I hold in my hand it appears that last year 38 additional civilians were employed as instructors at this academy. In the present bill in all, under "Pay of professors and others, Naval Academy," there is carried an appropriation of $430,440 compared to $413,860 last year, or approximately a $17,000 increase. There are at the Naval Academy to-day about 1,200 students. The full quota is 1,700 students. At that rate the instructors, teachers, cooks, butchers, and bakers are paid approximately $253 per pupil, if the entire 1,700 were at Annapolis. There are only 1,200 there. I do not know, but I have been told that the cost of each student at Annapolis per annum is something like $4,500. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that in selecting young men to go to Annapolis it has been my pleasure and my pride to select boys who were not able to pay their way through any college, but who as American boys are ambitious to get an education. I believe when you spend upon a boy the sum of $4,500 per annum for his education instead of assisting him in making him a better citizen you come nearer to making him nothing but a parlor-carpet young man who believes only in wearing gold epaulets and having gold all around him; and I do not believe these young men should be brought up in that manner; nor do I believe the young men desire to be brought up in that manner. For four years it was my pleasure to go to a military establishment, and there we did not have to employ watchmen. In this bill 22 watchmen are provided for at salaries. I can not see why these young Americans could not be detailed, as I was detailed, to serve their turn and save this expense, small though it may be, to the Government. What I say may not save anything to the country, but I believe the people are finally going to wake up to the fact that we are spending too much at these colleges, not so much to educate the young men to defend the country, but to educate them so they may go out and be society entertainers. I believe, Mr. Chairman, we could well afford to pass some law whereby these retired Army officers could be sent to Annapolis to instruct these young men, be-

cause they should be better able to teach them than any civilian.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word merely for the purpose of making a single observation. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] said he understood the cost at Annapolis was $4,500 a year for each student. I have had the impression from what the gentlemen have said that it cost the Government of the United States $50,000, at least, for every man who was graduated from Annapolis.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. MANN. I will yield for any information.

Mr. PADGETT. We had some reports on that two or three years ago, and one estimate was that it cost about $15,000 to graduate a young man. Another ran it up to about $18,000 or $19,000. It varied.

Mr. MANN. That depends on what you compute.

Mr. PADGETT. That included interest on the investment of about $14,000,000 that is invested in the buildings.

Mr. MANN. I do not think that computation even charges the salaries of the officers who are over there. They go on the theory that they are already in the Naval Establishment.

Mr. PADGETT. That was included as an item also.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to ask a question. I would like to inquire of the chairman if the estimates he has given the committee relative to the expense of educating a student at Annapolis are based upon the number who are now in attendance, 1,200?

Mr. PADGETT. No; that was based upon the former number of 800.

Mr. DOWELL. Can the chairman give to the committee a statement of what additional expense there would be if the number were increased to the capacity of 1,700?

Mr. PADGETT. Perhaps $150,000 more.

Mr. DOWELL. In the aggregate?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. It would require perhaps a little more than that, say $200,000.

Mr. DOWELL. Of course, there is a greater expense for 1,700 than there is for 800.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; the great bulk of the expense in the larger estimate was the interest on the $14,000,000 investment, the maintenance, upkeep, repairs, heat, all those charges that are fixed charges. They do not increase with the increased number.

Mr. DOWELL. As I understand the chairman, we could educate 1,700 for practically the same amount as 800?

Mr. PADGETT. Not practically; but I think about $200,000 more.

Mr. MANN. We will have to rebuild the academy. We have spent $14,000,000 on the Naval Academy since I have been a Member of the House, and if you make a further increase, you will have to expend that much more.

Mr. PADGETT. The present authorization runs the number up to about 1,800—I am speaking of the operating expenses and the enlargement of the Naval Academy—we have a provision in here for enlarging it to accommodate the increased number.

Mr. DOWELL. As I understand, in order to have the 1,700 there must be provision for enlarging the academy.

Mr. MANN. There has to be an enlargement of the academy, anyhow. We built the academy before the census of 1900 was taken. We increased the representation; each Member and Senator only had 1 cadet, and the President only had 10. Now, we have given the Secretary of the Navy a bunch of them, increased the number to the President, increased the representation in both House and Senate, and given to each Member twice as many as he had before.

Mr. PADGETT. Three times as many as it was when I came here.

Mr. MANN. And yet they said when they built the academy that they were making the limit as close as they could. It was not built with the idea of giving each Member of Congress two or three cadets.

Mr. DOWELL. At any rate, from the answers of the chairman, I understand that the fewer the number of cadets at Annapolis the greater the percentage of expense.

Mr. PADGETT. Per capita, yes; because you divide the overhead charges by a smaller number.

Mr. MANN. There are no overhead charges.

Mr. PADGETT. There is the interest on the investment.

Mr. MANN. You will have to build accommodations for every new cadet.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In the bill we are now appropriating $824,729.20 for the Naval Academy at Annapolis. That alone amounts to $6,873 for each of the 1,200 cadets there.

Mr. PADGETT. Does the gentleman take into consideration that we propose an enlargement of the academy?

Mr. NORTON. How much is to be used for that? I do not believe any amount is provided for that here.

Mr. PADGETT. I beg the gentleman's pardon; what I had reference to is under public works.

Mr. NORTON. I quite agree with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] that it appears that the system they are practicing at the Naval Academy is the same system carried out by the Army and Navy officers in their work in the field. They do not want a soldier to do any manual labor of any kind if it can be avoided; it is repulsive to most officers to do anything but drill and dress up. That is the policy that is being carried out as I have frequently observed it. It seems to me that in the Naval Academy it is an outrage that it should cost the Government about $10,000 a year to educate a midshipman.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman has made an error of one cipher in his division. The gentleman said it was $6,000 for each cadet, whereas it is $600.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman is right—that does make a decided difference. My calculation made on the total appropriation stated in the bill was not correct.

Mr. SEARS. I understood the chairman to say that it required $16,000 or $18,000 to educate a cadet at Annapolis.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; including the interest on the $14,000,000 investment; the salaries of the officers, and counting in the pay of officers detailed for this duty, it amounts to that in the aggregate. But when you take the operating expenses, you have all that in the bill before you. For 1,200 cadets it would be so much, and if you had 1,700 cadets it would be less. Of course, if you had 1,700 cadets you would have to increase the number of professors, instructors, mess boys, and cooks.

Mr. NORTON. This appropriation does not, of course, cover all the expenses of the academy. I understood the gentleman [Mr. PADGETT] to say that the expenses of educating a midshipman for four years was about $50,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no; there have been two estimates. One was about $15,000 and the other about $18,000 or $19,000, as I recollect.

Mr. NORTON. Then I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. PADGETT. That is for the four years, and it includes the expenses of maintenance, upkeep, officers' salaries, interest on the $14,000,000 invested, and all that.

The Clerk read as follows:

Departments of electrical engineering and physics: Three electrical machinists, at $1,180 each; 2 mechanics, at $1,180 each; 1 laboratorian, $1,000; in all, $6,900.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think there must be something very wrong at the Naval Academy. About one year ago I appointed a young man to take the entrance examination, which he passed after he had made preparation here. He went to the Naval Academy and served until about 10 days ago, when he was notified that he had failed in one or two subjects of the semiannual examination held last month. I think he failed in French and also in Spanish. He was not the only one who failed; there were 60 others who failed to pass the examination. I asked him what the real trouble was. He said that there was a certain man there who was a teacher of a foreign language, the man being a foreigner himself, and the boy said the only reason he failed was because this foreign teacher had a prejudice against him. I think that is entirely wrong. Here is a boy who has gone to considerable trouble and expense to make his preparation. He had prepared here in the city of Washington for at least a year. He passed the entrance examination about a year ago; was admitted to the Naval Academy and served for something like eight months and is now dismissed. I am satisfied, after making my own examination of this boy's case, that he has been wronged, and I would like to know from some one——

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

Mr. McCRACKEN. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Did the gentleman appeal to the academic board of the Naval Academy?

Mr. McCRACKEN. I have not had time. The boy has been dismissed and was told to go home.

Mr. BUTLER. When was he dismissed?

Mr. McCRACKEN. Just about 10 days ago.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is it not a conditional dismissal, and will he not have 60 days within which to prepare himself to take the examination over in those subjects in which he was deficient?

Mr. McCRACKEN. No; it is an absolute dismissal, because he has passed the age of 20 years, and he can not be admitted to another examination.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Can he not make up those conditions in those subjects?

Mr. McCRACKEN. No; not at all.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that I have a young man in the same position; although he served through his fourth class and was in his third, he failed in three of his studies. It is within the power of the academic board to put him back in a lower class. In this case they refused, but I have the privilege of appointing him again to take the examinations held in April, which I am going to do. Fortunately he is not 20 years of age, but I want to say to the gentleman that none of these boys were discharged. Every one was given the privilege of resigning, which they did.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Let me explain right there that I asked in regard to this so-called resignation and find that it is a forced resignation.

Mr. BROWNING. That is true.

Mr. BUTLER. That is true.

Mr. BROWNING. But they were not discharged. In the Military Academy they are discharged outright.

Mr. McCRACKEN. It amounts to the same thing.

Mr. BROWNING. Oh, no.

Mr. BUTLER. I am sorry the gentleman did not know of the remedy which the gentleman from New Jersey suggested. That boy might have been put back in the next class and his graduation postponed a year longer, which often occurs.

Mr. McCRACKEN. But he has passed the age of 20 years.

Mr. BUTLER. That would make no difference, because he was admitted to the Academy when he was 19. There is no time limit set for graduation; it is for admission. The boy was already admitted there, and I am sorry that the gentleman finds himself in an awkward situation. If he consulted the Secretary of the Navy, there might yet be a remedy.

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

Mr. McCRACKEN. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I was about to suggest that my candidate met with the same result, but I am not ready to state that it was not his fault. He was appointed after a competitive examination that I held, and he made very high marks upon the entrance. I thought he had an assured career, but in the work at the Academy he fell below the requirements. I am rather of the opinion that the rigidity over at the Academy is not to be charged against the teachers as any particular prejudice against the students. I do not believe that exists. I think that our boys simply do not get into the rigid methods of study that they require over there.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes, two minutes to be granted to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], and two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already recognized the gentleman from Idaho for five minutes. The gentleman will proceed, and at the conclusion of that time the Chair will put the request of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Idaho to make the statement that they were employing foreign teachers over there. Is it a fact that they employ foreigners to teach in the Naval Academy?

Mr. McCRACKEN. I am advised that there are instructors teaching foreign languages in the Naval Academy who have been in this country only a very short time. I do not know as to their citizenship. But these boys who are sent here from the farm and all parts of the country to this school come back and tell us they do not get any help there, and that is one reason also why they fall down on their examinations, and if that be true, it is time that somebody was making an investigation of the Naval Academy, especially of the gentlemen who constitute the faculty of that institution.

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

Mr. McCRACKEN. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I think there is some foundation for what the gentleman says in regard to the foreign teacher teaching the foreign language. The rigid methods of both France and Germany in the schoolrooms are not what we use in this country, and our boys are not used to getting down and boning as they do over there. I think it is more difficult to meet the requirements of a teacher from France, for example, teaching French, or a teacher from Germany teaching German, but the fault is not altogether with the teacher. It is because our boys do not meet the requirements, and I think our friend will admit that he never knew a pupil to fail when it was not the teacher's fault.

Mr. McCRACKEN. I grant that is the case many times.

Mr. PADGETT. I want to say to the gentleman from Idaho that the passing mark at the Naval Academy is only 62½ per cent out of 100, which is a very low passing mark; so I think there is some unjust criticism of these teachers when you take into consideration that 62½ per cent of 100 is the passing mark, which is certainly not a severe standard.

Mr. McCRACKEN. I would like to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that there were 600 boys at the Naval Academy last year, and of that number more than 60 have resigned, which is tantamount to dismissal.

Mr. PADGETT. Sixty of the whole school; that takes in the whole school?

Mr. BROWNING. That is right, because my young man is in the third class.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman speaks of that as unusual. At the University of Virginia, while I was a student there, 89 men applied for a law degree and 30 got it. It was an unusually large class, and I think the average of the college will show that there are more severe examinations and a harder test than at either Annapolis or West Point.

Mr. PADGETT. It is a hard standard, and a higher passing mark.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman realize it is absolutely necessary to have the midshipmen comply with the requirements of the professorial force rather than have the midshipmen determine their own standard of scholarship?

Mr. McCRACKEN. I will grant that; but I want to say that these boys do not get the help from the teachers at the Naval Academy, who are paid by the Government, which they ought to get.

Mr. STAFFORD. Boys are boys while attending either college or the Naval Academy, and they themselves know that if they do not apply themselves as assiduously as they should in order to make their lessons they will fail. Boys who want to make their lessons pass.

Mr. McCRACKEN. The gentleman has simply assumed that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I know that from my experience in college, and I do not think there is any different status as far as the boys at the Naval Academy are concerned.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Would the gentleman from Wisconsin be in favor of giving a boy a chance to make up his deficiency?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I do not think a boy should be thrown out just because of one deficiency. I do not think he is thrown out if he merely fails in one study, but if he is deficient in more than one it is assumed he has not the mental capacity to meet the requirements of the test when in active service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I went to school from the time I was a small boy until I graduated at college at the age of 19. [Applause.] Oh, I doubt very much whether when I was graduated at the age of 19 I could have passed the present requirements for admission to the Naval Academy. I know I could not unless I probably crammed for that purpose. Now, I have been a student all my life in school, and after graduating at college I took a course in a law school and was graduated at a law school. Now it would require three or four years at a law school, and if I had been going to a medical school as conducted now it would have required four years; and yet what do we require? We admit a boy at the Naval Academy at the age of 16, I believe, and it makes considerable difference in his windup whether he goes in at the age of 16 or at the age of 20. It make a difference whether he retires as a rear admiral if he lives. We expect a boy at Annapolis to learn all that a man is expected to learn at an ordinary classical college and various other colleges and universities, and in addition to that to become the most perfectly drilled man on earth. No other men drill like the boys at Annapolis and West Point; at least I never have seen any; certainly they are not in the Army or the Navy outside of those graduates. Then we expect them to know something of seamanship, something of gunnery, something of navigation, something of international law, something of a great many other things, and the human mind is not sufficient to grasp all of those thing at the age of 20, no matter how much study one can put in, and the result is that lots of boys who go to Annapolis, who would make just as fine officers as anybody who was ever graduated, get plucked on their way through. I never had that unfortunate occurrence come to any of my appointees, I believe, but I have had a good deal of difficulty getting boys into Annapolis and they have managed to stay when they got in; that is

my recollection, although I am not so sure about that. If a man is going to study medicine, he will go through high school. He will not leave high school by the time he is 16. He will go through college, and he will not leave college now by the time he is 20, and then he will go through a medical school, and he will not leave that before he is 25, and then he will have to go out and be an interne in a hospital for two years, and after that he has got to go out and hang his shingle out and do a lot of work for nothing before he really commences his real professional work, and yet we suppose that a second lieutenant in the Navy is competent to man a vessel, and often he is required to do so; to know how to keep the country out of international difficulty and how to navigate a vessel. No wonder we have had a lot of naval vessels on the rocks.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes as I indicated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking the chairman of this committee a question. He made a statement a few minutes ago that we had three midshipmen there.

Mr. PADGETT. I did not say you had them there, but I said that you could appoint them.

Mr. EMERSON. I have not got three there yet.

Mr. PADGETT. Perhaps your predecessor had the places filled.

Mr. EMERSON. I am not supposed to have had any predecessor.

Mr. PADGETT. You had not?

Mr. EMERSON. No; it is a new district.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not understand that. There has not been any apportionments since 1910, when your State was redistricted; but your appointment came from the Congressman at large, I presume.

Mr. EMERSON. I do not know. Maybe he did not appoint from my district.

Mr. PADGETT. Whomever you succeeded had the places filled. There are three appointments for each Senator and for each congressional district.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Did we not create a new cadet during this present Congress?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Did not the gentleman from Ohio get that appointment? A new cadet was authorized for each Member at this present Congress.

Mr. EMERSON. I have not got even that.

Mr. PADGETT. There was an additional one created in the last session for each Member.

Mr. EMERSON. I have not had an appointee even under that.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman is entitled to it.

Mr. EMERSON. I did not get it. I have called at the department and I have not gotten it.

Mr. KELLEY. My impression is, and it may be an explanation in this case, that if there was an appointment at large by some Member from your State in that district, that that would count from your district.

Mr. BUTLER. No; it would come from the State at large.

Mr. SABATH. Your Republican colleagues might have gotten away with the appointment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have had some experience in the appointment of these cadets at Annapolis and have had several boys graduate from there, but I want to say that there is one thing about the Naval Academy I do not understand. Perhaps it is imaginary, but I know from experience that I have never named the son of an officer that he was not admitted, and always they were permitted to graduate. I believe that there is some foundation for the charge that is frequently made, that the sons of naval officers receive additional help at that institution that permits him to graduate. I do not know whether that is true or not, but I do know that I have never had a boy fail who was an officer's son, and I have appointed some of them. When it comes to West Point, perhaps I have been unfortunate. It may be I am unfortunate in the young men that I have in my district, but I have been a Member of this body for almost 14 years and I have never yet had a man graduate at the Military Academy. Never have I been able to get a boy in West Point that they did not find something the matter with him, usually a physical defect.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, can I have one minute, that I may raise my voice in this experience meeting?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I would like to say to the gentleman from Washington that if he would have his boys come to Florida and stay a while, I think we would give them a physical make-up that would enable them to get through.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If you did, I think you would do something with the efficiency of the Naval Academy rather than the boys.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, since I have been a Representative in this House I presume I have named 12 boys to Annapolis, and have never had one fail after admission. I have appointed them directly, with but very few exceptions. They are prepared in advance. I have never heard one of them say that they were suspicious that the son of an officer had better treatment and better advantage than the son of a civilian. And the boys I have named, with one exception, have all come from civil life—have been the sons of men in civil life.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentlemen yield for a moment there?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. Is it not a fact that at the present time the head man of their teams down there—the president of the class—is from the enlisted force?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; he comes from the enlisted force.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Department of seamanship: Two coxswains, at $480 each; 3 seamen, at $420 each; in all, $2,220.

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

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

Mr. EAGLE. If any of the gentlemen of this House have ever had any gratification, any satisfaction, in the matter of appointing cadets to West Point and to Annapolis, I congratulate him. I have had nothing but disappointment from beginning to end.

When the matter arose of my selecting young gentlemen to our Naval and Military Academies, I concluded to give the civil-service plan a fair and impartial trial in my district.

I have had 19 young gentlemen, first and last, write me requesting that I designate them either to West Point or to Annapolis. I had 178 persons write me separate and distinct letters saying favorable things concerning one or the other of those 19 applicants. I wanted for once to rise to the stature of a disinterested statesman, and accordingly I announced that not for political or personal considerations but purely upon the merit of applicants such appointments would be made. I have two vacancies at West Point and three at Annapolis. The candidates must be so many years old, weigh so many pounds, have flawless eyes, fine intelligence, a good education, and good morals; and hence I announced a civil-service examination to determine qualifications, and so I got the Civil Service Commission to hold the examination recently. I am not complaining about its work; I am talking about how the civil-service plan has worked in this matter.

Here is what happened: The civil service held such examination in my city of Houston, at the post office, beginning at 10 o'clock in the morning on January 10 of this year. Three months before that time, in order that everybody might have information concerning the examination, I had copies of instructions made on the multigraph, setting out the requirements of the Navy Department for admission to Annapolis and of the War Department for admission to West Point.

Having done that—and it filled an entire page—I mailed a copy to each newspaper in my district, a copy to each of those 19 young gentlemen, and a copy to each of those 178 persons who had written to me extolling the virtues of those 19 young gentlemen; and with the notice thus duly given, the time fairly stated, and the place duly set, when the commission properly constituted sat to pass upon the qualifications of all the applicants in my district, only two young gentlemen came to take the examination, and one of them made 60 and the other 75 per cent. [Laughter.]

Now, what should I do about it? I do not know.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Appoint them! [Laughter.]

Mr. EAGLE. Appoint whom? Appoint the two? The other three did not even apply, and were evidently not willing to stand the necessary examination. And now I am having many letters from some of those young gentlemen and their friends urging their selection, notwithstanding they were not willing to un-

dergo an examination to test their fitness. It would seem that the public and our constituents will not let us divest ourselves of the plague of patronage even when we earnestly try to divest ourselves of it.

What are you going to do about it? We can not have an efficient army corps and we can not have an efficient naval corps based on my preference when I do not know, or based on the preference of Senators and Representatives who do not know, the physical, educational, moral, and mental qualifications of applicants or candidates. You can not decide it sensibly at random. It is a pure guess.

Now, when I tried to be a disinterested statesman and a civil-service reformer, and not a politician, to appoint on merit alone, that is the result. I do not know what to do about it. If any of you gentlemen have solved the problem, I would be thankful to you. [Laughter.]

Seriously, it is a painful service we are called upon to perform—to dispense patronage of any kind. No matter whom we select we are criticized, if not even abused. Even where we do not seek the responsibility it is forced upon us. If we select our enemies, our friends accuse us of ingratitude. If we select our friends, our enemies accuse us of intolerance and clannishness. And when we invite the civil service to aid us—by testing applicants in order to enable us to select the best qualified—we are accused of cowardice in trying to evade responsibility. And when notice is given and expense is incurred, even then the applicants do not come forward to stand the examination. But afterwards they and their friends write us to please designate them because of friendship.

In all other matters and at all other times I have decided each contest coming before me with the best lights before me—undergoing the toil and observing the courtesies and entailing the consequences. Having now fairly tried out both plans, I have found such to be the only sensible course to pursue. But I could wish for no other blessing in public life quite equal to that of being relieved entirely from patronage. It kills time, makes enemies, belittles endeavor, and injures our opportunities to give to the public service the best of energy and talent we possess, but it is inevitable, because it is the people's way of conducting their own Government. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in six minutes, one-half to be used by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] and one-half to be used by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in six minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] is recognized.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I have no fault to find with the Naval Academy, although I have heard a great deal of criticism of it. I am inclined to think that the failure of our applicants is due more to themselves than to the authorities of the academy.

But I am interested in knowing how a man like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] can in 20 years make appointments and never miss them by having every applicant succeed.

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

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I take the chance of criticism by selecting the boy. That boy is usually selected by me two years in advance. When he is prepared and admitted he never fails, and I think five or six of my boys have been graduated near the head of their class.

Mr. FESS. How do you select them?

Mr. BUTLER. By my personal knowledge. I select boys that I know—rich or poor, it matters not to me, so that the boy can stand up—and have the boy's parents and neighbors, in a sense, in part responsible for his success.

Mr. FESS. I am much obliged to my friend. My colleague here from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] says he has not had a failure, and there are others who say they have not.

Now, I have only one ambition in reference to Annapolis and West Point, and that is to get good sailors and good soldiers. I have tried to select them by competitive examination, believing this to be the best way to insure the best choice, yet this year what would be called the "star" applicant whom I recommended is out, I suppose, by a forced resignation, which is a great disappointment to me. As I just remarked, I have no fault to find with the authorities over there, understand. I suppose my method of procedure is at fault.

Mr. BUTLER. I think it is not a good one. I think the gentleman's knowledge of the candidate would be much more useful to the candidate when that knowledge is more than what he could get through a competitive examination.

Mr. FESS. There is another question I would like to propound to some one who can answer me. One of the candidates that I was very anxious might have a chance—because I happened to know his parents, and they are not wealthy, and this is a very promising as well as deserving young man—was also in the examination, and was also recommended for Annapolis. He failed to enter; that is, he failed on the entrance examination. Then I took it up to see whether I could get him a retrial, and I was denied it, but was told that there was a certain board that I should apply to. The Bureau of Navigation notified me that he was not included in the list recommended for another examination. I applied to the academic board and was politely informed that the case was carefully considered, after which the board decided to deny him permission to appear to take another examination.

Mr. BUTLER. I fear I may have misled my friend——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman could reappoint him. I may have misled the gentleman. Within the last two or three years I have endeavored to assist by appointing directly from among boys whom I have known well in my district, hoping we could help them reach the mark. It is true they could not take the first examination on every occasion, but the boys who succeeded in entering the academy have done very well and in no case failed.

Mr. FESS. My familiarity with young men as students leads me to know how often the first examination does not establish the ability of the applicant. It appears, to say the least, a singular decision for any academic board to deny flatly the solicitation on behalf of a young man's desire to prove his worth, of the appointing authority, who doubtless knows more about the young man's qualifications than a single examination will show. While as a man who has spent his life in college circles I give no credence to attacks upon our constituted Government institutions, I admit such treatment does subject the authorities to suspicion.

The gentleman will understand that both these boys to whom I refer took the examination held at my own college and passed. I made both recommendations upon a competitive examination.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand.

Mr. FESS. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one question upon which I would like to have the attention of the House for a minute. There is a matter that has been presented to the educators of the country that I think the House ought to consider. I do not refer to the exact items discussed in the Senate yesterday, but to one other phase of similar character. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] referred a moment ago to the crowded curriculum of our schools. We establish grades for the high school. Then we set up certain standards for entrance to college. We require four years' work in the high school to make it of first grade. Then we fix a certain number of units—15, to be specific—in order to qualify for college entrance. A few years ago, by the munificence of Mr. Carnegie, there was organized in the country what is called the Carnegie Foundation. Among other things it has attempted is a standardization of colleges, in which it has published what it calls the standard requirement for college entrance, as well as the requirement of a college degree. Most of the colleges have adopted its recommendations. These requirements are not confined to scholarship, but extend to financial rating. I happen to have been at the head of an institution which, while it meets the requirements of both entrance and graduation, does not fall within the requirements of that foundation in all respects. The Carnegie Foundation fixes the requirements for a standard college, as I have just suggested, not alone upon educational qualifications but in addition upon a minimum number of professors who must not only be on the faculty but must confine their teaching in the college—that is, they must be free from teaching in the academy. In addition to that the size of the endowment that the college possesses is a third condition of standardization. A college, no matter what character of scholarship it represents, if it does not meet these two financial items—(1) number of teachers, (2) size of endowment—its rank will be unclassified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the limit——

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed by the committee itself.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the limit, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] may be permitted to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. FESS. I should like two minutes more.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for two minutes. The gentleman says that will be sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. I thank the membership of the House, because I want to get this matter before the body. I repeat that this unofficial mentor names three elements that enter into the requirements to make up what is denominated a standard college. One is qualification in scholarship for entrance, which is equivalent to graduation from a first-grade high school of four years' work, and then graduation after four years in college. But, in addition to scholarship, there must be a certain number of salaried professors, and the Carnegie Foundation even suggests minimum salaries upon the ground that a small salary can not command the ability demanded by a standard college.

Mr. PADGETT. There is nothing of that kind which applies to the Naval Academy or to West Point.

Mr. FESS. No; nothing whatever. I have no reference to either Annapolis or West Point. I simply call the country's attention to a tendency in education.

Mr. PADGETT. I have had several young men enter Annapolis right from our high school.

Mr. FESS. Yes. Another qualification required by the Carnegie Foundation is that there must be an endowment, the minimum of which is fixed; and if the college does not come up to that financial standing, no matter what the character of work, it can not be regarded as a first-rank college, and its diploma amounts to nothing beyond that of an unclassified institution. While the Carnegie Foundation is not official, yet it is rapidly fixing our standards of education, since I may say, unfortunately, the colleges of the country have adopted its standard as their standard; and when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] suggested that a professional career demands four years in the high school, and then four years in a college, before one begins his special work for his profession. If you want to enter a law school, that means four years after the four years at college, or if you want to enter a medical school, it is four years after the four years in college. While I do not find fault with these rigid requirements, I do question the wisdom of specific tendencies. It means that some of the most worthy educational institutions in America that are builded, not on money but upon the sacrifices of men who are willing to teach at a smaller salary than that which is arbitrarily fixed, are absolutely excluded from the standard rank of colleges, and the diploma granted to a student will not mean anything, because the student carrying that diploma can not enter a first-grade medical school or first-grade law school that requires four years in a standard college as a prerequisite for entrance upon technical or special training. I believe in a standard, but it must not be a financial one, but educational. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the real purpose of this rating is to destroy the small college. There is a well-defined conviction that there are too many colleges in the country. This method of elimination has been adopted. The colleges of a State or section capable of meeting the financial requirements associate themselves as the college association, excluding all institutions which do not meet the standard.

The requirements of the professional schools, such as medicine and law, will limit entrance to those either matriculated in or graduates of one of the associated colleges. This discounts at once the diploma of any institution not included in the association, no matter how high the character of scholarship.

It consequently deals a deadly blow to the prosperity of the institution, since no ambitious student desires to attend an institution whose diploma is not a sure credential for any profession.

This brutalizing tendency in education which attempts to fix a money standard is both undemocratic and un-American. It substitutes a base standard for real scholarship. It augments the increasing expenses of education, and naturally crowds our institutions with heedless youth who are sent to college, and excludes the purposeful who would go to college were its standards other than the size of the pocketbook. It is this tendency that causes many a mother's heart to bleed when she learns that her son's chief college achievement is the modern college habits he knew nothing about until he learned them in his fraternity.

Whatever this country is to be, her citizens should avoid making her higher institutions a club or an association whose member's credentials are the size of his wallet.

Every tendency that would crush out the native talent by exclusion on a financial basis should be avoided, not only in an individual but in our institutional life. The small college doing a high-grade work, though its endowment does not reach a fixed minimum, though its professors are not upon a professional salary basis, should not only be allowed to live but should be valued for what it is—the cradle of real scholarship to-day, as it has ever been in the past.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to have read in my time a telegram from a Rhode Island institution breathing patriotism.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be read in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *February 9, 1917.*

Congressman GEORGE F. O'SHAUNESSY,
Washington, D. C.:

In case of need the facilities of our factory at Cranston, R. I., will be at the Government's service.

J. R. LEESON,
President Universal Winding Co.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet and asking the indulgence of the committee, and hoping that my time will be extended just for a few minutes, I wish to sympathize with my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. EAGLE], who has had so much difficulty in the selection of young men for Annapolis and West Point. I think the discussion under this bill is very timely, for the reason that the selection of proper men for Annapolis and West Point lies at the foundation of our preparedness program. [Applause.] Although I confess to a very resolute adherence to civil-service ideas and principles, going so far yesterday as to uphold the President in his recommendation that postmasters in first, second, and third class offices be selected under civil-service rules——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has fixed the limit.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. They just indulged another Member, and I am asking the same privilege.

Mr. PADGETT. To show no preference, I will ask that the gentleman have four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island be allowed to proceed for four minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I voted for the President's recommendation, believing that these men should come from the ranks of the employees, and that an outlet for ambition, energy, and efficiency should be given to the employees who have given their lives to that service. Still in choosing men for Annapolis and West Point I feel that I will have to differ from my own views on the civil service, so far as that branch of the governmental service is concerned. I believe it absolutely necessary that in appointing cadets or midshipmen we should have a personal interview with the men who are going to serve their Government in those capacities for the purpose of that test which only a face-to-face meeting can disclose. In my opinion you can not make a soldier out of a bookworm. A civil-service examination opening up these places to those who may be mentally qualified and perhaps physically so is not the supreme test.

I believe that the foundation of the application should be a vigorous, resolute, hardy manhood. [Applause.] First of all, a man, and, secondly, education. I want a man who, when he is called upon, will not think of books, but will think of his country; a man who, when he is called upon, will have no regard for sacrifice, but will be willing to stand any test, no matter how supreme, no matter how severe. It has been a pleasure to me to appoint young men to Annapolis and West Point after I have interviewed them myself, and when I have had a resolute, hearty handclasp from a fellow who looked me plumb in the eye, I have said, "By the eternal God, there is a man that will make a good soldier or a good sailor." [Applause.] Back of all qualifications there should be manhood, and I would respectfully commend my theory and my practice to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE]. And when I speak of men being physically qualified I do not refer to mere bulk, which must not be confounded with prowess. Deep down in the young man's heart must be a wholesome love of country and a willingness to serve. I trust that this subject will receive greater attention at the hands of Congress. I feel very much concerned when I hear of a man going to these institutions and failing after six months, after a rigorous examination to which they are subjected, and I fully believe that a thorough investigation at the time of their entrance by the Congressman who has the privilege of sending them there will remove a great many of these difficulties and add to the service of the Army and Navy of the United States. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Department of marine engineering and naval construction: One master machinist, $1,900, and 1 assistant, $1,400; 1 pattern maker, $1,400; 1 boiler maker, 1 blacksmith, 3 machinists, 1 molder, and 1

coppersmith, at $1,280 each; 1 pattern maker and 1 blacksmith, at $1,080 each; 1 instructor in mechanical drawing, $2,000; machinists and other employees, $9,515.20; in all, $27,335.20.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Some estimates were made a few moments ago as to the cost of maintenance of a cadet at Annapolis. I would like to have the chairman of the committee tell me the cost of maintenance of one enlisted man.

Mr. PADGETT. For an enlisted man in the Navy, I think the ration the past year was 39 cents.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not want the actual cost of maintaining the Navy, but the cost to the country of each enlisted man in the Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. I have not taken that matter up.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I assume that it would be at least the cost of one soldier in the Army.

Mr. PADGETT. I would think so.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is estimated that one enlisted man costs at least $1,200 a year. The chairman of the committee says that it costs about $4,000 a year to maintain a cadet at Annapolis. Gentlemen raise their hands in holy horror at the tremendous waste of money in giving a young man an education so that he will be competent to command a battleship, and yet eventually he will command a thousand men whose cost of maintenance is $1,200 a year each. Will any man on this floor say that a man educated at Annapolis competent to command a battleship is not worth at least four times what an enlisted man is?

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. Does the gentleman think that the Government ought to pay that difference while he is obtaining that knowledge?

Mr. LONGWORTH. How could he eventually have the knowledge unless he obtains it at Annapolis? The value of an education at West Point or Annapolis can not be estimated in dollars and cents.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words in reference to this matter of Annapolis and West Point appointments. We have had a discussion on Annapolis and West Point examinations annually ever since I have been in Congress, and I desire to advocate again briefly the method I have used with some success; that is, the Rhodes scholarship method as nearly as it can be applied. I hold a competitive examination, or rather two examinations, a mental and physical examination, take the two sets of marks and add them together and then divide them by 2. Then take into consideration participation in school athletics, and the character and manhood of the boys the same as they do for the Rhodes scholarships. That is the only standard way to pick out an all-around boy that I know of. It requires a district, of course, in which you can get a number of candidates. It does not work very well if you have only two or three candidates, but if you can get a dozen candidates for examination, so that you can have some chance of getting an eligible list from your mental examination on the regular Annapolis or West Point requirements, conducted by the civil service—I think that is best, though some of my examinations have been conducted very well by local school authorities—and then have a physical examination on a competitive basis of the boys who stand highest the result is going to be that you will get a pretty good all-around boy. And I want to add that such a test usually appeals to the boys themselves and attracts more candidates than you can get for a competitive examination confined to the mental side.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I want to say that there was an examination held in my district several years ago of that kind, and the boy eventually graduated at the head of his class.

Mr. PLATT. I am glad to hear that, and I think it a natural outcome. Competitive examinations of course do not do everything, but they generally give you a boy that can pass the entrance examination at Annapolis, and with a fair chance of standing well afterwards.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman realize that there is something more, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY], and that is, is not the supreme test whether the boy has the metal besides necessary educational qualifications to render him eventually able to handle a battleship?

Mr. PLATT. Yes; and that is why we count the boy's physical examination and his record in athletics and his capacity for leadership.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mere physique does not determine whether a man has the metal to qualify him for leadership. I have seen a big bully who had plenty of physique who was a coward.

Mr. PLATT. The combination of mental capacity and physique ought to show the right qualification.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman whether, when a young man enters the Naval Academy, the whole test now is not book knowledge and his ability to pass the examination?

Mr. PLATT. No; there is a vast amount of physical training, and a good many boys break down under the physical training both at West Point and Annapolis. After the boy gets in he has to have the capacity to study, but the great trouble is that our grammar schools and high schools are not thorough. They do not ground the boys thoroughly in the things that they ought to be grounded in. Boys fail largely in the grammar-school subjects. I have had a boy pass an examination with almost 100 in algebra and geometry and fail in history, which he ought to have been able to read up on in two weeks so as to pass. The boy I have in mind did so well in mathematics in a competitive examination that I made him an alternate. I told him of his weakness in history, and suggested that he had plenty of time to read and master enough to pass the examination, but he could not do it. It was simply because he had not been trained to study and could not concentrate himself. He could not do what every boy who has had a good high-school education ought to be able to do.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Does not the gentleman feel that he is reflecting on the teachers of the high schools in the country when he says that the boys have not been trained to study?

Mr. PLATT. I am reflecting on the high schools and the private schools, too. I have had boys from both kinds of schools, and they have not been trained thoroughly in either. The idea of the usual school is to pass as many boys and girls as possible to higher grades, so as to give the school a good statistical record. That is the way the schools work all over this country. They are rarely thorough.

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate upon the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I object. I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not the floor. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SABATH. But I moved to strike out the last two words before the gentleman secured the floor, and the Chair recognized me.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman whether two minutes would satisfy him.

Mr. SABATH. I replied that I would not use more than two or three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee prefers a request for unanimous consent that all debate close——

Mr. PADGETT. In three minutes; that the gentleman from Illinois have two minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] have one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. That debate close in three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition for the purpose of asking a question of the chairman of the committee. The statement has been made by some gentleman upon the floor this afternoon that the sons of officers, as a rule, succeed in passing the examinations before boys who have been appointed who are not relatives of officers. I myself have suspected that, because whenever I appoint the son of an officer he always passes, but whenever I appoint some one else who is not connected with the military or naval service he has his own troubles. For that reason I would like to ask the chairman if he could give the House information as to the percentage of boys who are now in the Naval Academy who are the sons or relatives of officers?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I can not; and I can not give the gentleman that information, because what I have heard here this evening is about all I have ever heard upon this subject. I want to say to the gentleman that perhaps it might be accounted for by this fact: If an officer has a son in the academy and that officer is there at the academy, he would have

the boy in his home and would be likely to give him instructions. I do not know, though, that there is any foundation for these rumors. I have had young men enter the academy from the high schools without preparation and I have had other young men who took special preparation who failed. I have never seen any evidences of favoritism. They have treated me just as they have others. When my boy failed they kept him out, just as they have kept others out.

Mr. SABATH. Then it is the opinion of the gentleman that these examinations are honestly conducted and without any preference being given?

Mr. PADGETT. As far as I know, they are absolutely square and honest.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I wish to have read in my time a telegram from Dr. J. H. Kellogg, one of the foremost scientists of the country and the head of a very great sanitarium, which telegram I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the telegram, as follows:

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., *February 5, 1917.*

Hon. J. M. C. SMITH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

America ought to set an example to the whole world by finding means for settling the controversy with Germany without war. The war will ultimately be settled by economic rather than military forces. America is big enough to be patient and pioneer the way to better things.

J. H. KELLOGG.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commissary department: One chief cook, $1,200; 8 cooks, at $600 each, and 12 assistants, at $360 each; 1 steward, $1,200, and 1 assistant, $1,080; 1 head waiter, $840, and 3 assistants, at $600 each; 4 pantrymen, at $420 each; 1 chief baker, at $1,200; 5 bakers, $600 each; 2 assistants, at $540 each, and 3 assistants, $480; 1 head butcher, at $900; 2 assistant butchers, at $720 each, and 1 butcher's helper, at $480; 4 baker helpers, at $300 each; 65 waiters, at $20 per month each, and 65 waiters, at $16 per month each, $29,280; 4 coffeemen, at $300 each; 4 dish pantrymen, at $300 each, 4 firemen, at $300 each; 4 utility men, at $300 each; 2 linemen, at $300 each; 2 seamstresses, at $420 each; 4 clerks, at $360 each; in all, $64,620.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I have some amendments which I desire to offer for the purpose of making some clerical corrections.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 18, strike out the figures "$29,280" and insert the figures "$28,080"; page 46, line 22, strike out the figures "$64,620" and insert "$63,420"; and page 46, line 26, strike out the figures "$381,173.20" and insert "$379,973.20."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the gentleman that the paragraph to which the last amendment is offered has not yet been read.

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct. I will ask for a vote upon the other two amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Tennessee to the paragraph ending on line 22, page 46.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question, not in the way of criticism but for information. Is there any regulation or rule or law which pertains to men in the active service of the Navy who engage or associate themselves with others who are engaged in commercial enterprises for profit?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. There is a statute which was passed some years ago that prohibits retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, though not of the Army, from engaging in certain occupations and businesses in civil life that sell material to the Government.

Mr. HICKS. The question I have is with reference to an officer upon the active service.

Mr. PADGETT. A man upon the active service can not engage at all.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, this situation has been brought to my attention. I do not want to mention the name of any officer because it is possible that there are others who are in the same position, and it is possible that neither he nor they are violating any regulations. I know of an officer in the active service of the Navy who has lent his name to an invention he has made to a commercial enterprise. This commercial enterprise advertises the fact that he is a captain in the United States Navy, and that if the persons who are buying supplies desire special information this captain will supply it.

The question arose in my mind as to whether that was fair to the Government who is paying the man for his full service or fair to the competitor of that commercial concern, because the competitors do not have the same advantage in having a United States naval man at their head or as a consulting expert. It may be that it is best for the Government to allow this dual service so that the incentive for profit may stimulate the officers to perfect inventions from which the Government as well as private concerns will profit. Personally I question the expediency of such a practice.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know what the invention is and do not know about it, but the law prohibits a retired officer and I also understand active officers from engaging in business in that way.

Mr. HICKS. I took this up with the Navy Department and I could not get any definite information, but I did get this much, that they do not find any law which prohibits an officer in the active service of the Navy from lending his name to or associating himself with a private commercial enterprise.

Mr. BUTLER. It may be done, but it is against the will of the department, and it is certainly against the intention of Congress and I would be in favor of taking him off the active list if he does it.

Mr. PADGETT. He may have some patent and the concern uses his patent or invention.

Mr. HICKS. They do use his name in advertising it.

Mr. TALBOTT. Is it such an invention as the Government uses?

Mr. HICKS. No; it is used by small boat manufacturers.

Mr. TALBOTT. The gentleman knows the law is that any invention that an officer makes, either of the Army or the Navy, or anyone in the Government service, belongs to the Government?

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

Mr. TALBOTT. But if it is an invention that is something that is not used by the Government, while it is not good taste, I do not think there is any law in reference to it.

Mr. HICKS. The gentleman does not think there is any law to prevent it?

Mr. TALBOTT. No; but it may not be good taste.

Mr. HICKS. Should not there be such a law?

Mr. TALBOTT. I will take that up later on.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the gentleman presented the case to the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. HICKS. Yes; to the Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

Mr. BUTLER. And the Secretary has made the reply that there was no law to prevent it?

Mr. HICKS. The Judge Advocate did not state it very clearly. He said that so far as he knew there was no law to prevent it.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, I will make it my business to look into the matter and see if we can not have a law.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to represent a district filled with peace-loving, loyal, patriotic people. Practically all of them are opposed to war, but if war comes, whether our Nation is right or wrong, they will all support the Government with all their power. Having in mind possibilities, the loyal and patriotic citizens of the village of Aitkin, far north in the district, comes to the front with a telegram promising aid, which telegram I will insert as a part of my remarks.

The people of Aitkin have not taken this step to encourage war, but to stand back of the Nation in everything that may be necessary. In that district, at least, everybody knows that the war conditions are the result of the uneconomic law that governs trade and commerce—the privilege that has been given to a few in this world to make industrial slaves of the rest of us. With one proper act of Congress the world could be changed—conquered by the force of the collective demand of all mankind—when the way is pointed out that would make it sure that the industrious and intelligent in all the fields of useful work can command success for themselves by their industry instead of having it serve to make a few of the specially favored successful. That would result in a peace-loving people everywhere. Let one nation act wisely—really wisely—the rest will be forced to follow with even more speed than the unwise acts have been followed by one nation after another. There need be no war to establish and enforce our rights on the high seas. If we adopt the economic law for our own Government we shall conquer the world, not by drenching it in blood, not by vain glory that will be looked upon by succeeding generations as the last colossal act of American barbarism if it should come—no, not in the blood of the brave will we conquer insanity, but we can do so in the common sense of a new nation-wide intelligence applied to an adjustment of business to meet the needs and demands of the people generally instead of as now to satisfy the speculators and make them lord of all our actions, even to the extent of forcing us into war.

The telegram is as follows:

AITKIN, MINN., *February 7, 1917.*

Hon. C. A. LINDBERGH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Place at disposal of the War Department Red River Lumber Co.'s sawmill plant, consisting of five factory buildings, over 2,000-horsepower engines, and equipment located on ideal site with ample trackage and yards. Plant now idle. Ready for Government's immediate use.

AITKIN COMMERCIAL CLUB,
ED MCCONVILLE,
Chairman Committee.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In reference to the discussion had a few moments ago in regard to the fact that some midshipmen were dismissed on account of failure, my belief is that the age limit for admission is too low. My recollection is one can not be admitted over 20 years of age, and I think that is a great mistake. Most of the applicants who go to the Naval Academy go from high schools, and at 20 years of age they have not got the education or the maturity to enable them to stand the course that they have to take at the academy. I recommended applicants by a competitive examination before they went before the board, but a number of them failed, and I think it would be wiser to raise the limit of age from 20 to 22 years, and I think the chairman, if he would think over the matter, will do that.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, in reference to that I want to say that the naval officers for several years have appeared before the committee urging that the age be reduced from 16 to 20 to 15 to 18 and Members of Congress have come to me personally insisting that the best age that we could get them was just as young as possible, and the committee has refrained from taking either one of those. In England, I understand, they take them at 12 years of age instead of 16, as we do here. So that we are standing on the 16 to 20, and you ask here the higher age, and the department is wanting it put at from 15 to 18. The English have them admitted at 12 years of age.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. I think in England they get a longer course or else the course is not so hard as in the United States Naval Academy, because they could not possibly stand a course here at 12 years of age. Very few can stand it at 20 years, and last year—I am not sure whether it was the Naval Academy or the Military Academy—80 persons in the academy were dismissed because of failing to pass the examinations. They have not the maturity of age to enable them to stand the course.

Mr. PADGETT. It is not the age question, but if the gentleman will go down to the academy he will find it is the boy does not apply himself.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Oh, no.

Mr. PADGETT. The great bulk of them, the younger boys themselves who enter at 16 years, a larger per cent of them graduate than those who enter at 20 years of age.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. If the pupil in the high school will be regular he will finish his fourth year and will graduate from the high school at 18, and that gives him two years leeway after finishing in the best high schools in the country, so I rather agree with the chairman that the age limit is not too low.

Mr. PADGETT. No; the age limit is very satisfactory.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. It simply gives the boys who have parents who have the means to send them to advanced schools an advantage over the boy the son of parents of moderate means, and I am opposed to it. Our rural high schools are becoming more efficient year by year, and I am in favor of giving the graduate of the rural high schools an equal chance with the city boy.

The Clerk read as follows:

Department of Buildings and Grounds: 1 messenger to superintendent, $600; 45 building attendants, at $400 each, $18,000; in all, $18,600.

In all, civil establishment, $381,173.20.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 26, amend by striking out "$381,173.20" and insert "$379,973.20."

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

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I fear my original statement may be misunderstood. In that I gave you the expenditures for "Pay of professors and others at the Naval Academy." I now give you the total of the expenditures at the academy for this year, which is $824,729.20, as compared with $703,946.92 for last year. I desire also to call the committee's attention to the fact that on page 30 of the present bill under the head of "Bureau of Medicine and Surgery," in which is included the Naval Academy, together with other places, there is an appropriation in the sum of $1,121,740 for medical supplies, and so forth. I also find under the heading "Contingent, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery," on pages 30 and 31, in which is included the Naval Academy together with other places, an appropriation of $291,080 for purchase of one motor-propelled vehicle for official use only, and so forth, and for naval medical supply depots, sick quarters at Naval Academy, and so forth. I do not know how much of the above amounts go to the Naval Academy.

My colleague from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] stated that because a soldier in line received $1,200 it was unjust to criticize a boy who received for his services in the shape of education and supplies and maintenance, $4,000. I think the comparison is hardly fair, because the boy at college is securing for himself an education and is preparing himself for a life position at a salary commensurate with the services he is to render, while the poor fellow in line, who is willing to die for his country, can never hope to get more than the $1,200, and has no educational advantages.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. I will.

Mr. PADGETT. A great proportion of that $4,000 that the gentleman refers to is the interest, the maintenance, and overhead charges in keeping up the plant there. We have $14,000,000 invested in that plant, and in making up that we count the interest on that, the repairs to building, and the salaries of officers, and all that.

Mr. SEARS. If this Government of ours, when it can borrow money at 2 per cent, is paying this enormous amount because of the interest, something should be done to stop it, and we can not do it by increasing these appropriations.

I have no complaint to make about the young men I have sent to Annapolis. They have been true to the trust I have imposed in them and they are making good. Along that line I have no complaint. Nor would I object to the payment of any salary to any professor commensurate with the services he returns, but the House seems to have gotten away from the original point.

Mr. SNYDER. A moment ago you stated that the enlisted man was ready to die for his country. Do you expect that the young man you appointed to West Point would not be ready to die for his country?

Mr. SEARS. I certainly would expect him to die for his country if the same became necessary. The point I make is that you are paying the young man in the Army $1,200 per year for life for his services and it is costing the taxpayers about $4,500 per year to educate a boy at Annapolis. I do not believe it should cost so much. However, we have gotten away from the original proposition under discussion. I trust what I have said will not be taken in a spirit of criticism, and I have brought the various matters mentioned in my remarks to the attention of the House in order that we might discuss them and that we might discover really what is being done. I can not hope for results this year, and I have taken up the time of the House solely with the hope that some reforms may be accomplished. The question under discussion was not how a young man should get into the academy or how he should get out of the academy, but I contended then and I contend now, Mr. Chairman, that because of omission or neglect on our part or through oversight the Naval Academy at Annapolis is costing the people of this country more in proportion per man, 1,200 students, than any other college in the United States; and as one of the Representatives of the people I felt it was my duty to bring it to your attention and let you deal with the matter as you saw fit.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in order that I may save time by not again addressing the committee on the question, I want at this time to say that in the paragraph just read about 62 additional men will be employed next year. I do not know whether they will be employed after the quoto is increased to 1,700 or whether they will be employed under the quoto of 1,200.

Mr. PADGETT. I will say to the gentleman that the estimate for next year is that there will not be less than 1,500, an increase of 300, at least, over the present number in the academy.

Mr. SEARS. Well, then, with that increase they certainly ought to have butchers, chief butchers, assistant butchers, and so forth. But, Mr. Chairman, that was not really the point I was objecting to. As I said, I believe it is costing too much, and something should be done to correct it. I certainly believe retired naval officers should be used, as far as possible, as instructors at the academy, and I can not bring myself to believe they would object to such service.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS] to have 5 minutes, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be occupied by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS], 5 minutes by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], and 5 minutes by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, just before the gentlemen begin I would like to make a request. A great many gentlemen are asking that we expedite this bill. I am trying to do so. At the same time I, too, do not want to seem unfair. I will ask the membership of the House to please cooperate with me, if they can, and let us cut out some of this debate.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have been mum during the discussion of this measure until the present. I am not in favor of going wild over a great system of Army and Navy expenditures in line of preparedness. But I am in favor of having a most efficient and competent set of men educated to direct our military and naval forces; and the education is technical and expert, special, and should be thorough. And I am one of those that believe a fine investment is made even if you double the cost of the ordinary college in turning out from our war colleges a man who is able to take charge of a division of the Army in any part of the battle line that we may have anywhere on earth. I am one of those who believe that the money is well expended that will make not only a good fighter in our Navy, but a man who can understand the hydrography of the earth wherever his ship may be and be ready to direct his forces safely and accurately anywhere, and make a seadog, so to speak, of the boy, prepared to live a life of active service in the defense of his country anywhere his ship may be. And I am not bothered about the special extra cost. I want the knowledge complete and thorough. I would be glad to leave off a few great ships and have the remainder in charge of thorough and competent men. [Applause.]

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is recognized.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to what I consider to be a grave defect in this bill. The bill as originally drawn provides for hundreds and millions of dollars for ships and ammunition. We have had amendments brought in here because of the emergency that will add millions more. But there is no provision in this bill and there is no emergency amendment offered to provide for an increase in the personnel of the Navy. To my mind that is the gravest defect now existing in the Navy. It is the gravest defect now existing in this bill.

We have a deficiency already in the personnel of the Navy in the enlisted men of more than 20,000. We can not send out our commissioned ships. Of what avail will it be to us to expend additional hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships and more ammunition and more material if we do not do something to increase the personnel of the Navy? Gentlemen say here that they are making earnest endeavor to recruit the Navy, but they also say that they can not, under existing conditions, recruit the Navy even to fill the ships now in commission. Then we must do something in order to accomplish this result. We can expend hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships, but we are unable to spend a few thousand dollars to increase the pay of the men in the Navy in order to secure the necessary enlistment. I want to read from the hearings when the Secretary of the Navy was before the committee. Mr. KELLEY asked:

> I wondered if you had worked out any plan whereby we might hope to get men faster than we have been getting them during the past six months.

The answer of the Secretary was:

> Yes; we have worked out plans. We have increased the number of recruiting stations. I am asking for an appropriation of $50,000 for automobiles for the use of recruiting officials to be sent into the country districts.

Fifty thousand dollars for automobiles, but not one cent of increase in pay for the men who are to be enlisted in this service! [Applause.] And he goes on and says——

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

Mr. TOWNER. I regret I can not.

Mr. BAILEY. Just for a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; but I suggest to the gentleman to make it very short.

Mr. BAILEY. Is it not true that the pay of the men in the Navy to-day is greater, all things considered, than that of the ordinary workman?

Mr. TOWNER. Oh, no; but I have not the time to discuss it. But, whatever it is, what futility is it for us to build ships and pay hundreds of millions of dollars for them and make no provision for manning them? We ought not to build the ships unless we are willing to pay what is necessary to get the men to man the ships, and it makes no difference what the amount required is our ships will be useless unless we have the men to man them. Comparatively, the pay of the men in the Navy is but a small item in the large amounts that are provided for here.

Mr. KELLEY said further to the Secretary:

> This is rather an emergency time—I think everybody recognizes that—in the history of the world. Do you not think we ought to get the men now?

The Secretary said:

> Certainly; we ought to get the men.

And Mr. KELLEY asked:

> And take all the measures necessary?

And the Secretary said:

> We have already taken the steps necessary to increase recruiting, and we are already getting results.

It is fair to say that the Secretary agreed to the proposition that the pay of the men ought to be increased if we desire to get more recruits for the Navy.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he starts in?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. Yesterday the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] proposed an amendment to increase the pay of the sailors.

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; and it should have been adopted. I confess, Mr. Chairman, that I do not know what ought to be done, what inducements ought to be offered, whether it should be in the term of service or in some other form. But I do know, and I think every Member of this House knows, that we must do something in order to man the ships that are to compose our Navy.

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

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; certainly; I will be glad to yield to the chairman.

Mr. PADGETT. In the last session of Congress we authorized the increase of the enlisted personnel from 51,500 to a possible limit of more than 88,000. We provided a reorganization of the personnel, and we have stated time and time again that we have given them greater advantages. We have provided for many benefits to them that they did not have before. We shortened the term of enlistment, and put it down either in that bill or in the one just before, allowing one year's enlistment. It was in that bill, I believe. You could get as low as one year's enlistment, and then allow them to extend if they wanted to.

Now, all of that was provided in August last, looking after the personnel, and as soon as that begins to spread out and get into communication with the public, and they are knowing it, we are getting increased enlistments; and I think the thing to do is to try out in a reasonable way what we did on the 29th of August last, less than six months ago.

Mr. TOWNER. I will ask the chairman of the committee why he did not act on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy and increase the pay of these men?

Mr. PADGETT. Simply because we did not think it was necessary, in view of what we had done in the bill of August 29, 1916, less than six months before.

Mr. TOWNER. Now you have a deficiency of 20,000 men to man the ships now in commission, and you are not doing one single thing in this emergency to secure the men, and yet you are asking for millions of dollars to procure additional ships and ammunition.

Mr. PADGETT. Because we think we had done what was adequate only a few months before in the bill of August 29, 1916.

Mr. TOWNER. But we did not have the emergency then that we have now. You are offering amendment after amendment now to prepare for emergencies. Why not offer amendments to meet this emergency?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield me a moment to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. May I ask it in the gentleman's time?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Tennessee says that when we passed the law last year the enlisted men of the Navy were 51,500.

Mr. PADGETT. No; I said that was the authorized enlistment.

Mr. GARDNER. They were enlisted up to that amount?

Mr. PADGETT. They were a little over, and we had a provision enacted legalizing the three or four hundred enlistments over that number that had taken place.

Mr. GARDNER. And now on the 1st of February I find the number is up to 53,456.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. As against 52,000 in August, in spite of all your inducements.

Mr. PADGETT. And during the month of January we added a net gain of 1,344.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes. And is not January always the chief enlistment month of the year?

Mr. PADGETT. Not always. It is one of the good months.

Mr. GARDNER. That is when the snowbirds all come in.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to use the rest of my time. I hope that even in this bill the committee will do something to increase the pay of the enlisted men. At least that ought to be tried in this emergency. I find on page 794 of the hearings that Lieut. Commander McCandless says that the base pay of seamen of the first class is $35 down, with $24 a month; of second class, $30 down, with $19; of seamen of the third class, $22 down, with $16 a month; that for messmen it is $60 down, with $16 a month. In other words, for the class of seamen that we most need the pay is now $16 a month. It occurs to me, gentlemen, that it would be not only wise but a frugal policy as well, an economical policy as well, if we should raise the pay of these seamen to at least decent wages in order that we may secure them in numbers sufficient to fill the Navy. Sixteen dollars a month will not tempt many desirable young men to join the Navy, even in times of emergency; and we should have them now. It takes a year to train a recruit how to handle a gun on board ship. What folly it will be to be compelled, in case of emergency, to tie our battleships to our wharves until we can train men to handle them; $16 a month is too small a wage to secure men in such times as these.

Mr. PADGETT. The figures that the gentleman read were the base pay that was provided by statute years ago. There was a subsequent statute that added 10 per cent to that, so you should add 10 per cent to those figures.

Mr. TOWNER. One dollar and sixty cents a month?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Current and miscellaneous expenses, Naval Academy: Text and reference books for use of instructors; stationery, blank books and forms, models, maps, and periodicals; apparatus and materials for instruction in physical training and athletics; expenses of lectures and entertainments not exceeding $1,000, including pay and expenses of lecturer; chemicals, philosophical apparatus and instruments, stores, machinery, tools, fittings, apparatus, and materials for instruction purposes, $41,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise to obtain some information as to the policy pursued by the committee in increasing the salaries of the personnel at the Naval Academy. In the prior paragraphs there has been quite a general increase of salaries, in some instances ranging as high as $300, most of them only a reasonable increase of $100. Did the committee have any general policy in making these increases?

Mr. PADGETT. No horizontal increase or anything of that kind. We took up each case and dealt with it with reference to the character of men required, the character of the service to be performed, the duties of the office, and the general standard of requirements.

Mr. STAFFORD. In all these instances were these increases recommended by the department?

Mr. PADGETT. They were recommended by the management of the academy and approved by the department.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are there any instances where the committee declined to follow the recommendation of the department for increases?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recall any.

Mr. STAFFORD. So the committee virtually adopted the recommendation of the department in every instance?

Mr. PADGETT. Virtually. I believe where the department had recommended an odd figure we may have made it an even figure.

Mr. STAFFORD. The committee, following the recommendation of the department, did not go very far into each case, as to whether it was based on merit or not.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; we did.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume they took the word of the department, and followed it without much further investigation.

Mr. PADGETT. We had some of the officers of the Naval Academy before the committee—the superintendent and some of the other officers—and we inquired of them as to the character of the service to be performed, and so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was there any instance where the committee declined to follow the recommendation of the department so far as increases of salary are concerned?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recall any.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was the policy of the committee to accept the recommendations of the department so far as increases were concerned.

Mr. PADGETT. If we approved it at all. We may not have given some that the department recommended, but where we gave them we usually followed the recommendation of the department.

Mr. STAFFORD. The committee is rather acquiescent, in so far as increases of salary are concerned.

Mr. PADGETT. In the Naval Academy, and in the reorganization under the bill of last year, the whole thing is under reorganization, and we followed the recommendations of the department where they accorded with the administration of the academy.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may be in error, but I do not recall any instance where the committee has made such general increases in salaries as in the personnel of the Naval Academy.

Mr. PADGETT. No; we have not for years, because the bill of last August authorized a complete reorganization. Last year we gave the Secretary a lump-sum appropriation, $175,000, and this year it is being apportioned.

Mr. STAFFORD. For these specially enumerated officials who are carried in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. Professors and instructors, and so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the discretion granted to the Secretary what is the pay as finally fixed compared to the pay in other educational institutions?

Mr. PADGETT. He has not consummated his arrangements yet, and we have not got his report. The thing is undergoing reorganization now. He got his authority on the 29th of August and the school year began in September, and he has not had time to put into effect the reorganization. It is being worked out in the department.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand, in some instances naval officers who have been engaged in professorial work have been discontinued and civilian professors substituted in their stead?

Mr. PADGETT. That is contemplated as to some of them. Whether it has actually been done or not in the present session I am not prepared to say, because there had to be a very large increase in the number of professors and instructors in the aggregate, and they have been trying to get them, but there are certain matters, for instance, foreign languages and literature and things of that kind——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. With the information that the gentleman has gleaned after many years of service on the committee, can he inform the House whether there have been any instances where teachers in the Naval Academy have left to go to other institutions because of a difference in compensation between that of the academy and the private institutions?

Mr. PADGETT. Teachers at the Naval Academy have insisted very strongly that they were underpaid. A few years ago it was recommended by the prior Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Meyer, that the civilian instructors be dispensed with altogether and that their places be supplemented with naval officers. We never had such a propaganda come to the committee as we had then, with the insistence that they should be let alone. They had the presidents of the various universities send us letters—I remember receiving several of them—urging the importance and insisting on having civilian instructors remain in the academy. They showed a very great anxiety and an intense interest to remain in the academy, notwithstanding

prior to that time they had been urging that they were underpaid.

Mr. STAFFORD. They manifested as great an interest as public officials do to retain office?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. They liked their berths very well?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. But there have been no instances of leaving the Naval Academy because of disparagement in pay?

Mr. PADGETT. There may have been individual instances, but there has been no hegira.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Does not the gentleman think that in case of war or an emergency we could get all the volunteers for the Navy we needed?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I think so, with the authorization we have had and the 10,000 from the naval service and the reserve we are building up in a satisfactory way, and from the 30,000 or 35,000 ex-enlisted men who are in civil life.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Is it not a fact that the young men do not enlist now in great numbers because they do not like to be perpetual soldiers?

Mr. PADGETT. The Navy has been having satisfactory enlistments until the abnormal conditions arose in manufacturing, and even now, since we amended the act last August giving additional advantages and preferences, it is coming up again. A year ago we had a waiting list for enlistments in the Navy.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, Naval Academy, exclusive of public works, $824,729.20.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to correct a total.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerical error; page 48, line 20, strike out the figures "$824,729.20" and insert "$833,529.20."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In the present bill a great many increases in salaries have been made. I have no objection to these increases, because I like to be consistent. As I have stated several times, I believe in paying a man what he is worth. I have always made that fight, even when I asked for an increase in salary for myself. I voted for the District increase. I voted for the 5 and 10 per cent increase every time it came before the House. The House let all the others go through, and this has gone through, and meets with my approval.

But I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that when it came to the Post Office bill which related to the boys back home receiving less than $1,000 and less than $1,800 a year we were unable to secure for them any increase. I want to be absolutely frank, and state that I voted for the other increases because I believed they were entitled to it, and because I thought those back home would receive the increase they were also entitled to. The high cost of living at home is just as much as the high cost of living in Washington, if the amounts which I have to pay for supplies are any criterion to go by. I hope the House will see its way clear to allow the postal employees throughout the country receiving less than $1,000 a year the same increase in their salaries as allowed other employees, in order that they may meet the present high cost of living.

I want to say in this connection that if more talk had been indulged in in an effort to reduce the high cost of living rather than indulging in talk to secure raises in salaries there would have been better results throughout the country. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

MARINE CORPS.

Pay, Marine Corps: Pay of officers, active and reserve list: For pay and allowances prescribed by law for all officers on the active and reserve list, including clerks for assistant paymasters, nine, $1,690.666.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I believe this item carries the pay of all the officers in the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; except on the retired ist.

Mr. MANN. All on the active and reserve list.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. How are the officers in the Marine Corps appointed in the first instance?

Mr. PADGETT. By passing the examination, and under the law the Secretary of the Navy may assign cadets from the Naval Academy or from the Military Academy. Then they are taken from civil life, and those in civil life must pass an examination. If they pass satisfactorily, they are nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They are appointed for a probationary period of two years before the commission becomes permanent.

Mr. MANN. How do they become eligible for examination?

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary has advertised generally and anybody that makes application can take the examination.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, one of the most remarkable things I have ever seen or heard of in connection with such matters, under the gentleman's statement, is the list of officers or citizens named for a probationary period of two years by the President of the United States. On January 10 last, the President sent in the nomination of 10 citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps for the probationary period of two years. Among those names I find the following:

Louis W. Whaley, of South Carolina.
John M. Arthur, of South Carolina.
James F. Jeffords, of South Carolina.
Thomas P. Cheatham, of South Carolina.
William C. James, of South Carolina.

Of course, they make only 5 out of the 10. It may be that they are more enterprising in seeking these advertised-for examinations——

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

Mr. MANN. Not yet. I would like to use a little of my own time first.

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

Mr. MANN. No. I will give the gentlemen information, if they do not have it; and if they do have it, let them keep quiet until I get through.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, on February 6 the President sent in the names of 22 citizens for the same position of second lieutenants for a probationary period. Among those names I find the following:

Charles P. Gilchrist, of South Carolina.
Karl I. Buse, of South Carolina.
John R. Martin, of South Carolina.
Samuel A. Woods, jr., of South Carolina.
David H. Owen, of South Carolina.
James K. Bolton, of South Carolina.
James T. Moore, of South Carolina.
William C. Byrd, of South Carolina.
George B. Reynolds, of South Carolina.

There were altogether 32 names in the two lists. Thirteen of those come from South Carolina and 6 from Virginia. Three come from all of the Northern States. Of course, I am assuming that it is because the citizens of South Carolina are either more enterprising in answering these advertisements or else they are more capable in passing the examinations.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit?

Mr. MANN. It is such a peculiar circumstance that I think it is perfectly proper to call attention to it. Of course when I see the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] now standing in the center aisle just in front of me, I can understand how they can pass a better examination than the citizens from any place else in this country.

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

Mr. MANN. Yes; for an explanation or an apology, either one.

Mr. PADGETT. I should have stated that under the provisions of the law the graduates of military schools of a certain type and character are entitled to and are considered for the appointment, and upon inquiry I was told that most of those, or many of them, were graduates of these schools.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, there is no such law; and, in the second place, it is ridiculous for any gentleman, either by way of explanation or apology, to say that when you come to take the schools of the country, South Carolina, as to a competitive examination, would have a percentage of 13 out of 32.

Mr. PADGETT. Under the law the Secretary made regulations recognizing certain schools.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; he makes regulations that take care of South Carolina.

Mr. PADGETT. But all of these men were not graduates of South Carolina schools. They were graduates of schools of other States of the Union.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is seeking now to convey to the House the impression that if you scatter South Carolina students all over the country, no one else has an even chance to compete with them; that they can not come up to them. Mr. Chairman, I admit that South Carolina is a great State and that its people are the smartest in the United States, if not in the whole world. I make that admission, and will not require

proof from any of the gentlemen from South Carolina; and yet it hardly seems quite the proper method of selecting officers for the Marine Corps or any other branch of the Government service to fix it so that South Carolina and Virginia, between them, get 19 appointments out of 32.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is so obsessed with the idea that South Carolina is going to get something that even in the case of filling these appointments, where the men have accepted commissions and have gone to the front in Santo Domingo, where they are now doing duty as marines, he can not even stop chiding my State for sending these men to the front. South Carolina may not be as large a State as Illinois, but if you will go to the border, where the soldiers are on duty, you will find that the number and the service of those from South Carolina will compare very favorably with the soldiers from the State of Illinois. I want to say to the gentleman respecting the appointments, in so far as the Citadel is concerned, that men from the North recognize it as one of the honor schools of this Government, one of the honor military schools of the country, and when I learned that these appointments were to be made under regulations I wrote to the commandant of that school and asked him to give me the names of all of the graduates who were permitted to compete for it. I wrote a number of letters, and the commandant wrote them letters, and it is because of that fact that they came here under the regulations and stood the examination. If, forsooth, there are more men from that small State of South Carolina than from the State of Illinois in this trying hour of our country's need who apply to go to the front to fight her battles and protect her flag, it seems to me, if I were the gentleman representing that State, I would not want to call attention to it. The positions they have sought, and to which they have been appointed, are not sinecures. They are not swivel-chair positions, not places where they can hang around Washington and wear parade uniforms, but these men have had to go and serve where neither the gentleman nor myself have ever served, in places of danger, to protect the flag, and they have to go wherever the Marine Corps is ordered to go. But surely, when these young men are willing to devote their lives to their country's needs and go out and give this service, it ill becomes so great a man as the gentleman from Illinois to stand on this floor and chide this Government for accepting their services, or my little State for offering them, in this hour of the country's need.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I sometimes have regretted that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] himself had not been admitted to the Marine Corps, so that he would not be a Member of the House.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I am quite sure the gentleman would like to lose just a few more from the Democratic side, because he will be badly in need of them before he is Speaker.

Mr. MANN. We have got enough.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to be satisfied about this. I am not crediting citizens of one State with having more patriotism than those of another, but it will be interesting to me to know how all these young men from these two States reached the Marine Corps. I understood the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs to say it was by reason of some naval regulation. If these young men from these two States, after taking a competent examination, had gotten a better average than the young men from other States, I have not any criticism, but if the school from which they were graduated was selected as one from which its graduates were not required to take an examination, then I do take the exception, and ask the chairman to answer the question and put the inquiry at rest. There is a great deal of criticism and unfavorable comment upon the large proportion of appointments from these two States of the Union. Nineteen out of thirty-two appointments to the Marine Corps have been selected——

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that the Secretary has a list of schools in a number of States, and has placed them upon the same basis, and he takes the graduates from any and all of these schools and puts them on the same basis, where they have a certificate of graduation from that school of a certain standard; and if they pass that examination, and then they have their physical examination, they are entitled to be nominated. That applies to any school in any State that has the requirements of the standard prescribed for this character of military training.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman know the character of the schools? Can he tell us one of these schools?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not. I do not know where the schools are. I do not know where the schools are located; I do not know where these men graduate. I just understood that they were graduates of a military school that was on the list which met the standards or requirement or recognition, just as West Point has a list of a number of schools over the country where they accept their certificate in lieu of the examination that is required.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, of course the Secretary of the Navy will be pleased to give us this regulation, but I do know of a number of young men from the State of Pennsylvania who have been studying here one year and were compelled to take a hard competitive examination before they received a commission in the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. I know of a number from Tennessee who did so; some passed and some failed.

Mr. BUTLER. It is open to criticism and it is open to unfavorable comment that 19 young men out of two States of the Union should be selected to fill 32 places and without examination and without competition.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I do not just this minute recall, but will the gentleman tell me the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs in another body?

Mr. BUTLER. I can not at this minute recall. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. BUTLER. I am told that we are required to say "in another body" instead of "the Senate of the United States."

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Tennessee points out the fact that young men are admitted to the academy at West Point without examination, an academy where they are to be taught and from which they must graduate before they become second lieutenants. Is not that very different from admitting young men as second lieutenants direct without examination?

Mr. PADGETT. If they meet the standard which is involved in the examination to be held at that time, and if they do accept the standard, that is equivalent to the requirements of their examination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a minute or two.

Mr. PADGETT. And I want to say it is a probational appointment for two years.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two or three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUTLER. I have made no criticism of the administration of this department, but I am suspicious that the method by which these men are selected is not fair toward other applicants, and, for one, I propose to find out how it has been done.

I do not believe it is just to ambitious young Americans generally to designate an institution and then provide that if one graduates from that institution he shall be admitted to this corps. I am unwilling that this Government should be an advertising agent for any school. I am unwilling that it shall hold out any premium, prize, or reward to a young man to induce him to attend a certain institution that he may have an appointment in the United States service without examination or competition. I believe that all of the young men in the United States who desire to go into military life should have the same opportunity, and that they should not be met in their attempt by exempted graduates of certain institutions in the United States and those institutions designated by any one man.

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

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY]?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Is it not a fact that we have a number of schools throughout the United States where we detail officers as teachers?

Mr. BUTLER. We have many of them.

Mr. CALLAWAY. And where they are supposed to get the same instruction as at West Point?

Mr. BUTLER. I did not hear the gentleman distinctly, and so my colleagues inform me that my answer was not responsive. Military education would not be developed at these institutions like at West Point. The country is filled with institutions. I think there must be 60 or 80 such where young men are taught military duties, and they should have a fair chance with other young men.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Do they not have a fair chance?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know whether they do or not. It does not seem so to me. The gentleman from Texas knows as well as I do that other educational institutions in the United States——

Mr. CALLAWAY. Why all this discussion without any further facts than just saying here that a few more come from one State than another.

Mr. BUTLER. Three appointments, as the gentleman from Illinois said, out of 32. Three from the Northern States.

Mr. CALLAWAY. How many stood the examination?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know; but there were 32 appointed. Of the 32, as I understand now, 19 were appointed without examination.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The argument of the gentleman from Tennessee is entirely unsound. He says that these young men were required to show a definite standard before they could be commissioned second lieutenants in the Marine Corps. By whom was the standard judged? By the teachers at this school in Charleston, S. C., known as The Citadel, or by the teachers at some other school. That standard was not reviewed by anybody in the employ of the United States. The Navy Department took the judgment of those teachers in those schools, and yet unquestionably they must be prejudiced judges.

The gentleman compares this exemption from examination with the exemption from examination accorded to certain candidates for West Point who can present a graduation certificate from certain chosen schools. The cases are not parallel. It is a fact, I am sorry to say, that boys are admitted to West Point on the certificate of certain schools at which they prepared. But before those boys can be commissioned in the Army Uncle Sam does not depend on the word of any schoolmasters on earth except his own schoolmasters. There is the distinction between the two cases. In one case young men without any examination are given commissions in Uncle Sam's Marine Corps on the say-so of their own private schoolmasters. In the other case they are admitted to West Point to study for a commission in Uncle Sam's Army on the say-so of their own private schoolmasters, but they do not get any commission until Uncle Sam has found they are qualified to receive it.

Now, another thing. There has been some talk to the effect that these young men from these southern schools are perhaps better prepared than boys from northern schools. Mr. Chairman, we have what is known as the apportionment law in the civil service. The reason for the enactment of that apportionment law is that candidates from the Southern States for the Federal civil service do not get as high passing marks as candidates from the Northern States. The argument which the Civil Service Commission makes in defense of that apportionment law rests on the assertion that the South has not the facilities for adequate schooling, but that in other qualities these southern applicants are superior to the applicants from the Northern States. Never before have I heard anyone contend that in a competitive examination candidates from the Southern States could come within striking distance of candidates from the Northern States. It is not the fault of the South. I realize that this lack of educational facilities was one of the inevitable results of the Civil War. It was the result of their poverty and of the problems that confronted them. This apparent discrimination in favor of South Carolina and Virginia, whether the result of adroit rules or the result of the tipping of the early wink to favored schools, needs investigation.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 25 insert the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That no part of any appropriation herein shall be used to pay any officer on the active list of the Navy or Marine Corps who shall engage in any private business, either actively or as a consulting expert, or permit any person, firm, or corporation or association to use his name in the conduct of its business."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I will reserve it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in offering the amendment was on account of the statement I made here a few moments ago in regard to men on the active list in the Navy and Marine Corps engaging in active business in the management of concerns or as consulting experts. And it seems to me that if the Government of the United States pays these men in the active service a full wage the Government should have the entire service of those men in the affairs of the Government, and that those services should not be utilized by any commercial enterprise for the sake of profit.

Mr. PADGETT. I agree with the gentleman as to the general purpose.

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

Mr. HICKS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. The language of the amendment, as I understood it, applies probably only to the appropriation for the pay of officers in the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. No; it says "officers of the Navy and of the Marine Corps."

Mr. MANN. Yes; but it is offered as an amendment, apparently, to a provision which covers only the pay of officers of the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. And hence would not have any effect, if it went into the law, if it applied only to that appropriation, on the pay of the officers of the Navy. But from the way it was read, apparently, it strikes me that it would cover officers on the retired list.

Mr. HICKS. No; officers on the active list.

Mr. MANN. Very well.

Mr. HICKS. I realize, Mr. Chairman, that it does not cover exactly what I intended, and that is why I asked permission of the Chairman to allow a return to the right part of the bill where it could be offered properly, and the chairman thought it best not to agree that it should be done Therefore I have offered it here.

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

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest that the gentleman is not in as bad a position as he thinks. At the end of the bill a limitation can be placed upon all the expenditures in the bill, which would certainly apply to those relating to pay.

Mr. PADGETT. The limitation sought here is broader than the legislation to which it is sought to be affixed, and the objection to it is that it is legislation that ought to be considered and matured carefully by the House. We do not know what the legislation ought to be or what the conflicts might be. I insist that this limitation is offered on legislation respecting the Marine Corps, while the limitation is intended to apply to the Navy as well as to the Marne Corps.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike out of the amendment the words "and of the Navy," so that it will apply only to officers of the Marine Corps.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the proposed modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike from the amendment the words "and of the Navy."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER. Reserving the right to object, there is no criticism of the Marine Corps. Why, then, try it on the Marine Corps? Why will not the chairman allow us to offer an amendment at the right place?

Mr. PADGETT. We ought to understand it thoroughly. If we understood it and could understand whether it conflicts or not, it might not be objectionable; but offered in this way, without investigation, I do not think it is a good plan of legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. The bill probably will not be finished tonight. Would the gentleman have any objection to considering it to-morrow?

Mr. PADGETT. If I can see it and ascertain what the substance of it is, and see that it is well grounded, I would not have any objection to well-considered and well-digested legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Tennessee makes a point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Tennessee on the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. I think that, so far as striking out the words "and of the Navy" is concerned—and that is the state it is in now, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the committee agreed that the words as applied to the Navy should be stricken out, which makes it applicable only to the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. Well, it is useless to put that in. There is no complaint with reference to the Marine Corps. I ask the gentleman from New York to withdraw it so that we can see whether or not something can be prepared that has some merit in it.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I think that is perfectly fair.

Mr. HICKS. With that understanding, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of enlisted men, active and reserve list: Pay and allowances of noncommissioned officers, musicians, and privates, as prescribed by law, and for the expenses of clerks of the United States Marine Corps traveling under orders, and including additional compensation for enlisted men of the Marine Corps regularly detailed as gun captains, gun pointers, mess sergeants, cooks, messmen, signalmen, or holding good-conduct medals, pins, or bars, including interest on deposits by enlisted men, post-exchange debts of deserters, under such rules as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, and the authorized travel allowance of discharged enlisted men and for prizes for excellence in gunnery exercise and target practice and for pay of enlisted men designated as Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks, both afloat and ashore: *Provided*, That the provisions of the act of May 27, 1908 (35 Stats., 417, 418), as amended by the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stats., 560), are hereby extended to authorize the designation of enlisted men of the Navy or Marine Corps as Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks with expeditionary forces on shore. In all, $4,800,532.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege, as a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to draft the provision of the law authorizing naval mail clerks and assistant mail clerks, so as to enable the enlisted men on our battleships to have the privilege of a better mail service. I wish now to inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee what modification of that law is carried in the paragraph under consideration?

Mr. PADGETT. It does not modify the law that now exists. This simply makes it apply to the Marine Corps. It already applies to the Navy, but does not apply to the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps is the service that does the expeditionary work, as in Haiti and Santo Domingo and Nicaragua, where they go out in advance work. This is simply giving the same privilege to the Marine Corps that is now provided by law for the Navy.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not the purpose to have an extra man or seaman on each battleship to take care of the mail of the marines on that battleship?

Mr. PADGETT. Not at all. It is simply to allow a man to be designated to perform that duty, one of the enlisted men, so that he may have an official status. It does not involve any pay, or additional men, or anything of that kind.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the original law, I beg to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there was extra compensation provided for those who performed the work of mail clerks and assistant mail clerks.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not remember as to that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes. We granted them a small additional compensation. We thought it no more than right, in case they performed this responsible work of distributing the mail, and registering mail, and, I believe, issuing money orders, that they should be compensated for that service, in the main not to exceed $600, if my memory serves me aright.

Mr. PADGETT. This simply extends to the Marine Corps the same privileges as are now extended to the Navy.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is for that service on land in connection with expeditionary forces, and not in connection with their service on the vessels?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman explain how this mail service is handled? Under this method are the naval forces of the United States permitted to drop a letter into the mail box on board a ship or here on land or anywhere in the world, and then it is transmitted here and a 2-cent stamp is put upon it or a 2-cent stamp put upon it over there? Under this method are members of the naval forces of the United States permitted to drop letters in a mail box on board ship or on land anywhere in the world, and then is the letter transmitted here and a 2-cent stamp put on it, or is a 2-cent stamp put on it over there?

Mr. PADGETT. The mail would be under the general postal laws and subject to the requirements of the postal laws. This is simply to allow a man to act in the capacity of a mail clerk. It does not affect the law or the postage.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. PADGETT. No. That is what I understand that to be.

Mr. MANN. Supposing a man in the naval service mails a letter in Shanghai, what postage does he pay?

Mr. PADGETT. As I understand it, he pays the same postage that anybody else would pay under the law regulating that.

Mr. MANN. What is that?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know.

Mr. STAFFORD. Two cents, if it is deposited in the United States post office at Shanghai.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman from Tennessee said he would pay the same as anyone else. What is that? The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is posted.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. MANN. What is the postage from Shanghai to the United States?

Mr. STAFFORD. Two cents.

Mr. MANN. To everybody?

Mr. STAFFORD. It is; and the same from or to the Philippines. The United States has a branch postal station at Shanghai, and the rate of postage is the same, if my memory serves me right.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, I have received a number of letters from my son, who is superintendent of agriculture in the Philippines, and the postage was always 4 cents on his letters. I do not know what the rate is.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is because the gentleman's son is very considerate and writes him long letters which weigh more than an ounce.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers on amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GARDNER: On page 50, line 8, strike out "$4,800,532" and insert "$5,700,532."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, that amendment would not accomplish anything——

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I should like recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Tennessee because he anticipated that the gentleman was going to make a point of order. If not, the gentleman from Massachusetts, who offers the amendment, is entitled to recognition.

Mr. GARDNER. No point of order lies against this amendment, Mr. Chairman. A point of order would lie if I were to offer a clause which in terms would raise the pay of the men of the Marine Corps. However, that clause will be inserted in the Senate if this amendment increasing the amount of money available for Marine Corps pay is adopted. The amendment which I now offer increases the amount of money available for Marine Corps pay just enough to enable the Navy paymaster to give the enlisted men $5 per month more each. However, this amendment will not be adopted. Yesterday you voted down a similar amendment which I proposed for increasing the pay of enlisted men of the Navy $5 per month per man. This amendment is proposed only for the purpose of emphasizing my view that men of the Marine Corps, as well as men in the Navy, ought to have their pay raised $5 per month per man. The gentleman need not reply, because I expect the amendment to be voted down, and I offer it merely for the sake of uniformity.

Mr. PADGETT. I simply want to state that the pay of the Marine Corps is fixed in the Army appropriation bill. The law provides that they shall receive the same pay as is provided by the Army bill, and to appropriate this additional amount would not accomplish anything.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman realizes that if it were not for the point of order which might be raised everything which we desire could be accomplished in this bill. It makes no difference what the law says at present. If the gentleman raises no point of order and the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union choose to so vote, we can make the pay of members of the Marine Corps $100 per month per man, irrespective of the present law.

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly; but there is no necessity for it, because in August we authorized an increase in the Marine Corps of 5,000 men, and I understand they have gotten something like half of them already, since the 1st of September.

Mr. GARDNER. That is perfectly true. The increased pay is not needed in the Marine Corps, as it is in the Navy, in order to secure men. We can get men to go into the Marine Corps, because it is the favorite branch of the service. That is no reason why Uncle Sam should take advantage of men's necessities and underpay them.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not a fact that the pay of the Navy has been fixed not by statute but by departmental orders, the only exception to that being the increase that was made by statute last year, when 10 per cent was added to the pay which they then received?

Mr. PADGETT. That 10 per cent was added in 1908.

Mr. TOWNER. I mean 1908.

Mr. GARDNER. It was added in 1908, and the pay now is $17.60 a month by statute, though the gentleman is correct as to the origin of the legislation.

Mr. TOWNER. It is not fixed by statute even at $17.60.

Mr. GARDNER. It was increased by statute 10 per cent over what it was at the time the statute was passed; that is, $16 per month.

Mr. TOWNER. And that was fixed by departmental order.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has referred to certain appointments in the Marine Corps from the States of Virginia and South Carolina. At the time that his statement was made I had no information on the subject, so I undertook to call the Secretary of the Navy's office. I found that the Secretary was absent; but in conversation with Gen. Barnett, the commandant of the Marine Corps, I have secured some information, which will be supplemented in a few minutes by a written statement from Gen. Barnett, and which I ask permission to place in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Gen. Barnett states over the phone that last year he called this matter to the attention of the Secretary, and that the Secretary called the different bureaus together to consider the suggestion which he—Gen. Barnett—made, and as a result of such conference 12 or more distinguished schools, widely scattered, were written to for a list of graduates answering certain requirements.

Gen. Barnett conducted the correspondence, and informs me that from some of the schools no responses were received. The names submitted by the presidents of these different schools were carefully considered, and from such lists the selections were made. He assures me there was absolutely no discrimination, and that every name submitted was considered; and, so far as he knows, no complaints have been registered, either as to the method of selection or the young men selected.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. I will.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman inform us whether any inquiry was made as to the nature of the examination given at these schools?

Mr. OLIVER. My understanding is that there was a full inquiry made by Gen. Barnett, and that a certain standard was fixed which all applying for admission were required to meet.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask whether the examination papers as conducted at the school reached the Marine Corps here for its official recognition?

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that the graduation certificates were sent and also the grades made by such graduates.

Mr. MANN. May I inquire of the gentleman who gave him this information?

Mr. OLIVER. Gen. Barnett himself. He is just back from Haiti, and informs me that he is now preparing a written statement to be sent me on the subject.

Mr. MANN. It does not change the queerness of the situation.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Will the gentleman from Alabama also put in the names of the 12 colleges? I am interested in that.

Mr. OLIVER. I will. In reply to the remark of the gentleman from Illinois, I think all who are familiar with Gen. Barnett are glad to testify to his splendid efficiency as an officer and his high character as a man, and I am sure that any statement which he may make in reference to this matter will have the respectful and thoughtful consideration of every Member of the House.

It will be noted in the statement supplied by Gen. Barnett, and which I will here set out, that the University of Illinois was written to and no reply received. Gen. Barnett informs me, however, that he hopes when this splendid institution is written to again a number of its graduates will be submitted for consideration. The statement from Gen. Barnett is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
COMMANDANT'S OFFICE,
Washington, February 9, 1917.

MY DEAR MR. OLIVER: In connection with your telephonic communication with me this date, requesting information as to how young men designated as second lieutenants, graduates of certain colleges, were appointed, I have to state as follows:

When the naval appropriation bill passed on August 29 last I took the question of filling the vacancies (255 in number) up with the Secretary of the Navy. This matter was brought up at a council meeting with the Secretary and fully discussed. I proposed at this meeting that I be authorized to fill certain vacancies in the Marine Corps by the appointment of graduates of the military colleges designated by the President in general orders each year as "distinguished colleges." After a full discussion of this matter, the Secretary and the whole council decided that, as only a very few graduates of the Naval Academy could be spared, it would be a good thing to fill a reasonable number of the vacancies by the appointment of graduates of these distinguished military colleges. The Secretary of the Navy then authorized me to communicate with the presidents of these colleges and to designate not to exceed 60 of the graduates recommended by the presidents of the colleges. From many of the colleges we received no recommendations whatever, having heard that a great many of their graduates had gone into the Army.

Each graduate authorized to appear for physical examination was required to present his graduating diploma together with a letter of recommendation from the president of the institution, and also numerous letters as to moral character and general standing in the community from which he came. Most of the applications came from the Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va.; the Citadel, Charleston, S. C.; some from St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.; and some from Norwich University, Northfield, Vt. I am appending herewith a complete list of the colleges from which responses were received and also the number of appointments made from the colleges from which recommendations were received.

Some of the young men who appeared for physical examination failed to pass the required test. As I think I stated to you over the telephone, quite a number of the institutions had no recommendations to make; in fact, the majority of the institutions are in this list. In the selection of these young men no influence whatever was used by any human being. The only recommendations made were made by the presidents of the institutions referred to and the Army officers on duty at said institutions. As I stated to you, I would gladly have taken a great many more of the graduates than I was able to get, because, as stated above, I only secured 39 in toto from these institutions.

Before presenting this question to the Secretary of the Navy, I had heard so much of the good qualities of the Virginia Military Institute that I visited that institution last June and spent several days in going over their curriculum and witnessing drills of all kinds and talking with the superintendent and officers on duty there and with many of the cadets. In fact, this visit was the deciding factor which led me to make the proposition to the Secretary of the Navy. In selecting any graduates from one of these institutions the State he came from was never considered. Since these young men were designated we have held examinations all over the United States, at which any young man who made application or made known his desire to appear before the board was allowed to appear, and out of the total number examined (86 in all) only 29 successfully passed for entry into the Marine Corps from civil life. In this connection, I sent over 1,400 letters to young men all over the country who had in any manner requested information as to how he might get a commission in the Marine Corps. This 1,400 included the names of all young men recommended for appointment from any source.

Of the young men who have already been commissioned from these designated military schools, they have been ordered to duty at once in Haiti and Santo Domingo, and a late inspection of the Marine Corps posts in these countries developed the fact that these young men are doing unusually well and their commanding officers speak in the highest terms of them. Candidates from civil life, without such preliminary training at a military school, have to be sent to our school at Norfolk for 18 months before they can be assigned any military duty. Therefore, it may be seen that appointments from these designated colleges give far better returns to the Government than would be possible without the military training they have received.

I wish to reiterate here what I stated above, that in the selection or in the attempt to get designations from the different colleges, every college in the United States designated as a "distinguished college" by the President was given no favoritism of any kind, and no influence of any kind by word or letter was ever used or presented by any individual, nor was the slightest attention paid to the section of the country from which these young men came, the only requisite being that they should be graduates of these well-known distinguished colleges, and I wish to unhesitatingly state that in my opinion it is the best possible means of procuring second lieutenants, excepting graduates of Annapolis and West Point.

In accordance with the above procedure we have secured altogether 39 graduates of these institutions, but so far have been unable to obtain the authorized number, which, as I stated above, is 60.

Thanking you for your interest in this matter, and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely, yours,

GEORGE BARNETT,
Major General, Commandant.

Hon. WILLIAM B. OLIVER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MILITARY COLLEGES DESIGNATED BY THE WAR DEPARTMENT IN ITS GENERAL ORDER OF JUNE 16, 1916, AS "DISTINGUISHED COLLEGES."

University of California, none.
University of Illinois, none.
Kansas State Agricultural College, 1.
St. John's, Annapolis, Md., 3.
University of Minnesota, none.
University of Missouri, none.
Cornell University, none.
The Citadel, South Carolina, 20; 1 since killed in action.
Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, none.

University of Vermont and State Agricultural College, none.
Virginia Military Institute, 12.
Norwich University, Vt., 3.
University of Wisconsin, none.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of getting the floor. Mr. Chairman, without entering into the merits of the controversy raised on this point, I think in justice to the South Carolina Military Institute I should say a word, while the House is on this subject, concerning that institution.

Last year it was my privilege to be in Charleston and to see the students at the institute, and to inspect what is known as the Citadel, the South Carolina Military Institute. Inasmuch as a question like this has come up on the floor, one who knows about the institution should take the time to say a word in its behalf. I do not take the floor to argue the merits or demerits of the proposition raised here on either side. I think too much sectionalism is raised, anyhow. This institution, I may say, is known as the West Point of the South. There are men attending that school from a great number of States. It is the same with the Military Institute in Virginia.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I will.

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this institution of which he now speaks has a great many students from different States of the Union?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I will say that the students are not confined to the State of South Carolina.

Mr. BUTLER. They may not be confined to the State of South Carolina; but do students from other States go to this institution?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I know they do, but I can not go into the details.

Mr. BUTLER. It seems queer that a boy from your State and a boy from my State could not compete with the boys from South Carolina.

Mr. MANN. If our boys can not stand it with the South Carolinians, they ought not to go.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. There were two hundred and fifty-odd students at that institution. Lieut. Garey, of the Regular Army, is detailed there as instructor.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. How long is the course?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Four years, the same as in any other college. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get mixed up in the merits of the proposition raised here. My purpose in taking the floor was to say that in my opinion—and I think it will be borne out by the people who know on both sides as well as the Committee on Military Affairs—that the men who graduate from the South Carolina Military Institute are fitted in every way to enter this branch of the service on the same terms as other men who are educated without going to either the Naval or the Military Academy.

I never saw a finer set of men than at the institute at Charleston. The same applies to the Virginia Military Institute, the Culver Institute in Indiana, the Pennsylvania Institute at Chester, Pa., and the rest of the list that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] referred to, and which I asked him to put in his remarks, and which I think will clear up a good deal of the misconception on this point as to sectionalism. I thought that I ought to mention this South Carolina Institute inasmuch as I have been there and seen what a splendid institution they have and the splendid men educated there. [Applause.] I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay and allowances prescribed by law of enlisted men on the retired list: For 9 sergeants major, 1 drum major, 23 gunnery sergeants, 37 quartermaster sergeants, 43 first sergeants, 66 sergeants, 21 corporals, 20 first-class musicians, 1 drummer, and 24 privates, and for those who may be retired during the fiscal year, $175,986.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This item carries $175,986 for pay of enlisted men and enlisted officers on the retired list. The previous item carries $198,000 and odd for pay of officers on the retired list. So far as the gentleman knows, has there been any computation made of how many of these officers might be used in active service in case we should get into trouble where we needed trained officers? In other words, many men on the retired list may be retired because of such age that they can not go back and do active service, really, and many men on the retired list have been injured so that they can not do it, but there are many men upon the retired list who would make very useful officers in the active service, at least temporarily, when we need trained men.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, in case of war or emergency, yes; and the Secretary stated, and the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation stated that they had a list, that they had sent to every retired officer a designation of a specific duty and a specific assignment that was required of him if an emergency arose or if war was declared, and that every one of these retired officers has in his possession instructions which, of course, are confidential, as to what designation and what assignment he would have, the moment he was notified of the necessity of his service, and he would go directly and report for that duty.

Mr. MANN. I do not see how it could do any injury to make a statement as to the number of these officers who might be used in active service. I asked whether the gentleman had any such computation.

Mr. PADGETT. No; I have not the number. I have what is declared to be the status of the matter, that they have all of these officers assigned and that they have their instructions where to go. I can not give the gentleman the number.

Mr. MANN. We have complaint all of the time that they have not enough officers in the Navy, and we are requested to increase the number of officers. Why do we not know, so far as this emergency is concerned, how many we will have?

Mr. PADGETT. The statement was made here this afternoon. The list of retired officers is published in the Navy Register.

Mr. MANN. I know, but many of them can not possibly go to sea.

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

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. I just want to say to the gentleman that my understanding is that every retired officer has been asked to indicate to the Navy Department what work he considers himself fit and able to do. I am informed that they have accordingly made statements to the Navy Department. As to what work they have been designated for in the event of need, I do not know.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman from Kentucky think that the House, or at least the Committee on Naval Affairs, might properly be informed as to the number of men who could be put into real active service in case of emergency?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not questioning that. It so happened that a rear admiral of the Navy came to me the other day touching another retired officer. He himself is much too old to be able to do any active work, and he spoke of a request of that kind having been made and of the work he thought this particular officer could do with very great benefit to the country. That is the way I came to know of the inquiry being made of them.

Mr. MANN. The wonder to me is that this information is not given to us.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know the number, I can not tell how many out of the 900 could be assigned to active duty.

Mr. MANN. I doubt very much whether the Navy knows; but if they do we ought to know.

Mr. PADGETT. I presume the Navy does know, and I shall try to find out and give the gentleman the information in the morning.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of civil force: In the office of the major general commandant: One chief clerk, at $2,000; 1 clerk, at $1,800; 1 messenger, at $971.28.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee how many officers we have actively engaged in the Navy at this time. He said there were 900 upon the retired list.

Mr. PADGETT. There are something over 4,000 at the present time, I think. It was something over 3,900, counting the line and the staff, last year, and that, if I remember correctly, was prior to the graduation of the class at Annapolis last year, and I think there were something like 150 or 160 in that graduating class.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Can the chairman give the exact number on the retired list?

Mr. PADGETT. It is published in the register, if the gentleman will look at it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I want it in the RECORD.

Mr. PADGETT. I can not give the gentleman that. Somebody stated here this afternoon there were about 900. I have not looked it up myself.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how many of these 900 are admirals and how many admirals we have actually got engaged in active service.

Mr. PADGETT. Counting the extra numbers, there are somewhere between 25 and 30.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Actually engaged in actual service?

Mr. PADGETT. Counting the extra numbers.

Mr. CALLAWAY. How many on the retired list?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. The gentleman can get that from the register.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the chairman please put in his statement in reply to this question how many rear admirals are on the retired list?

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman will just turn to the Navy Register he can get it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I would rather have it from the chairman.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman can get it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. If I put it in, somebody may question it, but if the chairman puts it in nobody will question it.

Mr. PADGETT. I will try to look it up and put it in.

Mr. CALLAWAY. In connection with this statement.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me to answer the question I have the list here and it says 145 rear admirals on the retired list. This is from January 1, 1916.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. How many on the active list?

Mr. PADGETT. Between 25 and 30. This is not the last Navy Register, though.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the office of the paymaster: One chief clerk, at $2,000; one clerk, at $1,500; one clerk, at $1,200.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I intended to make an inquiry about the paragraph preceding the one which has just been read. This is one of several items for pay of the civil force in the office of the major general commandant—one chief clerk at $2,000, and so forth.

Mr. PADGETT. What page is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. MANN. At the bottom of page 50 and the top of page 51. I looked around the Chamber when this item was read and wondered I did not see some member of the Committee on Appropriations make a point of order on it and claim jurisdiction. Are not these employees engaged in the office of the commandant general here in Washington?

Mr. PADGETT. They are in the office here in Washington, and they have always been carried in this bill.

Mr. MANN. The paymaster is in Washington?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. The adjutant and inspector is in Washington?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. The quartermaster is in Washington?

Mr. PADGETT. These are all here in the department, but some of these are——

Mr. MANN. The Committee on Appropriations has been very energetic lately insisting upon jurisdiction over items of this character so that I am surprised they do not take charge of it now. However, it was my sympathies to these men which caused me to make this inquiry. If these employees were cared for on the legislative bill, those who draw salaries under $1,800 a year would probably get an increase, certainly would get an increase if the salaries were under $1,000. There might be some at that rate. I think there is one carried in this bill, but as it is they will get no increase of salary at all. This will be one time when the clerks will want to be carried in the legislative bill. Heretofore they have wanted to stay in this bill, and they have stayed in this bill, and the result will be they will have to be a little more economical the next fiscal year than the other clerks under similar circumstances.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I was called out of the Hall a moment ago and just as I entered the Hall I understood the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] and other gentlemen were discussing the proposition as to how many officers were on the retired list who the Navy Department could call to the colors.

Now, I want to ask the gentleman this question: Whether or not the law now requires the Secretary of the Navy to have men who are on the retired list and yet able to do considerable work to be examined from time to time and be assigned to duty?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir.

Mr. COX. Now, what earthly objections could there be to such laws as that?

Mr. PADGETT. The law provides that men upon the retired list can be called into active duty and receive active pay in the case of emergency or in war. They are all subject to call. In times of any emergency, upon their application, the Secretary of the Navy may assign them to duty and they receive the pay not exceeding that of a lieutenant commander, unless it is their own retired pay. If their own retired pay exceeds that of a lieutenant commander, they receive their own retired pay.

Mr. COX. Now, if the gentleman will yield further. Evidently there is some necessity, for the gentleman from Virginia in the last year's Army reorganization bill reported in the bill this provision, except in the Army bill it applied to Army officers on the retired list, and this, if enacted into a law, would apply to officers of the Navy on the retired list:

That the Secretary of the Navy shall make a list of all officers who have been placed on the retired list for disability and shall cause such officers to be examined at such intervals as may be advisable, and such officers as shall be found to have recovered from such disability or to be able to perform service of value to the Government sufficient to warrant such action shall be assigned to such duty as the Secretary of the Navy may approve.

Now, will the gentleman explain what earthly objection there would or could be to incorporating a provision like that in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think there is any necessity for it. It is getting along very well.

Mr. COX. I do not know whether it is getting along very well or not. We are appropriating money here.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I can not yield now.

In response to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY], who made the inquiry a moment ago, I have gone to the Navy Yearbook, and I want to put some figures in the RECORD here. There are men on the retired list of the Navy Department—captains, average age 55, 16; commanders, with an average of 50, 19; commanders, with an average age of 45, 25; lieutenant commanders, with an average age of 45, 27; lieutenants, 27; lieutenants (junior grade), 22; ensigns, 27; passed assistant surgeons, 12; assistant surgeons, 6; paymasters, 8; passed assistant paymasters, 1; naval constructor, 1; assistant naval constructor, 1; or a total of 202.

Now, of those higher grade officers, their average age is 45. Then, in the Marine Corps there is 1 lieutenant colonel, whose age is 50, on the retired list. There are 4 majors, with an average age of 45, on the retired list; 17 captains; 10 first lieutenants; and 3 second lieutenants; or a total of 35. Noncommissioned officers, who are retired with rank of a commissioned officer, chief, 8; boatswain, 10; chief gunner, 4; gunner, 12; or a total of 34.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Why is it that a person of 45 years of age is put on the retired list?

Mr. COX. You can search me. I do not know why. I can point out to the gentleman here in the city of Washington a man on the retired list, a graduate at Annapolis, who is now drawing $3,000 a year in the active practice of medicine, and there is another man, a graduate of Annapolis, who is now drawing $3,000, retired pay, and at the same time drawing a salary from the Government of about $1,400 a year in the United States Subtreasury at Philadelphia. If I had time I could enumerate case after case like that.

And yet, with an appropriation bill here amounting to nearly $500,000,000, building ships on top of ships, if we are short of anything in the world, it is of officers; and what objection the Navy Department can have to incorporating an amendment such as the one carried on the last Army reorganization bill, that would compel the Secretary of the Navy to examine these officers on the retired list and where they are able to do some work compel them to quit private employment and serve their country after the country has educated them is beyond my comprehension.

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

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

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

Mr. TALBOTT. These people are not placed on the retired list until after they are examined.

Mr. COX. Yes; and they get well mighty quick after being placed on the retired list. They are able to do a good day's work in private employment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not like to have that compliment paid to me when I rise to address the committee.

Mr. PADGETT. I did not want to slight the gentleman. I simply want to get through with this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I want to reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as to the need of having these departmental clerks included in this appropriation bill. I realize, and everybody else realizes, that it is in consonance with good legislative practice to have all the clerks in the departments here in Washington included in one bill. It is the only method that can be pursued in order to deal fairly and equitably with all concerned. I think it would be even better in the interest of good parliamentary procedure and for legislative convenience if the clerks in the Agricultural Department were brought within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations and included in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Last year it was brought to our attention during the consideration of the Army appropriation bill that there were some departmental clerks in connection with the office of the Chief of Staff that are utilized here in Washington.

Mr. PADGETT. These are of the same character.

Mr. STAFFORD. There was some understanding that they should be included in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. We attempted that this year, not with a desire to appropriate to ourselves legislation that applies to another committee, but with the sole purpose of having one rule applicable to all the clerks in the department. But when we did that this year the Committee on Military Affairs strongly resented our policy and came into the House and objected to their inclusion, and, on a fine technical parliamentary point, they were eliminated from the bill.

I would like to inquire of the chairman of the Naval Committee whether there is any need of having these clerks connected with the departmental offices here in Washington included in the naval appropriation bill?

Mr. PADGETT. I will say to the gentleman——

Mr. STAFFORD. I may say to my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] before the gentleman replies, that we did not attempt to have these clerks stricken out of this bill this year because we realized that the department would be without any clerks at all if we did. The legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill is already in conference. We could not provide for them otherwise.

But I wish to direct an inquiry of the chairman now as to whether, in the formation of next year's bill, it would not be better for legislative purposes to have the clerks provided for in these four paragraphs included in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill?

Mr. PADGETT. I think not. I think they ought to be under the control of the Naval Committee and in the naval bill, because they perform naval service, and they are under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, and right in the offices performing largely naval service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Wherein are they more under the naval officers than the clerks carried in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill connected with the Bureau of Navigation and the Bureau of Construction and the Bureau of Yards and Docks?

Mr. MANN. Or in the office of the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. STAFFORD. Or the office of the Secretary of the Navy? All the activities of the Navy other than this one, are included, so far as the departmental clerks are concerned, in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill.

Mr. PADGETT. They have always been appropriated for in this bill, time out of mind.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is that the only argument the gentleman can advance in favor of their retention in this bill? If he can not advance any other one, I will be tempted to call attention to the subject when the next legislative bill is considered for the sake of consistency and harmony to have these clerks carried in that bill.

Mr. PADGETT. I suppose in that event you would meet the same difficulty that you met on the Army bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, we might meet more. The Navy is much more potent with the big guns than the Army is with its little guns. But that, nevertheless, would be as good an argument in favor of the retention of these clerks in the naval appropriation bill as the members of the Committee on Military Affairs advanced in connection with the retention of those clerks connected with the office of the Chief of Staff.

Mr. PADGETT. I think we have all the arguments they had.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman may have something up his sleeve that he is withholding, but I am tempted to call the bluff, and ask to have them included in the next legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the office of the quartermaster: One chief clerk, at $2,000; 1 clerk, at $1,800; 1 clerk, at $1,500; 2 clerks, at $1,400 each; 2 clerks, at $1,200 each; 1 draftsman, at $2,200.

Mr. MANN. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. What is the occasion for increasing the salary of this draftsman from $1,800 to $2,200? That seems an odd increase.

Mr. PADGETT. The reason he was increased was because he was offered that amount in another employment, and the department said he was a very valuable man, and they did not want to give him up.

Mr. MANN. He will probably be offered $2,500 or $3,000 next year, because private employers will pay, for particular men, more than the Government can pay, because the Government must pay more or less on a dead level between men.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but that is one of the services in the department where they are continually on a stress to keep up their necessary number of men.

Mr. MANN. What occasion do they have for a draftsman at all in the office of the quartermaster under ordinary circumstances?

Mr. PADGETT. They need one over there to do their drafting for their barracks and other work.

Mr. MANN. Have they not learned yet how to construct barracks without making new plans for them?

Mr. PADGETT. They need the man there, and this man was offered $2,200, and they want to keep him.

Mr. MANN. Undoubtedly he is a competent man, but have they not discovered yet how to construct ordinary barracks without requiring new plans each time they put up a little building?

Mr. PADGETT. They do not always put them up just alike.

Mr. MANN. Why do they not?

Mr. PADGETT. Simply because the necessities are different.

Mr. MANN. I can imagine, of course, that in Nicaragua they may require a building slightly different from a building up in Alaska, but I should think by this time they would have all types. These are not elaborate buildings, or they ought not to be, unless they are constructed for the benefit of a few officers, and I doubt even then whether they ought to be very elaborate.

Mr. PADGETT. The barracks are for the accommodation of the men, and they are built for the accommodation of 500 marines.

Mr. MANN. The barracks accommodate both men and officers.

Mr. PADGETT. I know, but they are the barracks we build for the enlisted men, with a capacity to accommodate 500 men, and that is what we have been providing.

Mr. MANN. Certainly by this time they must have discovered types of buildings, and they must have plans and specifications for them. Of course, I know that to be the case anyhow, or they could not get along with only one draftsman.

Mr. PADGETT. This is the only draftsman they have in the Marine Corps, and they certainly need one. He is a very valuable man.

Mr. MANN. I think they need that many for ornament, so I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I renew the point of order. Do I understand that the committee advanced this man's salary $400, to the maximum that he could obtain in private employment, and that was the only reason for advancing this salary more than any other advancement carried in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. It was stated to us that he was worth it, that he was a very valuable man, and that he had been offered $2,200, and the Marine Corps did not want to lose him.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will inform the gentleman that it has been testified many times before the legislative subcommittee, as a warrant for an increase, that men have been offered fourfold and fivefold the amount of their Government salaries by private employers, yet we did not feel warranted in granting the increase. Mr. Chairman, this is rather an inordinate increase. I would not object to a reasonable increase of a couple of hundred dollars, but to advance a man's salary from $1,800 to $2,200 just merely because some private employer thinks he is of value, is not warranted, I think, under the present conditions of the Treasury.

Mr. PADGETT. There is a very great demand for draftsmen.

Mr. KELLEY. The offer this man had was from the Bureau of Yards and Docks, another department of the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think that only strengthens my position. I think the Bureau of Yards and Docks has more need for draftsmen of this capacity than the Marine Corps. Therefore I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order against the figures "$2,200," and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Did the gentleman say that he would not object to $2,000?

Mr. STAFFORD. Upon the information furnished by the gentleman from Michigan that this man is really needed in another branch of the service, I will insist on having it $1,800.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by inserting the figures "$1,800."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 51, line 9, insert the figures "$1,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the office of the assistant quartermaster, Philadelphia, Pa.: One chief clerk, at $1,800; one messenger, at $840.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman a question. Why do you allow a messenger at $840 for Philadelphia and not one at San Francisco?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know just the work that is required there. This is not a new item. At Philadelphia they have a larger establishment, and they manufacture outfits under the Marine Corps.

Mr. SEARS. At San Francisco they have a chief clerk with no messenger, but at Philadelphia they have a chief clerk with a messenger.

Mr. PADGETT. They do not need one at San Francisco.

Mr. SEARS. The chief clerk at Philadelphia has a messenger, and the chief clerk at San Francisco has not, and they both have the same pay.

Mr. PADGETT. The work at San Francisco is not of so diversified a character.

Mr. SEARS. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, pay, Marine Corps, $7,133,002.78.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, there is a reduction of $400 in that total. The Clerk has heretofore been given authority to change the totals.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the Clerk has been given authority by the committee to correct the totals.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provisions, Marine Corps: For noncommissioned officers, musicians, and privates serving ashore; subsistence and lodging of enlisted men when traveling on duty, or cash in lieu thereof; commutation of rations to enlisted men regularly detailed as clerks and messengers; payments of board and lodging of applicants for enlistment while held under observation, recruits, recruiting parties, and enlisted men where it is impracticable to otherwise furnish subsistence, or in lieu of board, commutation of rations to recruiting parties; transportation of provisions, and the employment of necessary labor connected therewith; ice machines and their maintenance where required for the health and comfort of the troops and for cold storage; ice for offices and preservation of rations, $1,676,000. Hereafter no law shall be construed to entitle enlisted men on shore duty to any rations or commutation therefor other than such as are now or may hereafter be allowed enlisted men in the Army: *Provided*, That when it is impracticable or the expense is found greater to supply marines serving on shore duty in the island possessions and on foreign stations with the Army ration, such marines may be allowed the Navy ration or commutation therefor.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. This paragraph carries an appropriation for food or provisions, commutation of rations, and so forth. Is the gentleman from Tennessee able to tell the House the various places outside of the United States where the Marine Corps is now in service?

Mr. PADGETT. At Haiti, San Domingo, Nicaragua, some in the Philippines, some in Guam, some in Hawaii, some in Alaska, and a few in China.

Mr. MANN. Any other foreign countries that the gentleman now recalls?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recall any at this minute.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman recall how many are in Nicaragua or Haiti or San Domingo?

Mr. PADGETT. Quite a number in Haiti and San Domingo, but not so many in Nicaragua.

Mr. MANN. Any enlisted men in Haiti or San Domingo?

Mr. PADGETT. Quite a number.

Mr. MANN. We gave authority for the officers to recruit a local force there.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but there are quite a number of enlisted men there in addition to those provided in the legislation that the gentleman refers to, to form a constabulary.

Mr. MANN. If I may judge from current reports, the Marine Corps and the officials are doing excellent service?

Mr. PADGETT. It is so reported, and I have noticed in the press that they are rendering magnificent service.

Mr. MANN. As to Nicaragua, I do not feel quite so sure about it.

Mr. PADGETT. I have not much information about that.

Mr. MANN. In one South American State they had a revolution the other day. Which one was that?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recall, they come so often.

Mr. MANN. I think it was in one of the States along next to Nicaragua, probably the result of our course in Nicaragua. We have not sent the marines into Costa Rica to restore the Government there that was thrown out? Not yet, as far as the gentleman knows?

Mr. PADGETT. I have not heard of any.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order. Does not the gentleman think it is time for the committee to rise?

Mr. PADGETT. I would like to have the Clerk read a few more pages, down to the increase of the Navy.

Mr. MANN. We can easily finish the bill to-morrow.

Mr. PADGETT. We want to finish the bill and then pass the pension appropriation bill to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. I think it will be hardly possible to do that.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

The following Members were given leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD: Mr. SEARS, Mr. TAGUE, Mr. FESS, and Mr. MORIN.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20632, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. GALLIVAN, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for four days, on account of attending the obsequies of a friend.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ALLEGHENY RIVER, CATTARAUGUS COUNTY, N. Y.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we passed House bill 19298, a bridge bill, where an identical Senate bill (S. 7537) had previously passed the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which we passed the House bill, and then I will ask the House to agree to a resolution to recall the bill from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill H. R. 19298 was passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. And I ask to have the resolution passed recalling the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 491.

Resolved, That the Clerk be, and he is hereby, directed to request the Senate to return to the House of Representatives the bill (H. R. 19298) entitled an act authorizing the Western New York & Pennsylvania Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River in the town of Allegany, county of Cattaraugus, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 1061. An act to allow additional entries under the enlarged-homestead act;

S. 2222. An act for the relief of the heirs of Antoine Bayard;

S. 5632. An act for the relief of Aquila Nebeker;

S. 5203. An act for the relief of Gardiner L. Eastman;

S. 1553. An act for the relief of Peter Kenney; and

S. 3743. An act to reimburse John Simpson.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILLS 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 joint resolution and bills:

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution authorizing the National Society United States Daughters of Eighteen Hundred and Twelve to file its historical material in the Smithsonian Institution and to make annual reports to the secretary thereof;

H. R. 1609. An act for the relief of S. L. Burgard;

H. R. 6732. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Jennings;

H. R. 7763. An act for the relief of Stephen J. Simpson;
H. R. 11150. An act for the relief of mail contractors;
H. R. 11288. An act for the relief of S. S. Yoder; and
H. R. 11685. An act for the relief of Ivy L. Merrill.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill H. R. 18453, the Indian appropriation bill, for printing under the rules.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1448).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18453) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 55, 58, 62, 65, 73, 74, 76, 82, 88, 96, 100, 103, 106, and 112.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 15, 17, 18, 23, 25, 37, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 61, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 77, 78, 79, 81, 83, 86, 89, 91, 94, 97, 98, 99, 101, 102, 104, 105, 107, 108, and 109, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "*Provided further*, That $5,000 of the above amount shall be used for an investigation and report on the merits of the claim of the Indians of the Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon to additional land arising from alleged erroneous surveys of the north and west boundaries of their reservation as defined in the treaty concluded June 25, 1855 (12 Stats. L., p. 963), and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make such survey or resurveys as may be necessary to complete said investigation and report"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "*Provided*, That automobiles or any other vehicles or conveyances used in introducing, or attempting to introduce, intoxicants into the Indian country, where the introduction is prohibited by treaty or Federal statute, whether used by the owner thereof or other person, shall be subject to the seizure, libel, and forfeiture provided in section 2140 of the Revised Statutes of the United States"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"For construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings, including the purchase of necessary lands and the installation, repair, and improvement of heating, lighting, power, and sewerage and water systems in connection therewith, $400,000: *Provided*, That of this amount $300 may be expended for the purchase of a perpetual water right and right of way across the lands of private individuals, for the purpose of running a pipe line from a certain spring or springs located near the Sisseton Indian Agency buildings, South Dakota, to said buildings, the purchase of such water right to include sufficient land for the construction of a small cement reservoir near such spring or springs for the purpose of storing the water so acquired: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $500 of the amount herein appropriated may be used for the acquisition on behalf of the United States, by purchase or otherwise, of land for a site for the Mesquakie Day School, Sac and Fox, Iowa: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to allow employees in the Indian Service who are furnished quarters necessary heat and light for such quarters without charge, such heat and light to be paid for out of the fund chargeable with the cost of heating and lighting other buildings at the same place: *And provided further*, That the amount so expended for agency purposes shall not be included in the maximum amounts for compensation of employees prescribed by section 1, act of August 24, 1912."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "*Provided further*, That where practicable the transportation and expenses so paid shall be refunded and shall be returned to the appropriation from which paid"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "$475,000, of which sum not less than $75,000 shall be used for the employment of additional field matrons:"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of said amendment strike out the figures "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in line 1 of said amendment insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment numbered 24 and the following language appearing in lines 10 to 14, inclusive, on page 13 of the bill:

"That from and after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Interior shall have the power to authorize any superintendent, clerk, or other employee in the Indian field service to administer oaths and take acknowledgments in connection with matters pertaining to their official duties."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the amendment proposed, after the word "Interior," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "reimbursable to the United States from any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of the Navajo Indians in Arizona, to remain a charge and lien upon the lands and funds of said tribe of Indians until paid"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"That section 3 of the act of January 12, 1891 (26 Stat. L., p. 712), entitled "An act for the relief of Mission Indians in the State of California," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to authorize the President, in his discretion and whenever he shall deem it for the interests of the Indians affected thereby, to extend the trust period for such time as may be advisable on the lands held in trust for the use and benefit of the Mission Bands or villages of Indians in California."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"IOWA.

"SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to pay to the enrolled members of the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi Tribe of Indians of the State of Iowa, entitled under existing law to share in the funds of said tribe, or to their lawful heirs, the sum of $10,334.96, together

with the interest which has or may hereafter accrue thereon, remaining in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi Tribe of Indians of the State of Iowa, from the sum of $42,893.25 transferred to the credit of those Indians under the provisions of the act of June 10, 1896, said sum of $10,334.96 to be apportioned per capita among the enrolled members of said tribe."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 6 of the amendment strike out the following: "for setting out trees, $500"; and in line 7 of the amendment strike out the figures "$75,175" and in lieu thereof insert the figures "$74,675"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the amendment strike out the word "on" after the word "bridge" and insert the following: "across the Mississippi River on the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the amendment, after the word "been," strike out the words "omitted erroneously from the rolls," and in lieu thereof insert the following: "heretofore erroneously stricken from the rolls and reinstated prior to the passage of this act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "Washington," in lines 21 and 22 of the amendment, insert the following: "and other Chippewa Indians visiting said city"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 3 and 4 of the amendment, strike out the following, "for the purchase of additional land, $41,600; in all, $129,920," and insert the following: "in all, $88,320"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the amendment strike out the figures "$52,100," and in lieu thereof insert the figures "$50,430"; and in line 4 of the amendment strike out the figures "$99,100," and in lieu thereof insert "$97,430"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"For the construction of a steel bridge across the San Juan River in San Juan County, State of New Mexico, at the best and most available location west or southwest and near to the town of Farmington, in said county and State, $25,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, and to be reimbursable from any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of the Navajo Indians in the State of New Mexico."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"That the sum of $5,000, to be immediately available, be, and the same is hereby appropriated, out of any funds of the Chickasaw Nation, not otherwise appropriated, to reimburse Douglas H. Johnston, governor of the Chickasaw Nation, for extra expenses incurred in the performance of his duty as chief executive of the Chickasaw Nation and principal chief of the Chickasaw Tribe of Indians during the period covered between the years 1907 and 1912, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make such payment from the funds of said Nation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the proposed amendment, after the word "Congress," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to pay each and every duly enrolled citizen of the Creek Nation who has not been allotted lands in said nation and who is not included in Senate Document No. 478, Sixty-third Congress, second session, the sum of $1,040 in lieu of an allotment of land in said nation. Said sum of $1,040 to be paid to each and every person out of the funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Muskogee Creek Nation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 7 of the amendment strike out the following: "$40,000; in all, $162,200," and insert "$30,000; in all, $152,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 12 of the amendment, after the word "prescribe," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided*, That the application of this provision shall not interfere with any rights guaranteed by treaty to any allotted Umatilla Indian or Indians"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed insert the following:

"SEC. 21. For support and education of 365 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Flandreau, S. Dak., and for pay of superintendent, $62,955; for general repairs and improvements, $8,000; for new barn, $3,000; in all, $73,955."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "in all, $53,750." On page 40, line 1, of the bill, after the figures "$43,750," insert the following: ", of which amount not exceeding $900 may be expended for the purchase of two new busses"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"SEC. 26. That until the meeting of the Sixty-fifth Congress, those members of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives, not less than five in number, who are Members elect to the Sixty-fifth Congress, are authorized to conduct hearings and investigate the conduct of the Indian Service, at Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, and the sum of $15,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available and remain available until expended, is hereby appropriated for expenses incident thereto. The said committee is hereby authorized and empowered to examine into the conduct and management of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and all its branches and agencies, their organization and administration, to examine all books, documents, and papers in the said Bureau of Indian Affairs, its branches or agencies, relating to the administration of the business of said bureau, and shall have and is hereby granted authority to subpœna witnesses, compel their attendance, administer oaths, and to demand any and all books, documents and papers of whatever nature relating to the affairs of Indians as conducted by said bureau, its branches and agencies. Said committee is hereby authorized to employ such clerical and other assistance, including stenographers, as said committee may deem necessary in the proper prosecution of its work: *Provided*, That stenographers so employed shall not receive for their services exceeding $1 per printed page."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 48, 80, 95, and 111.

JNO. H. STEPHENS,
C. D. CARTER,
P. D. NORTON,
Managers on the part of the House.

HENRY F. ASHURST,
H. L. MYERS,
MOSES E. CLAPP,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The bill as it passed the House carried appropriations as follows:

Gratuity	$7,152,896.67
Reimbursable	2,697,700.00
Treaty	845,360.00
Total	10,695,956.67

The bill as it passed the Senate carried appropriations as follows:

Gratuity	$8, 395, 746. 67
Reimbursable	3, 157, 000. 00
Treaty	845, 360. 00
Total	12, 398, 107. 67

The bill as agreed upon in conference carries appropriations as follows:

Gratuity	$7, 778, 176. 67
Reimbursable	2, 905, 500. 00
Treaty	845, 360. 00
Total	11, 529, 036. 67

The above figures do not include amendments Nos. 80, 95, 111, and 112, which are in disagreement.

The estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, were $12,230,356.67. The bill as agreed upon in conference, exclusive of the amendments above enumerated on which there is a disagreement, is $701,320 less than the estimates of the department and $869,071 less than the bill carried when it passed the Senate.

The Senate conferees have receded on the following amendments: 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 55, 58, 62, 65, 73, 74, 76, 82, 88, 92, 96, 100, 103, 106, and 112.

The House conferees have receded unqualifiedly on the following amendments: 15, 17, 18, 23, 25, 37, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 61, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 77, 78, 79, 81, 83, 86, 89, 91, 94, 97, 98, 99, 101, 102, 104, 105, 107, 108, and 109.

The effect of the recession of the House conferees on the amendments on which they have unqualifiedly receded is as follows:

On No. 15: Provides for three warehouses in the Indian Service instead of two permanent warehouses in last year's law.

On No. 17: Makes $5,000 of the $135,000 appropriation for general expenses of the Indian Service immediately available.

On No. 18: Allows six Indian Service inspectors an increase of $1 in per diem expenses when actually employed on duty in the field.

On No. 23: Requires land purchased by the United States for day school or other administrative purposes to be sold to the highest bidder when any sale is made as contemplated by the law.

On No. 25: Amends the act of March 11, 1904, so as to permit of temporary rights of way for pipe lines across Indian lands for the conveyance of oil and gas.

On No. 37: Provides for the erection of a new school at the Fort Bidwell Indian school, California, and appropriates $12,000 therefor; also corrects the totals.

On No. 41: Permits the using of the funds arising from the sale of lands on the Klamath Indian Reservation for the purpose of constructing roads, trails, and other improvements for their benefit in addition to the purposes set forth in the act of June 17, 1892.

On No. 43: Corrects the section number.

On No. 44: Grants an increase of $2,000 for general repairs and improvements at the Indian school, Kickapoo Reservation, Kans.

On No. 45: Appropriates $8,000 for the purchase of additional land at the Indian school, Mount Pleasant, Mich.

On No. 47: Directs the Secretary of the Interior to accept the application of Richard Daeley to enter 1⅛ acres of land as assignee of Evaline Gallagher, and to issue patent to Daeley on his complying with the requirements of the law relative to making soldiers' additional homestead entries.

On No. 52: Removes the requirement of the act of June 30, 1914, for showing the quantum of Indian blood in the roll that is being prepared of Chippewa Indians.

On No. 53: Corrects the section number.

On No. 54: Does not increase the appropriation, but provides that $1,000 may be used for the purchase of two automobiles on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.

On No. 56: Increases the appropriation to the amount estimated by the department for the irrigation systems on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont.

On No. 57: Increases the appropriation for the support and civilization of the Rocky Boy Band of Chippewa Indians in Montana.

On No. 59: Corrects the section number.

On No. 61: Corrects the section number.

On No. 64: Corrects the section number.

On No. 67: Corrects the section number.

On No. 68: Corrects the section number. Also, provides for 10 additional pupils, an assembly hall and gymnasium, and additional land for a school farm at the Indian school, Cherokee, N. C., in accordance with the department estimates.

On No. 69: Corrects the section number.

On No. 70: Provides for the construction and equipment of a gymnasium building at the Fort Totten Indian School, North Dakota.

On No. 71: Provides for an assembly hall and employees' cottages at the Wahpeton School, North Dakota, in accordance with the department estimates.

On No. 72: Corrects the section number.

On No. 75: Provides that Osage County, Okla., shall be deemed Indian country within the meaning of acts of Congress making it unlawful to introduce intoxicating liquors into Indian country.

On No. 77: Provides for a reappraisement of Osage County, Okla., and appropriates $5,000 from tribal funds for such purpose.

On No. 78: Corrects the section number.

On No. 79: Provides that the city of Tishomingo, Okla., shall convey sites for the dormitories for the Murray State School of Agriculture by fee-simple title.

On No. 81: Provides for the payment of M. L. Mott, formerly national attorney for the Creek Nation of Indians, for expenses incurred during the period January 15 to February 8, 1914, when his successor was appointed.

On No. 83: Reinstates existing law providing for a national attorney for the Creek Indians, and authorizes the expenditure of Creek funds to pay for the same.

On No. 86: Corrects the section number.

On No. 89: Provides for the purchase of tracts of land on the Columbia River, Oreg., as fishing grounds for the Oregon Indians, and appropriates $5,000 therefor.

On No. 91: Corrects the section number.

On No. 94: Merely corrects the language.

On No. 97: Appropriates $7,500 for the repair and improvement of the road from Canton, S. Dak., to the insane asylum for Indians at that place.

On No. 98: Corrects the section number.

On No. 99: Corrects the section number.

On No. 101: Provides that certain patents issued to certain Indians as fee simple patents under the homestead act of May 20, 1862, be ratified and confirmed as of the dates of their issuance.

On No. 102: Corrects the section number.

On No. 104: Appropriates $1,500 for the purchase of a storage battery at the Indian school, Tomah, Wis.

On No. 105: Corrects the totals to correspond with amendment No. 104.

On No. 107: Amends the House provision authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw $300,000 of the tribal funds of the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin and to spend the same in clearing the land, building of homes, purchase of seeds, machinery, tools, etc., so as to protect the timberlands of the Indians where they seek to farm their allotments by requiring first a survey and certification of the forest service of the Indian Bureau that the lands are more valuable for agricultural purposes than for the preservation of the timber growing on the land. Also the amendment provides for a per capita payment, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, of $50 to each member of the Menominee Tribe.

On No. 108: Corrects the section number.

On No. 109: Increases the appropriation for the irrigation system within the diminished Shoshone or Wind River Indian Reservation, Wyo., and indicates two partly completed ditches or canals on the reservation where the work shall be completed. The amendment also appropriates $5,000 additional for the purpose of making further surveys and examinations relative to the irrigation of the conditionally ceded lands on the reservation.

On the following amendments the House conferees receded with modifying or substitute amendments: 2, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 19, 22, 24, 32, 35, 40, 42, 46, 49, 50, 51, 60, 63, 66, 84, 85, 87, 90, 92, 93, and 110.

The effect of the recession of the House conferees on the amendments on which they have receded with modifying or substitute amendments is as follows:

On No. 2: Strikes out the $5,000 appropriated for the investigation provided for and authorizes and directs the expenditure from the lump-sum appropriation for the survey, resurvey, classification, and allotment of lands to Indians.

On No. 5: Provides that automobiles used in introducing or attempting to introduce intoxicating liquor into Indian country in violation of law shall be subject to seizure, libel, and forfeiture as provided in section 2140 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

On No. 9: Decreases the amount allowed by the Senate for the support of Indian day and industrial schools from $1,650,000 to $1,600,000.

On No. 10: Decreases the amount allowed by the Senate for the construction, lease, and repair of school and agency buildings from $625,000 to $400,000 and restores two provisos as estimated for by the department.

On No. 11: Provides that when expenses for transportation and collection of pupils have been refunded that they shall be returned to the appropriation from which paid.

On No. 12: Decreases the appropriation for industrial work among the Indians from $500,000, as it passed the Senate, to $475,000, and provides that $75,000 of this amount shall be used in the employment of additional field matrons.

On No. 16: Decreases the appropriation for pay of judges of Indian courts from $10,000 to $8,000 and provides that no part of this money shall be expended for any judge for the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico.

On No. 19: Decreases the appropriation for industry and self-support among the Indians from $450,000, as it passed the Senate, to $400,000.

On No. 22: Decreases the appropriation for reimbursing Indians for loss of stock infected with dourine and other contagious diseases from $100,000, as it passed the Senate, to $75,000, and provides that the same shall be immediately available and remain available until expended.

On No. 24: Strikes out both the Senate and House provisions authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to empower any employee in the Indian Service to administer oaths and take acknowledgments in connection with matters pertaining to their official duties.

On No. 32: Provides that the appropriation for the construction of two bridges near the Leupp Indian Agency, Ariz., shall be reimbursable from any funds now or hereafter placed to the credit of the Navajo Tribe of Indians in the Treasury of the United States.

On No. 35: Decreases the appropriation for the purchase of lands for homeless Indians in California from $25,000, as it passed the Senate, to $20,000.

On No. 40: Authorizes an amendment to the act of January 12, 1891, so as to enable the President to extend the trust period on the lands held in trust for the use and benefit of the Mission Bands of Indians in California.

On No. 42: Directs the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to make a per capita payment to the enrolled members of the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi Tribe of Indians in Iowa.

On No. 46: Authorizes certain expenditures for the support and education of 225 Indians at the Indian school, Pipestone, Minn., including a domestic-science cottage, an addition to the hospital, a central heating plant, and for road and drainage, and decreases the total appropriation for this school from $75,175, as it passed the Senate, to $74,675.

On No. 49: Authorizes the expenditure of $5,000 of the funds of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River, Cass Lake Reservation, Minn., upon condition that Congress shall hereafter appropriate $10,000 to be contributed to the Forestry Service, and that the State of Minnesota, or the local Minnesota authorities, shall also contribute $10,000 for the construction of such bridge.

On No. 50: Authorizes the payment from Chippewa Indian funds to persons whose names had been erroneously stricken from the rolls of the Chippewa Indians and had been reinstated prior to the passage of this act.

On No. 51: Appropriates $6,000 of the funds of the Chippewa Indians for the expenses of the general council of such tribe to be held at Bemidji, Minn., and also the necessary expenses of delegations of Chippewa Indians when attending to the business of the tribe in Washington, D. C.; also authorizes a special agent of the Interior Department to attend future meetings of the council.

On No. 60: Authorizes the erection of a steel water tank and employees' quarters at the Indian school at Genoa, Nebr., and decreases the appropriation for the school from $129,920, as it passed the Senate, to $88,320.

On No. 63: Decreases the appropriation for the Indian school at Carson City, Nev., from $99,100, as it passed the Senate, to $97,430, this decrease being necessary by the action of the Senate conferees in receding from Senate amendment No. 62.

On No. 66: Merely changes the wording of the Senate amendment appropriating $25,000, reimbursable, for the construction of a steel bridge across the San Juan River in San Juan County, N. Mex., which bridge was shown to be badly needed by the Indians.

On No. 84: Changes the wording of the amendment appropriating $5,000 from the funds of the Chickasaw Nation of Indians for the purpose of reimbursing Douglas H. Johnston, governor and principal chief of the Chickasaw Indians, for extra expenses incurred in the performance of his duties as such governor and principal chief between the years 1907 and 1912.

On No. 85: Provides that hereafter no allotments shall be made to members of the Creek Nation of Indians without specific authority of Congress, and authorizes the Secretary to pay to the enrolled members of the Creek Nation who have not as yet received an allotment of lands $1,040 each in lieu of an allotment, said payments to be made from the funds of the Muskogee Creek Nation of Indians.

On No. 87: Reduces the appropriation for the construction of buildings at the Indian school, Salem, Oreg., from $40,000, as it passed the Senate, to $30,000, and corrects the total to correspond.

On No. 90: Authorizes an allotment of not exceeding 80 acres to each Umatilla Indian residing on the Umatilla Reservation, Oreg., who has not been allotted but who has allotment rights on the reservation, so long as the lands remain available for such purpose, and authorizes the issuance of trust patents for the selections so made. Also provides that the application of this provision shall not interfere with rights of the Umatilla Indians as guaranteed by treaty.

On No. 92: Corrects the section number and reinstates the House provision.

On No. 93: Strikes out the specific appropriation of $900 for two busses at the Indian school, Pierre, S. Dak., and provides that such busses may be purchased from the appropriation for the support and education of the Indians at this school. Also decreases the appropriation for this school from $54,650, as it passed the Senate, to $53,750.

On No. 110: Restores the House language providing for an investigation by the members elect of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth Congress, makes the appropriation immediately available and to remain available until expended; also gives the committee authority to examine all books, documents, and papers of the Indian Service, to subpœna and compel the attendance and administer oaths to witnesses, and to employ such clerks and other assistance, including stenographers, as may be necessary for the proper prosecution of its work.

JNO. H. STEPHENS,
C. D. CARTER,
P. D. NORTON,
Managers on the part of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks upon the naval bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on national prohibition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the subject of the necessity for a forest reserve at the headwaters of the Red River, in Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the Senate amendment to the legislative bill to place postmasters under the civil service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the rising cost of living.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 10, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for con-

tingent expenses, Executive Office, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 2044); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Public Printer submitting increased estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 2045); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting a supplementary estimate of appropriation to be immediately available for the establishment and equipment of a submarine base at the Panama Canal (H. Doc. No. 2046); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 20838) to donate certain condemned cannon and cannon balls to the city of Ironton, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20839) to donate certain condemned cannon and cannon balls to the city of Gallipolis, Ohio; to the Committee an Military Affairs.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 20840) providing for the construction of a public building at Binghamton, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 20841) for the reduction of postage on first-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 20842) providing for the registration of designs; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 20843) to authorize a report upon the necessity for the construction of a bridge across the Salt River on the Salt River Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 20844) to establish a United States commission of mediation and conciliation for the purpose of investigating the relations between railroads and their employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution (H. Res. 490) providing for telephone service at Capitol after March 31, 1917; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CALLAWAY (by request): Resolution (H. Res. 492) providing for a referendum vote on a declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER: Resolution (H. Res. 493) requesting certain information of the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURNETT: Concurrent, resolution (H. Con. Res. 73) to authorize the printing of 10,000 copies of the immigration law (Public, No. 301), Sixty-fourth Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting suffrage to women; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring amending the Constitution of the United States so that the President may veto single items in appropriation bills; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, urging the appropriation of $3,000,000 for a naval base upon the Columbia River in Oregon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the reclamation of arid and swamp lands in the United States; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the improvement of Crescent City Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the loaning of a portion of the funds of the postal savings bank directly to public-school districts; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the holding of a congress of States to consider the sources of revenue with the object of segregation of State and Federal revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the appropriation of money for the hydrographical work on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the lowering of water level of Lower or Little Klamath Lake; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the passage of a bill to provide for the construction of a military highway along the north bank of the Columbia River, between Fort Canby and Fort Vancouver; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, urging the appropriation of $2,612.60 by the United States to reimburse the State of Washington for expenditures in connection with the mobilization of the Washington National Guard; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the construction and maintenance of military highways along the Pacific coast from the Canadian border to the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, declaring the loyalty of the people of Connecticut to the Government of the United States in the present international crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon for the submission of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States whereby the President shall be authorized to disapprove of any items of a bill making an appropriation of money; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the President to disapprove of any items of a bill making appropriations of money; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 20845) granting an increase of pension to William H. Kidd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20846) granting an increase of pension to Adam Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 20847) granting a pension to Leon L. Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 20848) for the relief of Mary White, widow of Benjamin White, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 20849) granting an increase of pension to James Park; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 20850) to correct the military record of Frederick Colburn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 20851) granting an increase of pension to George Gunnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 20852) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Cloud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 20853) for the relief of R. M. Blount; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 20854) granting an increase of pension to John Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 20855) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Culbertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20856) granting an increase of pension to Marvin Waldorph; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20857) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Jennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 20858) granting an increase of pension to William N. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 20859) to relinquish, release, remise, and quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 20860) granting an increase of pension to John F. Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEATON: A bill (H. R. 20861) granting a pension to Harry E. Snyder; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of citizens of Framingham, Mass., asking Congress to submit suffrage amendment to the State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of Local Union No. 1347, of Pennsylvania, favoring embargo on foodstuff; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Scranton (Pa.) Supply & Machinery Co., favoring amending section 5 of House bill 8234; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of employees of the Post Office Department, favoring passage of House bill 17806, relative to salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John Schuette, of Manitowoc, Wis., relative to inviting all warring and neutral nations to a conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, against proposed tax on excess profits of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Fred K. Myer, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 20080, migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, against tax on excess profits of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry farmers in the State of Wisconsin, relative to advance in price of binder twine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of common council of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., relative to discontinuance of the package-freight business; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Borden's Condensed Milk Co., of Belvidere, Ill., against proposed tax on excess profits of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. B. Dromgold, of Landisburg, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 18531, to increase pensions of maimed soldiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers' Union No. 11, of Peru, Ill., opposing any declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of post-office employees of San Francisco and vicinity, favoring House bill 17806, to increase salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Ruthenian National Union, favoring House joint resolution 350, relative to raising funds for the relief of the Ruthenians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of sundry members of the Massachusetts Branch of the League to Enforce Peace, urging adoption by the United States of the league's proposals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of employees of the Post Office Department, favoring House bill 17806, relative to increase in salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HEATON: Memorial of Schuylkill Commandery, No. 202, Knights of Malta, to forbid public use in parades of any flag except the Stars and Stripes or the State flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Local Union No. 1656, United Mine Workers of America, of Shenandoah, Pa., to place an embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Conn., favoring passage of House bill 6915, a retirement law for superannuated employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of Local No. 2150, United Mine Workers of America, Maynard, Ohio, favoring embargo on foodstuffs to reduce high cost of living; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KONOP: Memorial of Common Council of Milwaukee, Wis., relative to rates of transportation, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Otto H. Schultz et al., protesting against House bills 17850 and 1898 and Senate bills 1082 and 4429; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Mrs. William I. Hull, chairman, and Mrs. H. H. Donaldson, corresponding secretary, of the Woman's Peace Party, of Philadelphia, Pa., urging settlement of our differences with Germany by mediation or other peaceful means; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Miss Luella Meloy and 48 other members of the Pennsylvania College for Women, of Pittsburgh, Pa., with reference to the migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of 700 citizens of the State of New York, favoring the Fitzgerald bill for an embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHOUSE: Petition of 28 citizens of Dillwyn and Christian Endeavor people of Coldwater, Kans., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEGEL: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of New York, favoring a judicious system of indirect taxes, including stamp dues and others; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring any fair and equitable taxation necessary to the protection of American lives and property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of L. O. Miller and 65 citizens of Kalamazoo, Mich., favoring passage of House bill 20204; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Washington, D. C., affirming its devotion to the program of preparedness and opposing taxation of excess profits of corporations and copartnerships; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of members of the faculty of Mount Holyoke College, relative to the United States taking its part in a league of nations to prevent future wars, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Old Middlesex Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution, indorsing compulsory military training in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America against proposed tax on excess profits of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Memorial of Local Union 1772 of the United Mine Workers of America, of Palisades, Colo., urging placing an embargo on food products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Papers relating to House bill 20570, for increase of pension for James Mackall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of ex-Confederate soldiers of Simpson County, Ky., for a refund of the cotton tax imposed by the Government during the Civil War; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial of Old Middlesex Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution, favoring compulsory military training in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America against proposed tax on excess profits of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of members of the faculty of Mount Holyoke College relative to the United States taking its place in the league of nations to prevent future wars; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of 400 Woman's Christian Temperance Union people of Holyoke, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of C. W. Ellington and other citizens of Velva, Bismarck Verein, and sundry citizens of Bismarck, N. Dak., opposing any policies, etc., tending to war, etc., with foreign nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *February 10, 1917.*

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we would open the duty of this day by invoking Thy blessing upon us, putting ourselves as willing instruments in Thy hands. We pray for the inspiration that comes alone from God, that out of the consideration of the problems that confront us and the possible dangers that surround us we may gain not only wisdom concerning the things of this life, but a deeper, truer, diviner conception of life itself. May we understand the relationship that the work of this day holds to the never-ending life and the relationship which our lives in their activities here hold to that destiny that knows no end. Guide us with God ever before us as our guide and light and defense. For Christ's sake. Amen.