successor. In the Fifty-sixth Congress, in which I first saw service in this House, both Mr. Reed and Mr. Dingley were absent. Mr. Reed had resigned and Mr. Dingley had died in the closing days of the Fifty-fifth Congress. Mr. Boutelle was the only one of the famous quartet that was in the Fifty-sixth Congress.

Mr. BURLEIGH was a man of comparatively few words. He did not often address the House, but he was active and energetic in the work that devolved upon him. He was particularly interested in preventing the cutting down of the representation of the State of Maine from four Members to three Members during the apportionment fight in the Fifty-seventh Congress. He and the late Charles E. Littlefield led that fight on this floor with marked success for his State.

I have been in Maine on a number of occasions. While visiting among Mr. BURLEIGH's neighbors it was indeed a pleasure to find what a warm affection they had for him. They knew and loved him for his industry, for the service he had given his State and his country, and for his sterling qualities as a legislator and citizen. It was but natural that his fellow citizens should elect him to the Senate of the United States. He had already served them as governor and treasurer, and they knew his worth. They knew his business ability. They knew that he was fair and honorable and just in all his dealings with his fellow man. They knew he had served them faithfully and well for 14 years in the House of Representatives. His elevation to the Senate therefore was a fitting climax to an honorable political career. We who were privileged to serve with him in this House know that in his death the country has lost an able, conscientious public servant and his State a distinguished son who had lived up to the best traditions of the Pine Tree Commonwealth.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that until March 4 the Members have leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life, character, and public services of the late Senator BURLEIGH.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order, the House will stand adjourned until 12 o'clock m. to-morrow.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes) the House adjourned.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *February 26, 1917.*

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Almighty God, the high and mighty Ruler of the universe, who dost from Thy throne behold all the dwellers upon earth, we come to Thee at the beginning of this day to invoke Thy blessing. We call upon Thee with reverence and Godly fear, but we call upon Thee also with the confidence of a Christian faith. We bless Thee for the assurance that the storms of earth do not shake Thy throne, that Thy law standeth sure. Amid perilous times we come asking that those whom Thou hast led out into places of influence and power may themselves be inspired by the truth which Thou hast revealed unto men. Give to us this day as we face the unsolved problems that are before us a patriotism which is founded upon the conviction that Thou hast given to us these lands, that Thou hast inspired our laws, that Thou hast guided and controlled our national history. So may we look above the storm to the face of God, and with the light of Thy countenance upon our pathway, with confidence and courage and faith, may we move onward to the great purpose of our creation as a Nation. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, February 20, 1917, when, on request of Mr. SIMMONS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a schedule of useless papers on the files of the Federal Trade Commission and requesting that action be taken looking to their disposition. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives thereof.

INVESTIGATION OF FOOD SUPPLIES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution adopted by the board of estimate and apportionment of the city of New York, urging an appropriation of $400,000 to be used by the Federal Government for a food-supply investigation. The resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution is as follows:

BOARD OF ESTIMATE AND APPORTIONMENT,
New York, February 24, 1917.

Hon. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,
Vice President of the United States
and President of the Senate,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I transmit herewith certified copy of resolution adopted by the board of estimate and apportionment February 23, 1917, urging the Congress of the United States to include in the appropriation bill now pending the sum of $400,000 to be used by the Federal Government for food-supply inquiry work.

Respectfully,
JOSEPH HAAG,
Secretary.

Resolved by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment of the City of New York, That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, urged to include in the appropriation bill now pending the sum of $400,000 to be used by the Federal Government for food-supply inquiry work.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution adopted by the board of estimate and apportionment at a meeting of said board held February 23, 1917.

JOSEPH HAAG,
Secretary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a telegram addressed to the Senate of the United States which will be printed in the RECORD.

The telegram is as follows:

BUFFALO, N. Y., *February 26, 1917.*

The SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.:

Fifteen thousand men of Buffalo assembled this afternoon at the Billy Sunday Tabernacle, and representing many of the city's largest industries and business and professional life, rising unanimously amid cheers while Billy Sunday from the platform waved a large American flag, voted to express appreciation to the Senate and the House of the United States for their action to effectively protect prohibition States against incoming liquor and the transmitting of liquor advertising through the mails into prohibition States, and urge the privilege to vote for national prohibition.

VOLNEY P. KINNEY,
Chairman Sunday Campaign Committee.

Mr. JONES. I have a memorial from the State Legislature of Washington, indorsing universal military training. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD, if it has not already been printed, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 5 of the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Washington, with the original copy of said memorial as enrolled, now on file in this office, and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington. Done at the capitol at Olympia this 17th day of February, A. D. 1917.

[SEAL.] I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 5.

To the honorables the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled for the fifteenth regular session, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the present volunteer system of military training has been proven to be inadequate and inefficient in providing a satisfactory system of national preparedness; and

"Whereas universal compulsory military training has been indorsed by the leading military authorities of the United States as the only adequate, efficient, and proper method of national defense; and

"Whereas this system is preeminently democratic, inasmuch as it places the burden of this highest duty of citizenship upon all rather than upon a few as a professional class; and

"Whereas members of the military committees of your honorable body have deemed it advisable to recommend universal compulsory military training; and

"Whereas by virtue of this training every citizen would have an opportunity to repay in part a just debt he owes his country on account of the protection, liberty, and inalienable rights it guarantees him; and

"Whereas the present crisis in international affairs now confronting the United States impresses peculiarly upon everyone the imperative need of adequate preparedness: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, urged to pass such legislation as will bring about a survey and preparation for mobilization in case of war, all the resources of the United States, and provide for universal training of our youth in military science or callings necessary for military proficiency."

Passed the house February 5, 1917.

GUY E. KELLY,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate February 13, 1917.

LOUIS F. HART,
President of the Senate.

[Indorsed.]

STATE OF WASHINGTON, *ss:*

Filed in the office of secretary of state February 16, 1917, at 4.38 p. m.

I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.

Mr. THOMPSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Spring Valley Township, Hepler, and Inman, all in the State of Kansas, praying that the United States remain at peace and that the question of war be submitted to a referendum of the people, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kansas, praying for national prohibition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GRONNA presented petitions of sundry citizens of Grand Forks; of 49 citizens of Hebron; of A. O. Banks and 78 other citizens of Fordville; of Rev. Z. G. Rugland and 24 other citizens of Corpio; and of 61 citizens of Bergen, all in the State of North Dakota, praying that the United States remain at peace, that the question of war be submitted to a referendum of the people and pledging their support to the President, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jacksonville, Fla., praying that the provision of the Post Office appropriation bill excluding interstate shipment of liquor through dry territory shall not take effect before October 1, 1917, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Audubon Society, of Cocoanut Grove, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation for the protection of migratory birds, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CURTIS (for Mr. GALLINGER) presented a petition of Local Branch No. 3, National Association of United States Civil Service Employees at Navy Yards and Stations, of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for an increase of pay for employees in navy yards, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE. I desire to present certain resolutions adopted by citizens of Dedham, Mass., and I ask to have them printed in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF SELECTMEN,
Dedham, Mass., February 23, 1917.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a mass meeting of the citizens of Dedham, Mass., convened in Memorial Hall on February 22, 1917, the following resolutions were unanimously passed:

"*Resolved*, That we, irrespective of party, commend and approve most heartily and earnestly, as an act of the highest wisdom and patriotism, the severance by President Wilson of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Imperial German Government.

"*Resolved*, That we are not unmindful that this decisive step may lead to war. We deplore it. But if it comes, we pledge ourselves to stand steadfastly by our President in all his efforts to uphold the honor and welfare and just rights of our country.

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of this meeting be requested to forward to the President, the Senators from Massachusetts, and the Representative of our congressional district a copy of these resolutions."

Respectfully,

FREDERICK D. ELY, *Chairman.*
FREDK. B. KINGSBURY, *Secretary.*

Mr. PENROSE. I present a petition signed by over 7,000 railway postal clerks, praying for a salary increase. I ask that the text of the petition, without the names, be printed in the RECORD, and that the petition be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the POSTMASTER GENERAL AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS:

We, the undersigned railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks, hereby pray for an increase in salary of $200 per annum for all railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks for the following reasons:

1. The cost of living has increased and is continuing to increase with such alarming rapidity that it has become a question of serious concern to the salaried workers as to how they are going to meet the ever-increasing expenses.

2. Comparing wages paid by outside corporations with those paid in the Railway Mail Service you will find that we are much underpaid.

3. The study and requirements demanded of railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks are greater than the brain expenditure of other classes of workmen who are better paid.

4. The Railway Mail Service is much harder to-day than it was even six months ago, on account of the numerous resignations of valuable men who played the part of experienced distributors in the service.

5. The civil-service records will show that the Railway Mail Service is not attractive to new men. On account of the present salaries nearly all are declining appointment. This condition makes it impossible to maintain the high-standard efficiency of the service.

6. We believe that we are asking for this increase in salary upon just and equitable grounds.

7. We can not live on the scale of the day laborer, but have to present a neat appearance before the public, and if we can not live respectably we can not work properly. The clerk who is worrying about his salary and wondering how he can meet his expenses can not put proper effort into his daily work.

8. Another point which we wish to bring to your attention is that the salaries of Government employees are fixed by statute, and they have no means of recuperating their losses occasioned by abnormal necessary living expenses, as they are prohibited from participation in outside business.

We therefore most earnestly solicit your best effort in support of legislation in the next Congress which is designed to immediately relieve the financial situation among the workers in our service.

We thank you in advance for any action taken in this direction.

Mr. PENROSE. I present a petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, urging the passage of the so-called Webb bill, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD. It is short.

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

PHILADELPHIA BOARD OF TRADE,
Philadelphia, February 21, 1917.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Your memorialist, the Philadelphia Board of Trade, respectfully requests that your honorable bodies make every effort to pass the Webb bill (H. R. 17350), eliminating the two amendments passed by the House, which, if allowed to stand, would nullify the bill as originally presented.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

[SEAL.] WM. M. COATES,
President.

Attest:

W. R. TUCKER, *Secretary.*

Mr. PENROSE. I present a petition from the Philadelphia Bourse, protesting against the provisions of House bill 20573, authorizing a tax on excess profits and on capital invested by corporations and copartnerships, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

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

PROTEST AGAINST PROVISIONS OF BILL H. R. 20573, KNOWN AS THE REVENUE BILL, AUTHORIZING A TAX ON EXCESS PROFITS AND ON CAPITAL INVESTED OF CORPORATIONS AND COPARTNERSHIPS.

Resolutions adopted by the Philadelphia Bourse, an organization composed of over 2,500 business men, firms, and corporations, having as one of its objects the improvement of the commercial interests of the city, State, and Nation, acting through its board of directors, at a meeting held February 14, 1917.

To the honorable the Senate of the United States of America:

At a meeting of the board of directors of the Philadelphia Bourse, held February 14, 1917, the following was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That the officers of the bourse be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to forward to the Senate of the United States a protest against the enactment of bill H. R. 20573 in its present form for the reasons set forth in the resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America at its fifth annual meeting, February 2, 1917, as follows:

"'*Resolved*, That the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America reaffirms its devotion to the program of preparedness which it has approved by vote of its constituent members through referendum No. 15 and through resolutions adopted in annual meeting, and further pledges the support of this body to any just and reasonable measures of taxation which the Government may see fit to adopt under such a program. But while reaffirming its devotion to this policy it feels compelled to protest against the inequitable and discriminatory methods of taxation proposed in the bill known as H. R. 20573, providing for a tax on excess profits of corporations and copartnerships; and be it further

"'*Resolved*, That while fully recognizing the necessity of providing increased revenues to carry out wise and patriotic measures for the adequate defense of our country, we would respectfully suggest that any bill passed by Congress to accomplish these purposes should be along lines of fairness to all interests in the country so that every citizen should pay his just share of the tax.'"

True copy.

Attest:

[SEAL.] EMIL ALBRECHT, *Secretary.*

Mr. PENROSE. I present a preamble and resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the imposition of a tax upon incomes, upon inheritance, and upon capital stock of corporations, which as it comes from the legislature I will ask to have read.

The resolutions were read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

IN THE SENATE, *February 20, 1917.*

Whereas the Federal Government has already imposed taxes upon income, upon inheritance, and upon the capital stock of corporations, all of which sources of revenue have heretofore been relied upon by the States for their income; and

Whereas the further extension by the Federal Government of the plan of raising its revenue by taxes upon sources which the several States have heretofore relied upon for their revenues constitutes a serious menace to the fiscal plans of the States; and

Whereas it appears to be entirely possible for the Federal Government to secure adequate funds for its legitimate needs through a judicious system of indirect taxes to cover current expenses coupled with the funding of amounts to cover permanent improvements:

Resolved (if the House concur), That the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania expresses hereby its emphatic disapproval of the proposed plan to impose a Federal tax upon the profits of corporations, joint-stock companies, associations and partnerships, or any other extensions by the Federal Government of taxes upon sources heretofore relied upon by the States for their revenues, and the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State are hereby requested to oppose any such contemplated action on the part of the Federal Government.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the clerks of the Senate and House of Representatives to the Ways and Means Committee of the National House of Representatives and to the Finance Committee of the United States Senate, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from this State.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Legislature of Pennsylvania on February 20, 1917.

[SEAL.] HARMON M. KEPHART,
Chief Clerk Senate of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I present resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York, with respect to the quarantine station at the Port of New York, which I ask be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
IN SENATE,
Albany, February 15, 1917.

[By Mr. Cromwell.]

Whereas the commission created pursuant to chapter 342 of the Laws of 1916 to negotiate for the transfer of the quarantine establishment at the port of New York to the United States has passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the secretary be directed to inform the Secretary of the Treasury that, after due deliberation and consideration of such evidence and figures as it was able to obtain in regard to the value of the quarantine establishment at the port of New York, the commission agrees to transfer the quarantine establishment at the Port of New York, on or before July 1, 1917, upon the payment by the Federal Government to the State of New York of the sum of $1,395,275"; and

Whereas it is necessary, in order to carry out the transfer of the quarantine establishment at the port of New York to the United States, that an appropriation be made by Congress to be paid to the State of New York of the consideration stated in the resolution, to wit, $1,395,275:

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby requests the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State to use their utmost efforts to obtain the passage of such appropriation; and

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the clerks of the senate and assembly to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and to the Finance Committee of the United States Senate, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from this State.

By order of the senate,
ERNEST A. FAY,
Clerk.

IN ASSEMBLY,
February 15, 1917.

Concurred in without amendment.
By order of the assembly.

FRED W. HAMMOND, *Clerk.*

Mr. PHELAN presented a memorial of Typographical Union No. 84, of San Bernardino, Cal., remonstrating against the provision in the Post Office appropriation bill applying the zone systems to newspapers, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 7827) to authorize the sale of certain lands at or near Yellowstone, Mont., for hotel purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1108) thereon.

Mr. HUGHES (for Mr. JOHNSON of Maine), from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20748) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, reported it and submitted a report (No. 1110) thereon.

Mr. BROUSSARD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 5400) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Susan A. Nicholas, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1109) thereon.

STATUES OF PULASKI AND KOSCIUSZKO.

Mr. CHILTON. From the Committee on Printing I report back favorably, with amendments, House concurrent resolution No. 59, to print and bind the proceedings upon the unveiling of the statue of Count Casimir Pulaski in Washington May 11, 1910, and I ask for its present consideration.

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

The amendments were, on page 1, line 5, to strike out the words "statue of Count Casimir Pulaski" and insert "statues of Brig. Gen. Count Casimir Pulaski and Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko"; in line 9, to strike out "National Polish-American Alliance" and insert "Polish National Alliance of America"; in line 13, to strike out the words "Count Casimir Pulaski" and insert "Brig. Gen. Count Casimir Pulaski and Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko"; and, at the end of the resolution, to insert "said proceedings shall be compiled and printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing," so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed and bound in the form of eulogies, with accompanying illustrations, 17,100 copies of the proceedings upon the unveiling of the statues of Brig. Gen. Count Casimir Pulaski and Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko in Washington May 11, 1910, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, 2,000 to be delivered to the Polish National Alliance of America for such distribution as said alliance may desire to make, and the remaining 100 copies shall be bound in full morocco and distributed through the Department of State to the descendants of Brig. Gen. Count Casimir Pulaski and Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko and the speakers who took part in said celebration. Said proceedings shall be compiled and printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. CHILTON. I desire to explain that this matter came to the committee in the form of two resolutions, and for the purpose of economy the Committee on Printing embraced the substance of the two in one resolution.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

THE IMMIGRATION LAW.

Mr. CHILTON. There is a House concurrent resolution, No. 73, on the Vice President's desk, and a similar one has been reported. I ask that the House concurrent resolution be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House concurrent resolution No. 73, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That 10,000 copies of the immigration law (Public, No. 301, 64th Cong.; H. R. 10384) be printed for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives, to be distributed as follows: One thousand five hundred copies for the use of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate Committee on Immigration, 4,500 copies to be distributed through the folding room of the House, and 3,000 copies through the folding room of the Senate.

Mr. CHILTON. I move that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

ADDRESS BY JUDGE BLAIR (S. DOC. NO. 723).

Mr. CHILTON, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 378), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the manuscript submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] on February 24, 1917, entitled "What Corrupt Practices in Elections Did in Adams County, Ohio," an address before the national conference of the National Popular Government League, by Judge A. Z. Blair, be printed as a Senate document.

IMPORTATION OF SISAL AND MANILA HEMP.

Mr. CHILTON, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 377), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That there be printed, with corrections, 3,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 919, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, entitled "Importation of Sisal and Manila Hemp," for the use of the Senate document room.

ST. JOHN RIVER (S. DOC. NO. 724).

Mr. CHILTON. From the Committee on Printing I report back favorably with an amendment Senate resolution 362, and I ask for its present consideration.

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

The amendment was, in line 3, after the word "Senate," to insert "with illustrations," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That 5,000 copies of the report of the international commission pertaining to the St. John River be printed for the use of the Senate, with illustrations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 8316) granting a pension to Edith Blankart Funston, widow of the late Maj. Gen. Frederick Funston; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 217) relating to the constitutionality of acts of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INVESTIGATION OF FOOD SUPPLIES.

Mr. BORAH. I introduce a joint resolution and ask that it may be read and go over until to-morrow morning.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 216) providing for the investigation into the cause of the rise in prices of foodstuffs and furnishing relief for those who are in need was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $6,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended under the direction and in the discretion of the President of the United States, as follows:

1. To make thorough and complete investigation and inquiry into and concerning the rise in prices and the causes thereof, particularly of those articles of food and clothing entering into the daily living of the people of the United States.

2. To carry out the orders of the President of the United States to investigate within the scope of his powers and to report the facts relating to any alleged violation of the antitrust laws by any corporation or individual in the production, ownership, manufacture, storage, and distribution of foodstuffs or by-products arising from or in connection with their preparation and manufacture.

3. To cause to be formulated and outlined by those who have given special time and study to the question, publicists, economists, and experts a plan for a more efficient and thorough system of marketing of food products with a view and for the purpose of bringing the producer and consumer in more immediate relation and of eliminating, in so far as practicable, those who speculate in foodstuffs and to report such plan covering the whole subject matter to Congress not later than December 10, 1917, to the end that Congress may, if practicable, asist in establishing an extended and comprehensive system of marketing upon a national scale.

4. To cause to be made by those who have given special time and study to the question a thorough study of the distribution of our population with a view, if possible, of relieving the congested centers of population and of encouraging the people to become identified with production and of aiding and assisting those who desire to do so to become landowners and cultivators of the soil, producers rather than consumers, and to report the result of such investigation and study and any plan that may be proposed to Congress not later than December 10, 1917, to the end that Congress may, if practicable, assist in such matter in the way of legislation.

5. To give prompt aid and assistance if upon investigation it shall be deemed necessary to local authorities in the matter of furnishing food and clothing for those who are now actually suffering for want of the same and to take such action generally as may be necessary to relieve any conditions of want or hunger now obtaining in any part of the country.

Mr. BORAH. I take it that the Senate does not want to dispose of the joint resolution this morning, and I ask that it may lie on the table for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will lie on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. SAULSBURY submitted an amendment to enable the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to completely report on certain portions of the improvements, as provided in the act approved August 29, 1916, and to enter into negotiations for the purchase of the existing Cape Cod Canal and the existing Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, respectively, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 20632), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that the parcel of ground north of Q Street NW., between it and Cemetery Street NW., etc., be included as a part of the connecting parkway between Potomac Park, the Zoological Park, and Rock Creek Park, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 20967), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment proposing to change the date relative to persons qualifying and being registered in the grade of colonel or lieutenant colonel, pursuant to the provisions of the act of January 21, 1903, from June 3, 1916, to February 20, 1917, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 20783), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment providing that not to exceed $10,000 be expended for the salaries of employees of the field-surveying service temporarily detailed to the General Land Office, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 20967), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Buford J. Lowman, of Hamilton, Mont., the sum of $65 in compensation for a horse lost while in the employ of the United States Forest Service, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $1,200 to pay Dennis M. Kerr for extra and expert services rendered to the Committee on Pensions during the second session of the Sixty-fourth Congress, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $500,000 for the construction, repair, and maintenance of the military post roads, bridges, and trails in Alaska intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 20783), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia submitted an amendment proposing to purchase the lands on the battle fields of the first and second Bull Run, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 20783), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $50,000 for the improvement of the San Antonio Arsenal, at San Antonio, Tex., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 20967), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $1,150,000 for aviation post, depot, necessary land, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 20783), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALSH submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $189,430 for the construction of administration buildings, a bridge across the Flathead River at Belton, Mont., and a ranger cabin and auto-checking station at Glacier Park Station, Mont., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 20967), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $115 to pay M. I. Howell for services rendered the special committee appointed under Senate resolution 543, Sixty-third Congress, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 20967), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

FEDERAL ANTITRUST DECISIONS.

Mr. CULBERSON submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound uniformly with the "Federal Antitrust Decision" printed and bound under Senate concurrent resolution No. 3, Sixty-second Congress, first session, passed August 22, 1911 (37 Stats. at L., p. 1455), 3,000 copies of a revised volume, four thereof and of such succeeding volumes as may be necessary to contain the further compilation of such decisions to June 30, 1917, to be prepared under the direction of the Department of Justice, 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR POMERENE ON WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I present to the Senate an address delivered by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] in Memorial Continental Hall, in Washington, D. C., on Washington's Birthday. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document (S. Doc. No. 725).

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

THE PREFERENTIAL BALLOT.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I ask to have corrected a Senate document which heretofore was printed on the preferential ballot prepared by Prof. Johnson, of Harvard University, and I ask that it go to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

DIRECT GOVERNMENT IN CALIFORNIA.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I have a copy of a paper presented to the National Popular Government League at the national

convention, Washington, D. C., January 5-6, 1917, delivered by Dr. John Randolph Haynes, of Los Angeles, Cal., on direct government in California, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR OWEN.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I have a copy of an address by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] relative to withdrawing from the Federal courts the power to declare acts of Congress void, which was delivered by him at the auditorium in Oklahoma City, Okla., January 27, 1917, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on February 26, 1917, approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

S. 1697. An act to declare Ollala Slough in Lincoln County, Oreg., nonnavigable;

S. 2543. An act for the relief of the State of Kentucky;

S. 5450. An act to provide for an additional judge in the State of Texas;

S. 5672. An act for the relief of sundry building and loan associations;

S. 5716. An act to establish the Mount McKinley National Park, in the Territory of Alaska;

S. 7644. An act to create a new division of the northern judicial district of Texas, and to provide for terms of court at Wichita Falls, Tex., and for a clerk for said court, and for other purposes;

S. 7796. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and convey to the Great Northern Railway Co. certain lands in the State of Montana for divisional terminal yards and other railway purposes, and for other purposes;

S. 8044. An act providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act;

S. 8079. An act to amend the first and seventh paragraphs of section 4414 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act of April 9, 1906;

S. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution giving authority to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make special regulations for the occasion of the reunion of the Confederate Veterans' Association, to be held in the District of Columbia in the year 1917, and for other purposes incident to said encampment;

S. J. Res. 205. Joint resolution authorizing the removal of the statue of Admiral Dupont in Dupont Circle, in the city of Washington, D. C., and the erection of a memorial to Admiral Dupont in place thereof; and

S. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to grant citizenship to Joseph Beech.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR PORTO RICO—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9533) to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 78), which was read:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the reenrollment of the bill (H. R. 9533) "To provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to strike out the words "and who does not own in his individual right taxable property in Porto Rico to the value of not less than $1,000," as the same appears on page 21, lines 22 and 24, in the engrossed bill of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I move the adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 8295) 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, which was on page 26, after line 14, to insert:

The name of Maberry M. Lacey, late first lieutenant Company A, and adjutant Sixty-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.

Mr. HUGHES. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives insisting upon its amendments to the bill (S. 8120) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HUGHES. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Maine, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. SMOOT conferees on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives insisting upon its amendments to the bill (S. 8296) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HUGHES. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Maine, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. SMOOT conferees on the part of the Senate.

BUREAU OF WAR-RISK INSURANCE.

Mr. SWANSON obtained the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for action upon House bill 20082. It is a bill to extend the life of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department, being Order of Business 948 on the calendar.

Mr. SMOOT. Would it not be better to go on with the consideration of the revenue bill and not take up the calendar at this time?

Mr. SIMMONS. I thought, on account of the necessity for the passage of this bill, and in view of it having been unanimously reported favorably from the Committee on Finance, there would be no debate about it at all.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. It will only take a minute to pass it, and it ought to be passed. Everyone will recognize that this bureau ought not to be allowed to die.

Mr. SMOOT. All I was thinking of was that at some time in the near future it is desired to take up the calendar and to pass a number of bills to which there is no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. But I will ask the Senator from Utah, Is there any objection to this bill? There was no objection to it in the Finance Committee.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no objection to the bill whatever that I know of.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then why not let us get it out of the way? It has to go back to the House of Representatives because of the fact that important amendments have been reported to the bill by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMOOT. The only question is this——

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator object to the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not object to the bill at all; the bill ought to pass, and it will, in my opinion, pass without a doubt.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope it will.

Mr. SMOOT. But what I was thinking of was that if we now begin to take up bills on the calendar other Senators will ask the same privilege, perhaps, as to bills in which they are interested.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ROBINSON The Senate is not in order. Senators are totally unable to hear the proceedings of the Senate.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, this is a matter of probably as much importance as any bill that is pending. It necessarily has to go back to the other House, because the Senate Finance Committee has, upon the suggestion of the Treasury Department, reported very important and essential amendments to the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I know the importance of the bill, and I shall not object to its consideration; but I shall object to the taking up by unanimous consent of any other bill on the calendar for consideration.

Mr. SIMMONS. Very well.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 20082) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

The first amendment was, at the top of page 2, to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 2. That section 7 of the act of September 2, 1914, be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That for the purpose of paying losses accruing under the provisions of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 7, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. That all moneys received from premiums and from salvage shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation made for the payment of losses and be available for the purposes thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19359) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the conference report, with a view of having a further conference, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. GRONNA. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 20632, being the naval appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] to proceed to the consideration of the bill named by him.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 20632) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments.

Mr. SWANSON. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

Mr. POMERENE. Will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. SWANSON. I will; but I desire to have the question put on the agreement for which I have asked.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, there is very great interest manifested in what is known as the Webb export bill. I realize that the naval appropriation bill has the right of way, and I do not think, under the rules of the Senate, that anything ought to interfere with appropriation bills; but I simply want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the export bill, to which I have referred, is now on the calendar, and at an opportune moment I shall ask the Senate to take it up for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask for the reading of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection, and the Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill and read to page 22, line 14.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, my attention was diverted for a moment, and I do not know just where the Secretary is reading. I want to follow the reading very closely, so I will inquire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEA of Tennessee in the chair). Page 22, line 14.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill and read to page 31, line 9.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by E. T. Taylor, jr., one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 79) providing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 26th day of February, 1917, at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEA of Tennessee in the chair) laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 79), which was read:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 26th day of February, 1917, at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20632) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill at line 9, page 31, and read to line 3, page 72.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES.

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.). The hour having arrived at which, in accordance with the concurrent resolution of the Congress of the United States, the two Houses are to assemble in joint session, the Senate will now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives to listen to an address by the President of the United States. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the order of the Senate.

Thereupon the Senate, preceded by the Sergeant at Arms and headed by the Vice President and the Secretary, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m., and the Vice President resumed the chair.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The address of the President of the United States, this day delivered to the two Houses of Congress in joint session, is as follows:

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONGRESS: I have again asked the privilege of addressing you because we are moving through critical times during which it seems to me to be my duty to keep in close touch with the Houses of Congress, so that neither counsel nor action shall run at cross purposes between us.

On the third of February I officially informed you of the sudden and unexpected action of the Imperial German Government in declaring its intention to disregard the promises it had made to this Government in April last and undertake immediate submarine operations against all commerce, whether of belligerents or of neutrals, that should seek to approach Great Britain and Ireland, the Atlantic coasts of Europe, or the harbours of the eastern Mediterranean, and to conduct those operations without regard to the established restrictions of international practice, without regard to any considerations of humanity even which might interfere with their object. That policy was forthwith put into practice. It has now been in active execution for nearly four weeks.

Its practical results are not yet fully disclosed. The commerce of other neutral nations is suffering severely, but not, perhaps, very much more severely than it was already suffering before the first of February, when the new policy of the

Imperial Government was put into operation. We have asked the cooperation of the other neutral governments to prevent these depredations, but so far none of them has thought it wise to join us in any common course of action. Our own commerce has suffered, is suffering, rather in apprehension than in fact, rather because so many of our ships are timidly keeping to their home ports than because American ships have been sunk.

Two American vessels have been sunk, the *Housatonic* and the *Lyman M. Law*. The case of the *Housatonic*, which was carrying food stuffs consigned to a London firm, was essentially like the case of the *Fry*, in which, it will be recalled, the German Government admitted its liability for damages, and the lives of the crew, as in the case of the *Fry*, were safeguarded with reasonable care. The case of the *Law*, which was carrying lemon-box staves to Palermo, disclosed a ruthlessness of method which deserves grave condemnation, but was accompanied by no circumstances which might not have been expected at any time in connection with the use of the submarine against merchantmen as the German Government has used it.

In sum, therefore, the situation we find ourselves in with regard to the actual conduct of the German submarine warfare against commerce and its effects upon our own ships and people is substantially the same that it was when I addressed you on the third of February, except for the tying up of our shipping in our own ports because of the unwillingness of our shipowners to risk their vessels at sea without insurance or adequate protection, and the very serious congestion of our commerce which has resulted, a congestion which is growing rapidly more and more serious every day. This in itself might presently accomplish, in effect, what the new German submarine orders were meant to accomplish, so far as we are concerned. We can only say, therefore, that the overt act which I have ventured to hope the German commanders would in fact avoid has not occurred.

But, while this is happily true, it must be admitted that there have been certain additional indications and expressions of purpose on the part of the German press and the German authorities which have increased rather than lessened the impression that, if our ships and our people are spared, it will be because of fortunate circumstances or because the commanders of the German submarines which they may happen to encounter exercise an unexpected discretion and restraint rather than because of the instructions under which those commanders are acting. It would be foolish to deny that the situation is fraught with the gravest possibilities and dangers. No thoughtful man can fail to see that the necessity for definite action may come at any time, if we are in fact, and not in word merely, to defend our elementary rights as a neutral nation. It would be most imprudent to be unprepared.

I cannot in such circumstances be unmindful of the fact that the expiration of the term of the present Congress is immediately at hand, by constitutional limitation; and that it would in all likelihood require an unusual length of time to assemble and organize the Congress which is to succeed it. I feel that I ought, in view of that fact, to obtain from you full and immediate assurance of the authority which I may need at any moment to exercise. No doubt I already possess that authority without special warrant of law, by the plain implication of my constitutional duties and powers; but I prefer, in the present circumstances, not to act upon general implication. I wish to feel that the authority and the power of the Congress are behind me in whatever it may become necessary for me to do. We are jointly the servants of the people and must act together and in their spirit, so far as we can divine and interpret it.

No one doubts what it is our duty to do. We must defend our commerce and the lives of our people in the midst of the present trying circumstances, with discretion but with clear and steadfast purpose. Only the method and the extent remain to be chosen, upon the occasion, if occasion should indeed arise. Since it has unhappily proved impossible to safeguard our neutral rights by diplomatic means against the unwarranted infringements they are suffering at the hands of Germany, there may be no recourse but to *armed* neutrality, which we shall know how to maintain and for which there is abundant American precedent.

It is devoutly to be hoped that it will not be necessary to put armed force anywhere into action. The American people do not desire it, and our desire is not different from theirs. I am sure that they will understand the spirit in which I am now acting, the purpose I hold nearest my heart and would wish to exhibit in everything I do. I am anxious that the people of the nations at war also should understand and not mistrust us. I hope that I need give no further proofs and assurances that I have already given throughout nearly three years of anxious patience that I am the friend of peace and mean to preserve it for America so long as I am able. I am not now proposing or contemplating war or any steps that need lead to it. I merely request that you will accord me by your own vote and definite bestowal the means and the authority to safeguard in practice the right of a great people who are at peace and who are desirous of exercising none but the rights of peace to follow the pursuits of peace in quietness and good will,—rights recognized time out of mind by all the civilized nations of the world. No course of my choosing or of theirs will lead to war. War can come only by the willful acts and aggressions of others.

You will understand why I can make no definite proposals or forecasts of action now and must ask for your supporting authority in the most general terms. The form in which action may become necessary cannot yet be foreseen. I believe that the people will be willing to trust me to act with restraint, with prudence, and in the true spirit of amity and good faith that they have themselves displayed throughout these trying months; and it is in that belief that I request that you will authorize me to supply our merchant ships with defensive arms, should that become necessary, and with the means of using them, and to employ any other instrumentalities or methods that may be necessary and adequate to protect our ships and our people in their legitimate and peaceful pursuits on the seas. I request also that you will grant me at the same time, along with the powers I ask, a sufficient credit to enable me to provide adequate means of protection where they are lacking, including adequate insurance against the present war risks.

I have spoken of our commerce and of the legitimate errands of our people on the seas, but you will not be misled as to my main thought, the thought that lies beneath these phrases and gives them dignity and weight. It is not of material interests merely that we are thinking. It is, rather, of fundamental human rights, chief of all the right of life itself. I am thinking, not only of the rights of Americans to go and come about their proper business by way of the sea, but also of something much deeper, much more fundamental than that. I am thinking of those rights of humanity without which there is no civilization. My theme is of those great principles of compassion and of protection which mankind has sought to throw about human lives, the lives of non-combatants, the lives of men who are peacefully at work keeping the industrial processes of the world quick and vital, the lives of women and children and of those who supply the labour which ministers to their sustenance. We are speaking of no selfish material rights but of rights which our hearts support and whose foundation is that righteous passion for justice upon which all law, all structures alike of family, of state, and of mankind must rest, as upon the ultimate base of our existence and our liberty. I cannot imagine any man with American principles at his heart hesitating to defend these things.

Mr. STONE subsequently said: I move that the address delivered to-day by the President of the United States to the joint session of Congress be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The Chair is informed that the address is not before the Senate.

Mr. STONE. I have moved that it be referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri moves that the address of the President delivered to-day be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JONES. I want to say that the address is not here. How can we send it to the committee when it is not in our possession.

Mr. STONE. It was delivered in a joint session, as much to the Senate as to the House. It is directed to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JONES. I have not any objection, but I can not see just how it can be referred.

Mr. STONE. My purpose is merely to give the committee some control of it, or at least to bring it to the official consideration of the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Would it not be possible for the Senator to ask that the address be printed in the RECORD and referred.

Mr. STONE. I have no objection to that; but it will be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the address of the President be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign

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

THE REVENUE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20573) to provide increased revenue to defray the expenses of the increased appropriations for the Army and Navy and the extensions of fortifications, and for other purposes.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, whenever I am tempted to protest against an administration revenue bill my courage is completely dominated by those four small words, "What is the use?" The pending bill, worse than any of its predecessors, is checked through to arrive next Wednesday night at 8 o'clock. It is to become a law not because the majority of the Members of this body favor it but because of political conditions which enable a faction of the dominant party to control the caucuses of that party. I am not questioning the power and I am not questioning the necessity of its use if bills like the pending one are to be made a part of the law of the land. But I do say that the bill is unsound in principle, unjust in its operation, and utterly fails to represent or even consider the vital interests of the Nation which it is supposed to nourish and protect.

Taxes are inevitable in civilized States and high taxes are inevitable in times like the present. Just and equal taxes are well-nigh impossible at any time, but that is no reason why in an hour of great excitement and possible danger wisdom and experience should be thrown to the winds. In a time like the present every care should be had to use the merciless power to tax in a way that will encourage and protect the source from which other and larger taxes may be demanded in the future. The leaders who are now in control of this Government entertain views upon the subject of taxation which are entirely at variance with what is now the settled and approved policy of all the civilized nations of the earth. I do not question the sincerity of these men, but I deny their right to assume that the industrial life of this Nation can be protected and sustained by excessive taxes at home and unrestricted competition from abroad. The party responsible for this bill, for the enactment of which the alarm clock has been set, has spent four full years experimenting with regulative and restrictive legislation, laws punishing illegitimate business, but never approaching the honest business man except for the purpose of taking his money away from him in taxes or baring his back to the competition of the world.

The Republican and Progressive platforms in 1912 declared in favor of a trade commission. Mr. Wilson devoted a whole chapter in his "New Freedom" to a bitter denunciation of a trade commission and all similar devices for the control of monopoly. He insisted that the regulative policy would result in giving the great corporations complete mastery over the people. He changed his mind later on and became an ardent supporter of the Trade Commission.

The Trade Commission act and the Clayton Act severely punish the American business man for competing too sharply with his neighbor, while the President's pet revenue measure, the Underwood bill, "the halfway stone on the road to real liberty," invited, and still invites, the trusts and monopolies of Europe to rob the American producer of his market and the American laborer of his wages.

It is the duty of the Trade Commission to secure the latest accurate information with regard to the needs of legitimate industry, and I find in their recent report their conclusions as to the need of protection to the American business man after the war closes. They express their views in the following emphatic language:

> In their struggle to regain their former trade, such foreign manufacturers and producers may be expected to fully utilize their highly efficient organizations for the promotion and handling of trade beyond their borders, even foregoing profit or taking a very low profit till their costs again become normal and they have reestablished their trade. Hence competition from foreign industrial combinations, aided by foreign ship lines and foreign banks and backed by foreign Governments, may be even sharper than before the war.

Mr. Wilson, himself, in his third volume of American history, said of the conditions following the War of 1812:

> Peace changed the very face of trade. English merchants poured their goods once again into the American ports so long shut against them by embargoes and war. * * * It was manifestly injurious to every young industry that a flood of English imports should continue to pour into the country at the open ports. The remedy was protective tariff, such as Mr. Hamilton had wished to see at first, and the young Republican leaders of Congress did not hesitate to advocate and establish it.

I may add that during the recent campaign in New England certainly the Democratic press and candidates insisted that the tariff question had been taken out of politics by the creation of the Tariff Commission, and that every protection would be given to prevent ruinous competition from abroad. This was four months ago. Four days would have been sufficient to prepare a bill to meet the situation if the administration had made promises which it intended to perform. Up to date, certainly, legitimate business has received nothing but ridicule and criticism, and exposure to the merciless competition of Europe and Asia will come as soon as the war closes.

There is the Webb bill somewhere, which is well named, for it will do nothing but catch the unwary. If it does no harm it will certainly do no good.

The pending bill exhausts every source of revenue but the right one, the one resorted to first by other nations. Judging from the letters and protests which I have received from my constituents, when they hear that the periscope of another revenue bill has appeared above the surface in this Chamber, they wonder what Connecticut industry is to be torpedoed next.

The pending bill taxes mutual life-insurance companies. Why not take 8 per cent of the contents of our contribution boxes? The profits of the one are the same as the profits of the other. Why not tax the profits on church, hospital, and school endowments? Their net profits are as easily ascertained as those of a thousand-dollar mutual life-insurance policy.

This act taxes incomes, however small, if invested in corporations paying more than 8 per cent. A widow whose sole property consists of 50 shares of stock in a company paying 20 per cent must pay a tax of more than 5 per cent on her income of $1,000. It is no answer to say that the 19 per cent is enough. The stock may have cost and probably did cost $4,000 or more a share, and she is getting not 19 but less than 5 per cent on her investment.

The bill cruelly discriminates against copartnerships, as has been explained many times since this discussion began. It increases the tax on inheritances, thus driving the States to a land tax if they are to meet their constantly rising obligations.

But the real vice is the 8 per cent excess tax, not because of its size but because of the sound principle it offends. When this administration started in to impose direct taxes its spokesmen asserted that its purpose was to tax accumulation, large, and very large fortunes in the hands of individuals. This excess tax is a complete abandonment of that principle. It is as likely to fall upon small incomes as large, and what is worse it falls upon the producer or creator of wealth. Instead of taxing the lust of possession and accumulation it taxes production and so tends to prevent the beginning of new enterprises and cruelly discourages the extension of existing enterprises. It is a tax condemned by every economist on earth and is never to be resorted to except when a nation is in extremis. If we had 3,000,000 men in the trenches and a national debt of $20,000,000,000 it might be justified. There is no possible excuse for it under existing conditions. If the time comes when this sort of indiscriminate confiscation is necessary to save the honor of the country, you will find my constituents ready and willing to submit to any and all means to meet the needs of the hour. But why punish them now, when all the money needed in excess of the general income taxes can be raised by customs duties, which will encourage and protect our industrial independence and national prosperity while it furnishes funds to protect our political independence? Why tax life insurance and incomes, however small, and legitimate production, wherever it succeeds in this country, rather than raise the tax on silks from France, or broadcloth from England, or silver-handled cutlery from Germany, or cassimeres and cottons from Japan? A bill could be prepared in a day that would raise $100,000,000 in customs duties upon luxuries.

The few men who framed this bill and caucused the Democratic Party into supporting it are free traders. They are able men and very excellent men, but they belong to a school of political economy that is dead and which died because no nation can sustain it and live. The war, while it lasts, will cover and cloak the vices of a tariff for revenue only, and it will smother the folly and injustice of refusing to aid legitimate business in a wise and reasonable way. But when the war ends experience will come, and with it wisdom for a time.

If the gentlemen who are responsible for this legislation think they are representing the wishes of the American people let me call their attention to some facts which completely refute any such inference.

Most presidential elections settle temporarily some of the important disputes between the great parties. The election in November last settled nothing except the fact that Mr. Wilson received more votes than Mr. Hughes. In the West the issue was anti "old guard." If Mr. Hughes had been introduced to his audiences by the right persons he would have been elected.

It is not important to inquire what the issue was in the South. It may have been anti-Republican extravagances, or anti-civil-service reform, or just the name on the ticket. The fact remains that the South elected more than 120 presidential electors, with fewer votes than were cast in the State of Illinois. Nearly 90 per cent of the taxes collected in this bill will be paid in the States that voted for Mr. Hughes. States producing more than two-thirds of the national income and representing more than two-thirds of the industrial forces of the country voted for Mr. Hughes and protection. Can anyone see in these facts any indorsement of a tariff for revenue only? Nobody disputes your right to hold the reins. I am simply calling your attention to the fact that you have received no authority from the people to drive them into the ditch of panic and hard times. Your success at the polls in November last was due to a series of flukes and irreconcilable combinations of men and circumstances, and it was utterly devoid of any approval of your legislative records. The great Democratic prophet, Mr. Henry Watterson, in his recent forecast for 1920 throws a very bright light upon the forces which carried his party to victory in 1916. Let me read it:

> We live in an age of experiment. Barnum used to say that the people of his day liked to be humbugged. Now they dote on humbug. The party that succeeds in uniting all frauds, of combining all hypocrisies, of consolidating all the pharisees, the fools, and the cranks under a single standard will carry the election in 1920. But it will not be the Republican Party.

Certainly the combination he describes will, I hope, never bring success to the Republican Party. But I want to express the firm belief that within six months after the war closes reason will be restored to the people of the United States and everybody knows what happens at the polls when the American people are sane.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Georgia in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Beckham	Hitchcock	Nelson	Shields
Borah	Hollis	Norris	Simmons
Brady	Hughes	Overman	Smith, Ga.
Brandegee	Husting	Owen	Smoot
Bryan	James	Page	Swanson
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Thomas
Clapp	Jones	Pittman	Thompson
Clark	Kern	Poindexter	Underwood
Culberson	La Follette	Pomerene	Vardaman
Cummins	Lane	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Curtis	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Warren
du Pont	Lewis	Robinson	Watson
Fall	Lodge	Saulsbury	Works
Gronna	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	
Hardwick	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry as to just what amendment is pending before the Senate? What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN] was addressing the Senate——

Mr. PENROSE. I understand the Senator from Connecticut has closed his address, and I make the inquiry for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Secretary that the question before the Senate is on the amendment reported by the committee, on page 13, in lines 24 and 25, to change the amount of "$300,000,000" to "$500,000,000."

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I did not catch the statement of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The pending amendment is, on page 13, line 24, where the Committee on Finance proposes to strike out "$300,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$500,000,000."

Mr. BORAH. What is the nature of the amendment, Mr. President?

Mr. SIMMONS. The amendment is in reference to the certificates of indebtedness.

Mr. BORAH. And it is only proposed by the committee to increase the sum from "$300,000,000" to "$500,000,000"?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee if any explanation has been given of why that increase has been proposed?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; but I shall be very glad to give it now.

Mr. PENROSE. I think the Senate ought to have some information on that point.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I will now state that, because of physical exhaustion on the first day I addressed the Senate in explanation of the pending bill, I did not finish my general statement. I had intended to embrace this and some other features of the bill in that statement, but was not able to do so at that time.

The present law authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue $200,000,000 of these certificates. It is a power which is given to him in case the revenues of the Government at any time during the fiscal year, because of inequality in the receipts from month to month, because certain taxes are not payable until late in the fiscal year, are not sufficient to cover current expenses, to relieve the Treasury by temporarily issuing short-term certificates, not to run at any time over a year, the certificates to be taken up as soon as the delayed receipts come into the Treasury. The other House provided for the increase of these certificates from $200,000,000 to $300,000,000; but that was not thought by the Senate Finance Committee to be sufficient, for this reason, that under the present law the tax imposed upon incomes and upon munition manufacturers, and by the provision of the pending bill the tax imposed upon excess profits amounting to about $500,000,000 would not be payable until the last month of that fiscal year. It is evident that under these circumstances that some time during the other 11 months there will be necessity for the issuance of a large amount of these certificates to run until the revenues from the sources above stated are collected during the last month of the year.

Of course, as soon as this money is paid in, during the month of June, the temporary deficit will be wiped out; but it may be necessary, and has heretofore been necessary very frequently in circumstances such as would be thus created, for the Secretary of the Treasury to have authority to issue short-time paper, in order to meet the situation. The purpose of the amendment made the amount of certificates sufficient to provide for the situation created by the fact that $500,000,000 of the revenues provided under the law, if this bill becomes law, will not reach the Treasury until just before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. PENROSE. I understood that was the purpose of the amendment; but my mind is still not clear as to why the Senate committee found it necessary to raise the amount from $300,000,000, as provided by the other House, to $500,000,000.

This bill as amended by the Senate committee does not raise to any material extent any more money than it did when passed by the House, as I understand, and why is it necessary for the Senate to provide for a greater amount of certificates of indebtedness than the amount authorized by the House?

Mr. SIMMONS. Simply because the Secretary of the Treasury represented to the committee, or rather to me as chairman of the committee, that the amount provided by the House was not sufficient to meet the situation as created by the additional tax payable during the last month of the fiscal year if this bill was enacted into law.

Mr. PENROSE. Was not the amount as fixed by the House so fixed on the recommendation of the Treasury Department?

Mr. SIMMONS. I can not answer that question, because I do not know.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I am impressed with the fact that millions by the fifty and the hundred are thrown around in a rather free-and-easy manner. The House bill deliberately fixed the sum of $300,000,000, but the greatest discrepancy develops when the bill comes to the Senate as to the requirements of the department. This discrepancy is occurring in every phase of the consideration of revenue measures, and it presents a most disheartening condition to those who are endeavoring to ascertain the facts and seek the truth. Estimates are made by the department; and then, almost before the ink is dry on the original estimates, supplemental estimates come in. Appropriations are made for commissions and bureaus, and acts are hardly approved by the President, before very much larger amounts are asked for and provisions for such additional appropriations are hidden away in deficiency bills and other places where they are never noticed. I only want to call the attention of Senators to the great discrepancy occurring within two weeks between the amount estimated for by the House and the amount which, in the opinion of the Senate committee, seems to be necessary.

I do not intend to discuss the matter any further. The bill is bad enough; but, as the majority is entirely responsible for a deficit, principally due to wasteful expenditures, I am entirely willing to have them assume the responsibility of providing for it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, without any reference to the action of the other House, it seems to me it must be apparent

to every Senator that, in view of the fact that $500,000,000 of this revenue can not reasonably be expected to reach the Treasury until the last month of the fiscal year, and a great part of it not until the very end of that month, any fund for the purpose of meeting that situation ought to be as large as the amount which can be withheld to the very end of the fiscal year.

Mr. PENROSE. Well, Mr. President, I do not intend to pursue the matter further; but it certainly seems to me extraordinary that, two weeks after the House deliberately decided on a certain amount as being necessary, the Senate committee discovers it necessary to increase that amount nearly 100 per cent.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I do not happen to have the bill before me; but does this proposed law contemplate that until it may be modified or repealed, year after year, these certificates can be issued?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; this bill does not place any limitation upon the issuance of these certificates, because the Treasury Department can only issue as many as may be necessary to supply a temporary deficit in the Treasury occasioned by reason of the failure of the receipts to reach the Government in time to meet the expenditures.

Mr. CLAPP. Then, under this bill—so long as this bill, if it becomes a law, remains a law—the receipts will be coming in behind the expenditures each year, to the same amount, approximately, will they?

Mr. SIMMONS. Well, from this source; yes.

Mr. CLAPP. So the more tax we attempt to raise the greater the debt we incur pending the raising of the tax. That may be finance, but with all due regard to the Senator from North Carolina—and I certainly entertain for him very high regard and respect—it does seem to me that, inasmuch as we have in hand the actual framing of the law, we ought to frame it so that one year after another—there might be an emergency just now—it will bring in the revenue in anticipation of its expenditure. The idea that for the future we shall contemplate that in each year there shall be an indefinite number of short-time certificates issued it does seem to me, Mr. President, with all due respect, indicates an unfortunate condition. It seems to me we ought to frame this law so that, at least after the first year of its operation, the revenues will come in in advance of the expenditures.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, it is very difficult to frame such a law as this differently from the manner in which it has been framed with reference to the time of making returns on incomes and the time for the payment of the tax on those incomes. Likewise, with the proposed new tax in this bill, it is based upon incomes for the calendar year, and we have to get it for the calendar year in such a way that it is difficult to make payment except at a late period in the fiscal year.

This power has existed in the Secretary of the Treasury, so far as I know, for 20 years to the extent of allowing him to issue $200,000,000 of such certificates. It existed under Republican administrations, where it was originated, and under the present Democratic administration; but the pending bill creates an additional fund that will not be available to pay the expenditures of the Government until right at the end of the fiscal year. That condition may make it necessary to issue, if any at all, a larger number of certificates than provided for under the present law. If from the funds coming in, or if from the general fund the expenditures can be met, these certificates will not be issued. There may be years in which none of these certificates will be issued, but it was felt that no harm could come to the Government by simply authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury, by way of anticipating funds that do not come into the Treasury until later, to issue these short-term notes to the amount indicated. The notes might be for only two months or three months, or, for that matter, only for one month, until the money coming in from the tax at the very end of the fiscal year has reached the Treasury.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. Has the Senator explained or does he intend to explain whether or not the House took into consideration, or, if the House did not, whether the Senate will take into consideration the extra amounts which have been added, for instance, the $160,000,000 or $170,000,000 added to the naval appropriation bill and some millions that will necessarily have to be added, on account of later estimates, to the Army appropriation bill?

Mr. SIMMONS. I will state to the Senator that the Senate committee did not consider that, because at the time we acted there was no provision of that sort in any bill. The House Committee on Naval Affairs incorporated a provision for $150,000,000 of additional appropriations for the Navy, to hurry up the naval program, but provided that that money should be raised by a bond issue; but it was stricken out, as I understand it, on the floor upon a point of order.

Mr. WARREN. I speak of those increases which, as I understand, have occurred in the Senate, to the extent of $160,000,000 or $170,000,000 on the naval appropriation bill over and above what the House included.

Mr. SIMMONS. Is the Senator speaking about the certificates of indebtedness?

Mr. WARREN. I was asking if provision had been made by the Senate committee, to meet not only the outgo of the Government under the appropriations as made in the bills passed by the House but also under the additions that are to be made in the Senate. As the Senator knows, there have been large increases in the naval bill, for instance, since it started on its way in the other House.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will state to the Senator that the only additional increase we have any knowledge of is $31,000,000. The funds provided will be sufficient for that. It is true the Naval Committee of the Senate, as I understand—although I have not examined the bill—has added to the naval appropriation bill provisions carrying $150,000,000, in addition to the amount that was estimated to be appropriated for the purpose, for speeding up the naval program. That, however, has not yet been adopted. I do not know whether or not it will be adopted by the Senate and House; but I will express to the Senator my opinion about it, and say that, if it is adopted, I think it ought to be and will be provided for by an issue of bonds.

Mr. WARREN. I was not directing my question particularly to short-time paper, but the proposition I wanted to be sure of was whether, in the issue of $500,000,000 of certificates, there is going to be sufficient to cover these extra expenditures that were not perhaps contemplated when the appropriation bills began to be considered in the other House, because there will be further additions, as there must necessarily be, in connection with the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, these certificates of indebtedness are not to cover additional expenditures. They are simply to enable the Secretary of the Treasury——

Mr. WARREN. I understand that; but the point is, in order to pay out so many million dollars we have got to get the money in some way; and what I am endeavoring to ascertain is as to whether under this bill ample provision is going to be made to meet the amounts that we are going to expend under the various appropriation bills?

Mr. SIMMONS. Outside of the $150,000,000, which I understand has been added to the naval appropriation bill; yes.

Mr. WARREN. Then that was contemplated?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; the $150,000,000 in the Navy appropriation bill was not contemplated and not included.

Mr. WARREN. And anything further that might be in addition and that might come up unexpectedly will be added to that?

Mr. SIMMONS. Excepting in the case of additional estimates made by the Treasury Department, which, I think, up to this time amount to $31,000,000. If the proposed additional appropriation of $150,000,000 for the Navy is made and bonds are issued for it, surely there can be no question as to certificates of indebtedness with reference to it.

Mr. BRADY. And, Mr. President, the thought, as I understand, of the Senator from North Carolina is that that amount will be covered by a bond issue, so that it will not be necessary to provide for that in the revenue bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was merely expressing my view about that. I do not know what action Congress will take about it. We have not yet acted upon the proposal of the Naval Committee. I simply said if we did make an additional appropriation of $150,000,000 to speed up the naval program I hoped that would be provided for by a bond issue.

Mr. BRADY. Well, it would have to be provided for either by additional revenue or by a bond issue.

Mr. SIMMONS. Undoubtedly. There is no use in appropriating money unless you are going to provide for its payment in some way or other.

Mr. BRADY. And the Senator thinks the better way to provide for it would be by a bond issue?

Mr. SIMMONS. I expressed that opinion.

Mr. BRADY. I am inclined to agree with the Senator as to that.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator one more question, and then I am done. Does he not think that one year is a rather short time for these certificates to run? Would not five years be better?

Mr. SIMMONS. There is no necessity for their running more than a year. They may run less than a year, but there is no necessity for their running more than a year, because the funds will be in the Treasury to pay them as soon as the income tax and the excess-profits tax come in in June; and the bill expressly limits their life to not exceeding a year.

Mr. PENROSE. That is just the point, Mr. President. The Senator says the funds will be in the Treasury. As to that, I have very grave doubts. The realization of funds under the act of September 8, 1916, the Senator admits, is 25 per cent below what was expected, and in my opinion the tax on manufacturers of munitions is going to be an utter failure. As I stated last summer, it will be discovered that very few of them have made any money.

I venture the prediction now—and I expect to stand here in my place in the Senate and call attention to its verification—that if this kind of legislation keeps on, when peace conditions approach in Europe there will not be a corporation in the United States paying 8 per cent; and then from where will the funds come into the Treasury?

I think these certificates had better be for 5 years, or even for 10 years, or the balance of the present administration's term, to protect the Treasury from insolvency.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, before the preparedness program was entered upon, notwithstanding we did not realize quite as much as we expected under certain levies, we still had enough money to pay the expenses of the Government and some left. Last year we levied a new tax and made an additional appropriation of $329,000,000 for preparedness. We will not get quite as much money from the new tax as we estimated—very nearly as much, only a few millions less—but still we will have more than enough money in the Treasury when the Panama bonds are sold, as we calculated there would be, and the Mexican situation financed in that way, to pay all the expenses of the Government. If this bill passes, I have not the slightest doubt that we will have enough money to pay all expenses unless we shall make an additional appropriation of $150,000,000 for preparedness purposes to speed up the naval program. If we shall appropriate that additional sum, we will have to provide additional money by bond issue or otherwise. That is all there is in it.

Mr. HARDING obtained the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, will the Senator let us have a vote on the amendment which is before the Senate before he takes the floor, unless he wants to discuss it? It is the amendment to increase the amount of certificates of indebtedness from three to five hundred million dollars.

Mr. HARDING. I have no objection, Mr. President.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have been in attendance upon a session of the Committee on Military Affairs all the morning and did not know that this bill had reached that stage. I want to reserve the right to say something upon that subject, and to offer an amendment when the bill shall come into the Senate.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The SECRETARY. The next amendment is, on page 14, line 8, where it is proposed to strike out the words "a new section" and insert the words "two new sections," so as to make the paragraph read:

That Title I of the act entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes," approved September 8, 1916, be amended by adding to Part III two new sections, as follows:

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I shall not attempt to address my remarks to the amendment which is pending. I take it that that is not a very serious matter, in so much as such few thoughts as I may venture to offer at this hour are scarcely to be taken as addressed to the Senate, because it would be very much a waste of words if I attempted such a course. I think I shall assume that in talking to the Chair and those who honor us with their presence in the galleries I may say something to the Chair and to them and thus to the country.

The chairman of the committee having the bill in charge, during the heat of controversy in our last Saturday session, made some such remark as this: That "the minority was filibustering to defeat the revenue bill, carrying $248,000,000 of taxation, $226,000,000 of which is placed by the bill upon the great, rich, and powerful corporations of this country"; and there was the challenge, impliedly at least, that the minority was seeking to defeat the revenue legislation because of this burden placed upon the great corporations.

I can not speak for anyone on the minority side except myself; but I venture to put into the RECORD, Mr. President, the acceptance of that challenge, and I for one am speaking in opposition to the pending revenue bill because of the two hundred and twenty-six millions of unfair, unjust, unreasonable, and uncalled-for class tax upon the great corporations of this land.

I know it is not very popular to rise and speak in defense of the corporations. Many a man who finds himself with a seat in Congress has contributed to his presence or his ascendency to that position by going about swatting corporations. It is about as popular in Ohio as it is in Kansas or North Dakota. Usually, the swatters come from communities which have no corporations in them. That is why they are communities instead of cities. Much of it is done by men who do not know anything about corporate endeavor, but are very eager to seize upon a popular prejudice and take whatever temporary political advantage there is therein.

I happen to be of a different mind, because I come from a city which is an industrial center, and I know what made it that. As a newspaper publisher, chronicling its progress from a little crossroad county seat trading center, back in 1870, to an important industrial city, I have seen the various steps of progress. I know what has made its advancement, and I know that without its corporate bodies it would still be the same old country crossroads county seat trading center, without very much excitement except when the circus comes to town or there is a revival meeting in the winter. But through the corporate combinations of capital—which means association and cooperation—we have developed a corporation community; and the capital represented in those corporations already pays more tax and contributes more to the public funds of that community, twice over, than the capital individually owned.

We have been making very curious progress, if you can call it that, with the irresponsible fakir in politics and the educated fakir on the Chautauqua platform and a good many newspaper fakirs faking for commercial gain. We have been making a good deal of progress in the lines of taxation. I venture to cite my own experience.

Some years ago, as a youngster without capital—about three-tenths of 1 per cent capital and 99.7 per cent hope and aspiration—I went into the newspaper business. I suppose if there had been any means in the world whereby I could have gotten out of it at any time during the first seven years I would have done so. Many a time the sheriff or the constable tried to help me out of it, and friends would not allow it, and so I was bound to continue, and by that sort of persistence and hopefulness I eventually became the owner of a county-seat newspaper, an interior newspaper, which eventually paid its way, and more.

Then, in 1909, I became a real uplifter, not a pretender or a fakir; I became a real one, and looking about me and seeing the young men engaged on our newspaper who were giving the very best of their energies to its success, I said: "It is hardly fair that these fellows should give the best part of their lives to the making of this individual property for a mere salary or wage. If they want it, I believe I will incorporate it and let them become part owners," and I did so.

Now, I want you to note the processes by which the law, State and Federal, under this modern hypocrisy about corporations, penalizes well-meant endeavors.

Nobody could fix a real value on this plant. As I intimated a few moments ago, the initial investment was $300; but in the accumulation of years, through persistency and some little good fortune, it, of course, became more valuable; and when we came to incorporate it and give the several working units in our office an opportunity to have a part in the corporate ownership, the sum of the capital stock was arbitrarily fixed, and not too high, I will say. The charter for an $80,000 corporation cost us at that time $80, a tax by the State of Ohio, since increased to $120 per year for the mere privilege of having a corporate existence; and the county taxing agent, who heretofore looked upon our little physical property which was the tangible thing that might be assessed, who heretofore was delighted to have that returned at approximately $10,000, immediately that we became a corporate body advanced that physical property to approximately $70,000. It was the same property, no change of policy of the paper, no new reason why I, as the chief owner of it, should be penalized; but my effort at uplifting was penalized by this increased valuation because of the face value of our capital stock. Then the State stepped in and required us to publish all our affairs to the world. Then the Federal Government

steps in under the recent enactment, the one of 1916, and requires us to pay a tax on our capital stock and surplus in excess of $99,000, I believe; and in passing I want to say that the Federal Government, in collecting that tax, requires a statement from our corporation that can not be made to dovetail by any political genius that ever existed with the pending revenue measure. I am going to call attention to that, however, a little bit later. So that by the mere act of becoming a corporate body we were assessed in round numbers a thousand dollars a year more than I was required to pay as the individual owner of that property; and I think, Mr. President, that is the experience of 90 per cent of the transfers of personal property to corporate ownership throughout this land.

These are the taxes that are already assessed, and now the Federal Congress comes in and proposes to assess a tax of 8 per cent on profits in excess of 8 per cent on the capital stock of the corporations of this land; and I want to voice the protest that has been uttered in every industrial center in my State. I want to put into the RECORD, Mr. President, that this tax in the first place is not necessary; that it is revolutionary; it is unfair; it is sectional in character; it is distinctly class legislation, and not designed but well inclined to discourage success; and then, in the last analysis, it is utterly impracticable to collect it along lines of just application.

Mr. President, I have not any desire to indulge in a political discussion. I would not want to address it to the genial Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] if I did. You know it takes a new Member of this body a little while to get inured to the emptiness of this Chamber when he indulges in an illuminating address, such as I am in the process of delivering. It puts me in mind of the story of Nat Goodwin's speech in a Missouri town, where they were about to have a benefit for their "busted" theatrical company. Just as everything was being completed in perfect order they heard a fire alarm sound, and when they looked out they saw the department go down the street, and somebody offered the cheering news that the opera house was burning up, but that they were saving some of the red-plush chairs, and so forth. We have the red chairs.

The Senate is a curious body, Mr. President; it is so wise that a goodly number of the contributors to the learning of the Senate will make their utterances and in a little while they are gone beyond the reach of one who might choose to make reply; therefore I am a little reluctant, I say, to indulge in the political phase of this discussion, because the esteemed Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], who has talked about the recent political campaign, is not present; but I want to make just one reference along that line.

A very genial and affable agent of the Federal Government dropped into my home city the other night to address the chamber of commerce—which, by the way, is an organization maintained very enthusiastically in my city for the promotion, very largely, of corporate organization and endeavor. Our chamber of commerce puts a feather in its cap every time it establishes a corporate industry in our community, and the community applauds every time it does such a thing. This genial agent of the Government dropped into my town to address the chamber of commerce the other night. He was talking about these new methods of taxation, and he proclaimed the necessity for them by explaining that on account of the war we were not receiving the customary amount of imports from foreign countries, and therefore were unable to have the usual amount of revenue by the collection of duties. The members of the chamber of commerce of my home town being an honest lot of fellows, and knowing one honest man in public service from their own community, I assume they thought that most of public men were inclined to tell the truth, and they accepted that balderdash. I want to say to the chairman having this bill in charge that the imports into the United States for 1916 were $571,000,000 greater than in any previous year in the history of the country; they were $574,000,000 greater than in 1912; and yet, because of the existing tariff law, the duties collected were $110,000,000 less; and I think no one will offer to dispute it when I say that with the schedule of duties existing under the last Republican tariff legislation, on the imports of 1916 we would have collected $248,000,000 more duty than was collected under the present Underwood-Simmons law.

It is this fact, Mr. President, that leads me to state that in the first place the pending legislation is not necessary, and if we had in existence such a law relating to duties on imports as I should like to support there would be no necessity for putting this unjustifiable class burden upon the great corporate industries of this land.

Mr. President, I said "corporate industries," when perhaps I ought to correct that statement. The tax, of course, applies to all corporate organizations; and I want to ask, what is there about this term, so freely bandied on the stump and the lyceum and the Chautauqua platform, that makes it an odious thing in the popular mind? I should like to correct the impression in this country that anything corporate is something inimical to the popular interests of the American Republic.

Why, Mr. President, suppose I want to undertake some little enterprise for which I have not sufficient means myself. Suppose it is a $25,000 undertaking, and I can only command $5,000; but, rather than have it fail, I ask the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS]—I will pick him because he is retiring from office, and a little corporate association can not possibly injure him—and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], and then, in order to have it entirely virtuous, I will take the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], and we all put our little savings of $5,000 each together and we have a $25,000 corporation, which furnishes us the necessary capital to undertake what we want to do. I want somebody to tell me what there is about that that taints the money, that is inimical to the public interests, that makes it proper to add twice or thrice the normal burden of taxation we should have to bear as individuals? What is there to bring upon us public suspicion and the outcry of the demagogue who would tax us, if he could, out of existence?

Why, Mr. President, I have seen this thing work out. I said a little while ago that I lived in a fairly representative industrial center in Ohio. I know very well what made it. One day early in the seventies a little, modest, German blacksmith came into that community. I do not think he had a dollar in the world; but he had genius in his head, and he had courage in his heart, and he so deported himself that he could enlist the confidence of a number of men in that community. They saw the possibilities in an invention that he had brought out, and they put their small means in this county-seat town together in a corporate body, and gathered it about their confidence in the genius and the talent and the industry of that modest little German blacksmith. That was the first industrial corporation in my community, and it was the beginning of a new city and a new existence. Instead of that man being an enemy to the commuity, when he died a few years ago—all too soon—we stopped every wheel in the city, closed every business house and bank, every activity was suspended while we paid tribute to that man who had become and was recognized as the benefactor of that city.

Out of his beginning and attending success sprang others, not all prosperous ones. As a newspaper publisher, chronicling the progress of the making of that city and trying to practice what I preached in the press, I became in a small way an investor in every corporate undertaking in that community, and I could to-day paper a small office with stock certificates which I own and for which I paid good money, which are not worth the snap of one's fingers.

That is the curious phase about it, Mr. President. Nine out of ten of these undertakings are failures but the average popular mind takes no cognizance of that, though it is ever ready to sit on guard and cry out in envy when one succeeds. I know an institution in my town that paid out more than $2,000,000 in wages to add to the golden stream of the industrial wealth of that community, and every stockholder in the organization that put out that splendid sum was assessed to pay the indebtedness of the corporation. Its failure was a miserable one, but in the some 20 years it existed it had contributed a very large part to the fortunes and the progress of that community; yet in the end some 200 stockholders lost ever dollar that they had placed therein, and paid assessments in addition. There are two sides to this story.

But my chief objection, Mr. President, to the assessment of this excess-profit tax is that it establishes class legislation and is absolutely sectional in its character. I can not emphasize this last thought without drifting to the verge of a line of discussion that I am very reluctant to take up at this moment, but I want to say to you of the majority side of this Chamber, who are sponsors for this bill, you are adding to the belief in this country that it is the righteous thing to indulge in class legislation. You are encouraging the belief that those who have ought to be plundered. I make bold to say that that is dividing American citizenship along the most dangerous lines to be found in the development of this Republic.

It is sectional in character, because it is putting the burden of this taxation on the great industrial centers of the United States; and I tell you, Mr. President, the good fortune of our agricultural centers would be unknown if it were not for the good fortunes of the industrial centers of the land.

I heard it said in the campaign, as all of you heard it said, that the Democratic Party and administration were responsible for peace and prosperity and the European war was responsible

for high prices. Mr. President, I am not going to say that the Democratic Party was not responsible for peace, though if I understand developing events—no; I will not say, Mr. President, who is responsible for peace just now; but the party that claims the sponsorship for prosperity must accept at the same time the sponsorship for high prices.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HARDING. Certainly.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio, when he questions who is responsible for peace, what he thinks would have been the situation had President Roosevelt been in the chair during the past three or four years rather than President Wilson. Does he think then we would have had peace?

Mr. HARDING. I am very glad the Senator from New Jersey asks me that question. I have an abiding conviction, Mr. President, that if Theodore Roosevelt had been President of the United States the last four years the *Lusitania* would not have been sunk. [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair admonishes the occupants of the galleries that demonstrations of applause are not permitted under the rules of the Senate, and the Sergeant at Arms will clear the galleries under the direction of the Chair if the demonstration is repeated.

Mr. HARDING. I have a striking conviction, if the Senator from New Jersey will allow me, that we would be living under the guarantee of peace to-day rather than trembling on the verge of war.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Of course that is only an opinion on the part of the Senator.

Mr. HARDING. That is all I am offering. That is all you have a right to ask.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I only ask the Senator's opinion, but I think it is the universal consensus of opinion throughout our country that had President Roosevelt been in the chair for the past four years this country would have been plunged deep into the abyss of war. And let me say——

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I am not holding a brief for the former President of the United States. I only know that he was the President of the United States during seven eventful years, and he held us honorably at peace throughout that time, and there were wars across the sea in which we might quite as reasonably have become involved as we could be with the present war in Europe. Again, if the Senator from New Jersey will allow me, I will say the former President of the United States not only kept us aloof from the war between Russia and Japan, but Theodore Roosevelt intervened and brought about an honorable peace between those great warring nations.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Be that as it may, I am not yet satisfied with the answer of the Senator from Ohio that we would have been at peace, as we are to-day. Possibly we are on the verge of war to-day, but for four years we have been at peace, and we have been blessed with prosperity unexampled.

The Senator made some remark later as to what was responsible for high prices. I can not believe it possible the Senator will insist that the war has not been largely responsible, if not entirely so, for high prices. I believe that the inordinate price of food in our country to-day is the result of the war, and it is my hope that through the passage of a bill which I introduced we may prevent a further rise in commodities which is directly the result of shipments abroad.

Mr. HARDING. The Senator from New Jersey is taking me out of the line of thought I meant to follow; but I am very glad to make reply to him. I think myself that the war in Europe is responsible for the high prices existing throughout the United States as well as——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Then, our proclamation to the people previous to the election that the war was responsible for the high prices has the authority and the acquiesence of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HARDING. Oh, I am not going to quarrel with the Senator.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I would not quarrel with him for the world.

Mr. HARDING. At the same time, Mr. President, there are a good many manifestations of high prices that are not to be traced entirely to the war. We have been having some very interesting developments about high prices and food riots in this country. I myself have the conviction that the food demonstrations in this country are not real, but are part of a propagandist movement to deter the United States from protecting its commerce on the high seas. That may be a far-fetched statement, Mr. President, but the demonstrations that we have had in the great centers of population in the East hardly could have come from natural causes.

Appropriate to my theme, since I am following this line of thought, I venture to say that if the corporations of this country were holding back food products for advanced prices, as does the American farmer—within his rights, let it be said—there would be an outcry from one end of the country to the other. I know of farmers out in Ohio so fortunate in their material affairs that they are not obliged to seek the market, and they take their grain products, their live stock—unless it is ready for the market—their garden products, and they hold them, just as anyone else would, for the most advantageous market possible, holding their supplies back from the current market. But there is plenty, nevertheless. Food is ample, if only marketed.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

Mr. HARDING. If that were done by any organized capital in this country there would be an investigation at once at the hands of the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WORKS. The Senator from Ohio seems to concede the fact that the war is the cause of the high cost of living. Does not the Senator think that to a great extent the war instead of being the cause of high prices may be an excuse for putting up prices?

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I think the Senator from California has asked a very pertinent question. Primarily the war is responsible for the high cost of living, because this unspeakable world war is carrying on a destruction the like of which no man ever contemplated before, and the destruction of wealth, foodstuffs, clothing, and life itself must inevitably involve an increase in prices. But the Senator from California is quite right. With the natural, normal, inevitable advance in prices has come a saturnalia of price advances, and every thief and every robber in the land has taken advantage of the situation. I would be very glad, let me say in passing, if the Government would reach out its arm at every opportunity and stop it.

But, Mr. President, while I have that in mind, I do not agree to the suggestion that the Federal Government should step in with enormous appropriations of money to relieve any existing situation, because in every State in the Union where there is a condition of starving the State is quite equal to meet the situation.

Mr. President, I have gotten away from my theme. I did want to say one thing more about the tendency of this proposed law to create a situation which I can best describe by saying a lack of oneness of purpose or unanimity of citizenship. I want to say it now with all the earnestness that I can command. Much as I love and believe in this great country of ours, it is a mighty serious thing to contemplate the existing lack of solidarity of citizenship and lack of national character—the Republic's lack of nationality. Just such class legislation as that in this pending measure is contributing to the lack of American nationality. It conveys the impression that those who do, those who accomplish, those who succeed, are to take up the burden of taxation and the support of the Government, and somehow or other the tendency of this legislation is to array Kansas and the Dakotas against Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New York. It has a tendency to make Louisiana, Mississippi, and the cotton States suspicious of the industrial States of the North; at least it has a tendency to make them believe that the industrial centers should bear all the burden.

I tell you, Mr. President, we are all interested alike. Recently, after the election, somebody made the statement that the victory of President Wilson in the West had divorced the country from Wall Street, New York. Mr. President, I am not a defender of Wall Street; I know precious little about Wall Street; but I want to make the statement in this Chamber now that when you divorce the great financial artery of the Republic from the great agricultural regions of the West you have got a divided Union, and the continued onward march of the American Republic is founded on the mutuality of interest of agriculture, industry, and our financial forces—Wall Street, if you choose to call it so. It is founded, at least, on the great financial resources of the country working in perfect harmony with the great agricultural resources of the country. They inevitably go together, and either would fail alone.

So I am objecting, Mr. President, to this measure, because it has a tendency to establish sectionalism in the United States. It does not for one minute contribute to the nationality that we must establish in the United States if this Republic is to continue worth while.

Mr. President, I said that this bill is objectionable because it is not practicable to justly collect the taxes. I hold in my

hand a copy of the blank on which any corporation is obliged to report to the income-tax department its capital stock for purposes of taxation under the enactment of last September. This blank contemplates a report to the taxing department of the Federal Government of the market value of any specific stock for every month in the year. It requires a report of its surplus, undivided profits, estimated earning capacity, and so forth, in order that the taxing department, requiring a tax on capital stock, is in a position to exact that which is a just return on the part of the company; I may say in passing that in contemplating this tax the Government takes cognizance of intangibles. In short, the policy is intangibles for taxation, but no intangibles for valuation or dividends.

Mr. President, out in Ohio, where, under a modern constitution, we have the initiative and the referendum, but not Bryanistic referendumitis, which has been spreading over the country, we have developed the means of fixing the value of public-utility corporations for taxing purposes, and we not only, under the law, take cognizance of intangibles, but we have a State commission which sits down and takes the sworn reports of a public-utility corporation, and from those sworn reports figures out its earning capacity and adjusts its capitalization for taxation according to earning capacity, and then requires it to pay taxes accordingly.

That is the practice of the State of Ohio; and yet this law, in conflict with the one passed last September, or in conflict with the practices adopted under the law of last September, proposes that a corporation shall not have this 8 per cent exemption on anything except capital actually paid in or the actual physical value of the property at the time it was transferred to a corporate ownership.

Mr. President, the two practices are in conflict at once on that proposition, and one or the other would be the most unfair thing ever attempted in the assessment of a tax burden.

The value of a corporation is not always the capital involved. I know of an instance where an institution of $250,000 capital could not sell a certificate for its shares at 5 cents on the dollar because its business had been unsuccessfully conducted and its assets dissipated, until one day a man with a genius for the management of that particular line of business was engaged at a large salary to come to this failing corporation and bring with him $25,000 additional capital, which was but 10 per cent of the total amount involved. The coming of that man with brains and only 10 per cent in cash put the value of the $250,000 already paid in back again to par.

The value of the capital stock, Mr. President, does not rest exactly on the sum of money paid in. There is the increment; there is the valuation of service; there is everything which goes to the making of success. Mr. President, I want to cite an instance, and I should like to do it for those on the other side of this Chamber who are always talking about taxing the man according to his ability to pay. Not many years ago somebody possessed several hundred acres of land in Montana that had heretofore been used as grazing land and was never thought to be worth anything except for grazing purposes—land that might have been put on the market at any time at $5 or $6 per acre. That somebody, with the scientific knowledge of soil productiveness and with the courage to try put out a crop of wheat, developed the grazing lands into the wheat lands of Montana, and instantly that land which was worth heretofore $5 or $6 an acre became worth $75 to $100 an acre. Where would the justice lie in taxation if you did not require the owner of that land to pay according to the valuation which was so enhanced in the development of that land as a wheat-raising country? Yet if a corporation owned the land, you would—following the inference of this bill—deny it the privilege of increasing its assets or its capital accordingly.

There is another phase of this bill that I want to allude to in passing. There is a provision in section 204 wherein you propose to exempt corporations from tax under the provisions of this law. Corporations and partnerships which are doing business, as the bill originally was drawn, in agriculture or in personal services were exempt from this tax; and the bill as amended and pending before this body proposes to exempt corporations and partnerships which are engaged in exclusively personal service. Mr. President, since when have we reached the stage in the United States when a man engaged exclusively in personal service is entitled to extraordinary consideration at the hands of the taxing authorities? I am not lacking in the deference that any man owes to one who achieves distinction in personal and professional service. It was my ambition once to make an achievement along professional lines myself. I honor the man whose development in his profession makes him a shining light and makes him able to command large fees. But that man has much less to do with the weal or woe of any community than the man who gives his personal attention and his energies to the conduct of an enterprise which involves the employment of men and adds to the activities of that community. So I want to ask the Senators on the other side of the Chamber, why do you propose to exclude from the tax the great money maker in personal activities and put the burden on the man who is a contributor to the progress and fortunes of his community through his corporate activities and the employment of men in the promotion of enterprise?

I think it is absolutely unfair. It is unjust. It is nothing but class legislation, Mr. President, and I stand here to cry out against it, not alone in the name of the great hive of industries which enliven the great Commonwealth of Ohio but in crying out against a wrong in principle. It ought not to have the sanction of the Federal Government.

Why penalize a man who has the courage to go into an enterprise that bestows its beneficence on a score or a hundred or a thousand of his fellow men and gives them an opportunity to advance and achieve? Why exclude the man under the name of personal service who would be eligible to the tax when his earning capacity brought him beyond the exemption of the income tax? Why not let the burden of taxation fall on all men alike?

I should not hesitate, Mr. President, now that we have been committed to the policy of the income tax, if the needs of the Government are such as to demand it, to increase the rate of the income tax, but I would not vote to increase it until we first voted to reduce the exemption and put the burden of sustaining government equally, according to ability to pay, on the shoulders of all men who know the advantages of government and the advantages of citizenship under that Government. I know why it is not done. It is not done, Mr. President, because it is not considered popular. It is not done because there are many voters who would come in under the exemption if it were reduced to $1,500 or $1,200, as it might well be reduced. But you put this double burden of class legislation upon the corporations because you know they have no votes; because we think of them as soulless things. They have no outcry to make. Mr. President, it may be that a corporation has no soul, but it has just as much conscience as the men who manage it, and ever must have.

I want to say that in our boast to-day of American achievement, when we point with so much pride to American development, when we plume ourselves that we have taken an advanced place among the industrial nations of the earth, when the great Executive of this country is exhorting us to ply our genius and energies in open competition with the world—I want to say, Senators, that, while I rejoice in the advancement that we have made, and I hope it will ever continue, the United States of America to-day would not be one-twentieth in the list of industrial nations if it were not for the corporations of this country, which have brought together men of small means and made possible their united endeavor and enabled them to dominate the markets at home and to go out and make successful conquests of the markets of the world.

FLOOD CONTROL.

Mr. RANSDELL (at 3 o'clock p. m.). Mr. President——

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr RANSDELL. In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 14777, which is known as the flood-control bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The Senator from Louisiana moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the flood-control bill.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I am not going to object, but I merely wish it understood that the Senator from Louisiana makes this motion with my assent. I do not think he has any right to take me from the floor. In view of the fact, however, that the Senator desires to take up this bill for consideration at this time, I will assent to the motion.

Mr. RANSDELL. I am very much obliged to the Senator; but there was a unanimous-consent agreement that at 3 o'clock——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It was agreed that the motion to take up the bill might be made at this time.

Mr. RANSDELL. It was agreed that I should move, or that at least the friends of the measure would have the right to move for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I expect to vote against taking up the bill, but the Senator from Louisiana is clearly in order to move that it be taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the motion of the Senator from Louisiana is in order under the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore made.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana moves that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of what is known as the flood-control bill.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. There are several Senators who, I think, desire to participate in the discussion of this question and who are not now present. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum, in order that Senators may be called into the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Hollis	Overman	Smoot
Beckham	Hughes	Page	Sterling
Brady	Husting	Penrose	Sutherland
Brandegee	James	Phelan	Swanson
Broussard	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Thomas
Bryan	Kirby	Poindexter	Tillman
Catron	La Follette	Pomerene	Townsend
Chamberlain	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Underwood
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Reed	Vardaman
Cummins	Lewis	Robinson	Wadsworth
Curtis	Lodge	Saulsbury	Walsh
Dillingham	McCumber	Shafroth	Warren
du Pont	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Watson
Fernald	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	Weeks
Fletcher	Myers	Simmons	Works
Gronna	Newlands	Smith, Ga.	
Harding	Norris	Smith, Mich.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] to proceed to the consideration of the bill named by him.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider 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. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I shall occupy but a few moments of the Senate's very valuable time to explain this bill. It is well understood by most of us and is a very brief measure, consisting of only nine pages, divided into three sections. The first of these sections provides for authorization of the expenditure of $45,000,000 for continuing work on the Mississippi River, under the Mississippi River Commission, which has had charge of that stream since 1879—for more than a third of a century. Not a dollar of that money is appropriated in the bill, and we are not adopting any new projects. The work has been under way for many years. We are simply providing in this measure that contracts may be entered into to the extent of $45,000,000 during the next five years, in amounts not to exceed $10,000,000 per annum, for the carrying on of the work of levee building, bank revetment, and navigation on that river in connection with the local authorities, who are required to expend for levees a sum equal to one-half of the amount expended by the National Government; in other words, if it costs $45,000,000 to complete the levees—and we estimate that it will not cost exceeding $40,000,000—but if it should eventually cost $45,000,000 the National Government is to expend $30,000,000 of that sum and the local people are to expend an additional $15,000,000. So for every $2 expended by the National Government the local people must expend $1. The work is to be carried on from Rock Island, Ill., to the Gulf of Mexico under the Mississippi River Commission. That, in brief, is what is proposed by section 1 of the bill.

Section 2 provides that contracts to the extent of $5,600,000 shall be entered into for the work of levee building and navigation on the Sacramento River in conjunction with the California Débris Commission. The total amount to be expended by the National Government for the completion of that work is $5,600,000, and the State of California is to appropriate a like sum. That will give complete protection to the great Sacramento Valley, thereby redeeming a large area, and will restore splendid navigation up to the city of Sacramento.

Section 3 of the bill provides machinery by which various and sundry places in the United States, the inhabitants of which think they are entitled to aid in safeguarding their sections from overflow, may be examined. It authorizes the War Department to examine flood-control problems throughout the United States. Not alone, however, is the War Department to participate in this work, but other departments are authorized to name representatives to assist the War Department in such investigations.

So, Mr. President, if this measure is passed, provision will be made for the completion of the levee system and improvement of the navigation of the Mississippi River from Cairo to the Gulf, so far as the navigation and levees are concerned, and from Cairo as high up as Rock Island, so far as levees are concerned.

Provision will also be made for the completion of good navigation on the Sacramento River up to the city of Sacramento and for a complete levee system on that river.

Again, let me say, machinery will be provided for the investigation of flood-control problems throughout the United States. I shall not attempt to go into details in regard to the Sacramento, for I understand the senior Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] wishes to explain that matter somewhat in detail, but I will speak more particularly about the Mississippi.

Mr. President, levee building on the Mississippi River began 199 years ago, when Bienville, the founder of New Orleans, constructed, in 1718, in front of that city, then a mere village, the first levees. It has been a constant growth ever since. Enormous sums of money have been expended on levees. To give you a slight idea of the matter, let me tell you what my own State has done since 1866. I quote from the official reports made by the Mississippi River Commission on November 26, 1915, presented in House Document No. 645, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session:

These reports show that Louisiana has expended since 1866 a total of $66,527,116. Since 1882, when the Government first began to take a little interest in our levees, Louisiana has expended over $51,308,828. During that period of time the other States of the Mississippi Valley, especially Mississippi and Arkansas, expended something over $39,000,000—nearly $40,000,000. The total amount expended by the riparian States on levee building since 1882 has been something over $91,000,000, and during that same period the National Government has expended on levees about $30,000,000. So the people themselves have expended for levee protection about $3 for every dollar spent by the National Government.

What are those levees to accomplish, and what is the necessity for them? Mr. President and Senators, those levees are to protect 16,000,000 acres of the finest lands on this continent, lands which are flooded by the accumulated waters that pour down on that valley from the rainfall of 31 of our States. Something like 40 per cent of the entire area of continental United States sheds its rainfall into the Mississippi Valley. The rainfall from a total of 1,240,000 square miles of the area of this Nation has to reach the Gulf through the enormous drainage ditch which we know as the Mississippi River. These 16,000,000 acres, if properly protected against the ravages of that river, would, beyond any question, be the richest agricultural jewel in the American crown. There is no similar area in this country of greater fertility or in which the returns of agriculture are more certain. For many years, in fact, from the very first settlements, agriculture has been an uncertain thing in that valley because of the constant overflows.

As far back as 1850 an elaborate report was made on the valley by Lieut. Ellet, and it was shown that "the processes by which the people living in the upper States were benefited were the processes by which those in the lower States would be injured."

An interesting table in regard to that subject has been prepared by the Flood Control Committee. That table, taken from official sources, shows—and I hope Senators will listen carefully to the figures—that in 1850 the lands in the upper valley States, such as Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio, the Great Plains States, where the waters fall that pour down into the Mississippi, were valued at less than $1,000,000,000. Sixty years later, in 1910, those lands had increased in value to $20,000,000,000. They had gone up over 2,000 per cent in value because of the splendid development of those regions, because the agricultural lands and all natural reservoirs had been drained. There were a great many shallow lakes and marshes, many places where water would accumulate as it fell from the clouds and be retained on those lands for a long, long time; but, as the years passed by, all these lands were drained. A notable instance is that of the flats at East St. Louis, where a few years ago there was a marsh. Those flats have been thoroughly drained, and I understand the lands formerly covered by water are now worth at least $250 per acre. That system of drainage has caused the water to flow with the greatest rapidity into the various artificial canals, creeks, and rivers and to rush on with a great volume toward the Mississippi. The great flood of 1858 showed a flow of 1,475,000 cubic feet per second at the city of Cairo. Bear in mind that at that time the lands in the valley States were worth less than a billion dollars. Follow me now down to the flood of 1912, when the lands in those States had increased in value to $20,000,000,000. In that year what did the flood records show? The records of the flood of 1912 showed a flow of 2,300,000

cubic feet per second, which was an increase in the flood waters of more than 50 per cent in 54 years. In other words, while the lands in the upper States were increasing 2,000 per cent in value the lands in the lower States were remaining practically in value where they were, and the flood waters were poured down on them with an accumulated force 50 per cent greater than was the case 54 years before. I mention that fact to try to impress upon Senators the wisdom and the fairness of the upper States helping the people of the lower States to control waters that they can not control alone and unaided.

Again, let me say that the improvements, by drainage and otherwise, above have forced the water with greater rapidity on the States below. I glory in those improvements; I congratulate the people above for what they have done, but I ask them and their representatives in all fairness to come to the relief of those of us who are below, who suffer from their actions.

Do we come to you empty-handed? No. I have shown you that since 1882 the people of the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, Missouri, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Illinois have expended for levees more than $90,000,000, while the National Government has expended about $30,000,000. This bill proposes to have the National Government complete those levees by expending $30,000,000 additional, and the local communities $15,000,000 additional.

The question naturally arises, Will that amount do the work? Will it give protection? I can only answer that every great engineer who has ever studied the problem, including every member of the Mississippi River Commission, asserts that if we will build those levees strong and high, under the specifications of the Mississippi River Commission, the valley will be thoroughly and completely protected against any flood as great as those of which we have any record. They further say that 150,000,000 cubic yards of earth will be sufficient. They know what it will cost to put in place those 150,000,000 cubic yards, and they know that it can be done for about $40,000,000. If Congress will give them the money continuously, if they know in advance that they can make contracts, if the contractors themselves are positive that they can get work for a continuous period of four or five years, the engineers are convinced that it can be done for that amount.

What would be the saving to the Government if this work should go on continuously? Gen. Goethals testified before the Senate committee that there was always a very great saving if work could be done in a continuous manner. He said that, beyond any question, the great Panama Canal never could have been completed on time and for anything like its cost if there had not been authorization from the start for carrying on the work under the continuing-contract system.

The ablest engineers in the Mississippi Valley, men like Col. Townsend and Maj. Ockerson, of the Mississippi River Commission; Gen. Perrilliat, of Louisiana; Judge Taylor, of Indiana, who for 33 years was a member of the Mississippi River Commission—in fact, all of them who have studied it—say that if Congress will allow them to do this work under a continuing-contract system they can save from 20 to 25 per cent. Suppose that normally the work would cost $40,000,000, and we can save 20 per cent, is it not readily seen that that involves a saving of $8,000,000; and, as business men, ought we not to save that amount? Beyond any question; there can be no debate on that point.

We ought to place this work under a continuing-contract system and let it be finished. It has gone on in a piecemeal way for more than a third of a century with the assistance of the Government. It has gone on for nearly 200 years by the people themselves. For the first 160-odd years the Government did not aid at all, but it has been aiding for the last third of a century. The Government is as thoroughly committed to this work as it can be committed to any project; and if we are going to do it at all—and we are doing it to some extent every year; we are making appropriations in every river and harbor bill; the Government has been aiding in this work to the extent of from $4,000,000 to $6,000,000 a year for several years—if we are going to do it at all, why not do it right? It will never be done right until we place it on a continuing-contract basis, until some such big, far-reaching, comprehensive measure as this is passed.

Senators, let me remind you that there is a great flood problem of as large merit relatively in the far West on the Sacramento River, as will be explained to you in a little while. Let me remind you also that there are flood problems on several rivers of this Nation which ought to be looked into, for which we ought to legislate, and this bill creates the machinery and provides the methods by which that can be done.

I wish to call attention very briefly to the great danger in the Mississippi Valley from the enormous floods which pour down the river. In 1912 twenty-odd people were drowned near the city of Greenville. The levees have constantly been built higher and higher. It is thought by the engineers that we have about reached the limit as to height. The waters are now confined in the natural channels—that is, natural and artificial, caused by the levees—and if we can make those levees strong enough they will hold any water that will come against them. Those levees are very high in places, and if a crevasse should occur in front of one of the towns of that valley—such, for instance, as Arkansas City, Greenville, Lake Providence, St. Joseph, Plaquemine, or the great city of New Orleans, all of which are on the banks of the river—there might be a very great loss of life. It should not be forgotten that in some of the big floods in China tens of thousands of human souls were drowned.

I hope Senators in considering this measure will bear those facts in mind. I hope you will consider that if this measure be not passed now we are taking great risks; we are possibly endangering the lives of a very large number of people. Whenever we have great overflows, such as those of 1912 and 1916, people are lost, vast amounts of property are destroyed, the damages run into many millions in a property way; and why should we, I repeat, run the risk of a thing of this kind continuing?

Oh, Senators, I hope that nothing of the kind will be done. This bill passed the House by an enormous majority about 10 months ago. There was very little objection to it; and I hope that you are going to pass it this evening before we adjourn.

Mr. WORKS obtained the floor.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator permit me to offer an amendment to the bill (H. R. 14777) and ask that it be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. WORKS. I have no objection to the Senator offering an amendment if he is not going to take it up now.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Oh, no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the amendment will lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

Add an additional section as follows:

"SEC. —. That a commission, to be known as the Waterways Commission, consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and three additional members to be appointed by the President of the United States from the active or retired list of the Engineer Corps of the Army, or other Government services, or from civil life, one of whom shall be designated by the President as chairman, is hereby created and authorized, under such rules and regulations as it may adopt, to bring into coordination and cooperation the engineering, scientific, and constructive services, bureaus, boards, and commissions of the several governmental departments of the United States and commissions created by Congress that relate to study, development, or control of waterways and water resources and subjects related thereto, or to the development and regulation of interstate and foreign commerce, with a view to uniting such services in investigating, with respect to all watersheds in the United States, questions relating to the development, improvement, regulation, and control of navigation as a part of interstate and foreign commerce, including therein the related questions of irrigation, drainage, forestry, arid and swamp land reclamation, clarification of streams, regulation of flow, control of floods, utilization of water power, prevention of soil erosion and waste, storage and conservation of water for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and domestic uses, cooperation of railways and waterways, and promotion of terminal and transfer facilities, to secure the necessary data, and to formulate and report to Congress, as early as practicable, a comprehensive plan or plans for the development of waterways and the water resources of the United States for the purposes of navigation and for every useful purpose, and recommendations for the modification or discontinuance of any project herein or heretofore adopted. Any member appointed from the retired list shall receive the same pay and allowances as he would if on the active list, and not more than one member may be selected from civil life, and his compensation shall be $5,000 per annum.

"In all matters done or to be done under this act relating to any of the subjects, investigations, or questions to be considered hereunder, and in formulating plans, and in the preparation of a report or reports, as herein provided, consideration shall be given to all matters which are to be undertaken, either independently by the United States or by cooperation between the United States and the several States, political subdivisions thereof, municipalities, communities, corporations, and individuals within the jurisdiction, powers, and rights of each, respectively, and with a view to assigning to the United States such portion of such development, promotion, regulation, and control as may be undertaken by the United States, and to the States, political subdivisions thereof, municipalities, communities, corporations, and individuals such portion as belongs to their respective jurisdictions, rights, and interests.

"The commission is authorized to employ or retain and fix the compensation for the services of such engineers, transportation experts, experts in water development and utilization, and constructors of eminence as it may deem necessary to make such investigations and to carry out the purposes of this section. And in order to defray the expenses made necessary by the provisions of this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may hereafter determine, and the sum of $100,000 is hereby appropriated, available until expended, to be paid out upon warrants drawn on the Secretary of the Treasury by the chairman of said commission.

"The commission shall have power to make every expenditure requisite for and incident to its authorized work, and to employ in the District of Columbia and in the field such clerical, legal, engineering, artistic, and expert services as it may deem advisable, including the payment of per diem in lieu of subsistence for employees engaged in field work or traveling on official business, rent of offices in the District of Columbia and in the field, and the purchase of books, maps, and office equipment.

"Nothing herein contained shall be construed to delay, prevent, or interfere with the completion of any survey, investigation, project, or work heretofore adopted or authorized upon or for the improvement of any of the rivers or harbors of the United States or by this act."

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I desire to say just a few words in explanation of the necessity for the appropriation for the Sacramento River. My colleague [Mr. PHELAN], who is probably more familiar with the situation than I am, as he comes from that part of the State, may desire to go more into the details.

The Sacramento proposition presents a somewhat different one from the ordinary appropriations for this purpose. It involves a moral responsibility on the part of the Government to restore navigation on that stream. In the early days of mining in California there was a great deal of hydraulic mining carried on upon the upper reaches of the Sacramento River, permitted by the Government upon public lands, against the protests of the people of California, and in opposition to the most expensive litigation in order to prevent it. The result of it was that the upper reaches of the river were filled up, in some places as much as 4 feet, practically destroying the navigation of the river for a large part of the way above Sacramento. Finally a decision was secured from the United States Circuit Court at San Francisco enjoining mining of that kind, which was practically destroying the navigation of the stream. Following that the people of California endeavored in every possible way to induce the Government to take some steps not only to prevent further action of that kind, that was affecting the navigation of the stream, but to restore the navigable quality of the stream by the expenditure of money for that purpose. That was carried on until March 1, 1893, when an act was passed by Congress establishing what has been known since as the California Débris Commission. The statute provides for two things—first, that the commission should devise means by which the stream might be restored to its navigable quality, and to take steps necessary to prevent the carrying on of mining projects that had been injuring the navigation of the stream for years past.

That commission was appointed immediately after the passage of the statute. It made its first report June 30, 1907, which was a partial report. It made a second report on the 10th day of August, 1910. Congress adopted that report and appropriated $400,000, a like amount to be appropriated by California, to carry on the work of improving the navigability of the stream. That report recommended an equal amount to be paid by the Government and by the State of California. The expenditures necessary to be made were estimated at $33,000,000. That report was not satisfactory to Congress, and the appropriation was not made. Another and fuller investigation was made by this same débris commission, which was composed of Army engineers exclusively, and they made their final report on the subject June 17, 1913, and it is upon that report that this appropriation is founded.

It has been said by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] that California was required to put up dollar for dollar with the National Government to pay the expenses of this improvement. On the contrary, Mr. President, the State of California is compelled to put up something over $6 to $1 put up by the Government. To be exact, the Government pays $5,858,504 and the State pays $27,941,496. The Débris Commission undertook to determine, in the first place, what the total cost of these improvements would be, in conjunction and cooperation with the State authorities, by which not only the navigability of the stream might be restored, but the thousands of acres of overflowed lands might be reclaimed. It was estimated by the commission that the cost, exclusively of restoring navigation, would amount to $11,717,008. That, mind you, had no reference whatever to the amount necessary to be expended for the reclamation of the land; and it was recommended that the Government pay one-half of this amount—$5,858,504—and that the State of California should pay the balance of that amount for the exclusive purpose of restoring navigation.

The report was adopted by the House and this appropriation followed, making the total amount that is necessary to be paid for the purpose of reclaiming the land, as well as the total amount as found by the commission—it is itemized here, and I will introduce it as a part of my remarks directly—$33,000,000. Of that amount the Government, as I have stated, is only required to pay $5,800,000; so that in this particular instance, instead of the Government paying one-half of the amount that is necessary to do the improvement work, it pays nearer one-seventh of the amount, and the State of California and the people who own the lands pay the balance.

In order to meet the expenditure on the part of the people of California the legislature of that State passed an act establishing what is called a reclamation district, providing for the assessment of the land that was to be benefited by the making of this improvement. It included the appointment of a reclamation board, that had control under that statute of the work of making these assessments and raising the amount of money that was necessary to pay that portion of the expenses that devolved upon the State of California. That law has gone into effect. The reclamation district has been established. Assessments have been made already for the purpose of meeting these expenses, and the Government has paid $400,000 up to the present time and the State of California and its people have paid $1,900,000 in furtherance of the work that is already in progress.

I am not going to undertake to point out to the Senate the enormous benefits that will result in restoring the navigation of the stream, in reclaiming these thousands of acres of land that are submerged almost yearly during the rainy season. For the purpose of bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate I shall only ask to include in the remarks I am making—and I am trying to make them as brief as I can—a report that was made in the House, which sets out specifically the facts with respect to the appropriation and its necessities, taking only parts of that report showing what I think, if Senators had the time to read it, are the necessity, the propriety, and the justice of making this appropriation.

As I said in the beginning, the Government owes it to the people of California on account of the fact that it allowed a large part of its greatest stream to be practically destroyed as a navigable stream by permitting Government lands to be so used as to fill the stream with débris and silt that practically destroyed the navigation of the stream for a long distance. This report of the committee will show, among other things, the amount of money that has been appropriated by the State of California, the shipping that is done on the river that I shall not take up the time to discuss at the present time, and various other things, showing the advantages not only to the people of California but to the Government of making this appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from California will be granted.

Mr. WORKS. And with this very brief statement of the facts as I understand them I shall ask also to introduce as a part of my remarks these tables to which I have referred, and the statute bearing upon this question, which will show the purposes of the débris commission that was appointed under that act, and the work which has been done since that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from California will be granted. The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

An act to create the California Débris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California.

SECTION 1. *Be it enacted, etc.*, That a commission is hereby created, to be known as the California Débris Commission, consisting of three members.

The President of the United States shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint the commission from officers of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. Vacancies occurring therein shall be filled in like manner.

It shall have the authority, and exercise the powers hereinafter set forth, under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers and direction of the Secretary of War.

SEC. 2. That said commission shall organize within 30 days after its appointment by the selection of such officers as may be required in the performance of its duties, the same to be selected from the members thereof.

The members of said commission shall receive no greater compensation than is now allowed by law to each, respectively, as an officer of said Corps of Engineers.

It shall also adopt rules and regulations, not inconsistent with law, to govern its deliberations and prescribe the method of procedure under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. That the jurisdiction of said commission, in so far as the same affects mining carried on by the hydraulic process, shall extend to all such mining in the territory drained by the Sacramento and San Joaquin River systems in the State of California.

Hydraulic mining, as defined in section 8 hereof, directly or indirectly injuring the navigability of said river systems carried on in said territory other than as permitted under the provisions of this act is hereby prohibited and declared unlawful.

SEC. 4. That it shall be the duty of said commission to mature and adopt such plan or plans for examination and surveys already made and from such additional examinations and surveys as it may deem necessary as will improve the navigability of all the rivers comprising said systems, deepen their channels, and protect their banks.

Such plan or plans shall be matured with a view of making the same effective against the encroachment of and damage from débris resulting from mining operations, natural erosion, or other causes, with a view of restoring, as near as practicable and the necessities of commerce and navigation demand, the navigability of said rivers to the condition

existing in 1860, and permitting mining by the hydraulic process, as the term is understood in said State, to be carried on, provided the same can be accomplished without injury to the navigability of said rivers or the lands adjacent thereto.

SEC. 5. That it shall further examine, survey, and determine the utility and practicability, for the purposes hereinafter indicated, of storage sites in the tributaries of said rivers and in the respective branches of said tributaries, or in the plains, basins, sloughs, and tule and swamp lands adjacent to or along the course of said rivers, for the storage of débris or water or as settling reservoirs, with the object of using the same by either or all of these methods to aid in the improvement and protection of said navigable rivers by preventing deposits therein of débris resulting from mining operations, natural erosion, or other causes, or for affording relief thereto in flood time and providing sufficient water to maintain scouring force therein in the summer season; and in connection therewith to investigate such hydraulic and other mines as are now or may have been worked by methods intended to restrain the débris and material moved in operating such mines by impounding dams, settling reservoirs, or otherwise, and in general to make such study of and researches in the hydraulic mining industry as science, experience, and engineering skill may suggest as practicable and useful in devising a method or methods whereby such mining may be carried on as aforesaid.

SEC. 6. That the said commission shall from time to time note the conditions of the navigable channels of said river systems, by cross-section surveys or otherwise, in order to ascertain the effect therein of such hydraulic mining operations as may be permitted by its orders and such as is caused by erosion, natural or otherwise.

SEC. 7. That said commission shall submit to the Chief of Engineers, for the information of the Secretary of War, on or before the 15th day of November of each year, a report of its labors and transactions, with plans for the construction, completion, and preservation of the public works outlined in this act, together with estimates of the cost thereof, stating what amounts can be profitably expended thereon each year.

The Secretary of War shall thereupon submit same to Congress on or before the meeting thereof.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 17. That at no time shall any more débris be permitted to be washed away from any hydraulic mine or mines situated on the tributaries of said rivers and the respective branches of each, worked under the provisions of this act, than can be impounded within the restraining works erected.

SEC. 24. That for the purpose of securing harmony of action and economy in expenditures in the work to be done by the United States and the State of California, respectively, the former in its plans for the improvement and protection of the navigable streams and to prevent the depositing of mining débris or other materials within the same, and the latter in its plans authorized by law for the reclamation, drainage, and protection of its lands, or relating to the working of hydraulic mines, the said commission is empowered to consult thereon with a commission of engineers of said State, if authorized by said State for said purpose, the result of such conference to be reported to the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, and if by him approved shall be followed by said commission.

SEC. 25. That said commission, in order that such material as is now or may hereafter be lodged in the tributaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin River systems resulting from mining operations, natural erosion, or other causes, shall be prevented from injuring the said navigable rivers or such of the tributaries of either as may be navigable and the land adjacent thereto, is hereby directed and empowered, when appropriations are made therefor by law, or sufficient money is deposited for that purpose in said débris fund, to build at such points above the head of navigation in said rivers and on the main tributaries thereof, or branches of such tributaries, or at any place adjacent to the same which, in the judgment of said commission, will effect said object (the same to be of such material as will insure safety and permanency), such restraining or impounding dams and settling reservoirs, with such canals, locks, or other works adapted and required to complete same.

The recommendations contained in (1) Executive Document No. 267, Fifty-first Congress, second session, and Executive Document No. 98, Forty-seventh Congress, first session, as far as they refer to impounding dams or other restraining works, are hereby adopted, and the same are directed to be made the basis of operations.

The sum of $15,000 is hereby appropriated, from moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available, to defray the expenses of said commission.

—

The estimate for the work in which the commission recommends that the United States should participate on a 50 per cent basis is as follows:

(a) Enlargement of river channel below mouth of Cache Slough		$9,075,420
(b) Weirs		1,617,560
(c) Rectification and enlargement of river channels		191,375
		10,884,355
Add 15 per cent for contingencies and administration		1,632,653
		12,517,008
Less amount appropriated by the United States and the State of California under existing project		800,000
		11,717,008
Share each of United States and State of California		5,858,504
Estimates of total costs in report of 1910.		
Levees:		
58,000,000 cubic yards, at 6 cents	$3,480,000	
28,000,000 cubic yards, at 12 cents	3,360,000	
18,000,000 cubic yards, at 20 cents	3,600,000	
		$10,440,000
Excavation:		
148,600,000 cubic yards, at 6½ cents	9,659,000	
8,250,000 cubic yards, at 12½ cents	1,031,250	
380,000 cubic yards, at 25 cents	95,000	
		10,785,250
Land:		
4,400 acres, at $200	880,000	
8,400 acres, at $75	630,000	
78,000 acres, at $25	1,950,000	
		3,460,000
Spillways:		
8,000 feet, at $125	$1,000,000	
4,500 feet, at $100	450,000	
1,140 feet, at $80	91,200	
		$1,541,200
Bridges		1,382,000
Miscellaneous		1,740,000
Engineering and contingencies, 15 per cent		4,451,550
Total		33,800,000
Less amount appropriated under existing project		800,000
Total		33,000,000
To be paid by the Government		5,858,504
To be paid by the State		27,941,496

—

[H. Doc. 81, 62d Cong., 1st sess.—Flood control.]

APPENDIX A.

REPORT OF CALIFORNIA DÉBRIS COMMISSION WITH REGARD TO AFFORDING RELIEF FROM FLOODS IN THE SACRAMENTO VALLEY AND THE ADJACENT SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY, CAL.

1. The principal duties of the commission as prescribed by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, which created the California Débris Commission, are:

"(a) To regulate hydraulic mining so as to permit the resumption of that industry so far as is compatible with the protection and restoration of the navigability of the Sacramento, Feather, and San Joaquin Rivers, and the prevention of damage from overflow.

"(b) To improve the navigability of all the rivers of this system, deepen their channels, and protect their banks, with a view of restoring as near as practicable and the necessities of commerce and navigation demand the navigation of said rivers to the conditions existing in 1860.

"(c) To afford relief in flood time and to provide sufficient water to maintain scouring force in summer season."

2. The first of these objects has been accomplished.

3. The commission, in a special report dated June 30, 1907, submitted a project for the continuance of the control of débris in the tributaries of the Sacramento River.

4. The commission now desires to submit a project for the control of the floods in the Sacramento River.

5. The interests of navigation, débris control, and flood control in the case of this river are so inseparably connected that it is thought that they should be considered under one general project, thus utilizing to the fullest extent and for the common good any work done under projects for improvement of navigation, control of débris, or the control of the floods.

6. The United States is interested in the improvement and maintenance of the present navigable channel; it is interested jointly with the State of California in the control of mining débris; but to date it has given no attention to the flood problem.

CONCLUSIONS.

114. The project here submitted differs much from the commonly accepted solution, but this commission is satisfied that it more nearly meets the requirements of the case than any heretofore considered. In a consideration of this project attention is invited to its small estimated cost and short time of completion; also to the fact that the floods are controlled immediately and completely upon its completion.

115. The results to the State of California in permitting reclamation and preventing damage to reclaimed lands are great, but the United States also gains in keeping the present channels uninjured. It is the opinion of the commission that both should therefore share in the construction of the works under this project—the United States to the extent of 33⅓ per cent. It is also the opinion of the commission that the State of California will benefit to such an extent by the control of the floods of the river that upon the completion of this project it should take over and maintain all flood-control works, the United States to provide only for the maintenance of the navigable channels. This seems an equitable distribution both of the first cost and the maintenance.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

116. It is therefore recommended:

First. That the United States begin at once the work for the control of the floods of the Sacramento River in accordance with the above project and provide for its early completion.

Second. That the United States contribute one-third of the cost of work and the State of California contribute the remaining two-thirds.

Third. That upon its completion the United States turn over to the State of California for maintenance all flood-control works.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN BIDDLE,
Lieutenant Colonel, Corps of Engineers.
THOS. H. JACKSON,
Captain, Corps of Engineers.
CHAS. T. LEEDS,
First Lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.

The CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY.

—

[Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives—Doc. 5, 63d Cong., 1st sess.]

WAR DEPARTMENT,
BOARD OF ENGINEERS FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1913.

From: The senior member Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors
To: The Chief of Engineers, United States Army, Washington, D. C.
Subject: Sacramento River, Cal.

1. This report is submitted in compliance with the following resolution:

"*Resolved by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, United States,* That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors created under section 3 of the river and harbor act approved June 13, 1902, be, and it is hereby, requested to examine and review its report of December 27, 1910, upon the navigation and flood control of the Sacramento and San Joaquin River systems, California, printed in House Document No. 81, Sixty-second Congress, first session, and to report its subsequent information and conclusions thereon."

* * * * * * *

In view of the present situation, the commission is of the opinion that the following conclusions may be properly drawn:

"(1) That the land should and will stand a larger share in the total cost of the project than was originally proposed.

"(2) That private capital may be depended upon to carry out certain elements of the project under a general supervision only as to the location and capacity of the river and overflow channels to be provided.

"(3) That the rate at which reclamation has proceeded in the last three years and the fact that such reclamation work is being designed and laid out to conform to the flood heights and general lines of the plan proposed by the commission renders extremely urgent the work of increasing the channel capacity of the Sacramento River below the mouth of Cache Slough."

5. The commission's original recommendations were as follows:

"First. That the United States begin at once the work for the control of the floods of the Sacramento River in accordance with the above project and provide for its early completion.

"Second. That the United States contribute one-third of the cost of work and the State of California contribute the remaining two-thirds.

"Third. That upon its completion the United States turn over to the State of California for maintenance all flood-control works."

6. The commission now recommends:

"First. That the United States begin at once the work for the control of floods, removal of débris, and improvement of navigation in the Sacramento River in accordance with the commission's report submitted August 10, 1910, and printed in House Document No. 81, Sixty-second Congress, first session, in so far as the same provides for the rectification and enlargement of river channels and the construction of weirs, and provide for the early completion of these features of the plan.

"Second. That the United States contribute one-half of the cost of the work indicated in the first recommendation and the State of California contribute a like amount.

"Third. That all land required for the work indicated be turned over free of cost to the United States.

"Fourth. That upon its completion the United States turn over to the State of California for maintenance all flood-control works."

7. The estimate for the work in which the commission recommends that the United States should participate on a 50 per cent basis is as follows:

(a) Enlargement of river channel below mouth of Cache Slough	$9,075,420
(b) Weirs	1,617,560
(c) Rectification and enlargement of river channels	191,375
	10,884,355
Add 15 per cent for contingencies and administration	1,632,653
	12,517,008
Less amount appropriated by the United States and the State of California under existing project	800,000
	11,717,008
Share each of United States and State of California	5,858,504

8. As the commission originally recommended an expenditure by the United States of $11,000,000, it will be noted that the division of cost now proposed reduces the amount to be appropriated by the United States by about $5,000,000. No estimate for maintenance is given, as all of the works covered by the estimate are flood-control works and as such are to be maintained by the State of California after their completion.

* * * * * * *

The BOARD OF ENGINEERS FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS,
United States Army.

GENTLEMEN: The flood-control committee of California that has for several years been cooperating with the California Débris Commission and with the State engineering department in the interests of navigation and reclamation in that State, respectfully submits the following suggestions and requests for your consideration:

In early years hydraulic mining precipitated vast quantities of débris into the Sacramento River and its tributaries, greatly impairing navigation in the main river and entirely filling the Feather River so that navigation became impossible.

The filling of the channels also increased the difficulty of controlling the floods and in protecting adjacent lands from overflow.

In 1893 the Federal Government recognized some obligation on its part to restore the stream to the condition that existed before the havoc was done by the mining interests, which operated under the laws of the United States.

In that year Congress passed an act known as the Caminetti Act creating the California Débris Commission, and declaring a purpose of dealing with the subject.

Appropriations were made from time to time for this object, and the State usually contributed an equal amount.

In 1907, pursuant to the directions of the Caminetti Act, the California Débris Commission made a partial report, recommending the execution of part of the plan under its jurisdiction.

Congress and the State each appropriated $400,000 for this purpose, which sum has been used in part to construct two large dredgers which have been completed and are ready to begin actual excavation at the mouth of the river.

* * * * * * *

The California Débris Commission kindly assumed the burden of separating, as far as possible, the portions of the plan which related to reclamation and which did not relate directly to navigation, although it has always been understood that a complete separation of these elements is impossible.

The purchase of rights of way for channel enlargement and rectification by the drainage district, created by the act of 1913, clearly affects and assists navigation, and this burden is cast upon the district; there is no logical way to separate the two elements.

Channel enlargement, in the interests of navigation, also has a resultant influence on the flow of the streams, and of course benefits reclamation to some degree.

A supplemental report has been submitted to you by the California Débris Commission, embodying its conclusions, and rearranging the estimates upon a basis considered by it to be fair to the United States.

The estimate of cost by the report of 1910 was $33,000,000, one-third of which, or $11,000,000, was apportioned to the United States. The supplemental report segregates all except $12,517,000, from which is deducted $800,000 already appropriated, leaving $11,717,000 to be borne by the State and Federal Government, or $5,858,000 each. This leaves over $20,000,000 of the original estimates to be provided by taxing the land of private concerns which would be benefited by the work.

A considerable portion of these estimates have already been paid by the reclamation of large tracts at private expense, under the direction of the State reclamation board, which is in turn guided by the débris commission.

—

[Supplemental report of House committee on pending bill (Rept. No. 616).]

A BUSINESS INVESTMENT FOR THE UNITED STATES—WHAT WILL BE ACCOMPLISHED BY IMPROVEMENT.

In the following statement of the results which will be accomplished by the completion of the project will be found sufficient justification for the Nation to regard it as a good business investment on its part.

40. It is the only plan through which flood control of the Sacramento River can be secured; and only through that flood control can the following results be obtained:

41. (a) Restoration and maintenance of the navigability of the Sacramento River, injured through hydraulic mining. Ocean freighters drawing 13 feet used to deliver cargoes at Sacramento city, 125 miles from the sea, at all seasons of the year. Light-draft craft formerly carried freight and passengers all the year round to Red Bluff, 323 miles from the sea.

42. (b) Protection of the San Joaquin River, which has a common delta with the Sacramento, and which is affected by floods of the Sacramento as far as the city of Stockton, 45 miles from the river's mouth.

43. (c) Transportation for passengers and freight from the lower stretches of the two rivers, which because of the physical conditions are not accessible to railroads.

44. (d) Maintenance of low freight rates for the products of the two valleys. Ninety per cent of all freight between Sacramento and San Francisco and between Stockton and San Francisco is carried by river boat, at about one-third the expense of rail transportation. Improvement of river conditions above Sacramento city would tend to induce similar conditions in the upper valley.

45. (e) Maintenance of an inland waterway system of which the two navigable rivers must be necessarily the main arteries. Upon such a waterway system depends in large measure future development of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys and the commerce of the State, since without cheap water freights to tidewater products of the valleys can not secure profitable access to the markets of the world. The history of inland waterways in Europe will make this point very clear.

46. These two valleys, comprising about 10,000,000 acres, will grow to advantage any product called for by the necessities or desires of the Nation. Properly developed and under intensive cultivation the year round they could furnish a large portion of the supplies demanded by the country in time of stress. They would become under such conditions a national economic asset which might be invaluable and which, it would seem, Congress at this time can not afford to ignore.

47. (f) Safety from disastrous floods for a million and a quarter acres of rich alluvial lands. The annual crop on so much thereof as is now reclaimed, or partly reclaimed, is valued at $30,000,000. Included in the district are the cities of Sacramento and Stockton, with population of 120,000 and property assessment of over $100,000,000.

48. (g) Creation of permanent wealth in lands now subject to overflow and which can not be reclaimed or used for any purpose in the absence of flood control of the Sacramento. If these lands were reclaimed and under intensive cultivation under protection of the completed flood-control project, the present value of the annual crop in the river districts would be easily doubled. (Secs. 188 to 215.)

EARLY NAVIGATION ON THE SACRAMENTO.

61. In the early pioneer days the Sacramento River was a perfectly clear stream with pebbly bottom. From 1850 to perhaps 1865 it was navigable at all seasons of the year for seagoing craft drawing from 9 to 13 feet of water up as far as Sacramento and, for the earlier part of the period named, some little distance beyond Sacramento. Indeed, most of the steamers which plied on the river in those days had to be seagoing craft, for they made their way to California from east Atlantic ports around Cape Horn or through the Straits of Magellan. Tidal influence was felt in 1849 at the mouth of the Feather River and at Sacramento was fully 2 feet. The records on these points are conclusive and interesting.

62. In the transcript of the hearing, held in California July 23, 1915, before the Rivers and Harbors Committee, appears, at page 15, the following statement made by A. E. Anderson, president of the California Transportation Co., which for many years has operated steamboats on the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers:

"Prior to the time when the river was damaged by hydraulic mining and up to 1865 seagoing ships drawing from 9½ to 13 feet made regular trips to Sacramento at all seasons of the year—spring, summer, autumn, and winter. One steamboat, the *Senator*, drew 13 feet of water."

The steamer *Senator* referred to by Mr. Anderson was a boat of 755 tons, built to run from New York to Portland, Me. She came to California, reaching Sacramento November 6, 1849, and thereafter plied regularly for many years between Sacramento and San Francisco. The *New World*, a very much larger boat, which was placed on the river many years afterwards to run between the same points, was built to run out of New York to Atlantic ports, and, like the *Senator* and other steamers, came to California by sea. (Judge Sawyer's decision, Exhibit A.)

63. Seagoing craft went up the Sacramento beyond Sacramento city and 30 miles up the Feather River to Marysville. In 1849 the steamer *Linda* came to California around Cape Horn, went up the Sacramento and Feather, and beyond Marysville up the Yuba 4 miles. The township within which she landed still bears the name Linda.

64. During the fifties several lines of steamers were regularly running to Marysville. The Sacramento Bee on February 16, 1862, recorded the fact that the *Defiance*, drawing 2 feet, had gone up the Feather 30 miles above Marysville to Oroville.

65. In "The History of Sacramento County," by Winfield J. Davis, published in 1880, from pages 60 to 66, are interesting details as to early navigation, from which the following facts are briefed:

66. The Alta California (a San Francisco newspaper) in its issue of January 4, 1850, refers to the bark *Whiton* (which arrived at Sacramento May 4, 1849, with cargo from the Atlantic) as a comparatively small craft. She drew 8 feet. The first big steamboat to be seen at Sacramento was the steam propeller *McKim*, which reached there from New Orleans in September, 1849, and thereafter made regular trips on the river. Her passengers paid in fares on her first river trip $16,000, the fare being $30 apiece. The steamer *Senator's* first trip to Sacramento is mentioned.

67. The Alta California of August 31, 1849, published a list of 45 vessels plying up the rivers Sacramento and San Joaquin, the sizes of which are not given, but most, if not all, of which must have come by sea from east Atlantic ports.

68. One day in 1850 a list of steam and sailing vessels at the wharves of Sacramento numbered 65.

69. A list of 25 steamers, large and small, is given which regularly ran in and out of Sacramento in 1853, the *Senator* being the largest. The total value of the steamers was $1,086,000. Fares had been reduced in 1851 to $1.

70. In 1854 one of the new river boats, the *Queen City*, built by the citizens of Marysville, 200 feet long with 9-foot hold, carried on her first trip 919 passengers.

71. The Sacramento River steamers increased in size and improved in appointments steadily for some years, the largest making regular trips to Sacramento being the *Capital*, 1,625 tons, which appeared first in March, 1866.

INJURY TO NAVIGATION—EFFECTS OF MINING DÉBRIS.

93. The deposits of mining débris, moving down the channels of the navigable rivers with each flood, acted in manner similar to that noted on the Yuba, gradually choking the channel, forming sand bars, and decreasing the available depth until in time it became impossible for even the lightest draft craft to navigate the Feather during the greater part of the year, while on the lower Sacramento the large seagoing craft were in time replaced by flat-bottomed stern-wheelers of light draft, and even these could not load to capacity in the summer and fall months, and often had to lighter cargo below Sacramento.

94. In 1875 the low-water depth in the Feather had been reduced to 2 feet, and one small steamer made a weekly trip between Marysville and San Francisco. In 1890 boats ceased running on the Feather, the débris conditions having become so bad that one steamer and one barge with full cargoes were sunk and insurance companies declined to write risks on the river traffic. Navigation of the river has not been practicable since then, save at flood stage. (Statement of Marysville levee commission to Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors Aug. 15, 1914, p. 27.)

95. In the latter part of 1859 and spring of 1860 a bar formed in the Sacramento River across the mouth of the American, which then entered the Sacramento a half mile below the present location, and extended down to the Sacramento city drawbridge, forming an obstacle to up-river navigation. In 1866 the large river steamers could no longer reach their landing at Sacramento city and the city levied a tax to clear out the channel. (History of Sacramento County, by Winfield J. Davis, pp. 60 to 66.) Dredging of this kind, however, could not stay the flood of débris, and gradually the deeper-draft steamers, such as the *Senator, New World, Capitol, Chrysopolis, Yosemite,* and others were withdrawn from the river and used exclusively on the Bay of San Francisco and its salt-water estuaries.

96. These deposits of débris in the stream were always greatest after heavy flood, and particularly below crevasses in the levees which had permitted a diversion of the current and a deposit in the channel below each break where slack water was produced.

97. Opposite Sacramento city in many seasons at low-water stage there was a bar on which one might walk dry-shod across the greater portion of the river. In 1910 the channel itself in front of the bridge draw was thus closed, and the United States Army Engineers used a clam-shell dredge to clear a channel so that up-river traffic might be resumed. They deposited the material, through necessity, at one side in the middle of the river, where it formed an immense mound, which gradually disappeared during succeeding flood seasons. In 1913 the engineers dredged through a similar shoal in front of Sacramento city, moving 27,000 cubic yards of material, and through another deposit at the mouth of the Feather, moving 25,000 cubic yards. (Report of Chief of Engineers, 1914, p. 3169.)

THE COOPERATION OF CALIFORNIA—APPROPRIATIONS BY CALIFORNIA.

175. Following the enactment of the law of 1893, in which Congress clearly indicated its intent, with the cooperation of California, to mature a plan and push it to completion, by which the navigability of the river could be restored, the débris cared for, and flood control secured, the State has cheerfully done her share, and even more. In making the first appropriation called for by the California Débris Commission under that act, California formally accepted the terms of the act and in effect pledged herself to carry out her share of the contract. Since that time she has promptly fulfilled all conditions and made appropriations usually in advance of Congress. She has already paid into the United States Treasury, to be expended by the California Débris Commission as agent of the Federal Government in carrying out the terms of the Caminetti Act, $1,000,000. These appropriations were made as follows:

1897	$250,000
1909	150,000
1911	400,000
1913	200,000
	1,000,000

Of these appropriations $400,000 was for impounding débris and $600,000 for improvement of navigation. In addition, $250,000 was appropriated in 1915 and is now awaiting requisition from the California Débris Commission. Over $350,000 more has been spent for rights of way, some of it from State appropriations, but most of it subscribed by landowners, and all necessary for carrying on operations of the California Débris Commission under the Caminetti Act. In addition, the State has spent independently, under its State engineering department and river boards, since 1897, all for rectification of navigable river channels and in direct interest of navigation, $1,275,000.

176. This is entirely aside from the work done by private landowners in dredging and construction of river levees, all valuable for and necessary to the preservation of navigation, as elsewhere referred to.

177. With each new appropriation the State formally renewed its approval of the plan and intent of Congress, as indicated in the Caminetti Act, and when that plan was finally perfected by presentation of the completed project in the report of 1910, transmitted to Congress by the Secretary of War June 27, 1911, the California State Legislature had adjourned and would not again meet until January, 1913. A special session, however, was called in December, 1911, for consideration of vital matters, and Gov. Hiram W. Johnson, realizing the overshadowing importance of this matter to the State, made it one of the few subjects in his special call to be considered at that session.

178. By legislative act the plan as presented by the California Débris Commission in Document No. 81 (Exhibit D) was formally adopted as the State plan for flood control of the Sacramento River; the State's aid, cooperation, and appropriations pledged thereto; and the State reclamation board created, in order that the duties imposed upon the State under the plan might be fully and promptly executed. In addition, State Senator A. Caminetti, who, as Congressman in 1893, had introduced the Federal act creating the California Débris Commission, introduced and had passed by the State legislature December 15, 1911, senate joint resolution No. 13, calling the attention of Congress to the fact that the legislature in extraordinary session assembled had formally adopted the project and recommendations of the California Débris Commission, and had provided for cooperation on the part of the State in putting the project into effect, and asked that Congress, on its part, give favorable consideration thereto.

PRESENT COMMERCE OF THE RIVERS—SHIPPING ON RIVERS.

205. The official reports on the commerce of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers for the last year available give the following figures (Report of Chief of Engineers, 1915, pp. 1466–3347):

206. Sacramento River: Freight, 720,000 tons; valuation, $38,000,000; passengers, 175,485.

207. San Joaquin River: Freight, 772,000 tons; valuation, $35,479,000; passengers, 189,667.

208. These figures do not include the tonnage of the large mosquito fleet of gasoline boats and their barges, which is not available.

At the hearing before the Flood Control Committee April 5, 1916, at page 8, Col. Harry Taylor, Assistant Chief of Engineers, United States Army, referred to the mosquito fleet and difficulty of securing statistics thereof, and said: "We know the published statistics are far short of the commerce carried on the river."

209. Through Sacramento city's lower or M Street Drawbridge (Northern Electric Railway) there passed during the year 3,054 steamboats, 1,005 barges, 969 gas boats, 73 sailing vessels, 30 dredges, and 29 pile drivers. Through the upper or H Street Drawbridge (Southern Pacific Railway) there passed in the same time 895 steamboats, 799 barges, 867 gas boats, 31 sailboats, 27 dredges, and 20 pile drivers. (This indicates traffic above Sacramento city; the down-river traffic goes through the M Street draw.)

210. On the Sacramento River most of this freight and practically all of the passenger traffic was between Sacramento and San Francisco and intermediate points. Present conditions in portions of the river above Sacramento city do not permit the use of boats thereon during the greater part of the year, and there is in consequence no incentive for investment of capital in steamers giving the frequent and rapid service to induce a large patronage, and no opportunity for shippers to secure the most advantageous water transportation rates. On the San Joaquin all of the tonnage and passenger traffic indicated was between San Francisco and Stockton and intermediate points.

211. The high class of freight handled on the two rivers is a noticeable feature, the value averaging $50 per ton, almost the highest, if not the highest, reported on any river in the United States. It includes fruit, alfalfa, hops, beans, asparagus, rice, potatoes, onions, celery, cabbage, dairy products, etc.

212. Ninety per cent of all freight between Sacramento and San Francisco and between Stockton and San Francisco is handled by boat, the average rate being 35 per cent less than by rail, while on certain classes of freight it is 66 per cent less. Between Sacramento and San Francisco is a daily merchants' express service by boat (overnight), the rates for which are between 7 and 10 per cent cheaper than for ordinary freight by rail.

222. (b) Reclamation's interest: The project has been criticized as a reclamation scheme. The project is undeniably of value to reclamation, since only through the flood control which it will insure can reclamation be made possible in some cases and permanent in all. But it is also true that navigation can not be fully protected by any other plan and that the interests of navigation, flood control, reclamation, and care of mining débris are so interwoven on the Sacramento River that they can not be separated in remedial measures. (See the Engineers' Reports, 1910 and 1913, Exhibits D and E, as quoted above.) And, further, because of reclamation's interest in the project it is being assessed for five-sevenths of the cost thereof, including all that can fairly be construed as being exclusively in the interest of reclamation and also much—notably the construction of river levees—which is undeniably partly in the interests of navigation, and even as to that portion of the project which is admittedly in the interests of navigation and in the navigable channel over which the Federal Government exercises exclusive jurisdiction, Congress is asked to pay only half of the expense. There is not recalled any flood-control project in which the State proposes to deal more generously with the Federal Government than in the case of the Sacramento project. Certainly this project does not deserve in any objectionable sense the charge of being a reclamation scheme.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question before he yields the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. Under the bill, I understand that as to the Sacramento project one-half of the expense is borne by the State or by local interests, whatever they may be.

Mr. WORKS. One-half of that portion of it which is devoted to the restoration of the navigability of the stream; but there is in addition to that the amount of $33,000,000, only about $11,000,000 of which is necessary to expend, as the engineers find, in improving and restoring the navigation of the streams. The State pays one-half of that amount, and pays all the balance.

Mr. KENYON. So that the Government in no part of this plan pays over one-half?

Mr. WORKS. The Government does not pay anything over one-half of that portion which is devoted exclusively to improving the navigation of the stream, and it does not pay any of that portion of it which goes to the reclamation of the land.

Mr. KENYON. Now, as to the other part of this bill, the southern streams, the Government pays over one-half. Why is it different there? Does the Senator know?

Mr. WORKS. I do not. I am not familiar with the Mississippi branch of it. As I said a while ago, the débris commission first reported in favor of the Government paying one-half of the total amount; but that was rejected by the committee of the House, and a new report was made on an entirely different basis than what I have already mentioned.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator has no reason in his mind, then, for the distinction between the amount that the Government pays in the Sacramento project and the amount the Government pays in the lower Mississippi project?

Mr. WORKS. I do not know anything about what moved the House of Representatives to make that distinction, if there is a distinction.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator knows there is a distinction?

Mr. WORKS. There is a distinction, as I understand; but I believe it is claimed that the people along the Mississippi have heretofore expended large sums of money in the improvement of that stream. I am not at all familiar with that, however, and do not undertake to speak with reference to it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, the time which the Senate has generously set apart for the discussion of this measure—a measure of so much importance to my constituents—is so limited that I can not afford to consume very much of that time in presenting my views to the Senate. Furthermore, after what has been said by the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], touching upon the merits of the proposition as it relates to the Mississippi River, and what the learned and patriotic Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] has said touching the Sacramento River project, anything that I might say would be a twice-told tale, vexing the dull ears of a tired Senate. These gentlemen have discussed the two projects in this bill in a most illuminating and convincing manner. But I will be permitted, I hope, in behalf of the people of the Mississippi River Valley to thank the Senate for this opportunity to consider this bill. I would also return my sincere thanks to the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] for so gracefully yielding to us in the matter of the consideration of the bill. Mr. President, may I express the hope that the friends of this bill will not take up too much of the time in discussing it, because I want those who are opposed to it, if unfortunately there should be such in the Senate, to have an opportunity to express their views. But I sincerely hope that there are none here who will overlook the merits in this bill because I believe it is overwhelmingly meritorious. The subject matter has received the careful investigation and I believe the universal approval of the best Government experts upon questions of this character. It contains not only the elements of justice—carrying out a policy of long standing—but it is the most economical method by which this great problem can be solved. I am interested in this matter very deeply for the reason that upon the favorable action by the Senate depends the happiness and security of homes, in truth the lives and welfare generally of a large element of the people whom I have the honor to represent in part in this Chamber. They have been knocking at the doors of Congress for many years, pleading that justice be done them, and this is the first opportunity that has come since I entered public life to grant the relief so much needed. May I not hope, therefore, that the friends of the bill and those opposed to the bill, if you please, may limit their remarks so we may be able to vote on the measure finally before 8 o'clock. I shall be greatly disappointed if we fail to get a vote. So great is my faith in the merits of the measure that I am perfectly willing for it to stand or fall upon the justice of its demands. I would be willing to submit the case at this moment to the jury without further argument. I am sure the Senate is informed and further discussion will not change a vote.

It has been suggested that the bill will probably be talked to death—that 8 o'clock will arrive or, rather, the five hours will be consumed and find us far from the end. I do not believe any Senator is going to abuse the privilege of free speech, vouchsafed to him by the rules of the Senate, and talk this bill to death. I trust we may be permitted to vote on it at the earliest possible moment. I want an expression of the will of the Senate, and if the Senate rules against my people I shall accept the verdict without complaint. Of course, it will be a disappointment to my constituents as well as to myself; it will be a miscarriage of justice, for they have suffered grievously and borne their sufferings with heroic fortitude; but if the issue shall be against them, we will accept it without complaint. My good friend, the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], asked a moment ago why it was that the people on the Mississippi Delta, the owners of the rich riparian lands on the Mississippi River should not pay as much as the people in the Sacramento Valley. Well, there is a great difference. There are many reasons why the people in the Mississippi Valley should not be called upon to pay as large percentage as the people of the Sacramento Valley. The Mississippi River carries water to the Gulf that falls upon 31 States of this Republic, and nothing but the Government of the United States is able to build levees and revet the banks so as to make it possible for the channel of the Mississippi River to convey all of that water to the Gulf without destroying the adjacent lands; while the Sacramento River begins and ends in the State of California. The proportion which the Government pays to the two projects embodied in this bill were fixed by Government officials appointed to investigate the projects. The Board of Engineers that investigated the Mississippi River project recommended that one to three would be a fair division of the expense, while the Government board acting upon the Sacramento proposition agreed that the Government's proportion should be one to one. Now, this bill provides that the riparian landowners on the Mississippi River should pay not less than one to two. That is the minimum sum which they are to pay. If the Mississippi River Commission shall finally conclude that the riparian landowners ought to pay more under the terms of this bill, the Mississippi River Commission can fix the amount. I think, Mr. President, that one to two is a fair proportion; certainly it is fair for the Government.

As I said in the beginning, Mr. President, I am not going to take up very much time of the Senate. The principal purpose of my rising was to ask the Senate to permit us to vote upon this matter before the five hours expired. I want to appeal to the Senate to do that because this is of such vital, far-reaching interest and concern to the people of the Mississippi Valley. If the Senate does not approve the bill, we want to know it. We want the question determined. I hope it will be acted upon favorably, but whether favorably or unfavorably let us have the will of the Senate upon it. And after that shall be done I am going to accept the conclusion of the Senate for my constituents, and I shall do it uncomplainingly.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Does this bill provide for a bond issue?

Mr. VARDAMAN. No; it does not provide for a bond issue, as I understand.

Mr. RANSDELL. It does not.

Mr. VARDAMAN. No; it does not.

Mr. RANSDELL. I will say to the Senator that the greatest amount that could be expended under this bill would be $11,000,000 per annum. It does not appropriate a single dollar. It authorizes contracts on the Mississippi to the extent of not to exceed $10,000,000 per annum and on the Sacramento not to exceed $1,000,000 per annum; a total on the Mississippi of not to exceed $45,000,000 in the next five years and a total on the Sacramento of not to exceed $5,600,000. Appropriations for those sums may hereafter be made by Congress. This bill does not appropriate anything, and no bond issue is provided for.

Mr. BORAH. This bill, then, provides simply for the obligation?

Mr. RANSDELL. Yes, sir; that is all.

Mr. BORAH. Which in future, of course, will fall upon the Treasury?

Mr. RANSDELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Louisiana why this bill, providing, as I understand, for an expenditure of about $40,000,000, is limited in its operation to just two sections?

Mr. RANSDELL. I will say to the Senator that the reason for that is that we have the information as to those two sections. In 1879 the Mississippi River Commission was created, and since that time it has been surveying and making the most elaborate studies of the flood-control question on the Mississippi River. It has studied it in every imaginable way, and all the engineering information which possibly can be obtained in regard to it has been obtained. A number of years ago—I do not recall the exact date—the California Débris Commission was created for the purpose of studying the flood control, reclamation, and navigation problems on the Sacramento. That commission was composed of United States Engineer officers, and it has made several elaborate reports. It is thought that all the information that possibly could be obtained in regard to the Sacramento from an engineering viewpoint has been obtained. That is not true as to any other flood-control problem in the United States.

We have not authorized the engineers to make an examination of floods in other localities. This bill, however, as I stated before, provides the machinery for examination of flood-control problems in other localities, and there are several places, I will say, where it is contemplated to have these investigations made. Probably in the future we will have similar problems in other localities. But we have not before us at this time sufficient information to legislate in regard to any localities other than these two.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I see that the Senator has colored maps on the wall, I assume, to designate what sections are subject to this flood control. Will the Senator tell me what the loss in 1916 in Louisiana was by reason of the Mississippi floods?

Mr. RANSDELL. I could not tell the Senator exactly what that loss was. We had a very bad overflow about 60 miles below where I live. It caused the death of a very large number of live stock of every kind and sort; it broke up a great many people in their business, destroyed their crops, and stopped every kind of enterprise. People were in very great distress as a result of that flood. I do not know exactly what the loss was.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish the Senator could give us an estimate of it.

Mr. RANSDELL. My friend, Mr. Humphreys, who is the chairman of the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives and who has been giving great attention to this matter, tells me that he understands the loss was about $11,000,000 in the 1913 flood and $40,000,000 in the 1912 flood.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does that mean just in Louisiana, or in the whole valley?

Mr. RANSDELL. No, sir; it means in the whole valley. I will state to the Senator, however, that Louisiana has considerably more than one-half the total overflowed area of the valley. I can give you pretty nearly the exact figures on that point. In the valley there are about 15,617,000 acres of overflowed land. That is the entire valley, now, from southeastern Missouri down to the Gulf, taking in some of the land in Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Of that total of 15,617,000 acres 8,573,000 acres are in the State of Louisiana, considerably more than one-half of the entire area.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, we have been appropriating for flood sufferers and for damages ever since I have been in the Senate—for about 18 years. Those appropriations somehow or other always seem to run down toward the mouth of the Mississippi River or the Ohio. They have not reached any farther north than that. We have a valley known as the Valley of the Red River of the North, about 60 miles wide at the south end and on our Canadian line possibly 125 to 150 miles wide. Very little of that, practically, is under cultivation. The Red River of the North flows north and not south. It falls at the head before it does at the mouth of the river. That produces ice gorges, and the ice gorges in that flat country throw out an immense quantity of water, which naturally in a level country flows very slowly, and covers hundreds of thousands and I do not know but millions of acres of land. Last year we suffered greatly by reason of floods, due to the cause I have mentioned and also because of an extraordinary fall of rain and the ditching on the Minnesota side of the valley into the Red River. I think the loss would run from sixty to seventy-five million dollars in a single year.

We have not yet gotten into the habit of coming to the Government every flood or every time we lose a cent up there. This year, on account of the drought and blight and the flood together, the entire State probably lost more than $300,000,000, and yet it has never occurred to us that we must ask the Government of the United States to make good.

If we are going into the matter of flood control, it does seem to me that we who have suffered so very much in the last year ought to have some consideration in this bill, and that there ought to be an amendment which will provide for the expenditure of a few million dollars in ascertaining how we may protect the farmers of the Red River Valley against these dangers and against the enormous losses due to the flooding of the valley on account of an extra amount of rainfall and because of the ice gorges which are formed in the spring.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WORKS. The remarks made by the Senator from North Dakota respecting the payment of damages for floods do not apply to California. We have suffered immensely from these overflows. I have been through that section of the country when it looked like the whole section was under water. We have made no claim upon the Government on that account. We are only asking now for doing the work that will restore the navigation. We are taking care of it with our own money and we are asking of the Government nothing.

I wish to say further that these two projects were selected because they have been thoroughly investigated and reported upon by the Board of Engineers. In the case of California a board of engineers was specifically provided for that purpose, and nothing more can be done except to make the appropriation.

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

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I find in the river and harbor bill, in section 5—

> That Congress hereby consents that the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, or any two of them, may enter into any agreement or agreements with each other to aid in improving navigation and to prevent and control floods on boundary waters of said States—

And so forth. Is that the Red River?

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the Red River.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The bill provides that there shall be a report made upon it—

> and the expenses of carrying the same into effect and what share of such expenses should be borne by the respective States, local interests, or by the National Government.

The sum of $25,000 is appropriated to make that survey. I wish to assure the honorable Senator that when the survey shall be made and reported upon, as is customary before the Government takes action upon it, as was done in the case of the Sacramento River and the Mississippi River, I do not think he will have any trouble in securing sufficient funds from the Federal Government to protect the interests of his constituents. I do not think there is any doubt about Congress doing the proper thing when the way is pointed out by the facts, and the merits of the question justify it.

The policy of making appropriations for leveeing the Mississippi River is of long standing. Whatever may be the fate of the flood-control bill, I know that Congress is going to make an appropriation for the leveeing of this river. Year after year large sums of money have been appropriated, but it has been in piecemeal, makeshift policy—the most expensive system by which such work could be done. A few days ago Gen. Black, head of the Board of Engineers, of this city, came before the Commerce Committee, when that committee had under consideration a great project for the improvement of the East River, N. Y., and he stated to the committee that if this project should be adopted the improvement should be made under the continuous-contract system, for the reason that it would save to the Government between 10 and 20 per cent on the cost of the completed project. I believe the entire project will cost something like $20,000,000 when it is completed. Now, I think it would be wise economy for the United States to adopt the continuous-contract system in all large Government enterprises. Four million dollars saved in the East River project is a matter worthy of the attention of the Congress. Up to this time the work on the Mississippi River has been done by yearly contracts, and millions of dollars have thereby been lost to the taxpayers, and the work has not been half so efficiently or durably performed as if it had been done under the continuous-contract system.

The plan proposed in this bill will settle it in a definite length of time for a definite amount, and, as stated by the Senator from Louisiana, there will be an actual saving to the taxpayers of the United States in the appropriation out of the National Treasury and by the contribution from the States of something like $8,000,000. That would be saved in addition to the enormous amount of property which is destroyed every year by the floods and the lives which are lost and, added to all that, the anxiety and suffering experienced by the women and children resident in the Delta.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am not complaining——

Mr. RANSDELL. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCUMBER. In just a minute I will. I am not complaining of the means under which this appropriation is to be made; it is the purpose of the appropriation. Senators will not say that the $40,000,000 is being expended here in aid of navigation. It is $40,000,000 that is being expended for the purpose of protecting vast areas of land.

Mr. RANSDELL. If the Senator will yield, I can not allow that statement to go unrefuted.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand the Senator's side of it.

Mr. RANSDELL. That is a mistake. All the engineers on that river have said that if there were no country there to be protected they would be compelled to build levees for the purpose of navigation. I will say to the Senator whenever a break occurs in the Mississippi levee system an enormous volume of water pours through that break, and the diminution of the cur-

rent causes sand carried in solution to fall a short distance below the break, and a great sand bar is formed, and boats can not run there the next summer. It is absolutely necessary to build those levees for the purpose of navigation. Only a portion of it is for straight-out protection of the bank. Some of it is, but navigation is a very important question there, too.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator agrees with me. We may not agree upon what proportion is for the benefit of the land and what proportion is necessary for navigation. I would rather reverse the figures if I were passing my own opinion upon the proportionate part. I have no objection to the appropriation of money for the purpose of navigation simply because it also protects the overflow. I think the two are more or less necessary. However, when I want to get $10,000 or $20,000 for the upper reach of the Missouri, where we have in reality some river commerce, I have found great trouble in getting it through the committee, and especially in getting a recommendation, unless we will get the people along the shores to do the revetting or to pay a proportionate share of the little work that is done to keep the current in its proper place.

I agree with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] that the attention of the public has always been turned toward the southern section of the United States. That is very natural, because you have been so long in the habit of crying when you are hurt and reaching into the National Treasury that you very naturally get a report upon the necessity of the work being done in that section. But the point that I want to make is this: There is ten times as much necessity to protect the farmers of the Red River Valley to-day against floods as there is to protect the farmers along the border of the Mississippi.

Mr. RANSDELL. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. McCUMBER. That is, measured by the damage that these floods are doing in that section of the country.

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

Mr. McCUMBER. In just a minute I will yield.

The Senator from Mississippi read a section from the pending river and harbor bill. Twenty-five thousand dollars is appropriated. Why? It is appropriated for the benefit of the Government of the United States, which claims control over the river itself and claims the right of control because it is a navigable stream. The States of Minnesota and North Dakota are attempting to enter into an agreement to settle the damages that have been caused, that have resulted from the overflow, and they are not asking the Government to settle it for them. They are not asking the Government to put in a dollar, but they can not settle their differences and they can not arrange for straightening the contortions of the river to give it a more rapid flow without the consent of Congress, and they can not get the consent of Congress unless there is a survey made. That is why an appropriation is made in the bill for the purpose of making that investigation. But to-day if you are going to reach into the question of protecting lands and protecting the people that suffer from overflow there should be another forty or forty-five million dollars provided for the Red River of the North.

Mr. RANSDELL. Will the Senator tell us how much he needs up there and where he got the information?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I can say right now that an investigation has been made by the people there, and they think that at the present time the work should be commenced and that they should have not less than $2,000,000. I do not know whether they need that; I do not know whether they need $20,000,000, so far as the work is concerned. All I know is that they are neglected and that the Government is taking care of other sections of the country.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I would not suggest to the Senator, and no one who has served here with him would suggest, for a moment that he has been neglecting his duty as a Senator, because he is one of the most wide-awake and forcible men we have; but certainly if the people up there have been neglected and have not had a survey it must be because he has not had it done. We have had surveys galore on the lower Mississippi, and have been doing our utmost there for a long time.

I want to say to the Senator that this bill is framed along broad lines. It is not confined to the Mississippi and to the Sacramento. It is framed in section 3 to take into consideration the very things the Senator speaks of. That is undoubtedly one they have in mind. It provides for having elaborate surveys made wherever they are needed, throughout the whole United States, and if the bill is passed they can go ahead and make those surveys from time to time.

I will further say to the Senator that "a fellow feeling makes us wondrous kind." My people are suffering in Louisiana so much from overflow that if it will appear from the report of the engineers that the people of the Red River of the North are suffering and need Government relief the Senator will get not only my vote but my voice. I will work night and day to help him, if his people suffer anything like the people of my section suffer.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I must tell the Senator now we never have been in the begging habit. We have never called upon the Government to take care of our losses. We meet them whether they come in the shape of storm or hail. We do not look upon the Government as the insurer of our interests against Providence, against floods, or against hail. We have never asked you to insure us. But when you come to voting Government money by little items of $45,000,000 for one project or two projects in the United States I think it is about time to call your attention to the fact that there are other sections in the United States outside of Louisiana and Mississippi that do sometimes suffer by reason of floods, and to invite your attention to the necessities in the northern part of the United States in protecting the Red River Valley against inundations. We simply ask for a fair consideration of that subject, not for the purpose of reaching into the pockets of the American public and having them tax themselves to pay our losses but to give us fair consideration, such consideration as we ought to have in the expenditure of public moneys for the prevention of damage by floods.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, just one word. The Senator speaks about our losses. We are not asking that a single dollar of loss be paid. We simply want to have these levees built to protect us from the enormous loss that may be caused in the future, not to pay back—that can not be done—the untold millions of dollars that have been lost. We do not ask that. We simply ask that these levees be built so that in future the floods that pour down from the Senator's State and from 31 other States of the Union shall go in safety to the sea without causing further awful losses.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota would seem to indicate by his remarks that these projects are new and that the policy of the Government has not been established upon the lines and principles embodied in this measure. The Senator from Louisiana has explained very thoroughly the project, so far as it relates to the Mississippi Valley; but I desire, in addition to what has been said by my colleague [Mr. WORKS], to call attention to the fact that far from this project being new or introducing a new policy on the part of the Government there is subsisting to-day between the State of California and the Federal Government what might be called contractual relations, because as far back as 1893 Congress created the California Débris Commission, consisting of United States Army engineers, and that act is still in force.

The very duties of the commission are to provide for the resumption of hydraulic mining, so far as can be done without injury to navigation and without damage from overflow, to restore as near as practicable the degree of navigability of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers which obtained in 1860, to afford relief in flood time, to provide sufficient waters to contain scouring force in summer.

Cooperation with the State was provided by empowering the commission to confer with such body of engineers as might be appointed by the State, and the expense of barriers, dams, ditching, etc., done by the Federal commission in pursuance of these duties was to be shared half and half by Congress and the State of California.

Therefore that act of 1893 was a business proposition made by Congress to the State of California. The State accepted it promptly, the legislature ratified the proposition, making it in effect a contract, and since that time California has promptly paid to the United States Treasury such sums as were called for under the act as her one-half of the necessary expense involved, because it was the Federal commission that had the power to use and to employ the money. The State of California has paid those amounts in good faith on the assumption that when the necessary plan had been matured it would be carried out so that the injury done to navigation could be corrected and so that future loss from flood might be prevented.

The plans have been matured. The very purpose of the appointment by the Federal Government of the commission and of the reclamation board by the State was to mature plans. As in the case of the Mississippi, so in the case of the Sacramento, we have matured and approved plans by Army engineers. These propositions are the only two finished and completed plans which have been so approved and reported. That is the reason why they are before Congress to-day. It is certainly not on account of any discrimination against the Red River Valley or against any other valley. Those valleys have not perfected

their plans, and I believe that a proposition is to be presented, either as an amendment to this bill or to the river and harbor bill, providing for a comprehensive scheme for caring for all such conditions, where valuable lands are washed away by extra-seasonal flood waters.

The Sacramento River was navigable 326 miles from the sea to vessels which sailed around the Horn as late as 1860, but that river and its tributaries are now full of débris; they have silted up, as it is called. Hence the necessity for providing some means, apart from perfunctory dredging, to protect them against such obstructions to commerce.

I conceive that it is peculiarly the function of Congress to insure the navigability of streams. The navigability of the Sacramento River is provided for in these plans, and incidental thereto vast areas of land will be reclaimed. While the Federal Government is not paying for the reclamation of land, it is not repugnant to the purpose of Congress that such land might be incidentally reclaimed. The payment for that cost, however, is made by the State of California through her citizens.

This bill provides ultimately for the expenditure of $5,600,000 on the Sacramento, not more than $1,000,000 to be expended each year. The State of California has already provided for her half of that expenditure. Hence it is in all good faith and reason a matter, I say, of contract for Congress to provide in the passage of this bill for the continuation of that work. Thirty million dollars will have to be levied upon the property owners, who will derive some profit from it, covering an area of 1,750,000 acres of land. The California Reclamation Board is now engaged in the business of making assessments upon that land, so as to take up the work for the benefit of the property owners, and incidentally the State and the Nation, just as soon as the major work is accomplished by the Army Board of Engineers provided by the United States. So it is not in any sense a discrimination in favor of one State as against another. This State has its plans approved by the Federal Board of Army Engineers, which is known as the California Débris Commission. We are ready, having accomplished our part, to receive what Congress has to grant. Other projects are not in that position.

I take it that it is the wise policy of the United States to reclaim land, whether it be from the desert by reclamation and irrigation or whether it be the saving of what we have against the incursion of floods, that come like an invading army and blot out lands under cultivation. Such reclamation yields great wealth to the country and recompense to the farmer. To stand by and see the devastation go on without preventing it when it is within our power and not to lift a hand to save it by cooperation with the State would be a neglect of the exercise of the wise and beneficent power which has been conferred on Congress by the Constitution of the United States.

Nations go to war for the purpose of acquiring territory, causing, in the exercise of the war power, tremendous loss of treasure and of life; but here, if we may look upon it in that view, we peacefully acquire new territory or save the loss of territory. It is none the less the acquisition of territory to reclaim it from storm waters or from desert conditions than it is by conquest in war—without the loss of life and by the wise expenditure of comparatively an insignificant amount of money. We are told that the European war now costs $100,000,000 per day. After it is all over, instead, possibly, of there being anything acquired by any nation, there will be nothing but waste and loss. In good season we are now reclaiming this land from natural conditions by reason of the skill of engineers and adding it to the national domain in the broadest and most comprehensive sense.

I do not think that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] quite understands that this measure is one that has been before Congress since 1893, and that it has now reached its fruition. The work that has been required of the State has been done, and Congress is now asked to perform its part of the contract. In that view I think the Senators present will agree with me, that there is an obligation upon the part of Congress to comply with the conditions of its agreement. Any other course pursued by Congress would savor very much of bad faith, and I do not think that Congress, advised as it is now of this fact, will hesitate to give this measure of productive relief to the State of California, which at the same time adds so much to the greatness and the wealth of the American Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, there is one amendment I desire to suggest that was practically agreed to in the committee, but which has been left out, I think, by inadvertence. On page 7, line 25, after the words "in their discretion," I move to insert the words "and shall."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, line 25, after the word "discretion," it is proposed to insert the words "and shall," so that it will read "in their discretion, and shall, upon the request of the Secretary of War."

Mr. RANSDELL. There is no objection to that amendment.

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

Mr. JONES. On page 8, after the word "thereon," in line 8, I move to insert "and the separate report of the representative of any other department."

Mr. RANSDELL. That amendment is agreeable to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were concurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be read the third time?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Hollis	Norris	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Hughes	Overman	Smoot
Beckham	Husting	Page	Sterling
Brady	James	Penrose	Stone
Broussard	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Swanson
Bryan	Jones	Pittman	Thomas
Catron	Kenyon	Poindexter	Townsend
Chamberlain	Kirby	Pomerene	Underwood
Clapp	Lane	Ransdell	Vardaman
Clark	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Wadsworth
Cummins	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Walsh
Curtis	Lewis	Saulsbury	Watson
Dillingham	McLean	Sheppard	Weeks
du Pont	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Works
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shields	
Gronna	Nelson	Simmons	
Harding	Newlands	Smith, Ga.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Mississippi River project or to the Sacramento River project as approved projects under a general scheme of legislation that will take care of all our waterways and promote them and develop them, not only for navigation but for every possible beneficial use, by a system of coordination of the engineering and scientific services of the country, and by a system of cooperation between the Nation and the States. The objection I have is not to these projects, but to the fact that there is no general scheme of legislation in this bill under which we can accomplish the full development of all our rivers. With that view I have offered as an amendment an additional section which is a condensation of the bills which I have been introducing on this subject for the past 10 or 12 years, which have been the subject of constant agitation throughout the entire country, which are well known in every watershed in the country, and which have received in terms the indorsement of all party platforms, the approval of three Presidents—Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Taft, and Mr. Wilson—and the approval of every Secretary of war from Roosevelt's time down to the present, with the exception, perhaps, of Mr. Garrison, whose approval was qualified. I urge that this condensation, this condensed section, embracing simply a scheme of administration and investigation, shall be adopted as a part of this bill.

Now, Mr. President, from what does this bill arise? It arises from the fact that certain parties, both on the Sacramento River and the Mississippi River, own large areas of swamp land which they desire to have reclaimed. That is the principal purpose of this bill. I find no word in this bill regarding the promotion of interstate commerce. I find no word in this bill regarding river regulation. I find no word regarding the promotion of transportation; and it is that word which I want to put in this bill and make it fruitful hereafter of results in a system which, through the teamwork of all the engineering and scientific services affected, and teamwork between the Nation and the States, will secure a related system of waterways throughout the United States as perfect as that of Germany and France, and, in connection with that develop-

ment, promote the reclamation of arid lands and swamp lands, the development of water power, intensive cultivation, and other beneficial purposes, just as the development of waterways in those countries has produced that result.

I urge this because it will result in a wider economic distribution of benefits. The purpose of this bill is to prevent flood waters from destroying property. I want to add to that purpose the purpose that will be covered by a general scheme, and that will be of creating property and wealth; and just to the extent that we can create wealth under a plan of regulating our rivers, to that extent we will diminish the cost of merely protective measures.

Now, Mr. President, to whom did these swamp lands originally belong? Have they been handed down by way of private title to the present owners? No. All of them were once in the possession of the United States. They belonged to the sovereignty of the United States, and the United States, abandoning its trust, turned over these swamp lands to the States, with the understanding that the States would by some process reclaim them; and the States, abandoning their functions as sovereigns, turned them over to individuals, in the expectation that the individuals would reclaim these lands and make them the homes of numerous people.

It was an undertaking that individuals could not pursue with success. The very nature of the undertaking required the control of large areas, the control of great rivers from source to mouth, such a control as a sovereign alone could exercise. So the individual grantees of these lands, having failed as might have been anticipated in their undertaking to reclaim these lands, come back to the National Government, the original owner and grantee, and ask it to cooperate with them in this great work, and to divide and apportion the cost.

Mr. President, as a mere scheme of reclamation of lands in private ownership, I deny the right of the sovereign to take hold of these lands and reclaim them for their owners, or aid in that reclamation; but if that reclamation will tend to regulate and control the river in such a way as to promote navigation, and thus advance what comes under the jurisdiction of the national sovereignty, interstate and foreign commerce, then it is within the jurisdiction of the Nation, and only then. Yet I contend that there is not a word in this bill that would tie this great work to the sovereignty of the Nation in the exercise of sovereign powers. The amendment which I propose will do that, and will make this entire work a part of the sovereign work of the Nation and of the States in securing an efficient system of transportation.

Mr. President, I have no disposition to obstruct this bill, although I have long realized that the only way to get through a measure of general effect and operation is to oppose those measures that are piecemeal in their character; that propose to take up work here and work there as a part of the piecemeal system, of the spoils system, which has come under deserved condemnation. Under the piecemeal system and under the spoils system we have expended hundreds of millions of dollars upon our rivers without result so far as any national purpose is concerned. The rivers are not so much used to-day as they were in years gone by in the promotion of commerce; and we have allowed the land carriers, the rail carriers, to sandbag the water carriers, so that they have almost been driven out of the commerce of the country.

This bill is a part of the piecemeal system and the spoils system as it stands. I want to make it a part of a great national system that will embrace every watershed in the country and that will result in the promotion of a real national purpose, and that is the promotion of transportation and commerce. This short amendment, boiled down, covering only a couple of pages, is offered with that view.

How am I, a friend of this bill; how am I, a friend of these projects, as approved projects under a general scheme, met? Why, they say: "We can not accept your amendment." They say: "It will imperil the bill in the House." Why? Are we to assume that the House is so devoted to the piecemeal system and to the spoils system that it will never get right upon this subject? Are we to assume that if this matter is presented in conference it will not receive fair consideration? And if the House, then, is opposed to it, can not the entire matter come back to the Senate to be disposed of, either by an affirmance or a recession?

Mr. President, in my judgment, it is cowardly not to express the conviction of the Senate—for I know that a majority of this Senate stands for a general system—simply because some one says that the House is opposed to it. So far as the River and Harbor Committee of the House is concerned, I have reason to know that that committee is converted to this theory; that in a recent river and harbor bill they proposed to insert an amendment such as I ask to this bill, and that it was supported by the River and Harbor Committee and went out in the House upon a point of order and not upon its merits. Then, when the powerful River and Harbor Committee, so long standing for the piecemeal system with reference to river and harbor legislation, yields the prejudices of years and proposes to adopt this system, what reason is there for believing that the House itself will be recalcitrant?

Mr. President, it is true that some of the large features of the bill which I have been urging for many years, involving large appropriations, continuous appropriations over a period of 10 years, have met with opposition because they seemed large. My purpose in presenting these large sums was to accustom the public mind to the fact that we were entering upon a great work, a work that would cost money, and a large amount of money. My original bill called for $600,000,000—$60,000,000 annually for a period of 10 years; and some timid souls raised their hands in apprehension with reference to an expenditure of this gigantic sum. Yet in the development of rail transportation our corporations have evolved a capitalization of $20,000,000,000, and are spending money at the rate of $600,000,000 annually in the extension of their lines, and are claiming that they ought to expend a billion dollars annually. Do the people shrink from these large sums, upon which they pay interest in the shape of freight and passenger rates?

Look at the map. There are 50,000 miles of waterways in this country—the most wonderful system of waterways in the world. Yet we have abandoned that system of transportation and neglected it in order to take up a system of transportation adapted better to the expensive and high-priced products, competent to pay high rates of transportation, water transportation being better adapted to cheap products, to bulky products; and one of the troubles under which this country is suffering to-day is the congestion caused by the cheap and bulky products upon our lines of railway transportation. Had we permitted our waterway transportation to advance step by step with rail transportation the rails to-day would not be overburdened as they are by the carriage of cheap and bulky products, such as wheat, corn, hay, coal, iron, and other products of the mines, which must be cheap, and which can only stand a very low rate of freight.

Mr. President, in deference to the fears of the timid I have reduced the proportions of this bill. I have absolutely stricken out the dedication of these large sums to a waterway fund for the development of our waterways and have provided simply for a commission of investigation, with a view to bringing these various services into teamwork, and appropriating only $100,000 for that work of investigation and report. Why is that work of investigation and report required? Because to-day there are four departments, each one having from two to four services or bureaus devoted to some form of water development, each department pursuing its way unrelated to the other department, each service pursuing its unrelated and noncooperative way, involving duplication of work, involving plans that do not dovetail into each other.

How is this cooperation provided for in this amendment? Simply by providing that a waterway commission shall be created consisting of the Secretaries of War, Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce, under whom all these scientific and engineering services now are, and three engineers of distinction in addition; and their undertaking is, through these chiefs of departments, to bring these various services, these various bureaus, these various engineering and scientific organizations into teamwork, so that their plans will dovetail into each other, so that their expenditures will dovetail into each other, so that their work will progress in such a way as to enable each to dovetail in with the other.

It is impracticable to take away all of these services from these various departments and put them under a board of public works; for if you did that, you would deprive the Cabinet officials, the department chiefs, of the jurisdiction which they now have.

Now, what are these services? In the War Department is the Engineer Corps of the Army, which is now at work upon the navigable parts of our streams; in the Interior Department are services, the Geological Survey, engaged in the study and investigation of all the problems that relate to water, and the Reclamation Service, which is now practically in occupation of the headwaters of most of our great rivers that flow into the Pacific Ocean and that flow into the Mississippi and the Missouri from the west, yet there is no method of bringing those two departments into teamwork. Organize a commission of which the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of War are members, and through their departments these services will be brought immediately into teamwork—one on the lower parts of

the rivers with regard to their navigability, the other on the higher parts of the rivers where the waters can be used for the reclamation of the public lands of the United States and for the development of water power—and the reclamation of the arid lands of this country and the development of the water power of this country mean the slowing up by artificial storage or by natural storage of the soil itself of this great flow of water that vexes our neighbors to the south. The policy heretofore upon the part of our southern friends has been to invite us to hurry these waters down to them. They say to the people of the North, we do not object to the reclamation of your swamp lands, to your hurrying these waters down upon us. All we insist upon is that you build levees of sufficient height and thus protect our lands from the inroads of these waters.

Is it not a part of the general scheme of flood control to hold the waters back at their source as well as to guard them in the lower reaches of the river? Is it not absolutely wise to bring these two great services, both of them composed of great engineers, into collaboration upon this great work? Yet there is no machinery under the law for accomplishing that. It is hardly known, perhaps, in the Senate that the Reclamation Service has attacked more difficult problems in hydraulics than have been attacked by the Engineer Corps of the Army, great as is the ability and experience of that organization. The problems that have been attacked by the Reclamation Service of the United States surpass even those of the Panama Canal in complexity and variety.

Why should not these two great engineering services be brought into collaboration, and why should we not provide the machinery for that purpose? So it is with reference to the Geological Survey, a survey that is engaged under appropriations made by Congress in studying all the questions that relate to water. And so it is with reference to the Coast and Geodetic Survey under the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Fisheries, which ought to be brought into collaboration with the scientific services of other departments. So it is with the Drainage Bureau, the Bureau of Soils, and other services of the Agricultural Department. All of them studying problems relating to the development and control and beneficial use of water and all of them studying these great problems in a detached and unrelated way, a single river being the subject of investigation and development by many services of the National Government acting without cooperation or a common purpose.

And so it is with the several States. My amendment provides for cooperation between sovereigns, National and State.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose to delay the consideration of this bill or to delay a vote upon it. I will be glad to have read here the approving statements of such men as Theodore Roosevelt, William H. Taft, and Woodrow Wilson. I would be glad to read the reports and the statements of every Secretary of War in any administration since Roosevelt's time. I would be glad to read the corroborative statements of such men as Secretary Fisher of the Interior Department, and Secretaries Taft and Stimson of the War Department, and Secretary Lane of the Interior Department, and of Secretary Baker of the War Department, and of Secretary Houston of the Agricultural Department. Secretary Baker appeared only recently before our Commerce Committee and urged legislation upon these lines. I would like to read the platform declarations of the different parties. I would ask permission of the Senate to have these matters inserted in the RECORD without reading.

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

The matter referred to is appended.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Now, Mr. President, I stated a few moments ago that the objection is urged that this amendment ought not to go upon this bill, because it will not be accepted in the House. I think I have shown the absurdity of that contention. If the House conferees can not accept it and will not accept it, it simply comes back to the Senate for action. I have not the slightest doubt that the Senate, rather than lose the bill, if it favors it, will make the concession, and there is certainly time enough to accomplish that. But another objection is made to the insertion of this amendment upon this bill, and that is that the Commerce Committee has put this very amendment on the river and harbor bill. Now, that is so. It has been put upon the river and harbor bill the very amendment which I have offered. But I am told that a point of order will be made regarding it. I do not know whether the point of order will lie or not; but it may go out on a point of order. Then, we run the chance of the river and harbor bill not passing. We know that there is strenuous objection to that bill as part of the discredited piecemeal system. I think the objections to that bill have been very largely removed in recent years in that regard; but still we know that at every session a contention—a determined contention—is made against this bill, because it belongs to the old spoils system. If that bill does not pass, this amendment will fail with it, and then we will have the piecemeal system perpetuated, and no check whatever upon the spoils system. We will have lost our opportunity for general legislation upon this subject when the Senate favors that legislation, as manifested three years ago, by putting an amendment in substantially these terms upon the river and harbor bill; I ask why should we lose this opportunity simply because our friends from the South think that there is a remote danger that it may imperil the bill?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. As the Senator from Nevada has long known, I am in favor of the plan which he has so frequently presented, of which the amendment is an abbreviation. I rise to ask him what authority would the commission which he creates in his amendment have over the appropriation that is made in the bill?

Mr. NEWLANDS. It would have none over this appropriation. I have been obliged to very much abbreviate the measure, which I have been urging for so many years, so as to simply create a commission for the purpose of investigation and report to Congress, and it can bring all these bureaus into teamwork with a view to making that report. But I do not understand that it would control this particular expenditure under this bill. It would be controlled, however, by the Secretary of War, who is one of the commission, and so it would be with reference to the expenditure for the Reclamation Service; that expenditure would be controlled by the Secretary of the Interior, who is a member of this commission; and so, although the bill does not especially provide for it, we will find that as the result of processes of investigation these departments would gradually get into teamwork before full authority for it is given by Congress in the shape of definite constructive work.

Mr. CUMMINS. But the $45,000,000 appropriated in this bill would still be spent for the purpose named in the bill, and that expenditure can not be either changed or supervised by the commission which is created in the section offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes; that is true; and I can only defend that by saying I approve this appropriation for the lower Mississippi, and I approve the one for the Sacramento. I believe that they ought to have the power of making continuing contracts. I believe that those projects have been thoroughly studied by the Army engineers and that they ought to be approved. What I am contending is that they should be simply approved as projects under this bill under a general system, and not as projects under the old system, and that we should now provide for a general system of development.

I will say that I have the deepest sympathy for my friends in the Mississippi Valley. I realize that this is a problem that the localities there can not take hold of. It is unreasonable to expect it, but I think it is also unreasonable to expect us to vote for these large appropriations unless we justify them under the interstate-commerce power of the Constitution. What I object to in this bill is that there is not a word said regarding interstate commerce nor a word said about the promotion of navigation. It is true that the work can be done in such a way as to promote navigation, but I want to see to it that navigation is declared to be the dominating purpose.

What are these great areas of swamp land—20,000,000 acres—from Cairo down? What are they but the alluvial deposits carried down the Mississippi River into what was at one time undoubtedly an arm of the Gulf of Mexico, an arm which has been filled up with this alluvial deposit? The alluvial soil there, I am told, in some places is 1,200 feet deep, a soil unparalleled in richness. Recollect, that the force of the Mississippi River is increased and its destructive power is increased by the reclamation of the 20,000,000 acres, those large areas that were the natural outlet of the flood waters. Just as soon as you confine the river within its banks, or within levees upon both banks, you contract the width of the stream, and to that extent increase its height and its destructive force.

I think it may well be worthy of consideration as to whether we should go along with our present system of reclaiming the swamp lands in the North and hurrying our waters down as fast as we can to the Gulf of Mexico. It is a question whether a portion of the Delta itself should not be maintained as an area of flood overflow. The question in my mind is whether we can ever build levees high enough to control and keep within their boundaries these flood waters if we pursue our present policy

of hurrying instead of retarding the waters on the way to the Gulf.

So it is of the highest importance from the standpoint of the southern interest itself that we should see to it that a system is pursued in the North that will gradually slow down the progress of the flood waters so that the period of flood can be lengthened a fourth or a half. Such lengthening of the period of flood will necessarily diminish the height and the crest of the flood and its destructive force.

All these things ought to be studied with scientific accuracy. We all realize that water is one of the most valuable assets in the world, absolutely essential to life. It composes three-fourths of our own physical organization and three-fourths of all the plant and animal life that we know of. It is the thing that is absolutely essential to production. Unfortunately the waters fall from the heavens in an accidental way. If we could control them so that they would fall with scientific accuracy from the heavens upon the soil there would be neither droughts nor floods. But that is impossible, and so the next best thing is to take these waters just as soon as they fall from the heavens and wherever they fall, whether it is on the watersheds of the Ohio or the Mississippi or the Yellowstone or the Missouri or the Arkansas, and slow up the progress of the water as it flows to the ocean, meanwhile putting the water slowed up in its progress to a remunerative and wealth-creating use.

Mr. President, in closing my remarks I wish again to disclaim any unsympathetic purpose in reference to the bill. My purpose is helpful. I also wish to state that the amendment as printed contains a mistake. The amendment as it is printed states that it is to be inserted in lieu of section 3 of the bill (H. R. 14777). That is not my purpose. I propose to leave the entire bill as it stands and to have this section as section 5—as an additional section to the bill. I ask that the Secretary may read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add as a new section the following:

Add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 5. That a commission, to be known as the Waterways Commission, consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and three additional members to be appointed by the President of the United States from the active or retired list of the Engineer Corps of the Army, or other Government services, or from civil life, one of whom shall be designated by the President as chairman, is hereby created and authorized, under such rules and regulations as it may adopt, to bring into coordination and cooperation the engineering, scientific, and constructive services, bureaus, boards, and commissions of the several governmental departments of the United States and commissions created by Congress that relate to study, development, or control of waterways and water resources and subjects related thereto, or to the development and regulation of interstate and foreign commerce, with a view to uniting such services in investigating, with respect to all watersheds in the United States, questions relating to the development, improvement, regulation, and control of navigation as a part of interstate and foreign commerce, including therein the related questions of irrigation, drainage, forestry, arid and swamp land reclamation, clarification of streams, regulation of flow, control of floods, utilization of water power, prevention of soil erosion and waste, storage, and conservation of water for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and domestic uses, cooperation of railways and waterways, and promotion of terminal and transfer facilities, to secure the necessary data, and to formulate and report to Congress, as early as practicable, a comprehensive plan or plans for the development of waterways and the water resources of the United States for the purposes of navigation and for every useful purpose, and recommendations for the modification or discontinuance of any project herein or heretofore adopted. Any member appointed from the retired list shall receive the same pay and allowances as he would if on the active list, and not more than one member may be selected from civil life, and his compensation shall be $5,000 per annum.

"In all matters done, or to be done, under this act relating to any of the subjects, investigations, or questions to be considered hereunder, and in formulating plans, and in the preparation of a report or reports, as herein provided, consideration shall be given to all matters which are to be undertaken, either independently by the United States or by cooperation between the United States and the several States, political subdivisions thereof, municipalities, communities, corporations, and individuals within the jurisdiction, powers, and rights of each, respectively, with a view to assigning to the United States such portion of such development, promotion, regulation, and control as may be undertaken by the United States, and to the States, political subdivisions thereof, municipalities, communities, corporations, and individuals such portion as belongs to their respective jurisdictions, rights, and interests.

"The commission is authorized to employ, or retain, and fix the compensation for the services of such engineers, transportation experts, experts in water development and utilization, and constructors of eminence as it may deem necessary to make such investigations and to carry out the purposes of this section. And in order to defray the expenses made necessary by the provisions of this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may hereafter determine, and the sum of $100,000 is hereby appropriated, available until expended, to be paid out upon warrants drawn on the Secretary of the Treasury by the chairman of said commission.

"The commission shall have power to make every expenditure requisite for and incident to its authorized work, and to employ in the District of Columbia and in the field such clerical, legal, engineering, artistic, and expert services as it may deem advisable, including the payment of per diem in lieu of subsistence for employees engaged in field work or traveling on official business, rent of offices in the District of Columbia and in the field, and the purchase of books, maps, and office equipment.

"Nothing herein contained shall be construed to delay, prevent, or interfere with the completion of any survey, investigation, project, or work heretofore adopted or authorized upon or for the improvement of any of the rivers or harbors of the United States or by this act."

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I have taken a deep interest in this bill from the time of its introduction in the other House and have given it a great deal of attention since it has been in the Senate. I had intended to speak at some length upon it, but I am satisfied that the Senate fully understands all of its provisions and appreciates the necessity of it immediately becoming a law.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], who has charge of this bill, has explained it, I have no doubt, very fully and forcefully to the Senate. I was unfortunate in not being present during the time he was explaining the provisions of the bill, being absent at a sitting of a conference committee. But, well knowing how fully he understands the subject matter, the necessities of this legislation, and knowing his ability to state the merits of the measure I am not going to delay the Senate with a further discussion of the bill. I perhaps should say nothing upon the subject, but for some suggestions concerning the character of this legislation which have been made by Senators who have spoken.

This legislation has been described, I hope not seriously, but still it has been so characterized, as a new project, as a reclamation project, as sectional, and as piecemeal legislation. This, Mr. President, does the measure great injustice. It is not a new project. It has been before Congress for more than half a century. It is not sectional. It affects 31 States of this Union directly and indirectly. It is not piecemeal. It relates to the great Mississippi Valley, one of the most important sections of this great country; a section over 2,100 miles long and over 1,300 miles wide, containing an area of 793,000,000 acres—covering the great valley lying between the Allegheny and the Rocky Mountains. It has been recognized, as I have said, for half a century, as a national project, as one affecting the whole country, and in which the entire Nation is directly interested and should bear the burden of its consummation.

I have said that this is not a new project, and the record bears me out. As far back as 1867 President Johnson, in a message to Congress, specifically urged legislation for the preservation of the levees of the Mississippi River, declaring it to be a matter of national importance. I quote his words:

As a subject upon which depends an immense amount of the production and commerce of the country, I recommend to Congress such legislation as may be necessary for the preservation of the levees of the Mississippi River. It is a matter of national importance that early steps should be taken not only to add to the efficiency of these barriers against destructive inundations, but for the removal of all obstructions to the free and safe navigation of that great channel of trade and commerce.

President Garfield, in his letter accepting his nomination for the Presidency, said:

The wisdom of Congress should be invoked to devise some plan by which that great river shall cease to be a terror to those who dwell upon its banks and by which its shipping may safely carry the industrial products of 25,000,000 of people.

President Hayes recommended legislation for the improvement of the Mississippi River for navigation and the protection of the people living along its banks.

President Arthur, in a message to Congress, said:

The constitutionality of a law making appropriations in aid of these objects can not be questioned. The safe and convenient navigation of the Mississippi is a matter of concern to all sections of the country; but to the Northwest, with its immense harvests, needing cheap transportation to the sea, and to the inhabitants of the river valley, whose lives and property depend upon the proper construction of the safeguards which protect them from the floods, it is of vital importance that a well-matured and comprehensive plan for improvement shall be put into operation with as little delay as possible.

Mr. Roosevelt, while President, in a message to Congress, said:

We, the Nation, must build the levees and build them better and more scientifically than ever before.

Mr. Taft, after he had inspected the river, traveling the entire distance affected by the provisions of this bill, said:

I am strongly in favor of expending the whole $50,000,000 to save that part of the country from floods in a reasonable time and to provide a proper levee system.

In addition to these utterances of Chief Executives, the great parties of this country in their platforms have repeatedly embraced provisions favoring the improvement of this great river by levee construction, as is now proposed, to promote navigation facilities for the benefit of many States and incidentally afford protection to the people inhabiting the country through which it flows. In 1912 all three of the great political parties recognized the improvement of the Mississippi River as a great national charge and pledged their respective parties to legislation to accomplish this purpose.

In the light of these declarations of Presidents and all the great political parties of this country, the fact that the measure affects 31 States, nearly 800,000,000 acres of land, and 25,000,000 people, it is impossible for me to conceive how anyone can characterize it as a sectional measure or as piecemeal legislation.

It is a subject so important and of which so much can be said in its favor that it is difficult to speak of it without consuming more time than ought to be taken at this time. Therefore I am not going to trespass further upon the time of the Senate. I only wanted to call attention to the utter want of facts to sustain the objections made to the bill.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] has presented an amendment, a condensation of the great scheme which he has been bringing to the attention of Congress for years past, one worthy of his ability and long experience as a legislator and in keeping with his interest in the prosperity of this Nation and the development of its great natural resources. A similar amendment, though somewhat different in form, was presented to the House when this bill was there pending, and rejected by a very decided majority. It was not the amendment now presented, but the principle was the same.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. SHIELDS. I do.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I merely desire to say that I heard that statement made some days ago, and I took occasion to look at the proposal that was made in the House and found that it went far beyond the amendment which I have offered here. It was quite different, whilst of the same general character.

Mr. SHIELDS. I am not going to controvert what the Senator has said, because I have already stated that the amendment offered in the House was in different form from the amendment which the Senator from Nevada has here presented.

Mr. President, this is a most important measure to all the people of the Mississippi Valley. The duty of the Nation to bear the expense of it has been recognized by the Nation. I speak more particularly of the Mississippi Valley, because I know more of that region, and because my State suffers tremendously from the annual floods of this river.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada, however meritorious it may be, if adopted would defeat the whole bill. There will be time yet for the consideration and enactment of the legislation the Senator from Nevada has proposed. There will be future Congresses which can take the matter under consideration and act upon it.

I believe that, however meritorious it may be, if the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada should be adopted at this late hour it would work the defeat of this bill. We never could at this session secure an agreement to that amendment by the other House; we never could get it considered there, in view of all the legislation that is now pending. It would simply result in allowing the difficult and conscientious labor which has been put upon the flood-control bill to be nullified and go for naught; all the work and time that has been spent upon it would be wasted; and this great measure defeated. I hope the Senate will not accept it.

Mr. NEWLANDS obtained the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada first addressed the Chair, and is recognized.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to have a vote on the amendment I have offered, if that is agreeable to the Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. RANSDELL. I have no objection to a vote on the amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, before the vote is taken——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I simply desire to make an announcement. In order to accommodate the convenience of Senators, I desire to announce that I shall ask the Senate to remain in session continuously until we have finished the bill now under consideration and the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill, at which time I shall ask for an adjournment until to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, when the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] originally presented his proposition for a commission to look into these matters I was one of the few Senators who favored the proposition and joined with the Senator in support of it. Since then it has developed gradually until it has come to the proposition that he has now.

I want to say to the Senators present that I am going to take only a minute or two.

I can not support the proposition that the Senator from Nevada has now. I am not in favor of a commission composed largely of Cabinet officers. I am in favor of the idea of his amendment, and I want that to be understood. I do not want it to go out that I am opposed to the idea of coordination of the different phases of flood control. I am in favor of it. I do not believe that this will bring about the proper coordination, however. I believe that the machinery that is provided here is of the most objectionable character, and that is the reason why I am going to vote against the amendment. I hope that the amendment in the form it is in now will be defeated. If it should be put upon this bill as an amendment it will lead to a great deal of debate to-day.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Washington that I greatly regret that I can not agree with him, because we have agreed with each other so much in relation to this water legislation. It is of the highest importance that this coordinating commission shall be composed in part of the department chiefs, because they are the ones who are to give directions to their subordinates in the various scientific and engineering services.

I do not wish to dwell further upon the matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. FALL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] and withhold my vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (when Mr. SAULSBURY's name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and therefore withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

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

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I inquire whether the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He has not.

Mr. WALSH. I have a general pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] has a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and we have arranged that they may be transferred. I vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. Noticing his absence, I withdraw my vote, as I do not know how he would vote on this question.

Mr. CATRON. Has the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He has not.

Mr. CATRON. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING], who is absent from the Chamber. I transfer my pair with him to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. I do not see him in the Chamber. I transfer that pair to my colleague [Mr. WEEKS] and that will permit the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] and myself to vote. I will let my vote stand; and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] stands paired with my colleague [Mr. WEEKS].

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, in view of the announcement of the Senator from Massachusetts, I vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] is necessarily absent from the Senate. He is paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN].

Mr. STONE (after having voted in the negative). I find that my pair, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] has not voted. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] and will let my vote stand.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Borah	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Sutherland
Brady	La Follette	Overman	Thomas
Brandegee	Lane	Page	Townsend
Bryan	Lodge	Penrose	Wadsworth
Cummins	McCumber	Pittman	Walsh
Fletcher	McLean	Poindexter	
Hollis	Myers	Shafroth	
Husting	Newlands	Smith, Mich.	

NAYS—32.

Ashurst	Kenyon	Reed	Stone
Bankhead	Kirby	Robinson	Swanson
Broussard	Lea, Tenn.	Sheppard	Thompson
Catron	Lewis	Sherman	Tillman
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Shields	Underwood
Hughes	Nelson	Simmons	Vardaman
James	Phelan	Smith, Md.	Watson
Jones	Ransdell	Smoot	Works

NOT VOTING—35.

Beckham	Fall	Johnson, Me.	Saulsbury
Chilton	Fernald	Kern	Smith, Ariz.
Clapp	Gallinger	Lee, Md.	Smith, Ga.
Clark	Goff	Lippitt	Smith, S. C.
Colt	Gore	Martine, N. J.	Sterling
Culberson	Gronna	O'Gorman	Warren
Curtis	Harding	Oliver	Weeks
Dillingham	Hardwick	Owen	Williams
du Pont	Hitchcock	Pomerene	

So Mr. NEWLANDS's amendment was rejected.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 4, after line 9, it is proposed to insert the following:

(e) Out of the money appropriated under authority of this section there shall be paid to the Reclamation Service a sum of money equal to one-half of the cost of the construction of all dams heretofore constructed or hereafter to be constructed by said Reclamation Service for the impounding of flood waters which in their natural course, without such impounding, would reach the Mississippi River. Any money so paid to the Reclamation Service as part payment for the construction of any dam shall be used exclusively for the particular reclamation project or projects for the benefit of which such dam is constructed, and the same shall not be included in the amounts to be repaid to the reclamation fund by the settlers under the various reclamation projects benefited thereby: *Provided*, That there shall not be paid in any one year an amount in excess of $200,000 toward the construction of any single dam.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I can not myself see how anyone favoring this bill can consistently oppose this amendment. To me it looks as though anyone who favored the proposition contained in the original bill, if he is logical, must necessarily favor this amendment. It seeks to carry out to its logical sequence, I think, the purposes of the bill.

There is flowing down the Mississippi River every year a large amount of surplus water that at certain stages at certain periods and at certain places does a great deal of damage. It is the object of this bill, as I understand it, to correct that evil. We may disagree as to how it is to be done, what proportions should be paid by private owners for the benefits they may receive, and other details of the bill, but I think everybody will concede that that is a good purpose.

This water that does the damage in Louisiana, if it were retained at its source in South Dakota, in Montana, in Wyoming, in Nebraska, and in other States, would not do any damage. Now, we have a law on the statute books known as the reclamation act. The object of that act is just the reverse of the object of this one. This act seeks to keep water from getting on land and doing damage. The reclamation act seeks to retain water and put it on land and make it beneficial. The water that gets away in Wyoming and Nebraska does damage in Mississippi and Louisiana. Under the reclamation act various dams have been constructed, and a few more are to be constructed. Every gallon of flood water that is retained behind those dams and put upon the lands that would otherwise be arid and useless saves the Mississippi and the Louisiana farmers from damage by overflow.

If you want to protect the farmer on the lower part of the river by saying that the Government shall construct a levee to keep the water off his lands, are you not going to give credit to the farmer in Minnesota, Montana, South Dakota, and Wyoming who keeps back the flood waters that would otherwise raise the level of the Mississippi River lower down and do damage that you are trying to protect the people from in this very bill?

Mr. President, this amendment in effect provides that out of the fund created by this bill there shall be paid, for every dam constructed by the Reclamation Service for the withholding of flood waters, one-half of its cost. It applies to no dam unless that dam holds back the flood waters that otherwise would get into the Mississippi River.

It provides for no payment for anything connected with any reclamation project except for the construction of the dam itself, and only one-half of that.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Do I understand that the Senator's amendment provides for the payment of a certain portion of this fund to the Reclamation Service?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. To enter into the general reclamation fund?

Mr. NORRIS. No; the provision is that one-half of the cost of the dams that I have mentioned shall be paid out of the fund created by this bill into the Reclamation Service, to be applied exclusively to the particular dams that hold back the flood waters, and that that amount shall not be returned by the settlers under that particular reclamation project.

Mr. BORAH. In other words, the effect of it would be to relieve the settlers of one-half the charge.

Mr. NORRIS. Of one-half the charge for the construction of the dam that holds back the flood waters that otherwise would get into the Mississippi River.

Mr. BORAH. How would you apportion it among the different dams?

Mr. NORRIS. You would pay one-half for construction. I have a list here of the dams that I am going to give in a few minutes.

Mr. BORAH. Each dam, then, is to be credited with one-half the amount it cost to construct it?

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly. A certain quantity of water does a certain amount of damage on the lower Mississippi. If that same water were held back and did not get into the lower Mississippi, it would not do any damage, and the expenditure of this money would be unnecessary; nobody would be injured. It is just as fair, it strikes me, to take the farmer in the arid region and let him get the benefit of the Government appropriation that holds back flood waters as it is to give all the benefit to the man in the lower Mississippi Valley.

I have provided in the amendment that one-half the value of these particular dams shall be paid out of this fund. When you get lower down you have a more liberal provision in the bill for the farmers down there. The bill provides:

That no money appropriated under authority of this section shall be expended in the construction or repair of any levee unless and until assurances have been given satisfactory to the commission that local interests protected thereby will contribute for such construction and repair a sum which the commission shall determine to be just and equitable but which shall be not less than one-half of such sum as may have been allotted by the commission for such work.

In other words, under the bill, if we appropriate out of the fund provided by the bill for a section in the South a million dollars, the local interests must put up $500,000. In other words, the Government puts up $2 to their $1. I have not been as strict as that in the amendment with the farmer on the plains. He puts up dollar for dollar with the Government for the construction of the dam that holds back the flood waters. I have a provision in it, so that it would not interfere seriously with the use of this fund, that not more than $200,000 shall be appropriated for any particular dam during any one fiscal year.

Mr. President, it would not be such a large amount of money, and let me say that it is all going for a good purpose. The people down below who are going to have their lands made valuable have to contribute one-fourth, and they get some benefit out of it. They ought to contribute something to it. The people at the other end of the same stream who hold back the water that would do damage below ought to be treated, to be fair, in exactly the same way.

That is not all, Mr. President. These flood waters do damage on their way down. They interfere even with navigation. In the regulation of the stream by holding back the flood waters at the source of the stream you regulate that and incidental benefits will go to everybody. Here is one farmer whom you are protecting by this bill by keeping the water off his land. I ask

that you apply the same principle and protect the fellow who saves the water from going down there and doing damage by putting it on his own land and applying it to a useful purpose.

Then bear in mind it is not a donation to irrigation, as at first blush might be imagined. It applies only to the dam, and that is a very small portion of the expense connected with any irrigation project. It has nothing to do with the laterals or the ditches and with all the other necessary expenses that go with every reclamation project. More than that, it does not apply to any dam, either, unless that dam holds back flood waters from the Mississippi River.

I will take a particular dam with which I am somewhat familiar, the Pathfinder Dam in Wyoming. I do not care to take up the time of the Senate unless it is necessary to go into the full details as to the exact amount of water that it holds back. It is a dam in the canyon of the mountains 250 feet high—I am speaking from memory—and holds back an enormous quantity of water. Under the law of the State through which the river flows it is necessary that the Reclamation Service should permit at all seasons of the year the ordinary volume of the stream to continue to flow. So they hold nothing but flood water. In other words, there are other rights involved lower down on the stream. So it is not a proposition of going out and damming up a stream and stopping all the water. They must let the ordinary flow of the river continue every day in the year. They only hold by that great dam the flood water that if turned loose and flowing down the Mississippi would destroy millions of dollars worth of property every year. Ought the Government pay for that dam? Ought it to pay for half of it if by this bill you are going to pay to build a levee on the Mississippi, which is just the same as the dam, except made of different material, to keep the water off from the other fellow's land?

Let us see what it would cost. That is one of the largest dams that the Reclamation Service has ever constructed. It cost $1,824,000. It is the largest of any. So we would have about $900,000 to pay in five years if this amendment should be adopted for that one dam. I have a letter here from the Chief of the Reclamation Service, in which he gives me a list of the dams. There is the Blackfeet Dam in Montana, that cost $138,000. In Montana there is the Four Horns Dam, which cost only $13,000; the Little Porcupine, in the same State, which cost $29,000; the Milk River Dam, in the same State, which cost $46,000; the Sun River Dam, in the same State, which cost $270,000. Then come the Wyoming dam, the Pathfinder, which cost $1,824,000, and in Nebraska the dam making Lake Alice, $210,000; the dam near Minatare, Nebr., $552,000; in South Dakota the Belle Fourche Dam, cost $1,235,000; and in Wyoming the Shoshone Dam, cost $1,357,000. There have been only three dams constructed by the Reclamation Service that cost more than $1,000,000.

It is fair to say that there are some other dams that will be constructed. I know of another dam that was to be constructed in Wyoming, and in this same letter I asked for an estimate on that—the Guernsey Dam. That is a part of the great North Platte project. I knew they had been making surveys and estimates for the construction of that dam. It will take only flood waters. It may be that some of the dams I have mentioned would not be entitled to anything under this amendment, because they, perhaps, get waters that are not flood waters. So he gave me, at my request, an estimate of the Guernsey Dam in addition to those that I have already read. He says:

> Surveys and preliminary estimates of cost of the Guernsey Dam were made some years ago, and the probable cost, including the development of some 3,000 horsepower, is from $400,000 to $500,000.

Mr. President, I might go on and give you the details of every one of these dams, but it seems to me that the amendment which I have offered comes so logically within the line of the bill that if those who are behind the bill are fair, and I know they intend to be fair, and from their standpoint are fair—it does look to me that if they are fair and want to be logical they will certainly make no objection to this particular amendment, and I most sincerely trust that the Senator from Louisiana will not oppose it.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I wish I could accept this amendment. I want to say to the Senator from Nebraska that I have always favored as strenuously as I could the irrigation of the arid lands of the West. I made a speech for that measure when it first came up in 1903, and I have been a devoted friend of improving those arid lands by irrigation ever since. We spent $111,000,000 and it is going to take a great deal more, and I am going to vote for every legitimate irrigation project that comes up.

But, Mr. President and Senators, we do not know how much money would be extracted from the pending bill if this amendment should go through. I am not going to enter into a discussion of it, but the amendment proposes to take out of the appropriation provided for in the bill $200,000 for every dam heretofore constructed or hereafter to be constructed in that portion of the arid West which sends its waters down into the drainage basin of the Mississippi. We have no estimate as to how many dams hereafter are to be constructed. Of course we might know, although we have not that information, how many have been constructed. We can not tell.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. RANSDELL. Pardon me just a minute and then I will yield. We know what it is going to cost to improve the Sacramento River. The estimates have been made. Five million six hundred thousand dollars is the proportion which the Government ought to pay. We know what it is going to cost the Government to improve the lower Mississippi. If we diminish those sums by so much, $1,000,000, $10,000,000, or $20,000,000, for these dams—I do not know what the amount may be—it will completely break up our estimates and our projects. I hope Senators will not support the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. RANSDELL. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator knows, of course, that these reclamation projects are limited and that we have very nearly exhausted, if not entirely exhausted, the possibilities of holding that land for the benefit of irrigation. The Reclamation Service will construct no dams, of course, except for purposes of irrigation. Practically all of them have been completed now. I read to the Senator the list. He can tell within a cent what it will cost. I do not have any idea that there will be more than three or four additional dams constructed on the watershed of the Mississippi River, because it is necessarily confined to arid lands that would be reclaimed by irrigation. So we need have no fear in that respect that we are going into an uncertainty or that it is going to mount up to a large sum.

Mr. RANSDELL. I know the Senator is absolutely honest; he does not think there will be more than three or four more, but we might extend a good deal the irrigation service by twenty or thirty million dollars as we did a few years ago. It is so uncertain and so indefinite as to amount that I hope Senators will not support the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am very heartily in favor of the pending amendment, and I trust we shall be able to get a vote on it. I want to support it. But I think the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is altogether too fearful about it. I appreciate very well his desire to have the bill go through without any amendment of any character whatever, but at the same time it might be well to have a little regard for the desires and interests of other sections of the country that are as well interested in the problem that the bill deals with.

It was the opinion of many of us that the general principle at least of the amendment tendered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] ought to find a place in the bill. I am satisfied that the idea advanced by the Senator from Nevada will take hold eventually upon the people of the country, and he is entitled to very great credit for his persistency in keeping it before the Senate.

Now, here is another idea that addresses itself with particular force to the people of the country about the upper stretches of the Mississippi River and the remote portions of that great valley. Our people tax themselves very heavily, indeed, for the purpose of holding back the waters, which if allowed to run their free course would go to swell the great volume that creates the disasters in the lower valley which we are endeavoring by this appropriation to avert. Every acre-foot of water that is held back lessens by just so much the risk by which the lands adjacent to the lower Mississippi are subject. Then by holding back the water by the dams undoubtedly adds to the value of their own property, but they at the same time make a most substantial contribution to the result which the bill is intended to effect. It is a very reasonable request upon their part that one-half of the amount which they are called upon to expend in the construction of dams for the purpose of holding back this water and storing it, that it may be spread out upon the land and not allowed to go to swell the great volume that flows into the lower Mississippi. It is a very reasonable request, it seems to me, and I am surprised if it is not very readily acceded to by the gentlemen who are advocating the bill, particularly in view of the fact that the people from that remote region are extremely desirous of aiding in securing the passage of this act.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I wish to say to the Senator that I am very much in disfavor of any measure which will not bring under the plow the arid lands in the West. I want to see homes builded out there.

I should not be opposed to this amendment at all if the matter had been investigated. We are leaping in the dark as to the amount of the cost. While I personally might not be opposed to it, I sincerely doubt, if this amendment be adopted, whether the bill stands the Chinaman's show to pass. If I thought the rejection of this proposition closed the door of hope in the face of the people of the arid West, I should be willing to take the chance; but when I realize that the adoption of an amendment of this kind is not going to get anywhere for anybody, is not going to accomplish any good for anybody, it seems to me that we are throwing away an opportunity to do a great governmental service, not exclusively to the people of the lower Mississippi—because the Government is going to continue to spend money on the Mississippi River—but the measure which we propose, if adopted, will save an enormous amount of money, something like $8,000,000, in the completion of the work. If the Senator's measure could pass, if we knew what it was going to cost, or anything about it, I should not oppose it at all.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am sure neither the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] nor the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] will entertain the idea that I would even suggest this amendment to the pending bill if, in my judgment, it would in any wise imperil its passage. I am not at all impressed with the fear expressed by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that an amendment of this character or the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] will in any wise imperil the bill. Why should it? It is said, Mr. President, that the bill can not pass if this amendment is put upon it. Why? Can not pass where? Will an amendment of this kind cause to arise any opposition to the flood-control bill? Who is it that is particularly desirous of having this bill passed? It is the Senators representing the States that are to be relieved by reason of the Government work, the construction of which it contemplates. Certainly, they have the control in their own hands, so far as an amendment of this character is concerned, because it is scarcely to be anticipated that opposition will arise from any other section of the country to a measure of this character.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If the Senator from Montana will pardon me just there, I do not feel at liberty to give his name, but a Senator upon the floor—a Senator from the West—stated to me before the vote was taken on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada that if the amendment should be adopted he would be opposed to the bill and that it would not pass.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator from Montana permit an interruption there?

Mr. WALSH. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Mississippi—and I think I heard perhaps the same remark—that that reference was not to this amendment, as I understood——

Mr. VARDAMAN. I stated the reference was to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS].

Mr. NORRIS. The reference was to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Yes. That, of course, in substance, has been tested out in the other House, and whatever the House may have done, of course, it is not in order to refer to here.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I have no information that would lead me to form any judgment about how the bill would be regarded in this body. I was considering the effect of the amendment in another branch of Congress, but that is neither here nor there. I apprehend that we should not find that the popularity of the bill in this branch was to any degree or in any measure lessened by the adoption of the amendment suggested by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RANSDELL. Will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. RANSDELL. I should like to suggest to the Senator that it might be all right to adopt this amendment if we knew what we were doing, but I served a long time in the House of Representatives—for 14 years—and I know they are very particular over there about leaping in the dark, as suggested by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN]. There has been no estimate made; there has been no report of any department of which I have ever heard, and nothing in the world of which I know whether this amendment, if adopted, is going to require the deduction from the items for the Mississippi and the Sacramento Rivers of $200,000 or $1,000,000 or $5,000,000. None of us knows that.

We are not in the habit, I will say to the Senator, as he knows as well as I do, of voting on something about which we are not informed, and we are not informed on this proposition.

Mr. WALSH. The difficulty suggested by the Senator from Louisiana is not a serious one, and it is easily obviated. In the first place, the amount which these various dams have cost is a matter of official record. I have the record before me.

Mr. RANSDELL. But that record applies to those dams which have been heretofore constructed.

Mr. WALSH. Exactly.

Mr. RANSDELL. It does not apply to those to be hereafter constructed.

Mr. WALSH. But the Senator from Louisiana will remember that those hereafter constructed can only be constructed out of the reclamation fund; that the reclamation fund is a revolving fund, and that the amount of the reclamation fund is limited. So the Senator need have no apprehension at all on that score. The amount that will be constructed in the future, in all reasonable probability, will bear no relation whatever to the amount that has been constructed in the past.

Mr. RANSDELL. I will ask the Senator if we did not add to the reclamation fund several years ago by a loan of some twenty or thirty million dollars?

Mr. WALSH. We did.

Mr. RANSDELL. And if it is not very likely that in the next three or four years we shall give them an additional loan? They can get my vote, I will say to the Senator, for an additional loan, for I think the businesslike thing to do is to finish these great reclamation projects and not have them hanging on forever. If we give them an additional loan, we shall have a number of those projects coming on very shortly.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. WORKS. I understood the Senator from Montana to yield to me by nodding his head in the affirmative.

I am not opposed to this amendment on the ground that it will defeat the bill—I do not know whether it will or not—but upon the ground that, applied to the Sacramento appropriation, it would be entirely unfair and unjust. In that case the Board of Engineers has figured very closely upon the expense, and it is provided in this bill that the State of California shall put up one half of that amount and that the Government shall put up the other half—that portion which will apply to the improvement of the navigation of the stream. If you take it out of the funds that are to be supplied by the Government, you simply reduce it to that extent, and therefore you dislocate the whole thing, so to speak.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator from California will permit me, I will permit the Senator from Nebraska to reply to the suggestion; but the answer readily occurs to me.

Mr. NORRIS. I supposed the Senator from Montana had taken his seat. I did not intend to interrupt the Senator with a view of answering the question. I am perfectly satisfied that the Senator from Montana can answer it; but I might say, briefly, that this does not apply to the Sacramento project, and has nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. WORKS. I did not understand that. I understood it went to the whole fund. It certainly applies——

Mr. NORRIS. It does not lessen the fund, as I understand, that would go to the Sacramento project, either directly or indirectly.

Mr. WORKS. I think the Senator would see that it would be entirely unjust if it did.

Mr. NORRIS. I can see that it has nothing to do with that project at all. It applies only to the other fund.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, for the purpose of showing the importance of these reservoirs in holding back waters which would otherwise swell the enormous volume that passes out the mouth of the Mississippi River, I call attention to the fact that the great Pathfinder Dam, referred to by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], has a storage capacity of 1,070,000 acre-feet; that is to say, it holds water enough to cover 1,070,000 acres to a depth of 1 foot.

The various dams constituting the principal features of the Sun River project, in the State of Montana, have a storage capacity of 577,700 acre-feet; that is to say, those dams will

hold back another half million acre-feet of water. All this, Mr. President, is so much taken out of the aggregate that would be found in the lower valley; and when the Government of the United States makes this appropriation out of the Treasury without any reimbursable feature to it at all, and then, Mr. President, enacts a law under which the whole expense of the construction of the reservoirs at the sources of these streams is made a burden upon those who own the lands upon which the water is placed a difference in treatment is at once obvious that does not commend itself to any fair-minded legislator. When this provision is being thus made it seems to me that we are asking only a very reasonable provision when we insist that one-half of the cost of the storage dams ought to be reimbursed to the people upon whom the burden is now cast to the full extent of the cost of these dams that thus contribute to the general result which this legislation seeks to bring about.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in behalf of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska. I have believed for a long time that equity demanded that the settlers should be relieved of some part of the cost of these great structures in the shape of dams that serve a double purpose. They serve the purpose of storing the water for the reclamation of the arid lands, and then the water originally stored behind these dams is a second time stored in the land itself, and thus gradually seeps back to the river and reinforces it, not during a period of flood but during a period of drought. These structures, therefore, serve a great purpose, not simply the purpose of the man whose land is reclaimed and who has to pay in 20 installments his proportionate share of the cost of the work, but a national purpose in regulating the stream itself so that the river has a more equal flow. We all know that standardizing the flow is the thing that is very desirable to attain, for if that is accomplished destructive floods will be lacking; and if that is accomplished, there will always be a sufficient depth for river carriage.

Now, we are considering the problem relating to the Mississippi River, and what I complain of in this bill is that it is treated as if the Mississippi River were entirely below Cairo. That river really consists not only of the main stream but all its tributaries. The watersheds of over 30 States are tributary to it, and there is no problem that relates to any one of those watersheds that is not, in a measure, the common problem of all.

The Senator from Nebraska seeks to recognize this in the amendment which he has offered, which recognizes the obvious equity of the men who have been struggling to pay the Government for the reclamation of their lands and which offers no material obstacle to the completion of the purpose of this bill, because it takes only a very small part of the fund created by it; and if it is necessary at any time, that part can be easily restored. The Senator from Nebraska is left, under these conditions, to what recourse? To presenting a special bill for the relief of the settlers behind three or four dams, with all the long waiting involved, when justice in this matter is so obvious as to demand immediate attention, and the relief can be given without any substantial loss to the very generous fund that is created by this bill. It seems to me, Mr. President, that this is a very appropriate time to consider this subject.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a word to express my hope that the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska will prevail. I think it is a most just and meritorious amendment. I have made a little calculation here, showing what will be required to be paid from this fund of $45,000,000, which we propose to appropriate for the lower Mississippi River to the Reclamation Service.

The whole amount for reclamation projects already completed is, as I have figured it, $5,674,000. One-half of that would be $2,882,000. Then, in addition to the projects already completed, comes the Guernsey Dam, for which surveys and preliminary estimates have been made, and the cost is estimated to be from $400,000 to $500,000. Adding one-half of the larger amount, $500,000, to the projects already completed, we have an aggregate of $3,132,000. Then, I take all the projects that have been contemplated, or that are under contemplation now. They aggregate the sum of $4,400,000, one-half of which would be $2,200,000.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. STERLING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator, of course, understands as to those projects that have been investigated, and I think he will agree with me when I state that that is the very furthest possible limit.

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Perhaps not one-half of those will ever be undertaken, and perhaps not nearly one-half. So that the Senator has given figures that go to the last possible cent that could ever be required under this amendment.

Mr. STERLING. I so understand, Mr. President; and I understand that it is altogether probable that within the five years within which the $45,000,000 are to be expended along the Mississippi River the most of these contemplated projects will never be entered upon at all. They will not have been commenced within five years, so that I think it is fair to assume that not over about $3,500,000 will be drawn from this total of $45,000,000 to pay the Reclamation Service.

Mr. President, the justice of this proposition appeals to me very strongly. We have in the State of South Dakota one reclamation project—the Bellefourche—which is one of the costly projects, the cost being $1,235,000. I know something about the burdens that have been borne by the settlers upon the Bellefourche irrigation project, how the cost of that project and the cost to them every year since its construction has been more than they ever anticipated and more than they thought they were contracting for with the Government when they took their lands under that project.

Mr. President, the contributions they have made and the burdens they have borne are contributions in a very large sense, I think, to the betterment of conditions along the lower Mississippi River. By the conservation and control of the waters that are tributary to the Missouri and the Mississippi Rivers they have done a great deal toward preventing overflows on the lower Mississippi, and it seems to me that it is no more than just that one-half of the cost of the construction of the dams for these projects should be turned back and paid to the Reclamation Service in order that these settlers may be to some extent compensated for the burdens that they have borne.

There is one other feature, Mr. President, that I have not heard mentioned in this discussion. It has been estimated by the Board of Army Engineers, or by some member of that board, that over 400,000,000 tons of silt or sediment are annually carried by the Missouri River alone down into the Mississippi River. It occurs to me that this condition must have quite an intimate connection with impeding navigation on the Mississippi River and also a close connection with the overflows of that river. The building of these dams, the control and regulation of the flow of waters by means of the dams, will hold back the sediment and the silt that is carried into the Mississippi by its tributaries, and on this account the construction of these dams is of great benefit to the lower Mississippi.

Hence, Mr. President, I feel that all the considerations which have been urged in favor of this amendment are weighty ones and I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, just a word or two in regard to this matter. I again wish to reiterate that I am a friend of irrigation in the West, and I wish to give just a few figures in regard to what we have already done out there.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. RANSDELL. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. I want to say to the Senator from Louisiana that I have an amendment that will not take long; but I wanted to tell the Senator now, so that if the discussion goes on to the limit of this time I do not want to be foreclosed from offering my amendment, and I do not want to stop the progress of the bill. I am just suggesting that to the Senator in case he is going to continue.

Mr. RANSDELL. I am very much obliged to the Senator. I was not going to speak more than five minutes, and then I am ready to vote on this matter. I hope we can vote on it.

I simply wish to say to the Senate that we have not been at all illiberal in spending money on the irrigated lands of the West. We have already spent about $111,000,000. We have irrigated, or, at least, arranged for putting the water on, 1,690,000 acres. It has cost us to date an average of $65.20 per acre to irrigate those lands, and I have not a bit of doubt that it is a wise expenditure. The total cost of all projects is estimated at $174,000,000. Deducting the $111,000,000 already spent, something like $63,000,000 must be spent to complete these projects, and when completed they will have cost an average of $56 per acre.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I do not want to take the time of the Senator, but he will recognize that you use our money that you get from the sale of our lands in the first place, and then it is reimbursable, and we must pay it back.

Mr. RANSDELL. I will not discuss that, but, I think, those lands belong to the whole Nation. The money is derived from the proceeds of sale of the public lands in the arid-land States,

and it is paid back. I understand that. There is an average of $56 per acre cost, and it is to be paid back in 20 years without any interest. You pay 5 per cent the first year, then five years without paying anything, then 5 per cent for five years, then 7 or 8 per cent per annum, and there is no interest charge. Money is worth, even to the Government, about 3 per cent; so there is an average time of 10 years that the people out there have the use of that money without any interest on land that has cost to irrigate $56 per acre. That is an average interest charge of $1.68 per annum, or a total of $16.80 per acre, that is given to those people absolutely as a donation.

I am entirely willing to do that; I think it is all right; but I wish to compare with that free contribution by the Government of $16.80 per acre the small donation, if you can call it that, which this bill carries. It will be a donation of not exceeding $3.75 per acre on the 16,000,000 acres that will be protected from floods by this bill, namely, appropriations by the Government for levees have been about $30,000,000 to date and $30,000,000 in this bill, a total of $60,000,000 in all, making an average of $3.75 per acre.

Senators, if there were anything logical about this proposition, I would not oppose it at all; but just glance on that map over there and see where the first flood of 1916 came from. Those colored areas show it. That map was prepared by the Weather Bureau. Glance on the one over this way and see where the second flood of 1916 came from. That map also was prepared by the Weather Bureau. It does not reach out to the arid West and does not go within hundreds of miles of it. Glance on this one in the center and see where the awful floods of 1912 came from. None of those waters fell within a long distance of the arid region of the West. We would not get any benefit, so far as our floods are concerned, from any of these appropriations; but that is neither here nor there. You have a great scheme and a good one, and I hope you will get all the money that you need for it, and I will assure you that you will get my vote for it; but I beg of you not to insist on tying this provision up with it and thereby jeopardize the measure.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] tells how much per acre it costs to irrigate the land in the Reclamation Service and then how much per acre it costs under this bill to save the land in Louisiana from overflow; but the figures he gives in regard to the Reclamation Service include the entire sum. There is not any intention in this amendment to use any money for any purpose except for the payment of one-half of the cost of construction of dams that hold back flood waters. It is not fair to take the entire reclamation cost and say that it costs that much an acre and that the Government is doing that, or that you are liable under this amendment to pay half of it. That has not anything to do with it. The comparison that the Senator makes of $3.50 an acre to save the overflow and the $60 an acre that he charges up against the land in the arid region have no relation whatever to each other. I say to the Senator that I should be glad if he would agree to an amendment to pay to this irrigated country, out of that fund, $3.50 an acre. The amount you will pay under this amendment, if it is adopted, will be less than $2 an acre. I have not had time to make the computation, but it will not be anywhere near as expensive as will be the payment of the money to save the overflowed lands of Louisiana.

We are not coming in here as beggars to get this money, Mr. President, as might be gleaned from some remarks that have been made. There has not been anything donated to those people who are reclaiming this arid country. They are earning everything that they get. Many of them fail. If crops happen to be poor or the prices are not high, they can not make enough off of it to pay for this land. That is neither here nor there, Mr. President. It is a matter of common, ordinary justice. You are going to appropriate money out of the Treasury of the United States to help the man in the South to reclaim land that is flooded from the Mississippi River. We ask you to pay some money to the man in the arid country who keeps back the water and saves the southern farmer from being flooded. It is all the same proposition, just alike, except that we are not asking as large an amount for the arid-land farmer as you are for the man who is going to have his land reclaimed in Mississippi and Louisiana. That is the only difference.

Now, I want to say another word, Mr. President. The Senator refers to these maps and says, "Why, here is a flood where the waters fell in a certain locality, and the damage came from the waters that fell in that locality." Why, Mr. President, he could draw another map and he could show the mountains of snow that have fallen in the Rocky Mountains, every particle of which, in the shape of water, came down and went into the Mississippi River; and when that rain took place there, if there had been no water anywhere in the Mississippi River or in that valley that had come from these melted snows of the mountains, you would have had an entirely different result. Sometimes you would have been damaged, it is true; but you can not get away from the fact that every gallon of water that is held back to irrigate land does not do any damage in the Mississippi Valley that it would do if it were not held back. So it is just as fair to pay one-half of the expense to the man who holds it back as it is to the man who builds the dam down along the Mississippi River instead of building it in Wyoming or in South Dakota or in Nebraska. The dam that is constructed in Mississippi—and a levee is nothing but a dam—we are going to pay for out of Government funds; but if we construct the dam somewhere else to hold back the same water you say it is not fair to pay for it.

Now, I submit it as a matter of common justice and common logic, Mr. President. If you are going to contribute public funds for the payment in one case, you must do it in the other if you are fair.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I had not intended to take any time in the discussion of this measure, and I do not want to delay it at all; but when an amendment comes up in which it seems to me my people are interested, either directly or indirectly, I feel that I ought to look after their rights just a little bit.

I offer the amendment which I send to the desk to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington offers an amendment to the amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the proposed amendment, the following proviso:

Provided further, That wherever dams have been or hereafter may be constructed in connection with reclamation projects which impound waters which would otherwise flow into navigable streams, one-half of the cost thereof shall be credited to the project in connection with which such dam is or may be constructed.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I am in sympathy with the proposition of the Senator from Nebraska, although I can not see myself that these reservoirs would to any appreciable extent affect the flood waters down on the lower Mississippi River. I have noticed that these floods on the Mississippi River come at a time of the year when the reservoirs constructed away at the headwaters are very likely to be full, and also that they come from a rainfall far below where the reservoirs may be constructed. But the impounding of these waters ought to be made a means by which the floods on the lower Mississippi may be diminished to some extent; I grant that; and hence there is a benefit accruing in that respect.

As the Senator from Nebraska has said, these reservoirs are constructed with the money of the individuals. That is, the Government advances the money; but it must be repaid to the Government, and it will be repaid, and it is being repaid.

I am getting just a little bit tired, myself, of statements and suggestions made on this floor that the Government is putting in these reclamation works, and that the Government is reclaiming these arid lands of the West and then stopping there.

A great many seem to have that impression. That is not the case, however. These lands are going to be reclaimed by the money of the people that settle upon or already have settled upon these lands. The money is being advanced by the Government, but the people and the lands are held for its repayment. We appropriate money for river and harbor improvement; we are going to appropriate over $50,000,000 by this bill, and not a dollar is to be paid back by those benefited. With reclamation appropriations it is different. Every dollar of it must be repaid. The Government is not reclaiming these lands; the settlers are paying for this reclamation, and I want the people to understand that.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. My attention was directed to another matter when the amendment of the Senator from Washington was being read. What is the purport and effect of the amendment of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. JONES. My amendment provides that wherever reservoirs have been constructed in connection with an irrigation project to hold back water that otherwise would go into a navigable stream, one-half the cost of that reservoir shall be credited to the project in connection with which it is constructed.

I have in mind my State, just as the other Senators on this floor are looking after the interests of their States. I note that the Senators who are supporting the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska come from States that will be benefited by the adoption of that amendment. They come from States where there are irrigation projects in connection with which great

dams and reservoirs have been constructed. Now, I come from a State where reservoirs have been constructed for impounding water for irrigation purposes. Every one of those reservoirs has been constructed at the headwaters of streams that flow into the Columbia River, which almost every year floods lands along its banks and very frequently floods the city of Portland to a very great extent, and other cities and towns along that stream, doing thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of damage.

Now, then, if by the construction of these reservoirs on the headwaters of the Mississippi floods are diminished on the lower Mississippi, so will the construction of the dams upon the headwaters of the streams running into the Columbia River diminish the floods and the damage by floods along the Columbia River; and if the settlers on irrigation projects connected with the Mississippi River are entitled to relief on a part of the money that they have paid for these reservoirs because of their holding back waters of the Mississippi, so are settlers on projects in the State of Washington at the headwaters of streams on the Columbia River entitled to relief because of holding back the waters of that stream and diminishing the damage done by the Columbia River lower down.

I really think that they ought to have some relief. I do not believe that the settlers in Nebraska or in Montana or in South Dakota ought to have to pay every dollar of the cost of the reservoirs that have been constructed—of course, they were originally constructed for the purpose of getting water for irrigation purposes, but they will result in great benefit to the people below—and neither should settlers in the State of Washington be compelled to pay every dollar of the cost of impounding waters that otherwise would flood the territory down below.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the Senator if he will not offer his amendment to the bill as a separate proposition? It is based upon an entirely different principle from my amendment, and, as a matter of fact, if it were not for the liberality of the rules, it would be subject to a point of order, because it is not material to my amendment, but takes up an entirely different phase of the subject and introduces into the subject an entirely new and different principle from that upon which my amendment is based.

Mr. JONES. I can not agree with the Senator. I think the principle of his amendment is the same. The only thing is he is attaching his amendment to an appropriation that is being made by the bill, and if it is adopted, of course, they get the money out of the money appropriated by the bill for flood purposes; but the principle is the same. The principle of his amendment is that the settlers ought not to be compelled to pay money for some improvement that is of benefit to some other people in other sections without being reimbursed.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. JONES. That is the principle of mine.

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. JONES. Oh, yes. The mere fact that there is no appropriation in this bill for impounding water or for preventing floods on the Columbia River does not take my amendment out of the principle of the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I admit that, but there is nothing in the bill about the Columbia River. There is not anything in the bill about the flood waters of any streams except the Mississippi and the Sacramento. The amendment I have introduced is confined entirely to that.

Mr. JONES. That is what I am objecting to. I know that.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator is objecting to the bill on that ground I can see how he would be logical to object to the amendment.

Mr. JONES. I should not say that I am objecting to the bill; I should not say that I am objecting to the amendment. I am not, but I am seeking to take care of settlers in my part of the country, people who spent their money for the reclamation not only of arid lands, but who have spent their money for the construction of reservoirs and dams that will have the same result as the reservoirs and dams on the headwaters of the Mississippi River.

The plea of the Senator from Nebraska would require us to wait until Congress sees fit to take up the matter of controlling the flood waters of the Columbia River before we would have any opportunity to get any benefit. I do not think that that should be required of us.

Mr. President, it is not fair to the settlers under one irrigation project that they should be treated differently from settlers upon another irrigation project, just because Congress sees fit to take up some independent work in connection with one section of the country while it does not take up the work in connection with another section of the country.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator, it seems to me, will have to modify that statement, because of the peculiar condition under which the water is held back in one case, it is acknowledged, and for the purposes of this bill it must be conclusively assumed that the Government is going to pay a part of the expense of reclaiming a certain piece of land. If you happen to be so located that you hold back water that would otherwise be paid for by the Government at the other end of the stream, that would be entirely different from an irrigation project where it is not even claimed that anything of that kind exists.

Mr. JONES. It is not claimed that there are no conditions of that sort on the Columbia River.

Mr. NORRIS. The Columbia River is something that is not in the bill.

Mr. JONES. I know the Columbia River is not provided for in the bill, but the principle is.

Mr. NORRIS. It may be that if the Columbia River overflowed, the same conditions would apply as to the Mississippi; but that is not the case.

Mr. JONES. Do we have to wait until Congress takes up that question?

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator should offer his amendment, then, to put the Columbia River in the bill and let us take up that question and see whether it is entitled to go in.

Mr. JONES. If my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska is voted down and his amendment is adopted, I am going to offer this amendment as a separate section of the bill. My amendment is a proper amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. If we are going in this bill to relieve settlers on irrigation projects of the payment of one-half of the cost of the dams and reservoirs that they have constructed under a law passed by Congress, which required them to do it and required them to pay the full cost of reclamation, then we ought to relieve the settlers under other projects who have constructed dams and reservoirs under the same law and with the same understanding.

That is all I am going to say just now with reference to this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. [Putting the question.] The noes seem to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana suggests the absence of a quorum, and the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Jones	Overman	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Kenyon	Owen	Smith, Mich.
Borah	Kirby	Page	Sterling
Broussard	La Follette	Phelan	Stone
Chamberlain	Lea, Tenn.	Pittman	Swanson
Cummins	Lewis	Ransdell	Thomas
Fall	Lodge	Reed	Underwood
Fletcher	McCumber	Robinson	Vardaman
Hollis	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Walsh
Hughes	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Works
Husting	Myers	Sherman	
James	Newlands	Shields	
Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Simmons	

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. My colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] is unavoidably absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FALL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] and withhold my vote.

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. HOLLIS (when Mr. SAULBURY's name was called). I desire to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT].

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] and vote "yea."

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when Mr. TOWNSEND's name was called). I desire the RECORD to show that my colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] is absent unavoidably, and that he is paired with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. I will let this announcement stand for the evening.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], which I transfer to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. JAMES. I transfer the general pair I have with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] and vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. In the absence of that Senator I transfer my pair to the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and allow my vote to stand.

I also wish to announce, while I am on my feet, that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]; that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN].

Mr. HOLLIS. I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—21.

Ashurst	Johnson, S. Dak.	McCumber	Shafroth
Borah	Jones	McLean	Sterling
Catron	Kenyon	Myers	Walsh
Cummins	La Follette	Newlands	
Hughes	Lewis	Norris	
Husting	Lodge	Pittman	

NAYS—30.

Bankhead	Martin, Va.	Reed	Stone
Broussard	Martine, N. J.	Robinson	Swanson
Chamberlain	Nelson	Sheppard	Thomas
Fletcher	Owen	Sherman	Underwood
Hollis	Page	Shields	Vardaman
James	Phelan	Simmons	Works
Kirby	Pomerene	Smith, Md.	
Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Smith, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—45.

Beckham	Fall	Lee, Md.	Sutherland
Brady	Fernald	Lippitt	Thompson
Brandegee	Gallinger	O'Gorman	Tillman
Bryan	Goff	Oliver	Townsend
Chilton	Gore	Overman	Wadsworth
Clapp	Gronna	Penrose	Warren
Clark	Harding	Poindexter	Watson
Colt	Hardwick	Saulsbury	Weeks
Culberson	Hitchcock	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Curtis	Johnson, Me.	Smith, Ga.	
Dillingham	Kern	Smith, S. C.	
du Pont	Lane	Smoot	

So Mr. NORRIS's amendment was rejected.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and I desire to have it read. Then I will take a moment in explaining it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, strike out lines 15 to 25, inclusive, and on page 3, strike out lines 1 to 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) No money appropriated under authority of this section shall be expended in the construction or repair of any levee unless and until assurances have been given satisfactory to the commission that the State or States, counties, municipalities, or local interests protected thereby will contribute annually for such work a sum equal to such sum as may be expended annually therefor by the United States under authority of this section, and that such equal contribution by the State or States, counties, municipalities, or local interests will continue annually until the full, equal share of the cost of such work shall have been contributed by said State or States, counties, municipalities, or local interests: *Provided*, That such contributions shall be expended under the direction of the commission, or in such manner as it may require or approve.

Mr. KENYON. I do not want to take much time or to be guilty of rolling any stones in front of the merry process of getting $53,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury; but it does seem to me that the local interests, the lands to be redeemed, the States to be benefited, ought to bear a heavier part of the burden than it is proposed they shall do under this bill. I do not mean to commit myself at all to the bill if the amendment which I propose is adopted, for I shall vote against the bill.

The California project has the same kind of provision that I have asked to have substituted for subdivision (b) in the Mississippi River project. Just why the Mississippi River project should be so arranged that the landowners in that great body of land to be redeemed shall pay one-third of the expense, while in California they shall pay one-half, is something that I have not been able to comprehend, the two principles being in the same bill.

As the bill now stands, if the Government allots to the commission, we will say, $500,000 for work on the lower Mississippi, under the terms of the bill and under appropriations to be hereafter made the local interests will contribute and expend $250,000. Under my proposition the local interests will contribute dollar for dollar with the Government; and that is exactly what is done in the California project. That is all there is to the amendment.

I wish to say just a word further as to the bill. I had intended to speak somewhat at length upon the bill, but shall not do so. I do say, however, that there are two ways of looking at this project along the Mississippi River. Everybody's sympathy is aroused by the suffering that has been caused down there, and a great deal of it has arisen from the breaking of levees; but, in any event, there has been great suffering. That is the part of it that appeals to humanity; and every part of this country would contribute without stint, unlimitedly, to the work of protecting the people along the Mississippi River in the South. There would be no sectional question raised about it at all. That is one side of this matter that appeals to me very strongly.

The other side is this: This project is going to reclaim 18,000,000 acres of land. That was the testimony, as I remember it, of ex-Senator Percy before the committee in the other House. That land will be increased in value enormously, and a great deal of that land, I have understood, is owned by syndicates that will reap enormous profits by the passage of this bill. Congress is put in the unfortunate situation of being asked to legislate to help these drowning people down there and at the same time to vote millions of dollars into the pockets of syndicates owning a great deal of this land.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I merely want to correct one statement which the Senator has made with reference to the holdings of corporations. The president of the Mississippi Levee Board has telegraphed me as follows:

CLARKSDALE, MISS., *January 5, 1917.*

Hon. J. K. VARDAMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

To meet objection urge that corporations own large holdings of cultivated and uncultivated lands in the Yazoo (Miss.) Delta levee district. Corporations own 50,000 acres in Tallahassee, 10,000 in Quitman, 7,000 in Leflore, 6,000 in Sunflower, 3 in Holmes, 14,000 in Coahoma, 10,000 in Tunlea—2,370,023 acres in district. These figures obtained from tax collectors of these counties.

ED FRANKLIN, *President.*
F. R. BIRDSALLE, *Secretary.*

That is a very great difference. I want to say to the Senator from Iowa that in Mississippi corporations can not own agricultural land.

Now, from the lower district—and I will put this in the RECORD——

Mr. KENYON. I suggest to the Senator whether or not he can not put that in the RECORD without reading it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I desire to say that the amount of land which is owned by corporations is negligible. There are no corporations owning land in Mississippi for agricultural purposes. That was stopped some time ago, when we discovered that an effort was being made to monopolize by European and eastern capitalists the cotton land of the Deltas of Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Mississippi may insert the matter in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

GREENVILLE, MISS., *January 5, 1917.*

JAMES K. VARDAMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Total acres of cleared land in this district is 626,627; total acres of uncleared woodland in the levee district, 1,018,908. Of cleared lands, total corporate holdings, 22,000 acres, 3.05 per cent—a little over 3 per cent corporate holdings. Of uncleared woodland, about 30,000 acres, 2.95 per cent—a little less than 6 per cent, including both cleared and uncleared land. Under the present Mississippi law corporations can not acquire for agricultural purposes any land so necessary. With the exception of land now in cultivation and owned by corporations, every acre cleared land in the Delta now and hereafter will belong to individuals as fast as it becomes cleared. The woodland owned by corporations (sawmill operators) is being rapidly cleared of timber, and as fast as cleared is being sold to individuals for agricultural purposes. These are called "cut-over lands." The corporate holdings of both cleared and woodland is exceptionally small in this district, as small or smaller than in any other section of the country.

BOARD OF MISSISSIPPI LEVEE COMMISSIONERS,
J. D. SMITH, *President.*
C. S. GLASSCO, *Secretary and Treasurer.*

Mr. KENYON. What the Senator from Mississippi has said may be so. I have been trying for two months to find out the ownership of some of these lands. I have had letters from that section of the country, which I do not feel free to use, stating that some of the very wealthy men of the Nation—and giving their names—were heavy owners of these lands. I do not know as to that, and we never have been able to find out. There was no hearing in the committee about this matter, and no chance to ascertain anything about it. I have asked the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Mississippi, and they have kindly volunteered this same kind of information as to-day; but I do believe that we are going to wake up and find that while we are helping these suffering people—and perhaps that will be sufficient compensation—we have voted millions of dollars into the pockets of a number of rich landowners.

The people in that part of the country are not united on this levee proposition. I have a number of editorials here from the Memphis News Scimitar.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. JAMES. The Senator from Iowa, as I understood him, stated that corporations owned vast numbers of acres of this land.

Mr. KENYON. I will say syndicates.

Mr. JAMES. Well, syndicates.

Mr. KENYON. In Mississippi corporations can not own land.

Mr. JAMES. I understood the Senator from Mississippi to state that a corporation can not own agricultural land. Does the Senator from Iowa mean to say that a syndicate has gone in to purchase land in order to circumvent the law of the State?

Mr. KENYON. No; I do not mean to say that, because I do not know. I do not think the provision that corporations can not own land amounts to very much, for two or three men can go in who can own the land on behalf of others, or one man can do that. That provision of the statute is easily evaded.

Mr. JAMES. Of course, the purpose of this bill, as I understand it—I know that is its direct purpose so far as it affects Kentucky—is to give homes to people who are really Kentuckians, real citizens and not corporations. I do not think, so far as the bill affects Kentucky, that any corporation or any syndicate owns any appreciable number of acres of this land. Of course, I know nothing about Mississippi.

Mr. KENYON. I think that may be so as to Kentucky. As I was saying, the people of that part of the country themselves are not certain that this levee system is to be the protection to them which is claimed by its sponsors.

The levees will certainly have to be followed by revetment. Mr. West, of the Mississippi River Commission, in giving his testimony some years ago, figured that the revetment work which would be necessary would cost something in the neighborhood of $200,000,000, as I remember. So Congress may as well recognize that they are committing themselves to a proposition running over $200,000,000.

The best report on this subject that, in my judgment, ever has been made and submitted to Congress was the report of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], made some years ago. That report covers the matter in a most comprehensive way. But I am not going to take up the time to discuss it, Mr. President. I ask to have placed in the RECORD some editorials from the News Scimitar, of Memphis.

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

The editorials referred to are as follows:

[From the Memphis News Scimitar, Jan. 12, 1914.]

FLOOD CONTROL.

* * * * * * *

The consensus of opinion among experts is that the fundamental defect of the Ransdell-Humphreys bill is that, although it professes to be in aid of navigation, it provides for large expenditures for levees, which increase the rapidity and total volume of the caving of the banks into the river. The Chief of Engineers reported to the Secretary of War that until the caving of banks into the Mississippi below St. Louis can be stopped it is practically hopeless to expect any improvement of low-water conditions in the river. In other words, the stream can not be continued navigable.

It is estimated that there are 749 miles of caving banks on the lower Mississippi, from which 9 acres in area by 66 feet deep for each mile is thrown in the stream, which in 50 years would mean half a million acres of land to a depth of 66 feet tumbled in to obstruct navigation.

* * * * * * *

It is claimed by those high in authority that the Ransdell-Humphreys bill should be entitled "A bill to destroy the navigability of the Mississippi River, and to eventually make it impossible to protect the valley from devastation by floods."

This is just what the railroads want, and have been working for so successfully, and this is why they are behind the levees-only people, who are making so much noise, but which is "all cry and little wool." The more that people investigate the matter the more they see the futility of patchwork and mud pies. Those who have been forced to study the question because it has been brought home to them, like Mayor Reubenstein, of Stockton, Cal., who has had experience in the San Joaquin Valley, know something about flood control. In replying to a communication from Secretary Fox, of the local association, Mayor Reubenstein exposes the fallacies contained in the Ransdell-Humphreys bill, and states: "Fortunately for our country a plan has been submitted that is sufficiently comprehensive to insure an orderly start on this great work, and with ample means for its successful completion."

THE LEVEE SYSTEM.

The NEWS SCIMITAR:

It seems to be the opinion of a great many, who ought to know as much about it as anybody, that the levee system will ultimately ruin a large proportion of the Delta lands and destroy the navigation of the Mississippi River. Higher levees mean higher waters; and the inevitable break spreads the pent-up flood over a greater area, destroying more lives and property.

The owners of the Delta lands, even those who favor levees, have discovered that, with all the help they are receiving from the Government, the cost of protecting their lands is greater than they can bear. If the planters alone had to pay for the levees, it would bankrupt them. If so, then the game is not worth the candle.

Of course, if Uncle Sam should dump sixty, eighty, or a hundred millions on the levees, it might afford temporary (and only temporary) relief; but wherein is the Government benefited or the "general welfare" promoted by protecting the private property of a few individuals?

I happen to know that many of these Delta planters are sometimes very loud in their denunciation of "paternalism." But their opposition seems to banish entirely when they are the sole beneficiaries.

The only public benefit to be derived from the levees ever urged by anybody is the improvement in navigation and increased taxable value of the protected lands, and it has been some time since a man with any brain has seriously asserted that the navigation has been, or ever will be, improved by the levees.

As to taxable values, the General Government does not levy a tax on lands. The only chance for us "hill billies" to get our money back is through taxation by the State. Again, I happen to know that, as a rule, these Delta planters dodge a just proportion of State tax by assessing thier lands at one-fourth to one-seventh of what they are willing to sell them for.

Now, if Uncle Sam is in the farming business at all, he owns a mighty big farm, of which the Mississippi Delta is only a small patch. And he is a very poor farmer when he undertakes to improve a patch when it is already a demonstrated fact that it won't pay expenses. If the protection of the Delta can be made a profitable investment, why should not those who are to get all of the benefits pay the expense bill?

Then, if Uncle Sam would protect his smaller valleys from overflow and his hill lands from erosion, would not that add greatly to their taxable value?

Ridiculous. Well, yes, my friend; I regard the whole proposition as ridiculous in the extreme; too much paternalism for me. But if we undertake Government protection of farm lands, why not go at it on the principle of "equal rights to all, special privileges to none"?

J. H. SIMPSON,
Member Mississippi Legislature.

BYHALIA, MISS., *R. 2, May 10, 1913.*

[From the News Scimitar, Dec. 2, 1914.]

CAUTION IS URGED IN HANDLING BIG WATERWAYS ISSUE—MEMBERS OF RIPARIAN LANDOWNERS' ASSOCIATION IN WIRES TO WILSON, LANE, AND GARRISON RECOMMEND DELIBERATION—ASK NEW INVESTIGATION AND A BROADER PLAN.

Protesting that advocates of the "levees-only" system of protection against overflows in the Mississippi Valley, as contemplated by the Ransdell-Humphreys levee bill, are seeking to overwhelm Congress by mere numbers rather than by relevant facts, officers and members of the Riparian Landowners' Protective Association Monday sent a mes-

sage to President Woodrow Wilson; Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior; and Lindley M. Garrison, Secretary of War.

L. S. Lake, of Memphis, a former Princeton undergraduate and local supporter of a broader defense than levees only, is a signer of the message, as is J. W. Bennett, president of the riparian landowners' organization.

The message to Wilson is as follows:

MEMPHIS, TENN., *December 1, 1913.*

Hon. WOODROW WILSON,
President of the United States, Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: A large number of delegates are now arriving in Washington to try to influence Congress and the Government in favor of the Ransdell-Humphreys bill, which means "levees only" for the lower Mississippi River. They seem to wish to overwhelm Congress by spectacular methods and carry their point by a whoop, whoop, hurrah!

We earnestly entreat you, Mr. President, not to surrender entirely to their views and not to pledge yourself irrevocably now to their methods or plans. We rely upon your courage and independence of thought to withhold a snap judgment on this great and important question.

The dreadful overflows and failures of the levees of the past two spring seasons should teach caution, as should also the tremendous demands on the purse of the Government. The Nation should unquestionably aid us in this lower valley to fight against the floods now precipitated upon us annually from numerous States above us, but in this progressive age its moneys should no longer be invested on a discredited "levees only" system, which now, in the face of repeated experience and palpable facts, is shown to be nothing but a superannuated superstition and a defiance of common sense.

The political levee boards have long dominated this Mississippi Valley, to its dreadful hurt. Thousands of the plain people—the actual working farmers of the alluvial lands of this valley—know that the levees, on their present unscientific, narrow, sinuous lines, following closely along the immediate banks of the ordinary river channel, can not restrain and hold the waters of unusual floods encurbed between their embankments.

When the flood waters began to dive under or break, by filtrating sand boils beneath the natural ground surface, the huge levees above, then the death knell of the present system was sounded. For how restrain the myriads of underground weaknesses along the thousand and more miles of levee fronts? Call a halt, then, and have a new examination of this whole subject by fresh and different independent and impartial eminent engineers. * * *

Very respectfully,

L. S. LAKE.

I hereby join in and approve the foregoing telegram.

J. W. BENNETT,
President Riparian Landowners' Protective Association.

RANSDELL-HUMPHREYS BOOSTERS AT CAPITAL.

WASHINGTON, *December 2.*

The white ribbons of the Mississippi River Levee Association are more frequent than Stars and Stripes here to-day. Three special trains from Memphis and neighboring cities arrived this morning, and the remainder of the representation will arrive on another special to-morrow. Chief interest now centers in the hearing before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House to-morrow. Former Senator Leroy Percy, of Mississippi, has been placed in charge of the hearing, and has called brief conferences of the speakers and other leaders for to-night, when final arguments in favor of the Ransdell-Humphreys bill will be made. Each of the States most interested furnishes one speaker.

The Missouri delegates have not arrived. The Memphis delegates are boosting the Ransdell-Humphreys bill providing for $12,000,000 a year for five years for Mississippi's levees, as against the Newlands bill, which appropriates a much larger sum and covers a greater scope of work. The Newlands bill is strongly urged by the New Orleans delegates.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. I desire to inquire whether this entire amount of land is in the State of Mississippi or whether it is spread over a number of States?

Mr. KENYON. It is spread over a number of States. This plan originally embraced the stretch from Cape Girardeau to the Head of the Passes, and has now been extended to Rock Island.

Mr. THOMAS. Eighteen million acres is more than three times the size of the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is——

Mr. KENYON. I will ask the Chair to wait a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator had concluded.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator has not concluded, but was asked a question by the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair misunderstood the Senator. He thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. KENYON. I am going to get through, but I do not propose to be hurried.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not attempting to hurry the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I recognize that. I ask to have read a letter addressed to the News Scimitar, of Memphis, by a lady dwelling along the river, who seems to have suffered from the levee system, and another letter from her I ask to have inserted in the RECORD. I ask to have the one designated read at the desk, as it will take but a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter indicated will be read at the Secretary's desk and the other letter indicated by the Senator will be inserted in the RECORD without reading. The Chair hears no objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

FROM A LADY OF OUR BEST "OLD FAMILIES"—AGAINST "LEVEES ONLY."

CORONA POST OFFICE,
Centennial Island, Tenn., February 23, 1915.

EDITOR THE NEWS SCIMITAR:

Have we people who live on the islands in the Mississippi River and on farms outside the levees become stupefied by our losses and the hardships we have suffered because of these levees that we sit idle and silent while these millionaire planters, with the help of Congress, build their mud banks and pile water over us that brings ruin to our lands and cattle and homes? If Mr. Fox, who is only a salaried man, and has nothing at stake save the money he gets for his talk, for a moneyed consideration can use his eloquence to influence governors to send memorials to Congress to aid in finishing this devilish work of utter desolation they have already wrought, surely the men who see their children and wives reduced to beggars because of these levees should be aroused by their pitiable condition and urge our Senators and Congressmen of west Tennessee, who have given a sacred oath to care for the interests of their people, to bring this outrage before Congress and use their influence in securing a recompense from the Federal Government for this murderous crime it helped to put upon a helpless people. And the women who, with breaking hearts, look upon their desolated homes and ragged children know that in the highest heavens there sits a Judge whom neither greed nor graft can corrupt, and whose spirit rides upon the face of the waters as when by the word of His power He called order out of chaos, and who in His omnipotence can break these mud banks and roll these waters out of our homes and off of our lands, and we shall sing as the children of Israel, "Thou didst blow with Thy wind; the sea covered them; they sank as lead in the mighty waters."

Mrs. O. K. JOPLIN.

The letter ordered printed in the RECORD is as follows:

[From the News Scimitar, Apr. 23, 1913.]

A LADY'S VIEW.

EDITOR THE NEWS SCIMITAR:

The supreme thing confronting the people living along the Mississippi River from Cairo to the Gulf is how to overcome the injury and hardships the St. Francis levee board and Mississippi River Commission have put upon them. Before these autocratic bodies were formed the farmers living upon the banks of the Mississippi River and upon the islands in the river were a happy and contented people, cultivating and marketing their crops, with no dread of overflows. Since the manipulation of the river by this levee board they have raised the bed of the river till we are threatened with an overflow with every general rain in the Mississippi Valley. The overflow of 1913 was far greater than 1912, though there was a much smaller rainfall than 1912. Islands which were never overflowed before these levees were built have had the water gradually encroach on them till this last overflow flooded them to the depth of 10 feet on the highest ridges, and would have gone much higher had not the break at Wilson given them relief.

A few years ago the Government took the sounding in an eddy 25 miles above Memphis to the depth of 80 feet and found no bottom; to-day that eddy is a mud bar, covered with willows, only 10 feet lower than the original bank. In a few years, if these levees are persisted in, the Mississippi River will be a desolation of sand and mud bars, as it is a proven fact that the beds of all large leveed streams are raised in proportion to the height of the levees. And if they did succeed in holding this vast amount of water, which they will never do, what is to become of the hundreds of people whose farms are on the islands in the Mississippi River and those outside of the levees? Is it just that they should be ruined and their property desolated to satisfy the greed and graft of this levee board and support royally and sumptuously these sinecures who compose the Mississippi River Commission? Are we freeborn Americans to suffer such injustice from these politicians? Capt. Cowden years ago advocated a policy which, had the Government adopted it, would have met these requirements and saved immense waste of the people's money. The Government should take hold of this matter, build reservoirs, open up drainage to the Gulf and Great Lakes, and deepen the channel of the Mississippi River, and give this long-suffering people a rest from the levee boards and these engineers which they graduate from West Point and who know no more about the requirements of this river than the old negro preacher knew about his text.

Gen. McDowell Townsend is right, "The situation is reduced to a mathematical problem, which is, how long before this people shall be pauperized to protect these great syndicates that were formed to buy up the sunk lands of Arkansas and Missouri at 25 cents per acre and drain them at the public expense and to sell them at an enormous profit?" It is for the chief benefit of these syndicates that these levees were built and are being maintained, and for which the people are taxed beyond endurance.

Mrs. O. K. JOPLIN,
1500 Court Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Iowa whether he takes this letter, which is evidently from a hysterical woman, as evidence to overturn the opinions of the learned and able engineers who have surveyed the Mississippi River and made reports thereon, that it can be controlled and can be improved for navigation by a levee system, and against the word and arguments of the Senators who represent the four States bordering on the Mississippi from Cairo to the Passes?

Mr. KENYON. Is the Senator asking me that as a question, or is he merely making an argument of his own?

Mr. SHIELDS. I ask the question.

Mr. KENYON. The poor lady who has suffered from the levee system is not the only one. There are plenty of experts, as the Senator knows, who have written on this subject, claiming that the levee sysem is injurious in the end, and that it

can not possibly operate as some of the other engineers have stated it can. I grant that the Army Engineers for a decade have agreed that the levee is the only system; but I am not going to prolong the discussion. Army Engineers have made many mistakes in the past.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I desire to say just a word in reply to the argument that the local communities ought to put up one-half of the cost. I will say, Mr. President, that the situation along the lower Mississippi is very different from that in California. There the people have not been paying out enormous sums, while we have been building levees on the Mississippi River since 1718, and have paid enormous sums, which, since 1882 alone, according to the official report which I hold here in my hand, amount to $91,000,000 for levees by the local communities, against $30,000,000 expended by the National Government, or in the proportion of three to one. They are required under this bill to put up $15,000,000 more. That will make $111,000,000. The Government has paid $30,000,000, and it is asked to put up $30,000,000 more. That will make $60,000,000 for the Government against $111,000,000 by the people of the States affected, and the people themselves, under the very terms of this bill, will have to pay all damages, rights of way, and everything of that kind. So more than $2 will be paid by the local people for every dollar the National Government puts up if the terms of the bill as now written are complied with, while under the terms of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa the local people will be putting up a great deal more than one-half. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I will occupy but a few moments. I rise simply for the purpose of correcting a misapprehension which I fear may exist. In 1898 I was chairman of a subcommittee that investigated the floods in the Mississippi River. We went from the headwaters of the Mississippi, where the reservoirs are built, clear down to the ocean at the Southwest Pass. We took a large amount of testimony, examined all the documents bearing on the question, and came to the unanimous conclusion that the only way of protecting the lower Mississippi Valley against floods was by a levee system.

There is no opportunity for an outlet; there can not be any outlets above the Atchafalaya River, and there are no places where reservoirs can be built for impounding the water to restrain the floods unless far more land was overflowed than would be overflowed by letting the floods run untrammeled. In other words, from the time the great investigation of Humphrey and Abbott of the hydraulics of the Mississippi River in 1875 to this day there has been no difference of opinion among men conversant with the hydraulics of that river that the only way of protecting the people of those lands from floods is by a system of levees. I am also inclined to agree with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] that in view of the fact that the people of those States—and it affects States all the way from Louisiana up to the State of Missouri on both sides of the river—have contributed so largely in the past, it would be hardly fair to make them pay half-and-half now.

The case of California is entirely different. In California it is a new proposition, and the evils there existing they have brought upon themselves by hydraulic mining. The people of the lower Mississippi can not be accused of having brought the floods upon themselves by any negligence on their part, for those floods, of course, are utterly beyond their control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON].

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

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

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] and withhold my vote.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. Not being able now to obtain a transfer, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as upon the last roll call, I vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] and vote "yea."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as announced on the preceding votes, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JAMES (after having voted in the negative). I transfer the general pair I have with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I transfer my pair previously announced to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

Mr. FALL. I wish to inquire if the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. FALL. I withhold my vote, having a general pair with that Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD], and vote "yea."

Mr. HOLLIS. I have a pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (after having voted in the negative). I see that my pair has not voted. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], and will let my vote stand.

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

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN];

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

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN];

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS];

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] with the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON]; and

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM].

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—20.

Brady	Husting	McCumber	Pomerene
Clark	Johnson, S. Dak.	McLean	Smoot
Cummins	Jones	Martine, N. J.	Sterling
Curtis	Kenyon	Norris	Thomas
Hughes	Lane	Page	Works

NAYS—32.

Ashurst	Kirby	Pittman	Shields
Bankhead	La Follette	Ransdell	Simmons
Broussard	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Smith, Md.
Catron	Martin, Va.	Robinson	Stone
Chamberlain	Myers	Saulsbury	Swanson
Fletcher	Nelson	Shafroth	Underwood
Hollis	Owen	Sheppard	Vardaman
James	Phelan	Sherman	Walsh

NOT VOTING—44.

Beckham	Fernald	Lewis	Smith, Mich.
Borah	Gallinger	Lippitt	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Goff	Lodge	Sutherland
Bryan	Gore	Newlands	Thompson
Chilton	Gronna	O'Gorman	Tillman
Clapp	Harding	Oliver	Townsend
Colt	Hardwick	Overman	Wadsworth
Culberson	Hitchcock	Penrose	Warren
Dillingham	Johnson, Me.	Poindexter	Watson
du Pont	Kern	Smith, Ariz.	Weeks
Fall	Lee, Md.	Smith, Ga.	Williams

So Mr. KENYON's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be read a third time?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, after all, I think there is something in the claim that it is more a matter of geography than anything else. If you build a dam to hold back the flood water in Louisiana or Mississippi and reclaim some land by building a dam along the river, the Government will pay $2 for every one that you put into it. If you go into California, a beautiful State but less favored by the powers that be—if you build a dam along the Sacramento River and hold back the flood waters from destroying things, the Government will divide up evenly with you. You have to pay half and half. But if you go out on the Plains, in the arid country, where man is striving to reclaim the desert, the Government will not pay anything. So, after all, it is a matter of geography. You have it your way. It depends on where you live and what you want to improve as to how much the Government will pay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be read a third time?

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read three times, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. KENYON, Mr. McCUMBER, and other Senators called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and withhold my vote.

Mr. FALL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON]. I am informed, however, that that Senator, if present, would vote as I will, and I therefore vote "yea."

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] and withhold my vote.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). Making the same announcement and transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as on the last roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Again transferring my pair to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] I vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as announced on the preceding roll call, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HOLLIS. Making the same transfer as before, I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Ashurst	Jones	Phelan	Shields
Bankhead	Kirby	Pittman	Smith, Md.
Broussard	La Follette	Pomerene	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Stone
Clapp	Martin, Va.	Reed	Swanson
Clark	Martine, N. J.	Robinson	Underwood
Fall	Myers	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Fletcher	Nelson	Shafroth	Walsh
Hollis	Newlands	Sheppard	Works
James	Owen	Sherman	

NAYS—16.

Brady	Husting	Lewis	Page
Catron	Johnson, S. Dak.	McCumber	Smoot
Cummins	Kenyon	McLean	Sterling
Hughes	Lane	Norris	Thomas

NOT VOTING—41.

Beckham	Gallinger	Lodge	Thompson
Borah	Goff	O'Gorman	Tillman
Brandegee	Gore	Oliver	Townsend
Bryan	Gronna	Overman	Wadsworth
Chilton	Harding	Penrose	Warren
Colt	Hardwick	Poindexter	Watson
Culberson	Hitchcock	Simmons	Weeks
Curtis	Johnson, Me.	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Dillingham	Kern	Smith, Ga.	
du Pont	Lee, Md.	Smith, S. C.	
Fernald	Lippitt	Sutherland	

So the bill was passed.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered into, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill.

The Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. I do not want to be heard. I just ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. THOMAS. Before a vote is taken upon agreeing to the conference report, I should like to hear from the chairman of the committee as to the action of the conference committee in regard to what is known as the salary amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. In response to the question propounded by the Senator from Colorado, I will say that in the Senate, while the bill was under consideration, the Senate attached to the bill what I am going to call the Smoot amendment. When the bill went back to the House an amendment was proposed under the parliamentary status and the Smoot amendment was rejected by a majority of 222 on a roll-call vote, and the so-called House amendment was adopted. Under the House amendment the number of employees in the Indian Bureau affected will be 5,517.

Mr. SMOOT. Before the Senator leaves the last subject matter I wish to have an understanding as to how it came about. I understand the Indian appropriation bill came to the Senate with no provision for an increase of salaries.

Mr. ASHURST. None whatever.

Mr. SMOOT. Then the Senate put upon it what is known as the Smoot amendment. It then went to the House.

Mr. ASHURST. No.

Mr. SMOOT. It went back to the House.

Mr. ASHURST. The conferees agreed on the Smoot amendment. The House rejected the conference report because we had placed the Smoot amendment thereon, and by a roll call they put upon the bill the House amendment by a majority of 222.

Mr. SMOOT. There was nothing in conference on the appropriation bill but the Smoot amendment and the House voted to increase that amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. I will let the Senator settle that with the House.

Mr. SMOOT. I wanted to know as a matter of fact if that was not the case. As far as I am personally concerned I have never yet made the statement, although there appeared in the newspapers a statement that I positively refused to make any compromise on the salary question. I wanted to have the facts placed before the Senate so that when we vote on the subject matter we may know just what they are.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator for interrupting me. Proceeding further, I will state that the House refused to accept and approve the conference report with the Smoot amendment in it. I have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD here. I do not want to read all the debate, but a roll-call vote was had on the direct question. I will read from page 3792 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15:

> Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a preferential amendment. I move to recede from the disagreement to Senate amendment 111—

That is the Smoot amendment—

> and concur in the same with an amendment striking out all of the language of the Senate amendment and inserting in lieu thereof the following.

Which is now the provision in the conference report. That was carried by 222 majority. The House conferees came to the Senate conferees saying that they felt bound in conscience and in honor to obey the House since the House by 222 majority had instructed them to recede from the Senate amendment and adopt the House amendment.

Now, then, as to the figures. Under the House amendment the number of employees affected in the Indian Bureau and in the Indian Service would be 5,517. Under the Smoot amendment the number affected would be 4,614. The total salaries affected are $3,913,749 by the House amendment. The total salaries affected by the Smoot amendment are $2,708,804.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, just a moment; let me read the entire figures. The total increase of House amendment over the Smoot amendment is $45,973.30. In other words, when the Senate conferees receded from the Smoot amendment and concurred in the action of the House we thereby added to the salaries of the various persons named in the amendment in the Indian Bureau $45,973.30. I say now that it is a very unpleasant commentary to have it whispered about this Chamber that we have increased the salaries $1,000,000. It is a sad commentary upon the American Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. ASHURST. Just let me finish my statement and then I will be glad to yield. I say it is an unpleasant commentary

to have it whispered about that we have increased the salaries $1,000,000 when the total increase is $45,973.30, and these figures are furnished from the Indian Bureau.

Now, just a word further before I yield the floor. It has been said that I have acted in this matter under the agreement I made. Mr. President, I was invited into the conference. I admit that I never thought they ought to have an increase. I did not vote for the Smoot amendment, which I thought was unfair. Just as I walked into that meeting the House conferees said to me: "Remember, sir, the House has refused to agree to the Smoot amendment and has adopted the House amendment by a large majority."

Mr. OVERMAN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield cheerfully.

Mr. OVERMAN. While the figures given by the Senator may be only a total of $45,000, if this amendment is adopted on all the appropriation bills, as it should be if it is adopted here, it will amount to about $28,000,000.

Mr. ASHURST. Of course I do not know. I yield to the superior judgment of the Senator from North Carolina. All I can vouch for is the accuracy of the statement I made.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator did not go into the other figures?

Mr. ASHURST. Confessedly not.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the amendment is adopted on this bill, ought it not to be adopted on the others?

Mr. ASHURST. Not at all.

Mr. OVERMAN. Then we would have one scale of wages for the Indian Bureau employees, one for the employees under the Agricultural appropriation bill, and another for the employees provided for in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill.

Mr. ASHURST. We would then be only doing that which Congress is noted for being—inconsistent in everything. We would preserve our record. We would be consistent by continuing to be inconsistent.

Mr. THOMAS. Except in the matter of appropriations.

Mr. ASHURST. We are consistent with the appropriation bills where there is any vote, but when we reach the poor Indian appropriation bill there are 300,000 dependents who can not vote. The Indian can not make his resentment felt. Rob the Indian, take his lands, and all he can do is to appeal to Congress. The Indian appropriation bill is always made the buffer, it is always the subject of graft, simply because the Indian can not vote. If he could vote Senators would all be urging increased appropriations and urging that the salaries of those in the Indian Bureau should be increased instead of decreased.

Mr. OVERMAN. The increase does not affect the poor Indian.

Mr. ASHURST. No; except in so far as by the increase we can get a few more efficient men in that bureau. The civil-service rules have imposed upon that bureau a large number of inefficient men who are not fit to handle themselves, much less dependent Indians.

Mr. OVERMAN. How through the civil service would you get efficient men, if you gave them three times as much?

Mr. ASHURST. If I had the opportunity under the civil service I would put out the incompetent.

Mr. OVERMAN. I would, too; but I do not see how we can do it, no matter what the salaries are.

Mr. ASHURST. I have stated the figures, Mr. President. That is all I care to say.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish I had the power to-night to express fully and completely my objections to the adoption of this conference report and my objections to the bill upon which this conference report is made. I desire that it be fully understood at the outset that my criticism, if it may be called criticism, does not apply to the private individual but does apply to the official. My purpose to-night is to discuss this report and bill in connection with general Indian appropriation bills heretofore passed by Congress, all emanating largely from the Indian Bureau.

My observation has been that for the past 20 years the Indian appropriation bills have been measures of the worst kind. They have been about 40 per cent robbery of the Federal Government and about 40 per cent robbery of the Indians, so far as relates to real benefits to the Indians themselves.

Mr. MYERS. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Can the Senator point out anything that is robbery either of the Indians or of the Government? If he can, I would like to have him specifically name the robbery and put his finger on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, my time is short to-night and I want to deal more in a general way as regards the real benefits to the Indian of Indian appropriation bills. If I went into specific details on this bill, that alone would take ten times more time than is allotted to me. I hope the Senator will realize my purpose.

Mr. MYERS. I just wish to call the Senator's attention to this bill, because it is now the one under discussion and it has to be passed upon.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes; very well, I shall cast my vote against this bill, as I do not think it any better than the average Indian appropriation bills that have become laws for many years. May I now call the Senator's attention to one specific appropriation which, I believe, was cited by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] a few weeks ago, concerning which a statement appears on page 218 of the House hearing? This related to appropriations for the Kiowa and Comanche Indians.

Allow me to insert in the RECORD some items concerning the Kiowa and Comanche Indians which appear on page 218 of the hearings held before the House Committee on Indian Affairs the other day. These people have about $3,000,000 to their credit in the Treasury, if I remember correctly. We have appropriated out of their fund for 1917 $25,000, and an analysis of the expenditures shows the following:

Salaries and wages	$19,314.10
Traveling expenses	368.29
Transportation of supplies	56.34
Heat, light, and power service	545.80
Telegraph and telephone service	340.08
Subsistence supplies	8.36

In brief, the appropriation was $25,000, which was asked for by the Indian Office——

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me understand the Senator. Does he mean by that statement that out of an appropriation of $25,000 for these Indians only $8.36 was expended for subsistence?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. That is according to this report.

Mr. THOMAS. Then the Indians did get something out of the $25,000; they got $8.36?

Mr. HUGHES. How did that happen. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I do not know. It must have been a mistake. The Indian appropriation bills have always been bad. They are made for politicians and for the convenience and upbuilding of the whites; ostensibly for the benefit of the Indians, but in reality for no such purpose.

Mr. President, now allow me to point out specifically a few of the matters in my own State, and I hope that will answer, at least in a way, the question asked by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], whom I am very glad to answer as best I can.

As an instance, I cite first the case of two hospitals completed in my State in 1915 the building of which shows an utterly reckless expenditure of money, a fair example of the unbusinesslike methods of our Indian system, for which I do not believe a sensible excuse can be offered. These two hospitals cost about $70,000, or $35,000 each.

One of them is built within the Rosebud Reservation in Todd County and the other within the Cheyenne Reservation in Dewey County. Keep in mind that these two hospitals were erected out of the Indians' funds without their permission or consent.

The one in Dewey County is built 35 to 40 miles off from a railroad. To reach it one must pass through a rough, broken country. Yet running through this particular reservation is a line of railroad entering the county on the north, toward the east side, and extending southwesterly to the west line thereof. Another railroad enters the county at about the same place, running in a southeasterly direction for 40 or 50 miles, thence in a southwesterly direction and on through said county to the west line, a distance of from 50 to 60 miles. Along both lines of railroad there are a number of splendid growing towns of easy access from the heart of this reservation, any one of which would have been a good and sensible location for the establishment of an Indian hospital, if necessary that one be built, as you will readily see by looking at the map of the country.

Now, what was done as regards the other hospital on the Rosebud Reservation in Todd County? It was also built 35 to 40 miles from the nearest railroad when it might have been built, if necessary, at any one of a number of convenient places upon a railroad easy of access and businesslike, at least, as to its location. It cost about the same amount as the one on the Cheyenne Reservation. They both stand to-day as a monument to mismanagement, extreme extravagance, and as examples of the unbusinesslike methods of handling the Indians' money by the Indian Office.

Now, let us see how the Government builds hospitals out of Federal appropriations. The maximum amount that can be used is $15,000 for each one. Thus you will observe that the Indian Office, in the erection of these two hospitals alone, built with the Indians' money, has wasted about $20,000 on each, or a total of $40,000.

I understand from good authority that the nearest laundry to the hospital in Todd County, when it was completed in 1915, was 12 miles away.

A friend of mine last summer went out to see this hospital in company with the agent at that place. Upon arriving at the institution he did not observe any Indians about. In fact, there was no one in sight with the exception of a few persons drawing salaries, whose business it was to look after the buildings, and so forth. He asked the superintendent how many patients were in this hospital then. The agent looked off across the prairie and advised my friend that the patients were off on their summer vacation.

Mr. MYERS. I ask the Senator if he does not think that a summer vacation is very good medicine to take—if the doctors do not recommend it—and if he does not think a summer vaca- is beneficial to him?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will answer the Senator by saying that there were not any patients there.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I wish to suggest that the parties building these hospitals wanted to get the patients away from the noise of locomotives and the rattle of trains.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will answer the Senator from New Jersey that I inquired of the Indian Office who located these hospitals. When I was advised that the superintendent and the doctors are the persons who locate hospitals at the various agencies, then I was not surprised as to these particular locations.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire, if, when an Indian gets sick and the authorities move him to one of these hospitals, do they charge him mileage?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. They charge him everything they can.

Mr. President, while I am on the subject I desire to say, further, that the superintendent held at the Rosebud Reservation for two years was paid an excess salary of some $650 a year more than the position paid heretofore or that his successor, recently appointed, will receive. You can not find an Indian on that reservation, not a beneficiary, who has not complained bitterly all the time as to the treatment received at his hands. Can you figure this out?

Only last week the Commissioner of Indian Affairs told me that he had appointed another man to that place. I said to him: "I hope that he will be a good superintendent for those Indians, because they are worthy people."

I also complained and filed affidavits at the Indian Office with regard to a boss farmer at that agency who deliberately shot an Indian off his horse a year and a half ago. As reported to me, the Indian lay on the ground for a long time before he was picked up. The offense of which the Indian was accused was that of forging a $5 check. I do not know whether or not he forged the check; but if he did, the poor fellow was probably hungry and needed the money.

I want to speak of this instance, Mr. President, because I have been asked to be specific. I filed many affidavits with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relating to this matter months ago; an immediate investigation was promised. Doubtless this is such a small matter that it must have been forgotten, because I have never heard further from it. This boss farmer is still on the job drawing his salary from the Government.

Mr. MYERS. I asked the Senator to be specific as to some appropriation in this bill, but the Senator does not get to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I have answered the Senator before. I do not wish to have my time taken up so that I may not have an opportunity to touch upon questions of greater importance to the Indians.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask whether it was an officer who killed the Indian?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. He did not kill him, but shot him off his horse.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But he shot him?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes. The man who fired the shot is the boss farmer, and he is still in the service; he is still employed there, as I am advised.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Was he trying to arrest the Indian?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. As I understand, he told the Indian to halt, but the Indian did not do so. Then he shot the Indian off his horse, as is reported to me.

Mr. President, at the Pine Ridge Agency, in my State, during the months of June, July, and August, 1915, there was no issue of flour to the 7,000 Indians there, so I have been reliably informed. At that same reservation during the months of February and March, 1915—the coldest months of the year in that locality—the supply of coal for the agency school gave out, because the coal contract for that season had not been properly let. Maj. Brennan, the local superintendent, in order to keep this school going, was compelled to take the Indian children out of school, so that they could go out and cut green wood for fuel. This is the system, and this is the practice in the Indian Office here—neglect, procrastination, delay, and inactivity in all the things that should help to make for the welfare and success of the Indian.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ASHURST. I am interested in the Senator's remarks. The Senator is a valued member of the Committee on Indian Affairs. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that petty tyrannies on the part of Indian agents here and there do occur; I have not the slightest reason to doubt what the Senator says; but I have no doubt in the world, if the Senator had laid these matters before the Committee on Indian Affairs when it was considering the bill—possibly he did so some morning when I was absent from the committee—or if he had laid them before the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, steps might have been taken to remedy the situation. It is a gratification, however, to know that the agent to whom the Senator refers has, as he states, been removed or transferred.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It must be a gratification to those Indians.

Mr. ASHURST. And to all persons who want justice done to the Indians.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President——

Mr. ASHURST. If the Senator will pardon me, as I stated a moment ago, a great many of these petty tyrannies and abuses which are practiced just as the Senator has described, have been brought about by the workings of what is called the civil service. It promotes and brings into the service incompetents, men who could not administer the affairs of the smallest institution, much less take care of these dependents.

Now, take my own State. I am conscious of a situation there where most gross injustice and tyranny are practiced not only upon the Indians, but upon the whites employed on the reservations. The Senator from South Dakota is doing a public service, I think, in calling attention to these things; and I wish to say here and now, that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in my judgment, has done, and is doing, all that he is able to do, surrounded, as he is, by rules which will not permit him even to hire a stenographer, except under the rules of the civil service. We ought not to hem an official in with such rules and thus cause to be forced upon him incompetents for his superintendents, agents, and farmers, and then blame him for the evil results that flow therefrom.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is run on rules and not by law. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is responsible for the orders given to these various superintendents, which they must carry out. I appreciate the remarks of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, but there are so many worse things that were testified to in the committee that the evils which I have mentioned are only a small part.

I recall one instance which was stated in the testimony before the Senate committee by one Mr. Joe Cooper, of the Crow Reservation, in Montana. He testified that his little children were forcibly taken from their home, carried away, and placed in a school at the agency. He wanted them to go to school at home. The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. HUSTING] asked the Commissioner of Indian Affairs if that was true. He said he supposed it was. The Senator then asked him if he would see that those children were taken back to their mother. The

commissioner said he desired to investigate all of the circumstances. The Senator from Wisconsin then said he wanted to know whether the commissioner would have those children returned to their parents. The commissioner finally said he would, and I hope he will.

Adverting further to this particular testimony, the fact was disclosed that the Government had also failed to pay last year's money to the Crow Indians, which they needed badly.

This testimony further disclosed that the superintendent of the Crows had at one time said he intended to make these Indians work if he had to starve them to do it. At these hearings numerous persons testified that the members of this tribe are, and have been, suffering through lack of food, and at times for many years past they had endured similar privations.

A bright, intelligent Indian by the name of Thomas Medicine Horse, from the Crow Reservation, testified that last spring these Indians, out of necessity, were eating the carcasses of dead cattle, which during the previous winter had wandered or drifted to some river and broken through the ice. During the spring freshets these carcasses floated downstream, where they were procured by the Indians and eaten, through the kind permission of the farmers, who directed that the Indians be careful to place the hides of these drowned animals back far enough from the river so they would not be washed away but could be sold.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. LANE. I should like to suggest to the Senator that at that time it was urged in all sincerity that from choice the Indians ate cattle that had died; that they had acquired an appetite for that kind of food.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I am not certain.

Mr. LANE. Yes.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Oregon is wrong about that. There was some explanation as to why Indians take garbage from swill barrels, but I do not remember anything in regard to the other matter.

Mr. LANE. I have an idea that the Senator was not there, but that was the testimony given.

Mr. MYERS. Perhaps I was not.

Mr. LANE. The Senator will find that in the testimony.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Testimony concerning the Crow Reservation in Montana was also produced showing that one of the witnesses had many times seen Indian women with babies in their arms and children by their side hanging around slaughterhouses gathering up the offals from butchered animals and carrying them away for food.

Mr. President, it appears to me to be an awful condition of things that the wards of this Government should be forced to such degrading practices in order to keep life in their bodies, and I desire to say to you now that I believe this man told the truth, and to say to you further that I myself have seen this very thing occur many times on different reservations, and I defy any man in Congress or in the Indian Office itself to successfully contradict what I have said.

Yet these Crow Indians are possessed of valuable lands and have money on deposit in the United States Treasury which is held in trust for them. They would, in all probability, have more cash to their credit if their affairs were more carefully managed by the Indian Office. Evidence was given in committee, and not contradicted, to the effect that $180,000 was received last year as rental for leased Crow lands. The evidence also shows that the overhead cost of caring for and managing these leases amounted to $100,000, leaving only $80,000 to the credit of these Indians.

Mr. MYERS. What I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota is this: If all these complaints against the Commissioner of Indian Affairs are true, if he is incompetent, if he mismanages affairs, if he has not done right, and if the Indians have not been properly treated, how is the Senator going to better matters by defeating this bill? That is what I should like to know.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. There need be no fear that this bill will not pass. Congress will pass any bill that carries a lot of appropriations and votes away a lot of the people's money wastefully.

Mr. MYERS. But still the Senator does not answer my question. I should like to have the Senator answer, if the Indian Commissioner has been guilty of all the charges brought against him, how is the Senator going to better matters by defeating this bill, which was not framed by the Indian Commissioner, but framed by the Senate committee? How will anybody be any better off by defeating this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I think the major part of the bill was recommended by the Indian Bureau.

Mr. MYERS. The bureau made estimates of money to be expended. Those estimates were for the Indians; but how is the Senator going to benefit the Indians by taking away from them this money, which has been estimated as necessary for their support?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. It would seem to me that the Indian, if he is no better off with this bill than without it, certainly the Treasury at least will be better off if the money otherwise appropriated and to be squandered should remain in the Treasury. In other words, if these large appropriations have not produced the desired effect, why make them? Probably the hiatus of one year, during which time these appropriations are withheld, might so concentrate public attention upon the condition which the Senator from South Dakota is so eloquently describing as to arouse an indifferent public opinion to the situation and bring about that relief which now seems impossible to be secured either by investigation or by legislation.

Mr. MYERS. If the Senator from South Dakota will permit me the courtesy of interrupting him further, let me say to the Senator from Colorado that the $180,000 which the Senator from Colorado evidently has in mind, to administer which required the expenditure of $100,000, was not the money of the United States Government, but was money that was paid by private individuals for leases on the Crow Reservation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, that does not seem to me to be the important factor in the proposition. Concede that the money does not belong to the Government of the United States; concede that it belongs to the Indians' funds; if, when appropriated, it is diverted from its real purpose, its ostensible purpose, and squandered by those who have the power of administration, then I should think it would be better not to make the appropriation.

Mr. MYERS. Just a moment. It was not appropriated at all. It was paid by Lee Simonsen and other lessees on the Crow Reservation.

Mr. THOMAS. If that is the case, I understand that it is a perpetual fund, and so long as the lease lasts it can be utilized in the way which the Senator from South Dakota is describing; and it seems to me that is worse yet.

Mr. MYERS. It has nothing whatever to do with any Government fund, but is totally separate.

Mr. THOMAS. If it is beyond the control of the Government, so that this legislation does not affect it, then certainly the Indian is in a very bad way if the money is so expended, and we are powerless to do anything to prevent it.

Mr. MYERS. Of course the Indian officials have the handling of it; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I hope I have made myself clear on this. The total receipts for leased lands on this reservation amounted to approximately $180,000, out of which the Indian Bureau expended as charges against the Indians for leasing the lands $100,000, leaving the Indians only $80,000 out of the $180,000 lease money.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I do.

Mr. OWEN. I just want to ask the Senator what amount per capita would go to the Crow Creek Indians if they got the money now paid to the employees of the agency.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I could not answer the Senator's question.

Mr. OWEN. Is it not $189,000 that is appropriated there?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I am not informed on that question; I could not answer.

Mr. WALSH. I can give the information.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. The revenues derived by the Crow Indians from the leases of land annually amount to $186,000. That would give to each Indian, man, woman, and child, $110.

Mr. OWEN. How much would that be to a family?

Mr. WALSH. Assuming that there are five members in a family, each Indian family would get $550—more than ample to maintain the family in comfort.

Mr. OWEN. What becomes of the money now?

Mr. WALSH. The facts are practically as stated by the Senator from South Dakota. There is an annual distribution

of from $25 to $50. The remainder is spent through the Indian Bureau. Much of it, in my humble opinion, is wasted. It would be quite erroneous, however, to assume that it all is. No little of it is expended in the maintenance of schools, in the maintenance of hospitals, for the payment of physicians, and the payment of farmers for the purpose of teaching the Indians. Much of it is spent for the benefit of the Indians, but there is no gainsaying the general line of argument made by the Senator from South Dakota that there is an enormous waste of the funds of the Indians.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, while I am touching upon conditions on this Crow Reservation, let me say that certain testimony was taken before the committee to the effect that at the little town of Lodgegrass on this reservation, away out in Montana, 2,500 miles away, the Indian Office has what is known as the "council of ten," composed of Indians who uphold it; that in the fall of 1914 the Commissioner of Indian Affairs was in that town during the night when this council met; that an affidavit of an Indian by the name of Curley was taken at the meeting of this council behind closed doors, the testimony showing that a guard was stationed at each door. A Mr. Linnen, chief inspector of the Indian Office, was also present at this meeting, before whom Curley subscribed and swore to this affidavit, which contained charges based entirely upon hearsay relating to the character of a woman, who, it seems, had been active in securing information detrimental to the Indian Office. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs testified that he did not remember whether he left the town of Lodgegrass the next morning thereafter or whether he stayed several days. However, this affidavit was brought or sent to the commissioner and filed in his office, according to the testimony, and was brought to the Senate committee by this chief inspector, Mr. Linnen, a week or so ago from the commissioner's office.

At the committee hearing, during a grilling examination in reference to the bringing of such testimony before it, the chief inspector testified that he had been called to the meeting of this "council of ten" at their request. Commissioner Sells testified that he had never seen the affidavit or heard anything about it until it was presented to the committee, although it had lain in his office for something over two years, and he was present in the little Indian town the night this affidavit was taken.

Now, a word about the character of the man who made this affidavit. Let me say first that he is the judge on the Crow Reservation, appointed, I assume, by the Indian Bureau. He is the man who decides the Indian's differences and settles his troubles. The testimony as to his character disclosed, without an exception, that his moral character was bad. There was much testified to regarding Curley's character unfit to give out to the public. This man Curley is the man who swore to this purported affidavit, based on hearsay; and, according to information secured from one of the greatest Indian writers and lecturers in America, it seems, was with Gen. Custer when he and his soldiers were killed. Curley, according to this writer, is the only Indian scout now living who ever betrayed this Government or went back on its flag. In the early seventies he was employed as a scout in the Army. He was in the service of Gen. Custer and deserted his post. It seems that he was sent ahead to reconnoiter. When he saw the critical condition of the white soldiers he sneaked around, went to the rear, and hid until after Gen. Custer and his brave soldiers were massacred, instead of reporting the true condition to him.

This is the kind of a man who made this affidavit, sworn to before the chief inspector of the Indian Service, against the character of a woman. It is such acts as these by Government officials which destroy the patriotism of these people. Can it be possible that such things as this can go on and no attention be paid to them by Congress? Is it possible that a department of our Government has gotten down so deep in the mire? Have we reached the time in our history when the head of one of the great branches of the Government will resort to such practices? Can it be true that in its endeavor to justify its acts on these reservations the Indian Office will permit such things, and then not have the courage to face the consequences of its own acts when made public? Do we use the power of government to destroy everything in its way, even in its suppression of those who are crying for bread? Can we realize that this is true?

Mr. President, there must come a time when such things as this will cease. There must come a time when Congress will see and realize the necessity of looking more carefully into legislation emanating from this Indian Bureau.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator, during his remarks, spoke of Inspector Linnen. I was not present at the time this testimony was taken, nor at the time the affidavit the Senator speaks of was offered, but I wish to say that I have known Mr. Linnen for some three or four years, and I never have heard a word to his discredit. On the contrary, the reputation he bears in the office of the Secretary of the Interior and among the public generally is a most excellent reputation as to his being a worthy and efficient official, and one of high character.

As to what the Senator says, of course, I have nothing to say.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The chairman was not present when this testimony was offered. I stated at the beginning of my remarks that I wanted it specifically understood that I was not criticizing any man, but that I was criticizing the officials, if you call it criticism.

Mr. President, permit me now to relate a few matters as regards conditions of the Indian in South Dakota. In April, 1915, a Capt. Mossman, who handles cattle extensively in South Dakota, desired to rent a large tract of Indian land for grazing purposes. The Indians all desired and were willing to rent their lands to him, as they were not used for other purposes. They held a big council, and the matter was put up to the Indian Office here in Washington. They fooled around about it until the latter part of June, and Mr. Mossman was compelled to take his cattle out of the State, the Indians getting nothing out of their land and the State losing the taxes on 8,000 head of cattle. Would you like to have your business handled in this manner?

I could talk all night about complaints—matters of great importance to the Indian—which have been totally neglected by the Indian Office. However, time forbids, and I must hasten.

Mr. President, another general and extremely important matter is the complaint embodied in the statements of many of the old folks who can not talk English. Many times they drive long distances to the local agency and are then compelled to return home because no interpreter can be found who can make known their wants to the superintendent. The younger and more progressive Indians complain of the fact that they are not given employment on their reservations, but, on the contrary, work is given to outsiders—white people. This course causes much dissatisfaction. The refusal of the Indian Office to permit places, in many instances, to be filled by Indians on their own reservation in various lines of work, such as boss farmer, brand inspector, lease clerk, and various other minor positions, which to the Indians themselves are of great importance, but, on the other hand, sending in outsiders to fill these places, persons who in most instances are unfit because they are unacquainted with the climatic conditions of a particular reservation, and more particularly because they do not know the customs, traits, and so forth, of the Indian residents thereof and can not talk their language, only tends to stifle their every ambition. One must remember that the conditions under which a farmer works in one State are entirely different in another locality.

Mr. President, a white man coming into my State from Illinois, Ohio, Oklahoma, or any other State would make a failure in the western part of South Dakota, if he attempted to farm by the methods employed in his former locality. So you can readily see that local people are much better qualified for these positions, because they are fully posted and are more practical as regards methods of local farming. They possess a knowledge of conditions which it is impossible for a man to have coming from the outside. Then there is the further and more important reason, that these outsiders can not talk the Indian language and consequently can not instruct the Indians. These conditions discourage them now, as they have for years, yet they are forced upon them by the Indian Office, and have been for the past 20 years.

This matter was discussed last year in the Indian Committee, and I offered an amendment to the Indian bill, making it imperative for a boss farmer to be appointed from within the State where the reservation at which he is employed is located, but a compromise was made in order to get it through by the acceptance of an amendment which provided that the farmer might be appointed from such State or an adjoining State. This improved the situation somewhat, it is true, but did not go far enough.

Again, we should consider the education of Indian children as of the greatest importance. There should be an earnest and practical effort made to permit all Indian children of school age to attend public school. Has this been done? According to the best of information, there are in South Dakota 1,400 Indian children of school age, who have not been furnished with school

facilities. Yet the law and the treaties are specific on this point. I presume the same average obtains in other States where there is an Indian population.

However, in connection with this matter I want to be fair, and I will say that the conference report to the bill under consideration makes provision for the appropriation of $300,000 for building and equipping public schools on the various Sioux reservations. This legislation was brought about by the hardest kind of work in the committee last year, and this year it became a part of the bill by the adoption of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] and will be of great service.

Now, let us see how the individual money of the Indian is handled in my State, and I think in most of the other States, so that you may know with what he must contend. Suppose an Indian has, say, $500 of his own money. This is sent to the superintendent by the Indian Office with instructions to deposit it in some local bank for the benefit of the Indian. These banks are located in various parts of the country, many miles from where the Indian lives. The deposits made for the Indians are under the control of the various superintendents. Should an Indian need money with which to buy groceries, clothing, medicine, or anything for the support or comfort of his family, or any of the necessities of life, or for any farm tools, or anything else he may need, the first thing he has to do is to hitch up his team and drive from 5 to 75 miles to the agency in order to get an order for a little of his own money with which to buy the necessary articles. After he gets to the agency, it is entirely discretionary with the superintendent as to whether he accommodates the Indian or not. In fact, he is the sole judge of his needs. Thus it may be seen that every Indian is compelled to approach his superintendent with about the same misgiving and fear as would a hungry beggar who approaches your back door and asks for bread.

By this process their money does them very little good. It is dribbled out to them in such small amounts that in many cases it is actually earned by them on account of the time consumed and work done in procuring the necessary order. So you can readily see that the management of this branch of the financial affairs of the Indian might just as well send his money to Mexico for any real good it does him.

And again, while I am on this subject, Mr. President, permit me to say on investigation, I find that on June 30, 1916, the Indians of South Dakota had over $7,000,000 of tribal and individual funds held in trust for them by the Government. The Government on the same day had over $60,000,000 of tribal and individual Indian funds belonging to all the Indians within the United States on deposit in the Treasury and in banks throughout the country, $11,000,000 of which, I am most reliably informed, is not drawing interest.

In this connection we must not lose sight of the fact that many of these Indians are actually suffering on account of lack of the common necessaries of life, when all these millions belonging to them are piled up in the Treasury and held by the Government.

Mr. President, I must complain of another matter which I think is of great injustice to the Indians. It is in reference to the manner of investigating complaints made by individual Indians. Let me say first that the average Indian is afraid to make a complaint for fear of punishment in some way by those who arbitrarily control his life and all his lands. Now, let me tell you the process that is followed in these matters, in case an Indian is brave enough to make a complaint as to his treatment. After it reaches Washington it is usually referred to the Indian Office through a Senator or Representative, where it then usually lays for a long time. The Indian Office has two methods of investigation. One is to send the complaint and name of complainant to the superintendent of the agency where the Indian lives. This immediately puts the Indian in bad with his superintendent, who, in many cases, commences a systematic course of persecution. Another process of the bureau is to send out an inspector, who generally goes to the superintendent, and in many cases the superintendent's police are sent out to bring the Indian to his office. By the time the superintendent and the police get through with the poor helpless Indian there is generally not much left of his complaint.

Now, remember that these superintendents and these inspectors are appointed by the Washington office, and that these police are appointed by the superintendent at the agency. Therefore you can readily see that after the inspection of a complaint against one official in the Indian Service by brother officials of the same department the information received upon which final action is usually taken is not very extensive, and the complaint after such inspection is very mild as compared with the complaint when first brought to the attention of the officials in Washington. The point I desire to make is this: The Indian Office here really makes its own investigation and obtains its information from itself. It does seem to me that if Congress took any interest at all in these matters it would stop long enough to realize conditions as they are, and that everyone who is not a beneficiary in some way would help in bringing about a change in this much-abused system. I want to warn you now that the treatment of these Indians by this Government is degrading rather than upbuilding, and any sensible man who is posted knows it. The treatment they are receiving will never help to make good citizens of them. On the contrary, it will drive them further and further away from any inclination for good or respect for the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, when you come to analyze exactly what rights the Indian has, they are very few indeed. Congress does not give him the right to sue for personal or property rights in courts of justice, as I so understand it, unless he gets permission from Congress to sue in the Court of Claims by special legislation. He can not select and employ attorneys to conduct his own business affairs without the approval of the Indian Bureau. While I am on this subject, let me advise you to what length the bureau will go in this submission process, if given an opportunity. In 1916 they had the appropriation bill amended in committee, so that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs would be empowered to negotiate all agreements with any tribe of Indians for the final adjudication and settlement of all claims they might have against the Government arising under any law, treaty, or agreement not heretofore settled.

I succeeded in having this amendment stricken from the bill. This same provision appeared in this year's bill, and was again stricken out in committee.

Mr. President, to my mind, had this legislation been enacted, it would have been the most vicious law ever placed on a statute book. It would have given one man the absolute power and autocratic authority to finally adjudicate and pass upon all Indian claims. It would have meant that if the Indians refused to settle their claims in line with the commissioner's views, they would never again have an opportunity to get any settlement, because their right to sue in the Court of Claims would in all probability have been foreclosed. Before they could hope to get a single dollar in settlement, no matter how just their claim might be, they would first have been compelled to agree with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs as to its amount. All further opportunity to get a settlement of his claim would have been denied the Indian.

Let me tell you, fellow Senators, that the Indian Bureau to-day has its strangle hold upon the Indians. It has them in a position where they are almost unable to offer any further resistance. It is a disgrace that Congress has permitted this condition to come about.

Mr. President, the Indian people have been made the football of every administration for the past 25 years, and this Indian Bureau, which you have heard so much about, is the greatest burden they have to bear. It is the one thing above all others which is keeping the Indian down. To-day the American Indian has, and for the past 25 years has had, a collar of steel around his neck, locked with a padlock, with log chain attached. He has been gradually but surely dragged down to the lowest depths of degradation. Will we, as Members of Congress, sit still and see this continue? I implore you in the name of humanity, in the name of decency, in the name of the great debt which we as creatures owe to our Creator to investigate this Indian Bureau, to investigate the heart-rending conditions under which these poor Indian people continually live. Upon us rests an important duty, for I say to you that the Congress of the United States is just as responsible for these conditions as is the Indian Office. Too much legislation is passed by Congress for the departments. Congress leaves too much to this great institution, the Indian Bureau.

Mr. President, as I view it, the Indian Bureau is the only department connected with the Government which traffics in human souls and human happiness. Of all the governmental departments its recommendations and acts should be the most closely scrutinized. It does not require any great stretch of imagination to realize the source of the great cry in opposition to giving the Indians some rights in life, when you recall, according to the last annual report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, that there are 6,117 persons whose salaries depend upon the continuation of this system.

Now, let us go back to the year 1853, when, for the first time, we seem to have any actual record as to the number of Indians living in this country. At that time there were about 400,000, not including those in Alaska. The appropriations for Indians that year amounted to approximately $1,000,000. There are no actual figures as to the number of employees in the Indian Service at that time. It is safe to conclude, how-

ever, that there were not many. This was at a time, we must admit, when greater consideration should have been given the Indians than at any subsequent period. According to the records, in 1864, the first year for which we have the figures, there were 155 persons in the Indian Service. Now, let us see what has since happened. In 1893 the Indian population had decreased by about 150,000, but the number of employees in the service had increased to 3,135. In 1903 the Indian population showed a small increase over 1893, while the number of employees had increased to 4,500.

Coming down to 1916, we find that the Indian population, according to the report of the Indian Office, exclusive of the Five Civilized Tribes, is only 234,234. In the same report we find that the number of persons employed in the service had increased to the enormous total of 6,117.

These figures show a decrease of 16 per cent in our Indian population. On the other hand, the number of employees in the Indian Service has increased over 3,800 per cent from the time first authentic figures are available.

This is the situation that confronts us to-day. Do not these statements of the Indian Office itself indicate as clearly as can be shown that the whole Indian system needs overhauling?

Mr. President, if any other business in the world were managed as our Indian Bureau is, it would be in the hands of a receiver every 30 days in the year.

Look at a map of the United States. You will find most of the Indians located on reservations in the western part of the country, where they are permitted to spend their days on their fast diminishing holdings. It has been the practice of the Indian Office for many years, when more of the Indians' lands is wanted, to send agents out to visit them. In their conversation these agents dwell and enlarge upon the great advantages to the Indian to permit the Government to take over additional lands belonging to him. The Indian is approached by these agents, who make great promises to influence him. In a short time we have his land and the Indian has the experience, nothing more. The money paid him in consideration therefor is then deposited with tribal funds, and, in turn, is appropriated to pay for some irrigation scheme of doubtful results, or some other project, to aid which the Government must appropriate many additional millions to complete. Either this is done or the money received for the Indians' land is locked up in the Federal Treasury, as I have shown before, to be appropriated and spent in ways devised by the Indian Bureau, which, so far as I have observed, have been of very little real benefit to the Indians themselves.

Mr. President, we have all heard much talk during our lives about the great trusts; but I want to say to you now that I believe the Indian Bureau is the greatest trust in the world to-day.

I submit to you in all fairness this question: Is not the treatment the Indians receive now, and which they have received at the hands of the Government, through the Indian Bureau, in times past, the real cause which forces them to sell their lands, in order to secure a few dollars to keep themselves alive?

At this point, Mr. President, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD, without reading, statements made by Dr. Lyman Abbott, touching on our Indian reservation system; Gen. R. H. Pratt, the founder of the great Indian school at Carlisle, Pa.; Prof. C. C. Painter; and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter referred to will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Dr. Lyman Abbott, at the twelfth annual meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference, said:

The American Indian on American soil was so far accounted a foreigner that in the Congregational organization he came under the head of foreign missions, and the churches maintained in the midst of Indians were a part of our foreign missionary work. They were shut up in reservations. The reservation is a territory, larger or smaller, surrounded by an imaginary line, beyond which no civilizing elements are permitted to go without the consent of a despot, the agent. The common interchange and play of life are all shut out. * * *

Dr. Montezuma, a full-blood Apache Indian, now practicing medicine in Chicago, Ill., says in one of his addresses: "Better, far better, for the Indians had there never been a bureau. Then self-preservation would have led the individual Indian to find his true place, and his real emancipation would have been speedily consummated."

Gen. R. H. Pratt, the founder of the United States Indian school at Carlisle, Pa., says that the Indian is no problem. It is all in our mind. To free the Indian is to free the Indian. There is nothing complicated about that. It is so simple we can not believe it. Common sense teaches us that when you free the Indian in civilization the Indian will civilize himself. It is automatic and involuntary, and that to free the Indian from bureaucrat is to free him from bureaucrat.

Prof. C. C. Painter, at one of the sessions of the Lake Mohonk Conference several years ago, said, in part, as follows:

As the direct result of our treaties for land we have the Indian reservation. * * * The reservation line is a wall which fences out law, civil institutions, and social order, and admits only despotism, greed, and lawlessness. It says to all the institutions, methods, and appliances of civilized life, "Thus far shalt thou come, and no further," and to patronized idleness, and to every vice which debauches the Indian, provided it does not endanger the safety of the white man. This is the condition of things which has been created and maintained by the reservation system as a policy. We wish these people to become industrious, self-reliant, self-supporting, and we forbid to them the conditions which make this possible. Seriously, let us ask in what way can the reservation be used by us as an instrumentality to the end we seek? Why should we for a day longer desire to perpetuate the system?

As necessarily connected with, and part of the treaty and reservation systems, and as related at least to our own needs, we have also the agency system. * * * As we grow stronger and the Indian weaker, and as the business of the agent became more and more that of a large disburser of provisions, with which we have made them helpless and pauperized dependents, his power has grown to the overthrow of all self-government, and he is now an irresponsible despot who has no laws to execute as related to the growth and development of the Indians, nothing but rules and orders as related to the department at Washington, to which he must give explicit obedience * * * though every weighty matter of civilization should be neglected.

Mr. President, I use these quotations to show you that the reservation system is a relic of barbarism and should have been done away with many years ago. As long as the reservation is retained as an institution the Indian will be helpless.

Mr. President, the general subject of slavery is older than the Constitution of the United States. It concerns the right of a very few to govern a portion of our population for the benefit of such few. Since the dawn of civilization and up to the present, the world has been compelled to contend with slavery in some form. In this instance it is that of the American Indian.

For the past 25 years they have not advanced, largely, I believe, on account of the treatment they have received at the hands of the Government through the Indian Bureau, which lack of advancement is caused through the policy adopted in its maintaining this reservation system and managing it as has been done. This policy is directly contrary to what I believe it should be. It is a policy which can never accomplish for the Indians what they desire and need most.

Let me say right here, that these people have come much nearer to living up to the treaties made with the Government than the same number of American citizens would have done under like circumstances. Indeed, much nearer to living up to these treaties than has the Government in its dealings with them. There has never been any Indian trouble for the past 50 years which has not been primarily caused by the white people themselves in their treatment of the Indian.

Until late years the Indians have had great confidence in the Government to the extent that some day it would fulfill its promises and allow them to be a free people, as they have understood it; but the Government's action in continually putting them off and treating them of late years in the manner I have outlined has led them to believe that Congress has not at any time had such intentions and that we have not done our duty toward them in any sense of the word. For that reason the Indian reposes less confidence in the Government as each year passes than he otherwise would, had he been accorded rights commensurate with his views and actions since these treaties were made.

Mr. President, the Indian feels, and I believe justly so, that he has been intentionally put off and not taken into our confidence for selfish reasons, on account of a lack of common understanding of what he desires and mostly needs. Ostensibly we have legislated for the Indian's benefit, but in reality for no such purpose.

In order to make real men and women of any people we must encourage them along lines of self-support in a practical way. In order to do this, first of all, we should make it possible for them to take some personal interest in their own affairs. This can only be done by placing upon them some responsibility and then show them by our acts toward them and our treatment of them that we are really trying to render some assistance. No race has ever become self-supporting, moral, and upright by any other treatment, and no race ever will.

Now, Mr. President, what the Indian really needs is a little more consideration as to his welfare and happiness while here on this earth, and not so much solicitude on the part of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs as regards his welfare in the world to come. Remember, these people have no way to free themselves from this system. They are greater slaves than any class of people ever were in the United States; their freedom must come through Congress, so you can not fail to see the important position which we occupy in relation to them. We teach our children to be honorable; we teach them manhood and womanhood; we teach them character and all that makes the best in men and women; we teach them to be truthful. After all this, can it be possible that we will continue to act as we now do toward our dependent citizens and subjects who are of another race? Can we allow these people to continue in slavery

and ever expect them to become good citizens? No; it is impossible. You can not build up a race of people unless you place upon them some responsibilities. The excuse of the Indian Bureau and its 6,100 employees, living from the funds of the Indians, and the proceeds of Government appropriations made primarily for the Indians, is that they are ignorant and that they could never be trusted to take care of themselves; that the majority of them can not talk our language. This, then, mind you, is the cry of the Indian Bureau, for what particular reason you must judge for yourselves. We know it is not true, and so do they. I know thousands of old Indian people who can not speak a word of English, who, if they had the chance, would be just as intelligent as the whites. Each year for the past 25 years, thousands of foreigners have been admitted into our country, who, at the time, were ignorant. They could neither read, write, nor talk our language. Yet many of them to-day are classed among our best citizens.

The first question we should ask ourselves is, Do we really want to help the Indian; and if so, will we try to do so? My appeal to you, Senators, may be utterly useless, but I hope and trust that you will at least look into the situation and give it your serious thought and consideration. The American Indian does not deserve to be treated in the cruel way he has been; the old people, at the time treaties were made with them, are dead and gone; their bones have turned to ashes. The young people and children of that day are now the old people of the present time, and their cry for freedom is still unheard.

Mr. President, the original Indian has two characteristics that are not surpassed by any human being: First, obedience to God, and, second, loyalty to friends. These characteristics are of rare beauty. I am speaking for these people, because they can not speak for themselves.

The American Indian is to-day, and always has been, a quiet, reserved, but honest citizen, one upon whom you can always depend, if he gives you his word. I can say to you without fear of contradiction that the Indians of my State are as trustworthy as the average white people among them. They would be just as progressive and anxious to advance in all that tends to uplift their race if they had a chance; but that chance has been continually denied them by the Government.

To assist the Indians, Mr. President, nearly a year ago I introduced a bill in the Senate, in which I tried to incorporate provisions for the first step necessary toward giving our Indian population a chance to have, in a small way, the privileges to govern themselves; to have a voice in their own affairs, on their own land. Such a law would give them an opportunity which has been denied them these many years. No man should dispute that they are entitled to this. This bill has been reported out of committee and has been detained on the Senate calendar at the instigation of the Indian Office through the objection of some Senator on the other side of the Chamber. In substance, this bill provides that no person shall act in the capacity of an Indian superintendent who is not satisfactory to a majority of the Indians on the reservation administered by him. It further provides that if a majority of the male adults declare against the retention of any Indian superintendent, the Secretary of the Interior shall remove him and appoint as his successor some person whom he—the Secretary—may select. You will readily see that this bill is strongly and properly safeguarded in such a manner that it should satisfy the most skeptical, who might fear bad results from its operation, should it become law.

But, fellow Senators, it seems that when a bill is introduced in Congress, having for its object the real relief of the Indians, this Indian Bureau and its various beneficiaries immediately raise a great cry that the Indian can not take care of himself, but that some designing white man will rob him. Immediately word is sent out to all friendly newspapers and periodicals. Articles are scattered broadcast throughout the land condemning any measure which proposes in a small degree to free these downtrodden people and release them from a slavery which is the greatest and most cruel that has ever existed in the United States.

The objections to this bill come, in the main, from the Indian Bureau itself or from people who know nothing whatever in regard to Indians or conditions affecting them.

The first opposition to this proposed legislation to appear in the RECORD, I believe, came in the form of a letter from a gentleman by the name of Sherman Coolidge, of Faribault, Minn., who at the time was president of the Society of American Indians, which was under the control of the Indian Bureau. This man, I am glad to inform you, has since been succeeded by another, who, according to what I have seen of his writings, really has the welfare of the Indian more at heart.

Opposition was also encountered by way of a letter from Mr. Joseph H. Choate, of New York City, a very eminent attorney I understand, and a man of high character, but who knows as much about the Indians as the average man knows about the moon. He has spent his entire life in the East and in all probability was never on an Indian reservation in his life. I doubt if he would know an Indian if he met one in the road, unless some one posted him. Mr. Choate's letter was printed in the RECORD.

I believe, Mr. President, there was also some opposition from the secretary of some Indian association here in the East, who in all probability depends upon the Indian Bureau for his job. And I have been told that some millinery association in the city of Boston also made serious objection to this bill.

Senators, this bill has not been condemned by a single Indian in the United States, nor by a single man who is familiar with Indian matters, unless he is or has been a beneficiary in some way of the present system. I only cite these instances to show you the source of opposition to this measure.

I have tried to present to you many of the objections to the workings of the Indian Bureau as I see them. I have related the facts in reference to the increase in the number of employees in the Indian Service. I have tried to show you how the Indians and their property are being used at the present for the benefit of the personnel of the Indian Bureau. If it were within my humble power, I would abolish the Indian Bureau entirely and create a commission in each State where there is an Indian population to look after their interests, which, to my mind, could then be done in a businesslike manner under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior. This plan would save the Government hundreds of millions of dollars, and, far more important than this, it would bestow upon our Indians the rights to which they are entitled.

Mr. President, you ask me if the Indians can take care of themselves. I answer you that in the State of South Dakota they can do it much better themselves than the Government can do it for them. In various parts of the United States where I am not acquainted, I could not intelligently answer the question. But I do know that after 50 years of dishonor this Government has failed to take care of them.

They tell us the Indian will not work. I tell you they have never been given a chance. They tell us the Indians are lazy. I tell you that is not so. They tell us the Indians are helpless. I reply that if that be true, the Government has made them so.

Mr. President, the Indian as a race is facing the west. They are decreasing in number as we continue with increasing zeal to withhold the necessities of life from them. The life we are compelling them to live is one which breeds disease and crime. Congress is responsible for it.

I wish I had the power to-day to make you realize conditions. I wish I had the power of speech so that I might demonstrate conclusively the deplorable state of the Indian to you. If I had, I know you would be impelled to act promptly to help avert this great waste of life and money. This Congress is now trying to raise revenue in various ways to protect the country and enable our people to live happily. And yet we have allowed to be spent since 1891 from the Treasury of the United States and tribal funds on deposit there, approximately $230,000,000, as shown by the reports of record, which, to my mind, has been of little real benefit to the Indian.

Mr. President, my desire is to try and show that the entire structure of the Indian Bureau is wrong; that its very foundation is honeycombed with injustice, carelessness, mismanagement, selfishness, and ignorance of facts, perhaps. It has an entire misconception, at least, of what should be for the real welfare of the American Indian; and now, if my conclusions are correct, the first question that naturally arises is, What is the remedy? The answer is, Free the Indian. This is so simple that we can not realize it ourselves. It means simply to free the Indian; give him his individual land; let him make a home of it; build him a little house and barn; fence his land for him and dig him a well; break up what land he can profitably cultivate, leaving the remainder for grazing and hay land; give him a few milch cows, his own horses and sheep; and then extend him the privilege of handling his personal property himself under certain restrictions. Give him the privilege to go out and buy or sell a calf, cow, or horse, but do not allow him to sell his individual land, which will always provide a good home for him and his family. Let him understand that his home farm is to be inherited by his children upon his death, as is the case with the whites. Make it a felony for anyone to incumber his land in any manner by mortgage or otherwise for a certain number of years, and say to him, Now, my friend, you must manage your own affairs; your farm will always provide a good living for you and your family, if you will do your part. We do this to make you happy, for the members of your family are now working for

themselves; and, instead of erecting large schools at the agencies, build small schoolhouses for the Indians throughout the country, the same as is done in the white settlements, under the township plan, same to be maintained by each school district whose inhabitants may be either whites or Indians. If these conditions are brought about, their children will take a greater interest and pride in securing an education than they will by attending the large Government schools, where they become lonesome and unhappy because they can not be with their parents and families. Then all will have the same chance. This method will not take away from any of them the right to attend other schools or colleges, but will enable all to get an education at home. When this is done, in my judgment, you will have reached the true solution of the Indian problem, for the Indian and his family will then begin to take a real interest in life. Let them once, before they die, breathe the free air of God as men and women.

Mr. President, all this can be done for every Indian family in the United States at an expense of from $60,000,000 to $70,000,000, which is about one-third of what has been fooled away in the last few years in maintaining this great army of Federal employees under the bureau system, and it certainly would be a great blessing to the Indians themselves.

An excerpt from the Literary Digest of August 9, 1913, page 196, quotes Secretary Lane as saying:

> I am satisfied, from what examination I have made, that there are tens of thousands of so-called Indians whose property, to a greater or less degree, is under the control of this Indian Bureau who are as competent to attend to their affairs as any man or woman of the white race.

The same article attributes the following statement to Secretary Lane: "To set him free is the greatest service we can do the Indian," and adds that "The Indian Bureau would be a vanishing bureau."

I believe that if the Secretary of the Interior had the time to look into the conditions of these people fully, he would render all the assistance within his power to abolish the Indian Bureau because I am sure he would see that such action is for the Indians' best interests.

A bill will be introduced early in the next session of Congress having for its object the passing of the Indian Bureau as an institution and substituting therefor a commission, composed of members from each State having an Indian population, appointed by the President of the United States, said commission to act under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior.

This will save the Government hundreds of millions of dollars and will inaugurate a common-sense system of business principles. If the measure is enacted into law, the dawn of a new creation for the Indian people, which will be of untold value to them, will be witnessed.

Fellow Senators, upon us rests a duty, a solemn, binding duty. It is to help free these people, to remove the iron hand that is oppressing them and give them the relief for which they have been asking these many years.

Congress has neglected this question in the past and is neglecting it to-day. Let me warn you that this question of slavery among the Indians and this great waste of Indian and Government money are our sins as well as those of the Indian Office. They will continue as long as the management of the Indian's affairs is under the control of the Indian Bureau.

My friends, I do not know how you feel about it. I do not know why Congress should follow the desires of the Indian Bureau with conditions among the Indians as they are. So far as I am personally concerned, I shall express my views regardless of the wishes or rulings of any department, when I know I am right; and, in doing so, I shall feel that I am well within my rights in urging legislation for the interest of the Indian, and opposing that which is against his interest.

The Indian people of South Dakota are my friends and I am their friend. If you want to continue enacting Indian legislation of the character passed during the last 25 years, if you believe in destroying these people in this manner, if you favor the system of the Indian Bureau, then I say, go on and God be with you; but do not ask me to stultify myself or to cast my vote for measures which perpetuate a system that is not only degrading to morality and decency, but which is a standing barrier to health, happiness, and life, as well as a living testimonial which forever bars these poor, unfortunate people from any hope that some day the Government will redeem its pledges to them and give them what they have prayed for by day and dreamed of by night for the last 50 years—their liberty.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator in charge of the bill, the chairman of the committee, with reference to the appropriation for the irrigation of the Yakima Indian Reservation. I called to the attention of the conferees a statement from the Indian Office showing the condition of the moneys heretofore appropriated for that purpose, and I have no doubt but that the conferees considered that information. I understand from the report, however, that the Senate conferees receded from the amendment increasing the amount to $300,000. Is that correct?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes, Mr. President; I wish to say, and I trust I am not violating the proprieties, if the Senate conferees could have had their way—which, unfortunately, in my opinion on this item they could not—the item would not have been $300,000, but even $400,000. It is feared that the reduction of the amount from $300,000 to $200,000 would disorganize the forces; it might unfortunately require for a short time the suspension of activities there, and I deplore the situation almost as much as the Senator from Washington. I sincerely and deeply regret that the Senate conferees were absolutely unable after 20 days to induce the House conferees to agree to an appropriation of $300,000.

I share the same opinion the Senator has expressed. I think it should have been $300,000, but we worked for many days and we thought we never would be able to compose the differences on some of the amendments. It was only after many, many weary hours of work that we were able to compose the disagreements on the 108 amendments. The differences were so radical and so far apart that it was very difficult to compose them.

Mr. JONES. I think I appreciate some of the difficulties of the conferees, and I am satisfied the Senate conferees did everything they possibly could to retain this item. The Senator shows by what he says that they know the situation there and appreciate it. I shall not oppose the adoption of the conference report because that item was not included in it, feeling that the conferees did everything to retain it that they possibly could. I regret that they could not hold it, because the Government is likely to lose a considerable sum of money by not making the appropriation now. The data submitted by the Indian Office shows that very likely before the 1st of July the money that has been heretofore appropriated for this work will be exhausted and that they will have to suspend work, the force will be disbanded, the machinery will be idle, and we will lose a considerable sum of money by not continuing the work.

The amount of money proposed to be appropriated in the bill by the Senate would very likely continue the work rapidly and economically during the next year. It simply illustrates how Congress carries on these great works in a sort of hit-or-miss way, in such a slipshod way as to make it very expensive and very wasteful and very costly to these Indians themselves and the owners of the land who want to reimburse the Government for the greater part of the money appropriated and expended.

I regret very much that the Senate conferees could not hold this amount, but I am satisfied they did everything they could to retain it.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator for his very generous references.

Mr. President, we have a slim attendance, and I believe I will suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard
Brady	Hollis	Myers	Shields
Brandegee	Hughes	Norris	Simmons
Bryan	Husting	Overman	Smoot
Catron	James	Owen	Sterling
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Stone
Clapp	Jones	Penrose	Swanson
Clark	La Follette	Phelan	Thomas
Cummins	Lane	Pittman	Underwood
Curtis	Lea, Tenn.	Pomerene	Vardaman
du Pont	Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Walsh
Fall	Lewis	Robinson	Warren
Fletcher	McLean	Saulsbury	Weeks
Gronna	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE obtained the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator, before he proceeds, permit me to make a motion relative to adjournment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-night it adjourn until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, as I understand the issue involved in the conference report upon the Indian appropriation bill now before the Senate, it may be stated as follows: There is a difference between the House of Representatives and the Senate on the matter of increase in the salaries of clerks. The Senate has adopted a provision that salaries of $480 and

less shall be increased 15 per cent and that salaries above $480 and up to and including salaries of $1,000 shall be increased 10 per cent. The House has adopted and stood by a provision upon every appropriation bill which roughly may be stated as follows: That all salaries paid to Government clerks up to and including $1,200 shall be increased 10 per cent; that salaries above $1,200 and up to and including $1,800 shall be increased 5 per cent. That is the issue presented to the Senate upon this conference report, and that is all there is of it. Senators may make addresses to the Senate upon the conduct of the Indian Bureau or any other bureau in the Interior Department; they may criticize what has taken place upon this or that Indian reservation. I have no doubt that is some satisfaction to the Member of the Senate making the criticism; but the issue upon which we are required to pass on this conference report is whether we are willing to increase the salaries of clerks who get $1,200 a year and less 10 per cent and the salaries of clerks who get above $1,200 and up to and including $1,800, 5 per cent, or whether we desire to give an increase of 15 per cent to those receiving up to $480 and 10 per cent to those receiving more than $480 and up to $1,000. Now, that is the only difference upon this Indian appropriation bill that has to be settled by the Senate.

Let me say to you, Mr. President, that the conferees of the Senate, the three men chosen by the Senate to represent them in the deliberations of the conference on the disagreeing votes between the Senate and the House, acceded to the House proposition and came back here with a recommendation in this report that we adopt the House provision.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I can hardly take the time, but I yield.

Mr. JONES. The Senator made a mistake. I thought it was 10 per cent up to $1,200 and 5 per cent above that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is exactly what I said. I have only a very limited time to cover the ground. I understand the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs stated the total amount of the appropriation that would be required if we accede to the House position upon the Indian bill as being in round numbers $45,000. If I am incorrect the Senator can correct me.

Mr. ASHURST. Let me put in the exact figures right here; $45,973.30.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But, Mr. President, he was interrupted by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and was reminded that if we fix this increase in the Indian appropriation bill upon the grade agreed upon by the conferees, which would increase this appropriation only $45,000, and give the clerks up to $1,800 this increase, it would result, provided the House yielded on the differences on the legislative, the Agricultural, and all the other appropriation bills, in paying the employees in the Indian Office more than other employees in the other departments.

That is true, Mr. President, but we have to deal with each one of these bills by itself.

The sole question before the Senate now is this bill. It is proper to consider its effect upon the other bills, and the suggestion made by the Senator from North Carolina was pertinent, for we ought to know what we are doing, but the question before the Senate now is, Shall we agree to this conference report? I concede, if we do agree to it, that we ought to yield to the House of Representatives on the other appropriation bills. That will entail an expenditure to the Government because of these increases of $26,000,000. If we accept the House provision on all of these appropriation bills, we shall have thereby increased the expenditures something like $26,000,000. Am I right, I ask the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator is perfectly right.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes. Now, Mr. President, taken in its largest aspect, that is the question before the Senate. As to this bill, the increase is $45,000 and a little more; but, Mr. President and Senators, shall this Congress, making appropriations such as were never before made in the history of this Government for a multitude of purposes, hold back on this appropriation of $26,000,000 to take care of the homes and the families of those who are in the public service and are enjoying salaries of $1,800 and less?

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. STERLING. Let me ask the Senator from Wisconsin this question: Is it an increase of $26,000,000 over what we are now paying these various employees or is it an increase over the Smoot amendment of $26,000,000?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is a total increase of $26,000,000. Under the Smoot amendment it would be something more than $13,000,000. It requires but $13,000,000 additional if we accept the House provision and make this addition to the salaries of clerks up to and including those receiving salaries of $1,800.

Mr. STERLING. I simply wanted that to appear.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for that suggestion. It does not mean an increase of $26,000,000 over what would be accorded to these clerks under the Smoot amendment, but it just about doubles the amount of the appropriation that would be required to meet the advances provided for by that amendment.

Mr. President, the question is, Should we do this? Oh, sir, I can hardly comprehend the mental attitude of Senators who approach this question in a spirit of hostility. For 10 years the Senate of the United States, with the House of Representatives concurring, have been engaged in increasing the salaries of everybody excepting the poorly paid clerks in the departments of this Government. They have increased their own salaries; they have increased the salaries of judges; they have increased the salaries of Cabinet officers; they have increased all of the salaries in the foreign service. Mr. President, shame should overwhelm this body and the other branch of Congress if we hesitated now to make this pittance of an increase.

I voted for some of the increases of salaries which have been made in the last 10 years. We increased our own salaries 50 per cent. I refused to vote for that, unless it was so limited as to apply to the terms of Senators to begin at the expiration of the term for which they were elected. I believed the salaries should be increased. I believe the salary paid to a United States Senator to-day is less than it should be. I believed that it was appropriate that the salaries of the judiciary, that the salaries of Cabinet officers, that the salary of the Speaker of the other House, that the salary of the Vice President and the Secretary of the Senate should be increased.

Mr. President, 18 years ago we entered upon a new economic era in the United States, entirely reversing the economic principles that had controlled prices from the beginning of the foundation of civilization down to that time. Prices controlling absolutely the cost of living had been measured by three great economic laws down to 1898; down to that time they had been dominated by three natural laws of trade. Prior to that time prices were not fixed by combinations of men, but we then entered upon a radical change. I am not going into that; the time does not permit. Of that more at another time; but from 1898 the scale of the wholesale and retail prices of products showed a steady increase down to the last year, down to the time when the influence of the awful conflict upon the other side had begun to make itself felt.

Mr. President, this body, thinking of the salaries of its Members and of the shortage at the end of each month when they came to strike a balance, felt the pressure many years ago. I have before me here the roll call of this body upon the question of the increase of salaries. It was January 23, 1907, just exactly nine years after the cost of living, influenced by artificial conditions, had begun to climb, and at that time United States Senators felt the burdens imposed upon them so keenly that they wanted an increase in their salaries, and they got it by 50 per cent. Many of these Senators upon this floor are now opposing this increase of a pittance to poorly paid clerks, grappling, not with the conditions of 1907, but with the conditions of 1917, when there has been a 100 per cent increase in the cost of many of the necessaries of life in a single twelvemonth. Some of these Senators are now about this floor working upon other Senators to induce them to deny this increase to the families of employees in this city, who are walking the floor nights to figure out some way to meet the increasing household expenses. I shall put into the RECORD, without stopping to read them, the names of the Senators who voted for an increase in their own salaries at that time.

Mr. ASHURST. If the Senator will yield to me, of course we want to discover if these Senators who have been "lobbying" to defeat this increase of salary to poor men are the same men who voted to increase their own salaries.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask permission to print in the RECORD the names referred to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Yeas—53: Aldrich, Allee, Ankeny, Benson, Beveridge, Brandegee, Bulkeley, Burnham, Burrows, Carter, Clark (Mont.), Clark (Wyo.), Clarke (Ark.), Crane, Cullom, Daniel, Dick, Dillingham, Dubois, du Pont, Flint, Foraker, Foster, Frye, Fulton, Gallinger, Hale, Heyburn, Hopkins, Kittredge, Knox, Latimer, Lodge, Long, McCumber, McEnery,

Millard, Money, Newlands, Nixon, Overman, Penrose, Pettus, Piles, Scott, Simmons, Smoot, Spooner, Sutherland, Teller, Tillman, Warner, Warren.

Nays—21: Bacon, Berry, Blackburn, Burkett, Carmack, Clapp, Clay, Culberson, Frazier, Hansbrough, Hemenway, La Follette, McCreary, Mallory, Nelson, Patterson, Perkins, Rayner, Stone, Taliaferro, Whyte.

Not voting—16: Alger, Allison, Bailey, Depew, Dolliver, Dryden, Elkins, Gamble, Gearin, Kean, McLaurin, Martin, Morgan, Platt, Proctor, Wetmore.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have more material here than I can use in two or three hours. I had intended when this question came before the Senate at different times to have taken part in the debate upon it, but circumstances intervened that led me to postpone my remarks to a more opportune time. This may not be the best time, but it is the time which under the circumstances I am constrained to take.

Listen just for a moment, Mr. President and Senators, to what we have done in 10 years, since the era of high prices came upon us. Lest I might arouse differences with my colleagues on this side and differences with my colleagues on the other side, let me not be diverted to discuss the reasons that lie back of the increase in cost of living. These increases have come; they began in the year 1898. A study of Bradstreet's and Dun's and of the books of any wholesale or retail grocer in any city of America will show the gradual rise in prices year by year from 1898 down to the time when the great war on the other side began to make itself felt, and then the cost of living began to advance still more rapidly than during the steady upward trend of the years that went before. But very soon after we entered upon the period of higher prices Congress began to increase the salaries of the highest and best-paid public officials. Mr. President, it is a record of which none of us can be proud.

Let us see what we have done for the executive departments of this Government since the high cost of maintaining life first began to be felt in this country. In 1905 the salary of the President of the United States was $50,000. It was increased by 1915 to $75,000, or 50 per cent. The salary of his private secretary was increased 50 per cent.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken about the date of the increase. He stated it as 1915. That is not the date of the increase of the President's salary.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Well, Mr. President, it was increased within that 10-year period.

Mr. JAMES. It was increased during President Taft's administration.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is true. If I have been understood as saying that the figures I have collected here indicate that the increases were made in the year 1915, then I have been misunderstood or I misstated myself. I have collected here the increases made in 10 years—from 1905 to 1915. The increase in the President's compensation was 50 per cent; for his private secretary it was 50 per cent; for the Vice President, 50 per cent; for the private secretary to the Vice President, 81 per cent; United States Senators increased their salaries 50 per cent; Members of the House of Representatives increased their salaries 50 per cent; the salary of the Secretary of the Senate was increased 30 per cent; that of the Sergeant at Arms was increased 44 per cent; the salary of the Speaker of the House was increased 50 per cent; the salary of the secretary to the Speaker, 33 per cent; the salary of the Clerk of the House, 30 per cent; the salary of the chief clerk of the House, 25 per cent; the salary of the Sergeant at Arms of the House, 44 per cent; and the salary of the Doorkeeper, 42 per cent.

The Secretary of State had an increase in his salary of 50 per cent; the Assistant Secretary of 11 per cent. We increased the salaries of our ministers and ambassadors and of the executive heads of all the departments. I have gathered the figures here; but I shall not conclude in the time allotted if I stop to read all, and so I ask, Mr. President, the privilege of printing these figures in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the same as though read upon the floor. They give the salaries in 1905, the salaries paid under the law in 1915, and the rate per cent of increase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter will be incorporated in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Branches.	1905	1915	Per cent of increase.
EXECUTIVE.			
President	$50,000	$75,000	50
Private Secretary to President	5,000	7,500	50
Vice President	8,000	12,000	50
Private secretary to Vice President	2,200	4,000	81
LEGISLATIVE.			
United States Senators	5,000	7,500	50
Representatives	5,000	7,500	50
Secretary of Senate	5,000	6,500	30
Sergent at Arms	4,500	6,500	44⅔
Speaker, House of Representatives	8,000	12,000	50
Secretary to Speaker	3,000	4,000	33⅓
Clerk of House	5,000	6,500	30
Chief Clerk	3,600	4,500	25
Sergeant at Arms	4,500	6,500	44⅔
Doorkeeper	3,500	5,000	42⅞
STATE DEPARTMENT.			
Secretary	8,000	12,000	50
Assistant Secretary	4,500	5,000	11⅛
EMBASSIES AND LEGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES.			
Argentina (ambassador)	12,000	17,500	45⅚
Austria	12,000	17,500	45⅚
Belgium	10,000	12,000	20
Bolivia	10,000	17,500	75
Brazil	12,500	17,500	40
Chile	10,000	17,500	75
Denmark	7,500	10,000	33⅓
Dominican Republic	5,000	10,000	100
Ecuador	7,500	10,000	33⅓
Portugal	7,500	10,000	33⅓
Greece	7,500	10,000	33⅓
Haiti	7,500	10,000	33⅓
Italy	12,000	17,500	45⅚
Japan	12,000	17,500	45⅚
Luxemburg	10,000	12,000	20
Montenegro	7,500	10,000	33⅓
Morocco	7,500	10,000	33⅓
Netherlands	10,000	12,000	20
Paraguay	7,500	10,000	33⅓
Persia	7,500	10,000	33⅓
Roumania	7,500	10,000	33⅓
Servia	7,500	10,000	33⅓
Spain	12,000	17,500	45⅚
Switzerland	7,500	10,000	33⅓
Turkey	10,000	17,500	45⅚
Uruguay	7,500	10,000	33⅓
TREASURY DEPARTMENT.			
Secretary	8,000	12,000	50
Assistant Secretary	4,500	5,000	11⅛
Secretary to Secretary	2,500	3,000	20
Chief Bookkeeping and Warrants Division	3,500	4,000	14⅔
Assistant chief	2,700	3,000	11 1/9
Chief clerk, Customs Division	2,700	4,000	44⅔
Assistant chief	2,000	3,000	50
Chief clerk, Public Moneys	2,500	3,000	20
Assistant chief	2,000	2,500	25
Chief, Loans and Currency Division	2,500	3,000	20
Assistant chief	2,100	2,700	28⅔
Chief, special agents	p:d. 10	4,500	23⅓
Comptroller Treasury	5,500	6,000	9 1/11
Auditor Post Office Department	4,000	5,000	25
United States Treasurer	6,000	8,000	33⅓
Assistant Treasurer	3,000	3,600	20
Commissioner Internal Revenue	6,000	6,500	8⅓
Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing	5,500	6,000	33⅓
Assistant Director	3,000	3,500	16⅔
Director of the Mint	4,500	5,000	11⅛
WAR DEPARTMENT.			
Secretary	8,000	12,000	50
Assistant Secretary	4,500	5,000	11⅛
Chief clerk	3,000	4,000	33⅓
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.			
Attorney General	8,000	12,000	50
Solicitor General	7,500	10,000	33⅓
Private secretary to Attorney General	2,750	3,000	9+
Assistant to Attorney General	7,000	9,000	28⅞
Assistant Attorney General	5,000	7,500	50
Chief clerk	2,750	3,500	27
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.			
Postmaster General	8,000	12,000	50
Chief clerk	3,000	4,000	33⅓
Chief inspector	3,000	4,000	33⅓
Solicitor	4,500	5,000	11⅛
Second Assistant Postmaster General	$4,500	$5,000	11⅛
Third Assistant Postmaster General	4,500	5,000	11⅛
Fourth Assistant Postmaster General	4,500	5,000	11⅛
NAVY DEPARTMENT.			
Secretary	8,000	12,000	50
Assistant Secretary	4,500	5,000	11⅛
INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.			
Secretary	8,000	12,000	50
Assistant Secretary	5,000	6,000	20
Chief clerk	3,000	4,000	33⅓
Superintendent of Capitol Grounds	4,500	6,000	33⅓
Superintendent Insane Asylum	4,000	5,000	20
AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT.			
Secretary	8,000	12,000	50
Assistant Secretary	4,500	5,000	11⅛
Solicitor	2,500	5,000	100
SUPREME COURT.			
Chief Justice	13,500	15,000	15 3/9
Associate Justices	12,500	14,500	16

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In the Treasury Department the salary of the Secretary was increased 50 per cent, that of the Assistant Secretary 11 per cent, that of the secretary to the Secretary 20 per cent, assistant chief 14 per cent. Of course, when we get down to the little fellows, who need it just as much as those with larger salaries, the percentage falls.

Oh, Mr. President, are we building up an official aristocracy in this country? What shall be said when these figures come to pass under the eye of the American people while we halt and listen to whispered arguments on this floor as to whether we will let some poor clerk, who is barely subsisting on a salary of $1,000 or $1,200 or $1,400 a year, have a meager increase of 10 per cent or 5 per cent, as he may fall into one or the other of these classes? Shame upon us! We ought to be hissed from our places. This is a democracy, sir, and the measure of equal justice to every man is the heart of our creed. Look into these figures and tell me if you can find any justification for the course of Congress and its Committees on Appropriations?

Riding home last night on a street car, I thought I would sound out the conductor, and so I inquired about his pay. I speak of this just by way of comparison. These men start in for the first year at 23 cents an hour, perhaps a fraction above that; I think they start at 23½ cents, but I am giving round numbers. They start with 23 cents an hour, and after five years of service they attain to 27 cents an hour. They make an average of 10 hours, or $2.70 a day for a man who has been in the service five years. That is between $900 and $1,000, figured by the month. They get one day off out of seven, but they lose their pay for the day they are off. However, Mr. President, they receive more than we are paying many of the Government clerks. I asked the man with whom I talked how they managed in these times to live upon such a wage. "Well," he said, "I am a single man, and I squeeze along." He was a man of more than average intelligence, and had been employed in some other line of business, but had met with disaster and had taken this position. He said to me, "You do not know how it weighs down upon the other fellows who have families"; and, mark you, the best paid of them are getting nearly a thousand dollars a year. He said, "by moving two or three families into one little house, dividing up the rooms, and cutting out everything except the bare, scant necessities of life, they squeeze along"—no flowers, no music, sir; nothing that ministers to the artistic side; only the scant necessities of life; no chance to own a home. The permanency of democracy, as I have always viewed it, rests upon the ownership of the homes by the people of this country. No homes for these men! They squeeze along; they barely subsist, sir. But if sickness comes to the family, he told me it was a common practice whenever any misfortune afflicts a family, the subscription list circulates, and the men set down what they can give out of their earnings to help the men of families out of their difficulties. I am informed that there are employed by this great Government that is building battleships, each to cost over $15,000,000, hundreds of employees who work during the day for their small Government salaries and then go out and find employment at night somewhere, absenting themselves from the home, working into the small hours of the night, in order that they may take care of their families!

Oh, Mr. President, I regret to have felt constrained to make this address to the Senate and put these facts into the RECORD. They are not to our credit.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. I want to know if the Senator has examined into the records of the last 15 years to see whether there have not been considerable increases of salaries of the other employees?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator. I might have overlooked that in the press of time.

Mr. President, on the point upon which I am talking, I wish to insert in the RECORD these further increases that we have made. The figures go all through the service. Listen! I will just read the heads. I have grouped all the increases of salary under each heading: The Executive Department, the Legislative Department, the State Department, the embassies and legations of the United States, the Treasury Department, the War Department, the Department of Justice, the Post Office Department, the Navy Department, the Interior Department, the Agricultural Department, the Supreme Court. And let me say, Mr. President, that this is by no means a complete list of the increases which we have made in 10 years. It just strikes the high points.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Now, let me come to the Senator's interrogatory.

Mr. OVERMAN. Before the Senator does that I want to call his attention to the fact that the increases in the departments are made by classes. There we have class 1, class 2, class 3, and class 4. If a man is getting a thousand dollars, and he is efficient, he is promoted to $1,200, from $1,200 to $1,400, from $1,400 to $1,600, and from $1,600 to $1,800. That is the way the promotions go in the departments.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, I understand that, Mr. President. This matter is not to be confused in anybody's mind. We know how these increases have been made which I have presented here. They have been straight increases made by direct provisions of law. You will find the same thing in every appropriation bill that comes up at this session. Men are singled out here and there, and their salaries increased. But, Mr. President, to find out how the great body of clerks and employees of this Government have been treated take just one department that is typical of all.

The salaries of employees of the United States Treasury Department employed in Washington in 1855 have been compiled by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics from the official register of that year, and a comparison has been made between the salaries in 1855 and the salaries in the same departments in 1916.

The following table gives the comparative figures for clerks, messengers, watchmen, and laborers employed in the Treasury Department in the District of Columbia in 1855 and 1916.

And what prevails in the Treasury Department will be found to prevail in the other departments of this Government. There has been no distinction made in the great departments.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I can not begin to cover the ground that I wish to cover.

Mr. BRYAN. It is within 15 minutes of closing time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I know; and we must vote upon this proposition within that time.

Mr. BRYAN. I want to suggest this to the Senator——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator will suggest something that will require, perhaps, five minutes of explanation to dissipate.

Mr. BRYAN. Well, Mr. President, the Senator says this is typical of all the departments. I only want to call his attention to the fact—and it is something that surprised me very much—that under the House provision, half of this increase would go to the post-office employees.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not care where it goes. For God's sake, let it go somewhere! If we can not make the increase everywhere, let us make it where we can.

Mr. BRYAN. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I decline to yield further, Mr. President. It is not fair——

Mr. BRYAN. Will the Senator——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have quite considerable matter here of importance to put into the RECORD.

Mr. BRYAN. May I ask the Senator one question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I can not yield any further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will say to the Senator that I am limited in time.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator is taking up all the time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have taken the time that no other Senator offered to take, and I have matter to put in here that has not been put before the Senate; and I am going to put it before the Senate if I can. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair again admonishes the occupants of the galleries that demonstrations are not permitted in the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment just at this point? I do not know, under the unanimous-consent agreement, whether we must——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. We must dispose of this matter within the two-hours' period. I understand that perfectly.

Mr. ASHURST. If the Senator knows that, I do not want to interrupt him.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understand that, Mr. President, and I decline to be interrupted again by anybody. I shall read from this illuminating analysis:

> There have been some increases in salaries in the administrative force, but it will be noted that these are among the very high-salaried officials, and these are more than offset by the large number of clerical positions in the lower grades.
>
> In 1855 the predominating salaries were $1,400 and $1,600, with less than 20 per cent of all positions paying $1,200 or less. The average salary in the Treasury Department in 1855, as the table shows, was $1,434.

Now, listen, Senators:

> In 1916 the average salary in the clerical departments was $1,280, a reduction of $154 per year in the pay of clerks in 1916 as compared with 1855.

Now, that was in part due—and the fairness of the matter that I am presenting is shown by the statement of the fact—that was in part due to the employment of women at lower salaries than male employees had been employed at in 1855. But comparing the salaries of male clerks and taking the male clerks of 1855, now; get this into your minds, Senators—taking the male clerks of 1855, leaving out the female clerks and taking the male clerks of 1916, there is a munificent increase of $9 in their average salary, which was $1,434 in 1855 and $1,443 in 1916.

Oh, Mr. President, the predominating salary in 1855 was $840, while in 1916 the predominating wage group in this department was $720!

Mr. President, I can not lay before the Senate all the facts that have been compiled by the Statistical Bureau of the Department of Labor, as applied to one of the great departments of this Government; but the showing that is made is a showing that should bring to the face of every man who has been in a position to repair this wrong in all these years the blush of shame, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to the fact that the hour of 10 o'clock is approaching, at which time the period allotted under the unanimous-consent agreement for the consideration and disposition of this conference report will expire.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Well, Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD this material compiled by the Statistical Bureau of the Department of Labor as a part of my remarks, together with the tables.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The salaries of employees of the United States Treasury Department employed in Washington in 1855 have been compiled by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics from the official register of that year, and a comparison has been made between the salaries in 1855 and the salaries in the same departments or groups in 1916.

The following table gives the comparative figures for clerks, messengers, watchmen, and laborers employed in the Treasury Department in the District of Columbia in 1855 and in 1916.

There have been some increases in salaries in the administrative force, but it will be noted that these are among the very high salaried officials, and these are more than offset by the large number of clerical positions in the lower grades.

In 1855 the predominating salaries were $1,400 and $1,600, with less than 20 per cent of all positions paying $1,200 or less. The average salary in the Treasury Department in 1855, as the table shows, was $1,434; in 1916 the average salary in the clerical departments was $1,280, a reduction of $154 per year in the pay of clerks in 1916 as compared with 1855. There were no women employed in 1855. Comparing the salaries of male clerks, it will be seen that the men alone have received the munificent increase of $9 per year in their average salary, which was $1,434 in 1855 and $1,443 in 1916. The figures of this table show very clearly that the Government employed women to depress wages and that the amount of depression acted as a total reduction of the average to the extent of $154. The average pay of female clerks in the Treasury Department in the District of Columbia in 1916 was $1,089, and 1,176 are so employed. The tendency of the Government to depress salaries is also seen in the next group—that of messengers. The predominating salary in 1855 was $840, while in 1916 the predominating wage group in this classification is $720. Considering only the male messengers, the table shows that the average salary of the messenger has been reduced from $723 in 1855 to $707 in 1916.

Watchmen have fared little better. All watchmen in the Treasury Department were paid $600 each in 1855, while in 1916 71 of the 73 employed are receiving the munificent sum of $60 per month. In 1855 but one man registered as a laborer. He was paid $576. The predominating wage in 1916 is $600, but as an offset to this munificence three lower grades have been established, the lowest one $480 a year.

Salaries of employees of the Treasury Department employed in Washington, D. C., in 1855 and in 1916.

Classification.	Salary grade.	1855	1916		
		Male.	Male.	Female.	Total.
Administrative force	$12,000		1		1
Do	10,000		4		4
Do	8,000	1	1		1
Do	6,500		1		1
Do	6,000		3		3
Do	5,000		8		8
Do	4,500	1	2		2
Do	4,300		1		1
Do	4,000		9		9
Do	3,600		2		2
Do	3,500	2	4		4
Do	3,250		1		1
Do	3,200		1		1
Do	3,000	13	13		13
Do	2,750		5		5
Do	2,700		1		1
Do	2,500	1	24		24
Do	2,400		3		3
Do	2,250		21		21
Do	2,200	2	4		4
Do	2,000	18	18		18
Do	1,900		2		2
Do	1,500	1			
Total		39	129		129
Average salary		$2,638	$3,255		$3,255
Clerical force	3,000		2		2
Do	2,500		12		12
Do	2,400		1		1
Do	2,250		3		3
Do	2,150		1		1
Do	2,100		5		5
Do	2,000		48	4	52
Do	1,800	14	269	25	294
Do	1,700	3	3	1	4
Do	1,600	105	262	77	339
Do	1,500	1	10	3	13
Do	1,400	178	273	126	399
Do	1,300	1	7	4	11
Do	1,260		1	15	16
Do	1,200	70	259	239	498
Do	1,140		3	8	11
Do	1,100	3	5	3	8
Do	1,080		8	14	22
Do	1,020		13	25	38
Do	1,000	1	93	184	277
Do	960		12	13	25
Do	900		86	237	323
Do	840		5	22	27
Do	800		4	56	60
Do	780			3	3
Do	720		4	94	98
Do	700			9	9
Do	600			14	14
Total		385	1,389	1,176	2,565
Average salary		$1,434	$1,443	$1,089	$1,280
Messengers, assistant messengers, and messenger boys	1,200		1		1
Do	1,100		1		1
Do	1,000		2		2
Do	900	1	3		3
Do	840	11	55	2	57
Do	780	1			
Do	720	2	74	3	77
Do	660	1			
Do	600	3	1		1
Do	540	1			
Do	500	1			
Do	480		8		8
Do	420	1	5		5
Do	360	1	20		20
Total		23	170	5	175
Average salary		$723	$707	$768	$709
Watchmen	$1,400		1		1
Do	900		2		2
Do	720		71		71
Do	600	16			
Total		16	74		74
Average salary		$600	$734		$734
Laborers	1,200		2		2
Do	1,000		5		5
Do	960		7		7
Do	900		7	1	8
Do	840		6	3	9
Do	720		5	9	14
Do	660		113	17	130
Do	600		1		1
Do	576	1			
Do	540		2		2
Do	500		15		15
Do	480			2	2
Total		1	163	32	195
Average salary		$576	$692	$690	$692
Charwomen	480			3	3
Do	240			143	143
Total				146	146
Average salary				$245	$245

Table No. 1 is a transcript of the salaries paid in the United States Treasury Department to employees in the District of

Columbia as of the date of September 30, 1855, as shown by the Official Register.

Table No. 2 is a classification of employees by grades in the Treasury Department as of April 1, 1908.

In both of these instances, the entire force, including the Cabinet officers, is included.

TABLE No. 1.—*A transcript of the salaries paid in the United States Treasury Department to employees in the District of Columbia, as of the date of Sept. 30, 1855, as shown by the official register.*

Office.	Salary.	Persons.
Secretary of the Treasury	$8,000	1
Assistant Secretary of the Treasury	3,000	1
Chief clerk	2,200	1
Disbursing clerk	2,000	1
Clerks	1,800	4
Do	1,600	8
Do	1,400	10
Do	1,200	3
Messengers	840	1
Assistant messengers	780	1
Watchmen	600	16
Comptroller	3,500	1
Chief clerk	2,000	7
Clerks	1,600	6
Do	1,400	4
Do	1,200	1
Messengers	840	1
Second Comptroller	3,000	1
Chief clerk	2,000	7
Clerks	1,600	4
Do	1,400	5
Do	1,200	1
Messenger	840	1
First Auditor	3,000	1
Chief clerk	2,000	0
Clerks	1,600	10
Do	1,400	16
Do	1,200	1
Messengers	840	1
Do	720	1
Second Auditor	3,000	1
Chief clerk	2,000	1
Clerks	1,600	11
Clerks	1,400	6
Do	1,200	2
Messengers	840	1
Do	600	1
Third auditor	3,000	1
Chief clerk	2,000	1
Clerks	1,800	1
Do	1,600	9
Do	1,400	52
Do	1,200	9
Messengers	840	1
Assistant messengers	720	1
Do	420	1
Fourth auditor	3,000	1
Chief clerk	2,000	1
Clerks	1,600	9
Do	1,400	8
Do	1,200	2
Messenger	840	1
Assistant messenger	360	1
Fifth auditor	3,000	1
Chief clerk	2,000	1
Clerks	1,600	2
Do	1,400	3
Do	1,200	1
Messengers	840	1
Sixth auditor	3,000	1
Chief clerk	2,000	1
Clerks (as disbursing clerk)	2,000	1
Clerks	1,800	5
Do	1,600	23
Do	1,400	51
Do	1,200	27
Messenger	900	1
Assistant messengers	540	1
Treasurer	3,000	1
Chief clerk	2,000	1
Clerks	1,800	2
Do	1,600	3
Do	1,400	4
Do	1,200	1
Messenger	840	1
Assistant messenger	500	1
Register	3,000	1
Chief clerk	2,000	1
Clerks	1,600	6
Do	1,400	17
Do	1,200	5
Messenger	840	1
Assistant messenger	660	1
Solicitor	3,500	1
Chief clerk	2,000	1
Clerk (as disbursing clerk)	2,000	1
Clerks	1,600	3
Do	1,400	2
Messenger	600	1
Commissioner of customs	3,000	1
Chief clerk	2,000	1
Clerks	1,600	3
Do	1,400	4
Do	1,200	3
Messenger	840	1
Bureau of Construction:		
Engineer in charge	3,000	1
Supervising Architect	3,000	1
Draftsmen	(1)	6

TABLE No. 1.—*A transcript of the salaries paid in the United States Treasury Department to employees in District of Columbia, etc.*—Contd.

Office.	Salary.	Persons.
Coast Survey:		
Superintendent	$4,500	1
Assistant superintendent	2,200	1
Do	1,600	1
Subassistants	1,000	1
Computers	1,500	1
Do	1,100	1
Draftsmen	1,800	1
Do	1,600	1
Do	(1)	1
Do	(2)	1
Do	(3)	1
Engravers	2,000	1
Do	1,700	3
Electrotypist	1,800	1
Disbursing agent	2,500	1
Clerks	1,300	1
Do	1,200	1
Do	1,100	2
Weights and measures:		
Superintendent	1,500	1
Assistant and foreman	2,000	1
Revenue-Cutter Service:		
First lieutenant	960	1
Second lieutenant	860	3
Third lieutenant	790	2
Lighthouse Board:		
Chief clerk	2,000	1
Clerks	1,600	2
Do	1,400	1
Do	1,200	1
Messenger	600	1
Laborer	576	1
Customs:		
Collector (Georgetown, D. C.)	1,241	1
Deputy	821	1
Do	800	1
Do	200	1
Clerk	500	1
Gauger and weigher	359	1

SUMMARY.

$1,800 clerks	$25,200	14
$1,600 clerks	161,600	101
$1,400 clerks	249,200	178
$1,300 clerks	1,300	1
$1,200 clerks	84,000	70
$1,000 clerks	2,200	2
$500 clerks	500	1
	524,000	367
Average	1,428	.....

[1] $5 per day. [2] $4.50 per day. [3] $3.70 per day

TABLE No. 2.—*Number of employees, by grades, in the Treasury Department, Apr. 1, 1908.*

Salary.	Male.	Female.	Salary.	Male.	Female.
$12,000	1	.....	$1,300	.....	1
$6,000	2	.....	$1,252	31	1
$5,500	1	.....	$1,200	310	254
$5,000	2	.....	$1,100	21	2
$4,500	9	.....	$1,000	238	130
$4,000	10	.....	$950	2	.....
$3,600	3	.....	$939	17	.....
$3,500	3	.....	$900	202	199
$3,400	1	.....	$850	8	.....
$3,250	1	.....	$840	103	25
$3,200	1	.....	$800	22	33
$3,000	13	.....	$780	29	33
$2,800	1	.....	$720	351	169
$2,750	5	.....	$700	3	389
$2,700	7	.....	$660	329	148
$2,600	1	.....	$620	7	34
$2,500	49	.....	$600	6	400
$2,400	11	.....	$550	1	.....
$2,300	2	.....	$548	78	.....
$2,300	2	.....	$540	72	2
$2,250	13	.....	$500	12	175
$2,200	25	.....	$480	3	2
$2,190	5	.....	$470	.....	14
$2,100	7	.....	$400	.....	19
$2,035	1	.....	$390	1	.....
$2,000	109	4	$360	9	.....
$1,900	4	.....	$300	.....	52
$1,878	2	.....	$240	.....	121
$1,800	310	8	[1]	748	.....
$1,700	6	.....	[2] $6	1	.....
$1,665	1	.....	[2] $4	4	.....
$1,650	1	.....	[2] $3	1	.....
$1,600	300	59	$2.50	1	1
$1,565	1	.....	$1.50	.....	764
$1,500	9	2	$1.25	.....	121
$1,400	333	112	.....	.....	.....
$1,350	1	.....	Total	2,610	3,089
	1,251	185		1,251	185
			Total	3,861	3,274
					3,861
			Grand total	.....	7,135

[1] Pro rata. [2] Per day.

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL PRICES.

The other side of this picture is presented by a statement covering the increase in prices for a period of years. The following table gives by five groups the wholesale prices on certain commodities, which we will let stand for itself:

Wholesale prices of commodities.

Year.	Cotton—Middling (pound).	Wool—Fine fleece (pound).	Wheat—No. 1 northern (per bushel).	Cattle—Llive weight, steers, good to choice (100 pounds).
1896	$0.079	$0.394	$0.641	$4.271
1901	.086	.545	.719	5.590
1906	.110	.718	.793	5.357
1911	.130	.647	.984	6.727
1916	.143	.736	[1] 1.358	[1] 9.491

Year.	Hogs—Live weight, heavy (100 pounds).	Beans (per bushel).	Butter—Creamery, Elgin (pound).	Cheese—Whole milk (pound).
1896	$3.358	$1.174	$0.179	$0.091
1901	5.958	2.193	.211	.101
1906	6.235	1.900	.246	.131
1911	6.747	2.289	.264	.140
1916	[1] 9.542	[1] 8.132	[1] .318	[1] .174

Year.	Eggs—New laid (dozen).	Flour—Spring patents (barrel).	Lard—Prime (pound).	Corn meal—white (100 pounds).
1896	$0.174	$3.796	$0.047	$0.813
1901	.210	3.810	.089	1.198
1906	.262	4.276	.089	1.267
1911	.298	5.078	.091	1.299
1916	.325	6.973	.118	2.021

[1] Eleven months.

Wholesale prices of commodities—Continued.

Year.	Bacon—Short clear sides (pound).	Hams—Smoked (pound).	Pork—Salt, mess (barrel).	Milk—Fresh (quart).
1896	$0.049	$0.094	$8.940	$0.023
1901	.089	.108	15.511	.026
1906	.094	.124	17.512	.030
1911	.095	.140	19.159	.034
1916	[1] .147	[1] .183	[2] 23.480	.039

Year.	Molasses—New Orleans, open kettle (gallon).	Sugar—Granulated (pound).	Potatoes—White (bushel).	Shoes—Men's, vici kid (pair).
1896	$0.325	$0.045	$0.197	$2.250
1901	.378	.051	.564	2.000
1906	.340	.045	.548	2.379
1911	.406	.053	.771	2.617
1916	[1] .450	[1] .069	[1] 1.058	[2] 3.350

Year.	Shirtings—4-4 (yard).	Coal—Anthracite stove (ton).	Coal—Bituminous, Pittsburgh (bushel).	Lumber—Yellow siding (thousand feet).
1896	$0.070	$3.794	$0.057	$16.417
1901	.075	4.322	.075	19.667
1906	.082	4.862	.079	29.333
1911	.087	[1] 4.806	[1] .083	[2] 30.591
1916	.091	5.288	.084	31.818

[1] January to June. [2] Eleven months.

RETAIL PRICES IN WASHINGTON.

The following table shows the highest and lowest average retail prices of certain specified articles of food in Washington, D. C., in five-year intervals from 1890 to 1915.

This is supplemented by a statement showing the prices in Washington on the same articles for October and November, 1916:

Highest and lowest average retail prices of specified articles of food in Washington, D. C., in five-year intervals from 1819 to 1915.

Year.	Round steak, per pound.	Pork-chops, per pound.	Ham, smoked, per pound.	Lard, pure, per pound.	Flour, wheat, for one-eighth barrel bag.	Potatoes, Irish, per peck.	Eggs, per dozen.	Butter, creamery, per pound.	Sugar, granulated, per pound.
1890	$0.124	$0.100	$0.134	$0.100	$0.843	$0.254	$0.220	$0.295	$0.055
	.133	.....	.138	.110	1.000	.296	.240	.338	.074
1895	.116	.125	.130	.100	.742	.238	.208	.313	.048
	.125	.....	.140	.120	.784	.283	.228	.317	.053
1900	.125	.125	.142	.099	.760	.258	.215	.288	.057
	.154	.....	.146	.105	.826	.279	.228	.321	.063
1905	.144	.141	.158	.120	.950	.250	.263	.323	.059
	.153	.146	.....	.126	.968	.281	.276	.333	.063
1910	.150	.182	.170	.150	.900	.217	.292	.313	.055
	.193	.228	.197	.187	1.000	.292	.328	.393	.059
1915	.223	.195	.183	.124	1.050	.189	.291	.374	.060
	.275	.221	.191	.138	1.144	.263	.364	.393	.063

Actual retail prices of certain specified articles of food in Washington, D. C., in October and November, 1916.

Year and month.	Round steak, per pound.	Pork chops, per pound.	Ham, smoked, per pound.	Lard, pure, per pound.	Flour, wheat, per one-eighth barrel bag.	Potatoes, Irish, per peck.	Eggs, per dozen.	Butter, creamery, pound.	Sugar, granulated, per pound.
October	$0.22	$0.25	[1] $0.22	$0.20	$1.40	$0.45	$0.45	$0.43	$0.080
Do	.26	.24	[1] .30	.20	1.30	.45	.42	.45	.075
Do	.30	.25	[1] .23	.18	1.35	.40	.42	.45	.075
Do	.23	.25	[1] .22	.20	1.40	.45	.50	.45	.080
Do	.....	.....	.....	.....	1.35	.40	.....	.39	.075
November	.22	.23	[1] .22	.20	1.50	.50	.50	.47	.086
Do	.25	.22	[2] .30	.20	1.30	.45	.48	.48	.080
Do	.25	.25	[1] .23	.20	1.40	.45	.50	.45	.080
Do	.20	.23	[1] .20	.20	1.40	.45	.50	.50	.080
Do	.....	.....	.....	.....	1.40	.....	.....	.42	.080

[1] Whole. [2] Sliced.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I say in conclusion, Mr. President, that the Senate of the United States should purge its record of this injustice by beginning now and voting to accept this report. All we need is a majority of the votes upon the next roll call, and we have settled the increase in this one department not at what it should be, but at least in a way to partially repair the

wrong. Such action will encourage the House of Representatives, and we will have a like increase in every one of these appropriation bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I think the Chair will agree that if we begin voting at 10 o'clock we are complying with the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Florida to the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. BRYAN. It is always construed that way.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if that be so, I still have the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. I understood the Senator from Wisconsin had yielded the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have other matter here. No; I yielded the floor only upon the statement of the Presiding Officer——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that under the language of the unanimous-consent agreement the matter must be concluded within the two-hour period, because the plain language is that the Senate will proceed to consider and dispose of the conference report within the two-hour period.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, suppose somebody should suggest the absence of a quorum, and only a minute or two should be left before 10 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would rule that that would comply with the agreement.

Mr. BRYAN. Then, Mr. President, I——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask leave to print some tables of the increase in food prices in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[New York American, Feb. 23, 1917.]

FOOD-PRICE CHANGES IN EIGHT CITIES.

Food prices gathered in eight great cities by the New York American show a general advance over those prevailing last year. In two instances there was a fall in price. In case of some of the food products which formerly were most used by the poor the advance ranged from 100 per cent to more than 1,000 per cent. New York has suffered most heavily in the general rise in prices of food.

The table of prices follow:

Article.	New York.		Boston.		Chicago.		Philadelphia.	
	1916	1917	1916	1917	1916	1917	1916	1917
Sugar	4½-5 cents	8½-9 cents	5½-7 cents	8½-10 cents	7 cents	8 cents	7 cents	9 cents.
Eggs	35 cents	60 cents	38 cents	58 cents	40 cents	50 cents	50 cents	75 cents.
Butter	43 cents	53 cents	36 and 40 cents.	38 and 42 cents.	38 cents	48 cents	50 cents	60 cents.
Lard	18 cents	25 cents	15 and 17 cents	20 and 28 cents	18 cents	22 cents	20 cents	25 cents.
Flour	$1.05 sack	$1.35	$7.50 barrel	$10.50	$8.50	$10.50	$6.50	$12.50.
Potatoes	2-3 cents	8½ cents	40 cents peck	$1.15	40 cents peck	90 cents	$1.25 bushel	$3.50.
Onions	2 cents	12-15 cents	6 cents	20 cents	5 cents	15 cents	$4.90 bushel	$13.00.
Beets	2 cents	5 cents	5 cents	10 cents			6 cents	8 cents.
Cabbages	1-2 cents	12-15 cents	3 cents	10 cents	5 cents	12 cents	4 cents	18 cents.
Chicken	30 cents	32 cents	28 cents	30 cents	25 cents	39 cents		
Roast beef	26 cents	30 cents	28 cents	30 cents	25 cents	30 cents	20 cents	26 cents.
Sirloin steak	28 cents	32 cents			30 cents	35 cents	25 cents	35 cents.
Chuck steak	22 cents	26 cents			12½ cents	18 cents	18 cents	24 cents.
Leg of lamb	22 cents	28 cents	20 cents	28 cents	25 cents	30 cents	20 cents	30 cents.
Corned beef	22 cents	28 cents	18 cents	23 cents	16 cents	20 cents	18 cents	22 cents.

Articles.	Los Angeles.		New Orleans.		San Francisco.		St. Louis.	
	1916	1917	1916	1917	1916	1917	1916	1917
Sugar	$6.30	$7.35			6¾ cents	7¾ cents	$6.94	$7.69.
Eggs	26 cents	30 cents	6½ cents	7 cents	37½ cents	45 cents	30 cents	45 cents.
Butter	34 cents	42½ cents	38 cents	40 cents				
Lard	20 cents	19 cents	40 cents	47 cents	40 cents	45 cents	13½ cents	20 cents.
Flour	$2 sack	$2.70	15 cents	20 cents	15 cents	22½ cents	$3.30	$4.50.
Potatoes	$2, 100 pounds	$1.75	3½ cents	6 cents	$1.75	$2.50	33 cents peck	75 cents.
Onions	3½ cents	12 cents	4 cents	8 cents	2 cents	6½ cents	25 cents	$2.40.
Beets	3 cents	5 cents	5 cents	15 cents	4 cents	15 and 20 cents.	$2	$2.15.
Cabbage	2½ cents	7½ cents	25 cents dozen.	50 cents			1½ cents	12 cents.
Chicken	25 cents	30 cents	2 cents	10 cents	20 cents	30 cents	18 cents	22 cents.
Roast beef	25 cents	20 cents	25 cents	25 cents	25 cents	30 cents	20 cents	25 cents.
Sirloin steak	20 cents	25 cents	20 cents	22½ cents	25 cents	30 cents	20 cents	25 cents.
Chuch steak	12½ cents	15 cents	20 cents	20 cents			15 cents	18 cents.
Leg of lamb	28 cents	35 cents	25 cents	25 cents	25 cents	30 cents	17 cents	25 cents.
Corned beef			20 cents	20 cents			12½ cents	15 cents.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I only want to say this: The Senator from Wisconsin gets the floor, perfectly in accordance with the rules of the Senate, and then he puts the Senate in the attitude—and I am only going to take a minute—of not increasing salaries at all. I call the attention of the Senate to this fact——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Well, Mr. President, the chairman of each of these various appropriation committees has had the floor by the hour.

Mr. BRYAN. I decline to yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator has not got the floor. I have not yielded it. If anybody is entitled to the floor, I am entitled to the floor, unless the order of the Senate takes me off the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have, and I will maintain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Florida that the Senator from Wisconsin had the floor when the Chair called his attention to the unanimous-consent order and to the construction that had been placed upon it, and he indicated his willingness to yield the floor in order to permit a vote.

Mr. BRYAN. Well, he yielded the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; but the Chair thinks that in good faith he would have to adhere to the ruling that he indicated to the Senator from Wisconsin he would make, and that is that under the unanimous-consent order the Senate proceeds to vote upon the conference report.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurt	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Shafroth
Brady	Hollis	Myers	Sheppard
Brandegee	Hughes	Norris	Simmons
Bryan	Husting	Overman	Smith, Mich.
Catron	James	Owen	Smoot
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Sterling
Clapp	Jones	Penrose	Swanson
Clark	La Follette	Phelan	Thomas
Cummins	Lane	Pittman	Thompson
Curtis	Lea, Tenn.	Pomerene	Underwood
du Pont	Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Vardaman
Fall	Lewis	Reed	Walsh
Fletcher	McLean	Robinson	Warren
Gronna	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Weeks

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. OVERMAN. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. DU PONT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. As I do not see him in the Chamber, I withhold my vote.

Mr. FALL (when his name was called). I am authorized by my pair to vote upon this question. I vote "yea."

Mr. GRONNA (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. LEE of Maryland (when his name was called). I am paired on this question with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] and withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. PENROSE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], he being absent as I am informed. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], who, I am informed, is absent, and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair heretofore announced to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and transfer as on the last vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "nay."

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

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HOLLIS. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and vote "yea."

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

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN];

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

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN].

I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and vote "yea."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my general pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and let my vote stand.

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—33.

Ashurst	Fall	Myers	Sheppard
Brady	Gronna	Norris	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Hollis	Owen	Sterling
Catron	Husting	Page	Thompson
Chamberlain	Jones	Penrose	Walsh
Clapp	La Follette	Phelan	Warren
Clark	Lea, Tenn.	Pittman	
Cummins	McLean	Pomerene	
Curtis	Martine, N. J.	Ransdell	

NAYS—22.

Bryan	Kenyon	Saulsbury	Thomas
Fletcher	Lane	Shafroth	Underwood
Hitchcock	Martin, Va.	Shields	Vardaman
Hughes	Overman	Simmons	Weeks
James	Reed	Stone	
Johnson, S. Dak.	Robinson	Swanson	

NOT VOTING—41.

Bankhead	Culberson	Gore	Lee, Md.
Beckham	Dillingham	Harding	Lewis
Borah	du Pont	Hardwick	Lippitt
Broussard	Fernald	Johnson, Me.	Lodge
Chilton	Gallinger	Kern	McCumber
Colt	Goff	Kirby	Nelson
Newlands	Smith, Ariz.	Sutherland	Williams
O'Gorman	Smith, Ga.	Tillman	Works
Oliver	Smith, Md.	Townsend	
Poindexter	Smith, S. C.	Wadsworth	
Sherman	Smoot	Watson	

So the conference report was agreed to.

COST OF LIVING IN NORTH DAKOTA.

Mr. OWEN. I was precluded by the shortness of the time from presenting for the RECORD a statement by Ray McKaig relative to the methods the people have adopted in North Dakota to reduce the cost of living there. I ask permission to present it and to have it printed in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE FARMERS' NONPARTISAN LEAGUE OF NORTH DAKOTA.

[Speech of Ray McKaig, of Mandan, N. Dak., State master of the Farmers' Grange of North Dakota, at convention of the National Popular Government League, Washington, D. C., Jan. 5-6, 1917.]

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the Popular Government Convention, I bring to you the story of one of the greatest political upheavals for popular government that this country has ever seen. The long-abused farmers of North Dakota finally turned and defeated the gang. The revolt is the story of the worm that turned. On November 7 we elected not only our governor, lieutenant governor, State legislators, and all the other members of the farmers' ticket, but also a majority of the supreme court. Like Abraham Lincoln, we wanted the Almighty on our side, but we felt that we must have the supreme court. The coroner was suggested to bury the old gang. On election day the farmers voted the farmers' ticket for the best men. They went solid and pushed ahead the cause of clean government a score of years.

ORIGIN OF MOVEMENT.

This movement grew out of the fact that better market distribution was needed. The private elevators of the State had for years systematically robbed the farmers in the grading of their wheat. We traced, for example, 6,000,000 bushels of poor-grade wheat sent to the terminal elevator at Duluth, Minn., where it came out as No. 1 wheat—a loss of $300,000. This is an instance of what has happened many times; the gamblers of the wheat pit not only set the price of wheat by betting on imaginary wheat, but also steal from the farmers by different grading. Our plan to remedy this is to have the State own and control the vast terminal elevators where mixing can be done. In connection with this we expect to establish State-owned flour mills. Why? one asks.

FARMERS LOSE $55,000,000 YEARLY.

Because our leading experts at the agricultural college have shown that the farmers of North Dakota lose over $55,000,000 every year because of the by-products of the grain going into other States and the unfair grading of the same.

Then, too, in that State the "Hog Trust" (you call it the "Beef Trust" here) has the cattle and hog business by the throat. We have no packing plant and are compelled to ship on an average of about 450 miles. Last year we got an average of 6 cents per pound for our steers, which, when made up into meat, cost you city people 25 cents a smell. The packer makes more off of the steer in three hours than the farmer does in three years of raising. We propose to establish a State-owned packing plant to fight with money and with brains the Hog Trust. We propose to lay down the gauge of battle with these combinations and to fight it out in our State.

AFTER THE LAND SPECULATORS.

Again, our program includes tax reform. We found that special increase of taxation in the past two years on the farmers meant no increase upon the corporations. The banking laws permit some bankers to evade much taxation. Insurance holdings are not taxed. Speculators' lands are a big menace to our prosperity, millions of acres being held by these speculators waiting for high prices. We propose to apply the British Columbia law of single tax on farm lands and to make the speculator pay as much taxes on unimproved land as the farmer does on improved. Along that line will go a State hail-insurance tax. It will be compulsory on all tillable land, and the beauty of it is that the speculator who refuses to till the soil and break his land will have to pay just as much taxes for hail protection as the farmer who plows and gambles with the storm.

A cold-storage plant to take care of the valuable potato crop of that State is a part of our program. At one time this year potatoes were selling at 60 cents per bushel. In New York to-day Idaho potatoes are selling in some of those big stores at 6 cents each. A great cold-storage plant where farmers can ship their potatoes in the fall, to be distributed over the Northwest at the mere cost of distribution, will not only bring up the price of potatoes for the farmer and down to the consumer, but will hit the potato gamblers a blow between the eyes that will be stunning. This is our platform. This is also the platform of the State Republican Party. This is what we expect to accomplish in our farmers' revolt. Seattle, New Orleans, and some of the Provinces of Canada and away-off New Zealand have proved that they can solve these problems. So can we.

POPULAR GOVERNMENT ALSO.

The reign of popular government has come to stay in North Dakota. The initiative and referendum and recall is a part of our program. And we intend to put over a new and up-to-date State constitution.

How did we succeed in this political upheaval? The old gang was well entrenched. They owned all the daily newspapers except one. Nine out of ten of the county weekly papers were against us. Some of the church leaders preached against us. The nationality of the voters was appealed to, but in vain. Farmers read the fiery articles against our movement, listened to the preelection church denunciation, shook hands with the polished politicians—and straightway forgot all about it. The other gang had been too strong for them. They wanted a change, and the State legislature was the secret of it all. I suppose that other legislatures had been about the same as the one of two years ago. We had good men whom we did not forget this year, who had fought our battles. But we also had bad men there. Insurance companies, the railroads, and the corporations went to that legislature and got what they wanted. We farmers went there and asked for simple

legislation—and we were refused. Much booze was spilled to defeat our bills.

"GO SLOP THE PIGS."

In the previous year 83 per cent of the voters had voted for a constitutional amendment authorizing a State terminal elevator. The farmers demanded that the legislature put it through, but the farmers were told to "go home and slop the pigs." We did so, and we came back this year and cleaned the legislative stables. That "slop the pigs" was a slogan that was like the firing on Fort Sumter—the disclosures fanned the flame of revolt. A few farmers banded together and organized the Farmers Nonpartisan League. They elected A. C. Townley, a former school teacher and farmer, as their president. His initials spelled the word "act." He is action personified—one of the shrewdest, brainiest leaders any crowd ever had. The revolt spread. Townley gathered about him some brainy leaders. Charles Edward Russell dug out the facts and furnished the ammunition to shoot against the old gang. He is the Henry Lloyd George of our farmers' movement. Now, how did we spread this gospel?

NINE DOLLARS FOR MEMBERSHIP.

One hundred Ford automobiles were bought, one for each organizer. Every township was convassed; farmers were asked to join the nonpartisan league. Nine dollars each was charged for membership. This $9 paid for a weekly newspaper, all expenses of campaign and candidates, and gave the farmer the privilege of participating in all conventions. Never did spellbinders have a more pleasant platform to talk from. The campaign of education was worth the price.

On the 22d day of February, 1916—Washington's birthday and the birthday of the farmers' political freedom—township caucuses were called in every precinct and delegates were elected to county conventions. Only genuine farmers were allowed. Delegates were elected to the State convention, which met the last day of March, and planned an April fool for the politicians. The State convention was like a crusade, only there was no office grabbing. A complete new farmers' ticket was nominated. It was decided to walk into the Republican Party at the open primary and appropriate the same to ourselves. I was a delegate at that convention, and will never forget how we grilled the men who were to be elected. We wanted to know if they had any political debts to pay. The offices sought the politician, and the politician did not seek the office.

THE NEW GOVERNOR.

Our new governor, Linn Frazier, is a genuine farmer with a college education and a liberal training, quiet in manner, and very determined. He made a whirlwind campaign through the State and won confidence everywhere. The next day after the convention a great mass meeting of 3,500 farmers assembled in Fargo and ratified the complete ticket. Billy Sunday enthusiasm is no match for our North Dakota spirit. Orators had full sway and our nominees went on record for this economic platform and for a clean government. Did these farmers stick? Stick those flicker-tail farmers did, and won out in the fall by a vote of over four to one.

HAD THEIR OWN NEWSPAPER.

The weekly newspaper was a feature of this campaign. It is called the Leader, and is edited by D. C. Coates, a former lieutenant governor of Colorado. It was soon sworn at and sworn by. Its amazing veracity and capacity to tell the truth soon upset all the bets of the politicians. The cartoons were very apt and picturesque. These cartoons spared no one. They seemed to catch the farmers' spirit. They should have, because the cartoonist, J. M. Baer, was once a farmer and knew what the farmers were up against. Scarcely had the farmer election bitterness worn off when, to the amazement of the old gang, the farmers walked in and captured also the Republican State machinery. William Lenks was elected chairman and I was elected secretary of the central committee. We turned around and began to nail government-ownership planks into the Republican platform. Shades of Matt Quay! What won't those Republican farmers do next? It was the entering wedge to destroy national politics in State issues.

FOR NONPARTISANSHIP.

Our ideal is to abolish partisan politics, and our speaker, our governor, and our legislature are with us. A better definition of the Farmers' Nonpartisan League is "A farmers' league to stand by friends of good government no matter what party they are in." A close analysis of the vote reveals a true desire to solve the economic problem of distribution. The high cost of living hits the producer and consumer alike. Food gamblers make more than the farmer. But the farmer is no hog—he realizes that the consumer must be treated white, and he agrees to work with the consumer. To bring the prices down by eliminating the middleman gambler will also bring the prices up for the farmer. That means a fifty-fifty break with the producer. We want to bring New Zealand into our Northwest States, where both consumer and producer are treated alike.

WORK WITH ORGANIZED LABOR.

We work with organized labor in the cities, and both of us make concessions. A still closer analysis of the vote reveals this also. The farmer has served notice on the corporations that they must keep out of politics and stop polluting the civic stream. One corporation in our State has played the political game so that it pays only $11,000 taxes where it ought to pay $100,000. The speculators and the insurance agents, with the railroads and the Hog Trust, have been guilty of many raw deals to save taxation. We serve notice on these gentlemen that if they want to play the game fair, we play it fair. If they want to put money and brains on the market, we can do the same, but this wholesale buying of legislators and franchises must stop. And stop it will, for we farmers mean business.

We do not expect to disintegrate, for we are organized from the ground up. Our farmers in North Dakota are now rapidly reorganizing. The farmers' league books are audited by outside auditors. Our officers receive good pay, but they are also under promise not to receive political appointment or seek office.

ON TO WASHINGTON!

On to Washington! is our battle cry. We are already organized in four States—North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota. Our head office has been transferred to St. Paul. We realize that this interstate movement means the balance of power at Washington. Twenty-five legislators and half a dozen fighting Senators would certainly put a monkey wrench in the machinery of monopoly at Washington. We are now planning on going into Nebraska, Iowa, Wyoming, and Kansas. These Northwest farmer States are full of fighting men. An interstate convention will soon be called. Congressmen will be indorsed who have been fighting for good government. The traders and corporation lawyers will be asked to stay at home. This nonpartisan movement means nonpartisanship in Congress also when it comes to fighting for good men. What a tremendous factor our farmers' league will be at the next presidential election, when we serve notice on Wall Street men to keep hands off. Progressive legislation is coming as a matter of necessity. Progressive leaders shall be our leaders; and this Interstate Farmers' Nonpartisan League movement is one of the greatest means for the spreading of aggressive, progressive sentiment that this country has ever seen. We do not prophesy much, but we do say: "Watch us grow in numbers and in power."

THE REVENUE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, the revenue bill.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20573) to provide increased revenue to defray the expenses of the increased appropriations for the Army and Navy and the extensions of fortifications, and for other purposes.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I ask unanimous consent to go into executive session for only a short time for the purpose of referring nominations. I hope I may have unanimous consent for this short session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware asks unanimous consent to temporarily lay aside the revenue bill and proceed to the consideration of executive business for the purpose indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand the request of the Senator from Delaware can not be granted unless the unfinished business is laid aside.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. I therefore raise that point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Delaware to ask unanimous consent to temporarily lay aside the revenue bill and proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was about to make a request to that effect. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Reserving the right to object, I will ask the Senator to incorporate in the suggestion for unanimous consent that we shall adjourn at the conclusion of the executive session.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have already made a motion relative to the hour of meeting to-morrow.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not know that.

Mr. SMOOT. Just a moment. May I ask that the unanimous-consent agreement be read? I do not desire to have the whole of it read, but the first part of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at 8 o'clock p. m., on Wednesday, February 28, 1917, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill H. R. 20573, an act to provide increased revenue, etc., through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; that the bill shall remain the unfinished business until finally disposed of, and no motion that would displace it shall be in order. If temporarily laid aside by unanimous consent, any Senator shall have the right to bring it immediately before the Senate, either to speak upon it or to propose an amendment to it. No motion to lay any amendment on the table shall be entertained by the Chair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask the Senator in charge of the bill to withhold his request for a moment. A number of Senators on both sides of the Chamber would like to have a fixed hour to vote on the oleomargarine amendment. I do not wish to make a request that does not meet the approval of the Senator in charge of the bill. Has the Senator any objection to fixing an hour to vote on that amendment?

Mr. SIMMONS. I have none if the Senator can get unanimous consent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. A number of Senators have expressed a wish that a definite hour might be fixed, and I should like to ask unanimous consent that we may vote on that amendment at 3 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not believe that under the unanimous-consent agreement such an agreement can be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would call the attention of the Senator from Alabama to the fact that there is in existence an order of the Senate based upon a unanimous-consent agreement which fixes the procedure of the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does that provide that no amendment shall be voted on until 8 o'clock Wednesday?

Mr. PENROSE. No; at any time.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me, I am afraid that such unanimous-consent agreement would complicate the rule under which we are operating.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not wish to do that.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the Senator will not press it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I withdraw the request.

Mr. SAULSBURY. May I renew my request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. JONES. Is it understood that nothing will be done in the executive session except merely to refer nominations?

Mr. SAULSBURY. That is my understanding.

Mr. JONES. The calendar will not be taken up?

Mr. SAULSBURY. The desire for an executive session was exactly as I stated.

Mr. JONES. I should like to have it made a part of the unanimous consent that the calendar will not be called up and that nothing will be done except to refer nominations. I want it to be a part of the unanimous-consent agreement that the calendar will not be taken up.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I do not think I can do that, Mr. President, but I will say to the Senator that immediately after the nominations are referred I shall move an adjournment until to-morrow.

Mr. JONES. I object to laying aside the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made. The unfinished business is before the Senate.

Mr. SIMMONS. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 10 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 27, 1917, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *February 26, 1917.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Eternal and everlasting God, supreme in all Thine attributes, just and equitable in Thy commands, let Thy spirit be upon these Thy servants that they may be calm in their deliberations, clear in their judgments, wise in their conclusions, firm in their convictions; that their work may be to the good of the people and well pleasing in Thy sight; and we will praise Thy Holy Name through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 24, and Sunday, February 25, was read and approved.

JOINT SESSION OF SENATE AND HOUSE.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution (H. Con. Res. 79) which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 26th day of February, 1917, at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of the late Representative FINLEY.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Agricultural bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. 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. 20967, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves 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. 20967, the sundry civil 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. GARNER in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of compensation provided by said act, including medical, surgical, and hospital services, and supplies provided by section 9, and the transportation and burial expenses provided by sections 9 and 11, the appropriation of $500,000 for the fiscal year 1917 is continued and made available until expended.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the gentleman from New York inform the House as to the present status of the Employees' Compensation Commission? My recollection is that the commissioners either have not been named by the President or have not been confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not certain whether they have been named or not, but I intend to ask the committee to pass over this paragraph temporarily for these reasons: At my request an estimate was submitted asking for $500,000 for the next fiscal year. Under the impression that there would be no need to make that appropriation and that by continuing the present appropriation there would be ample funds until Congress reconvened, the committee merely extended the current appropriation. Yesterday the Secretary of Labor came before the committee and called attention to the fact that there are already accumulated $250,000 of claims, excluding claims of the Post Office Department, and he very much fears that the $500,000 will be insufficient to meet the obligations upon the fund prior to the convening of Congress. Some time during the day he is to send up a complete statement of the status of the fund. I assured him if he would send that information we would propose an amendment adding such additional moneys as would make it absolutely certain that there would be no failure to meet the demands upon the funds. The claims are accumulating, and the Secretary stated that the claims will aggregate in the neighborhood of $350,000, and for the balance of the time between now and the next regular session the aggregate of claims will be in excess of the total amount of the appropriation.

Mr. MANN. It seems odd to me that this law passed last summer providing for the appointment of a commission—that up to the present time, when a large number of claims have accumulated and the people need the money, the commission has not been organized. Has any reason been given for the failure to put the law into effect by the naming of the commission?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; there has been no statement. Congress created several very important commissions, and I understand that the difficulties the President has had in conducting matters involving our relations with other nations has made it impossible for him to devote the time necessary for the selection of the class of men who should be on the various commissions.

Mr. MANN. I feel very confident that if the President would call the gentleman from New York into his councils it would not take very long to fill the commission.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I suggest that the gentleman from Illinois persuade the President of the feasibility of such a course, and if he succeeds I promise that there will be no ground for complaint in the future. Mr. Chairman, I ask that this paragraph be passed over temporarily.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

ERICSSON MEMORIAL COMMISSION.

For the erection in the city of Washington, D. C., of a suitable memorial to John Ericsson, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act for erecting a suitable memorial to John Ericsson," approved August 31, 1916, $35,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am glad this appropriation for a memorial to John Ericson is to be made. He was the inventor of the *Monitor*, which helped to turn the tide of the Civil War on the sea. The question of submarines as we now understand it had not arisen at the time of Ericson's achievement, but the subject of submarines and mines has been much discussed since that time.

I desire this morning in connection with this memorial to a great American naval inventor to read a statement from the London Times of July 16, 1914, by Sir Percy Scott, an Englishman of high grade in the naval world. Addressing the editor of the Times, Sir Percy Scott, in a controversy with Lord Sydenham, says:

To the Editor of the Times:

In a letter which you published from me of July 10, I replied to most of the criticisms of my views which had already appeared. Yesterday Lord Sydenham raised a further question in your columns which seems to call for an answer. With the greater part of this letter it is unnecessary for me to deal. Lord Sydenham is not a

seaman but a soldier, and he can not be expected to appreciate the technical points in my argument. With reference, however, to the question of an attack on our commerce by submarines, he says:

"The capture of vessels at sea is an old right of war. The right to kill unresisting noncombatants engaged in peaceful avocations has never been recognized. The submarine can not capture, but must destroy. I do not believe that the sentiment of the twentieth century would tolerate for a moment proceedings which have hitherto been associated only with piracy in its blackest form. Considerations of humanity apart, there are strong reasons for believing that this relapse into savagery would not serve the purpose of the navy which so far degraded itself, and I doubt whether Sir Percy Scott has thought out this part of his program."

This I consider a most dangerous and misleading doctrine, because it is calculated to make the British public believe that their food supply would be safe in time of war. In order to make this fallacy manifest, I would quote the following extract from a letter written by a foreign naval officer—

He does not say a German naval officer. He quotes that foreign naval officer as follows:

"If we went to war with an insular country dependent for its food supplies from overseas it would be our business to stop that supply. On the declaration of war we should notify the enemy that she should warn those of her merchant ships coming home not to approach the island, as we were establishing a blockade of mines and submarines. Similarly we should notify all neutrals that such a blockade had been established and that if any of their vessels approached the island they would be liable to destruction, either by mines or submarines, and therefore would do so at their own risk."

Such a proclamation would, in my opinion, be perfectly in order, and once it had been made, if any British or neutral ships disregarded it and attempted to run the blockade they could not be held to be engaged in the peaceful avocations referred to by Lord Sydenham. And if they were sunk in the attempt it could not be described as a relapse into savagery or piracy in its worst form. If Lord Sydenham will look up the accounts of what usually happened to the blockade runners into Charleston during the Civil War in America I think he will find that the blockading cruisers seldom had any scruples about firing into the vessels they were chasing or driving them ashore and even peppering them when stranded with grape and shell. The mine and the submarine's torpedo will be a surer deterrent. Trade is timid. It will not need more than one or two ships sent to the bottom to hold up the food supply of the country.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

PERCY SCOTT.

52 SOUTH AUDLEY STREET, GROSVENOR SQUARE W.,
July 15, 1914.

Mr. Chairman, that remarkable bit of foresight and prophecy by Sir Percy Scott, whom the London Times esteemed so highly, was published in the Times full two weeks before the outbreak of the European war.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman give me a little information? The act in reference to the John Ericsson memorial authorized $35,000, which is carried in this bill. Some time ago my recollection is that some people interested in the memorial protested that this sum was not sufficient. Is there any expectation, so far as the gentleman from New York knows, of having any increase in the amount already provided, or is it the purpose to proceed with this appropriation?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the purpose is to proceed with this amount. I introduced a bill appropriating $100,000 to erect a memorial to John Ericsson. The Committee on the Library, after a consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts, if I recollect, and some others, determined that a suitable memorial could be erected for $35,000. I have received a number of requests to have the amount increased. I conferred with the chairman of the Committee on the Library, and he informed me that the Committee on the Library would not recommend any further increase. I shall propose an amendment, however, to this paragraph, if it be passed over. I have been informed from various sources that some of the Swedish societies in the United States desire to supplement the appropriation by funds raised by subscription. There is no authority in the original act to accept or utilize moneys contributed in that way. If there be no objection, I shall propose an amendment authorizing the commission to accept donations of money to be utilized in connection with the appropriation for the memorial which will be proposed.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman wants to pass the paragraph over temporarily?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph be passed over temporarily.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Any unexpended balance after completing the work prescribed by the following appropriation contained in the sundry civil appropriation act approved July 1, 1916, "For five magazine buildings, including necessary barriers and fences about the buildings, railroad connections, sewer lines, lighting mains, etc., $90,000," shall be available for the construction of two primer dry houses.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 59, line 22, strike out "$90,000" and insert "$90,900."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this is merely to correct a clerical error.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction and repair of roads, including railroad sidings, $10,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 60, after line 6, insert the following as a new paragraph:
"General storehouse, $135,000."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the reason for this amendment is set forth by Gen. Crozier in his testimony before the committee:

Gen. CROZIER. I think the primer shop and the planning room are the more pressing. I can say in further explanation of the use to which this building is to be put that it will be used principally as a storehouse for stock for use in manufacturing. There are hundreds and hundreds of items of stock which have to be carried at the Frankford Arsenal, and they are kept now in a building which is shown here [indicating on map]. There is a considerable need for that building for other purposes. It will be needed for the manufacture of tools, gauges, and templets which are needed for the large manufacturing operations of the arsenal, and for use in connection with the procurement of ammunition and instruments from private manufacturers, which all have to be carefully inspected by means of gauges.

These gauges, tools, etc., are now made in what is called the instrument department, because it is the department in which optical instruments are made, such as range finders, telescopes, sights for cannon, and certain plotting instruments for both field and siege artillery. That department has not the capacity for doing this gauge work, and it has not the capacity it ought to have for doing the instrument work. We are now having great difficulty in having telescopic sights made by private manufacturers; they will not take our orders, and we are really up against considerable difficulty in getting this kind of thing, getting them at all. Last year Congress made an appropriation for the enlargement of that factory by adding a little to the building, but it was not very extensive. It will be very useful as far as it goes, but it will not give us the capacity that the arsenal ought to have for the manufacture of instruments and for the manufacture of these gauges and tools.

The committee at the time the General appeared before it was not disposed to grant this appropriation. I do not understand from the testimony that the committee was hostile to the appropriation, but put up to the Chief of Ordnance the question whether one building was more important than another, with the suggestion he should take that which was the more pressing. Since that time, the committee not having incorporated the appropriation in the bill, marked evidence of the necessity of this new building has arisen. My colleague from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], who is something of an expert on this question of gauges, has been spoken to by the department, and information has come from the arsenal itself that unless this storehouse is forthcoming now the work of preparation will be very much retarded because of the use of the present storage building for other purposes. I trust the committee, in consonance with the wishes of the bureau at this critical time, when we need this sort of preparedness so much, will yield and permit this amendment to pass. I can say to the chairman of the committee and to the members of the committee at large that there is urgent desire for this storehouse, and that unless this appropriation is made now there will be great delay and a considerable hindrance to the work of the Bureau of Ordnance.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, last session of Congress there were appropriated for improvements at Frankford Arsenal various sums aggregating $918,000. In the estimates of the current year a number of items were requested. The committee recommended the matters which the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance stated were the more pressing, which will cost $208,000. Last year two storehouses were authorized for this arsenal, and this bill carries provision for a storehouse for small-arms ammunition at a cost of $72,000. This proposed storehouse is to cost $135,000 and to be three stories high. We have just purchased some additional land at the Frankford Arsenal of a very expensive character and the space in the arsenal is quite limited. The committee believes that instead of building three-story warehouses at such arsenals that the policy of the Government should be to adopt the modern method of building warehouses six, seven, or eight stories high. Our space is too limited at places like Frankford Arsenal to be erecting two and three story buildings. No commercial houses do it, no enterprising up-to-date business establishment would do it, and the committee desires——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD (continuing). That when the necessities for storage facilities are so pressing that the time will be ripe to provide them, that provision shall be made for a storehouse that will be adequate for the future as well as for the present needs of the arsenal.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Has the committee adopted the policy of erecting high buildings for the storage of high combustibles?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is endeavoring to do so, and in some instances recommendations have been made for storehouses to be five stories in height. The committee did not believe it to be wise to spend $135,000 on a three-story warehouse when it is apparent that in a few years additional storage facilities will be required.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is a question whether we should keep on packing combustibles higher and higher in one building.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This building is not for high combustibles.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Some of these stores may be susceptible to explosion.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; the character of materials to be carried in this storehouse are of a different character.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Independent storehouses are provided for the ingredients that may be dangerous to handle, and the Committee on Appropriations, let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is not discriminating in items for the Frankford Arsenal because of antagonism to that establishment. It believes it to be a very important establishment of the Government and it is endeavoring to provide facilities to enable the manufacturing capacity of the arsenal to be developed to its fullest and to have it utilized for the very best interests of the Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. We believed this particular item was not of such a pressing character that it could not be deferred until arrangements can be made to have the type and character of the storehouse buildings established so that when we establish one we provide the same for other arsenals.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask the gentleman and the Committee to consider this: Appropriations were made last year and the committee looked after the interests of the Government at this arsenal. Now, by reason of those appropriations and increased manufactures there is an increased necessity for an enlarged storage capacity, and I submit that this is an appropriate appropriation to make at this time. Otherwise there would be delay and hindrance to the work that is already provided for.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We gave last year and this year money not only to increase the manufacturing capacity but to increase very materially the storage capacity, and the committee was under the impression that the purposes for which it was desired to use this particular storehouse made it desirable to provide, when the time was propitious, such a storehouse as would be of very great value to the Frankford Arsenal. These arsenals are being developed into great manufacturing establishments. Instead of following further the policy which has been followed for years, of erecting buildings low in height, covering great areas of ground, we should adopt the modern method of erecting modern concrete high-storied buildings when they can be utilized for the purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Proving-ground facilities: For increasing the facilities for the proof and test of field artillery and its ammunition, including the purchase of land, $1,000,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. FITZGERALD: Amend, on page 60, in line 19, after the word "including," insert "necessary buildings and."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, this is simply to make definite the purposes for which this provision is intended.

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

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

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall not make a motion to strike out this paragraph, but I doubt the wisdom of making this appropriation at this time, and I desire to be on record as expressing my opinion as to the doubtful character of the proposed expenditure. Undoubtedly we shall need and should have, if possible, some day a proving ground of the character proposed, somewhere in the interior of the country, and possibly in the vicinity of the Rock Island Arsenal; but the conditions are such at this time that in my opinion it is doubtful whether we can secure the right kind of a proving ground at a reasonable price. The purpose is good. The committee in its judgment thought it ought to be done, but I am not as yet convinced of the wisdom of the appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. 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. GARNER, 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. 20967) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SEATS FOR INAUGURAL CEREMONIES.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have just a minute in which to make a statement of interest to the membership.

In response to inquiries which are coming to me every moment I desire to announce to the membership that tickets for seats on the inaugural platform, erected on the east side of the Capitol, will be ready for distribution to-morrow morning The tickets will be distributed by the House Inaugural Committee from office room No. 127, my office, and will be in charge of Mr. GARRETT, Mr. MCKINLEY, and myself. Each Member will get 10 tickets. Nine of the tickets will admit to the platform only, and one ticket will admit the bearer to the Senate gallery. That ticket will also admit the bearer to a reserved space on the platform. Members elect who are not Members of this Congress will each receive three tickets to the platform, but none to the Senate gallery, for the reason that the Senate gallery is not large enough to accommodate all.

Let me suggest to the gentlemen of the House that as far as possible you call for your tickets in person. Four years ago some confusion arose as to whether an order for tickets presented by a Member's secretary was signed by the Member or not. We hope to avoid any confusion of that kind this year. If a Member's secretary comes to my office with an order bearing the Member's name, necessarily we will have to comply with that order and give the tickets to the secretary. If Members do not want that done, they must instruct their secretaries not to present orders with their names attached to them.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Where are you going to distribute the tickets?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I have stated that they are to be distributed from office room No. 127.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by presenting a resolution adopted by the Chicago Federation of Labor in opposition to the war.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota makes the same request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

JOINT MEETING OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE.

At 1 o'clock p. m. the Doorkeeper, J. J. Sinnott, announced the Vice President of the United States and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Members of the House rose.

The Senate, preceded by the Vice President and by their Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Chamber.

The Vice President took the chair at the right of the Speaker and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On behalf of the House the Chair appoints Messrs. KITCHIN, FITZGERALD, FLOOD, MANN, and COOPER of Wis-

consin as a committee to wait on the President and escort him into the House. The Vice President will make the announcement for the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In behalf of the Senate the Vice President announces the appointment of the following committee: Senators KERN, SIMMONS, CHILTON, BRANDEGEE, and SUTHERLAND.

At 1 o'clock and 1 minute p. m. the President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House and stood at the Clerk's desk amid prolonged applause.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the Sixty-fourth Congress, I present the President of the United States. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT.

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, and gentlemen of the Congress, I have again asked the privilege of addressing you because we are moving through critical times during which it seems to me to be my duty to keep in close touch with the Houses of Congress, so that neither counsel nor action shall run at cross purposes between us.

On the third of February I officially informed you of the sudden and unexpected action of the Imperial German Government in declaring its intention to disregard the promises it had made to this Government in April last and undertake immediate submarine operations against all commerce, whether of belligerents or of neutrals, that should seek to approach Great Britain and Ireland, the Atlantic coasts of Europe, or the harbours of the eastern Mediterranean, and to conduct those operations without regard to the established restrictions of international practice, without regard to any considerations of humanity even which might interfere with their object. That policy was forthwith put into practice. It has now been in active execution for nearly four weeks.

Its practical results are not yet fully disclosed. The commerce of other neutral nations is suffering severely, but not, perhaps, very much more severely than it was already suffering before the first of February, when the new policy of the Imperial Government was put into operation. We have asked the cooperation of the other neutral governments to prevent these depredations, but so far none of them has thought it wise to join us in any common course of action. Our own commerce has suffered, is suffering, rather in apprehension than in fact, rather because so many of our ships are timidly keeping to their home ports than because American ships have been sunk.

Two American vessels have been sunk, the *Housatonic* and the *Lyman M. Law*. The case of the *Housatonic*, which was carrying foodstuffs consigned to a London firm, was essentially like the case of the *Fry*, in which, it will be recalled, the German Government admitted its liability for damages, and the lives of the crew, as in the case of the *Fry*, were safeguarded with reasonable care. The case of the *Law*, which was carrying lemon-box staves to Palermo, disclosed a ruthlessness of method which deserves grave condemnation, but was accompanied by no circumstances which might not have been expected at any time in connection with the use of the submarine against merchantmen as the German Government has used it.

In sum, therefore, the situation we find ourselves in with regard to the actual conduct of the German submarine warfare against commerce and its effects upon our own ships and people is substantially the same that it was when I addressed you on the third of February, except for the tying up of our shipping in our own ports because of the unwillingness of our shipowners to risk their vessels at sea without insurance or adequate protection, and the very serious congestion of our commerce which has resulted, a congestion which is growing rapidly more and more serious every day. This in itself might presently accomplish, in effect, what the new German submarine orders were meant to accomplish, so far as we are concerned. We can only say, therefore, that the overt act which I have ventured to hope the German commanders would in fact avoid has not occurred.

But, while this is happily true, it must be admitted that there have been certain additional indications and expressions of purpose on the part of the German press and the German authorities which have increased rather than lessened the impression that, if our ships and our people are spared, it will be because of fortunate circumstances or because the commanders of the German submarines which they may happen to encounter exercise an unexpected discretion and restraint rather than because of the instructions under which those commanders are acting. It would be foolish to deny that the situation is fraught with the gravest possibilities and dangers. No thoughtful man can fail to see that the necessity for definite action may come at any time, if we are in fact, and not in word merely, to defend our elementary rights as a neutral nation. It would be most imprudent to be unprepared.

I cannot in such circumstances be unmindful of the fact that the expiration of the term of the present Congress is immediately at hand, by constitutional limitation; and that it would in all likelihood require an usual length of time to assemble and organize the Congress which is to succeed it. I feel that I ought, in view of that fact, to obtain from you full and immediate assurance of the authority which I may need at any moment to exercise. No doubt I already possess that authority without special warrant of law, by the plain implication of my constitutional duties and powers; but I prefer, in the present circumstances, not to act upon general implication. I wish to feel that the authority and the power of the Congress are behind me in whatever it may become necessary for me to do. We are jointly the servants of the people and must act together and in their spirit, so far as we can divine and interpret it.

No one doubts what it is our duty to do. We must defend our commerce and the lives of our people in the midst of the present trying circumstances, with discretion but with clear and steadfast purpose. Only the method and the extent remain to be chosen, upon the occasion, if occasion should indeed arise. Since it has unhappily proved impossible to safeguard our neutral rights by diplomatic means against the unwarranted infringements they are suffering at the hands of Germany, there may be no recourse but to *armed* neutrality, which we shall know how to maintain and for which there is abundant American precedent.

It is devoutly to be hoped that it will not be necessary to put armed force anywhere into action. The American people do not desire it, and our desire is not different from theirs. I am sure that they will understand the spirit in which I am now acting, the purpose I hold nearest my heart and would wish to exhibit in everything I do. I am anxious that the people of the nations at war also should understand and not mistrust us. I hope that I need give no further proofs and assurances than I have already given throughout nearly three years of anxious patience that I am the friend of peace and mean to preserve it for America so long as I am able. I am not now proposing or contemplating war or any steps that need lead to it. I merely request that you will accord me by your own vote and definite bestowal the means and the authority to safeguard in practice the right of a great people who are at peace and who are desirous of exercising none but the rights of peace to follow the pursuits of peace in quietness and good will,—rights recognized time out of mind by all the civilized nations of the world. No course of my choosing or of theirs will lead to war. War can come only by the willful acts and aggressions of others.

You will understand why I can make no definite proposals or forecasts of action now and must ask for your supporting authority in the most general terms. The form in which action may become necessary cannot yet be foreseen. I believe that the people will be willing to trust me to act with restraint, with prudence, and in the true spirit of amity and good faith that they have themselves displayed throughout these trying months; and it is in that belief that I request that you will authorize me to supply our merchant ships with defensive arms, should that become necessary, and with the means of using them, and to employ any other instrumentalities or methods that may be necessary and adequate to protect our ships and our people in their legitimate and peaceful pursuits on the seas. I request also that you will grant me at the same time, along with the powers I ask, a sufficient credit to enable me to provide adequate means of protection where they are lacking, including adequate insurance against the present war risks.

I have spoken of our commerce and of the legitimate errands of our people on the seas, but you will not be misled as to my main thought, the thought that lies beneath these phrases and gives them dignity and weight. It is not of material interests merely that we are thinking. It is, rather, of fundamental human rights, chief of all the right of life itself. I am thinking, not only of the rights of Americans to go and come about their proper business by way of the sea, but also of something much deeper, much more fundamental than that. I am thinking of those rights of humanity without which there is no civilization. My theme is of those great principles of compassion and of protection which mankind has sought to throw about human lives, the lives of non-combatants, the lives of men who are peacefully at work keeping the industrial processes of the world quick and vital, the lives of women and children and of those who supply the labour which ministers to their sustenance. We are speaking of no selfish material rights but of rights which our hearts support and whose foundation is that righteous passion for justice upon which all law, all structures

alike of family, of state, and of mankind must rest, as upon the ultimate base of our existence and our liberty. I cannot imagine any man with American principles at his heart hesitating to defend these things. [Applause.]

At 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m. the President retired from the Hall of the House.

Thereupon the Vice President and Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

Mr. SHERLEY took the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent that the House take a recess for five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the House take a recess for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.

The recess having expired, the House resumed its session.

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 20967) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARNER in the chair.

The Clerk, resuming the reading of the bill, read as follows:

The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to report to Congress on or before January 1, 1918, as to the most desirable method for quartering officers and enlisted men of the Army, and to submit detailed plans and estimates of cost for the carrying out of any proposed scheme or schemes, together with locations desired and in particular what existing posts shall be retained, enlarged, or discontinued.

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

Estimates amounting to $7,067,000 for the construction and enlargement of military posts were submitted to Congress. Of that sum $1,736,000 was proposed to be used for the construction at existing Army posts of barracks and quarters for the supply companies and Quarter master Corps headquarters companies, and the machine-gun companies provided for and added to our military organization by the national-defense act. Under the national-defense act our regiments are increased by these further organizations, and our military posts as constructed do not contain the buildings that are necessary for the housing of these companies.

In order that we may be able to house these companies as organized for the present enlisted strength of the Army it is necessary to construct, in connection with our present Army posts, buildings of an aggregate cost of $1,700,000. In addition to this is the estimate, totaling over $7,000,000, to which I have referred, which the Secretary of War, we were informed, proposed to use for the extension and enlargement of such military posts as, in his judgment, should be enlarged and extended, and he assured us that these enlargements and extensions were necessary in order to care for the first and second increments of increase of the Regular Establishment provided for in the national-defense act. As a matter of fact, if our troops were returned from the Mexican border at this time on the present enlisted strength we would lack permanent quarters for several thousand men; and if we are to carry out the provisions of the national-defense act and provide quarters for the men as rapidly as they are enlisted, it is necessary to make this expenditure in the coming fiscal year. It is particularly important that we should provide for the additional companies in the present Army posts, and those companies must be provided for the moment the troops return to their permanent quarters. If we were at this time to return to permanent quarters anywhere in the United States any of our military oganizations, we would be unable to care adequately for these additional companies provided for in the national-defense act.

The committee, in their wisdom, saw fit, not to entirely ignore this estimate of $7,000,000, but to provide for no part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. In lieu of the appropriation of $7,000,000 the committee saw fit to place in the bill the provision which has just been read, calling on the Secretary of War to report as to the most desirable method for quartering officers and enlisted men of the Army, and to submit detailed plans and estimates for the carrying out of any proposed scheme or schemes for the caring for these men. In my opinion that is somewhat superfluous. However, I have no objection to it. But whether we make that provision or not, it seems to me that it is absolutely essential that we at least provide for the additional organizations to which I have referred in the permanent Army posts in various parts of the country. And immediately after this paragraph I wish to offer an amendment for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The gentleman from Wyoming offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONDELL: Page 64, line 15, after the word "discontinued," insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Military posts: For the erection at the following military posts of the additional barracks and quarters necessary for machine-gun companies, Quartermaster Corps, and supply companies, $1,736,000, as follows:

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk do not read the list of posts where it is proposed to use this money, and I ask that the list may be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to print it in the RECORD.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman is going to insist on a vote on it, it ought to be read.

Mr. MONDELL. I thought I would save time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We should not vote on things that are not read.

Mr. MONDELL. I was simply trying to expedite matters. The gentleman knows what these posts are. He has the list.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know what they are, but other Members do not, and the list should be read.

Mr. MONDELL. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will continue the reading of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

INFANTRY.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.:	
Machine-gun company barrack	$21,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	28,000
Fort Brady, Mich.:	
Headquarters company barrack	21,000
Machine-gun company barrack	21,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	28,000
Fort Crook, Nebr.:	
Machine-gun company barrack	21,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	28,000
Fort D. A. Russell, Wyo.:	
Machine-gun company barrack	21,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	28,000
Fort Douglas, Utah:	
Machine-gun company barrack	21,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	28,000
Fort Jay, N. Y.:	
Machine-gun company barrack	21,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	28,000
Fort Lawton, Wash.:	
Machine-gun company barrack	21,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	28,000
Fort Leavenworth, Kans.:	
Machine-gun company barrack	21,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	28,000
Fort Mackenzie, Wyo.:	
Machine-gun company barrack	21,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	28,000
Fort McPherson, Ga.:	
Machine-gun company barrack	21,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	28,000
Madison Barracks, N. Y., supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	28,000
Plattsburg Barracks, N. Y., supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	28,000
Presidio of San Francisco, Cal.:	
3 machine-gun company barracks	63,000
3 supply company and Quartermaster Corps barracks	84,000
Fort Sheridan, Ill.:	
Headquarters company barrack	21,000
Machine-gun company barrack	21,000
Fort Snelling, Minn.:	
Machine-gun company barrack	21,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	28,000
Fort Thomas, Ky.:	
Machine-gun company barrack	21,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	28,000
Vancouver Barracks, Wash.:	
Machine-gun company barrack	21,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	28,000
Fort Wayne, Mich.:	
Headquarters company barrack	21,000
Machine-gun company barrack	21,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	28,000

CAVALRY.

Fort Bliss, Tex., headquarters company barrack	21,000
Fort D. A. Russell, Wyo.:	
Machine-gun company barrack	25,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	30,000
Fort Des Moines, Iowa:	
Machine-gun company barrack	25,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	30,000
Fort Ethan Allen, Vt.:	
Machine-gun company barrack	25,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	30,000
Fort Huachuca, Ariz., headquarters company barrack	21,000
Fort Leavenworth, Kans.:	
Heaquarters company barrack	21,000
Machine-gun company barrack	25,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	30,000
Fort Meade, S. Dak.:	
Machine-gun company barrack	25,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	30,000
Fort Myer, Va., machine-gun company barrack	25,000
Fort Oglethorpe, Ga., supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	30,000
Presidio of Monterey, Cal., frame supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	22,000
Fort Riley, Kans.:	
Machine-gun company barrack	25,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	30,000
Fort Robinson, Nebr.:	
Heaquarters company barrack	21,000
Machine-gun company barrack	25,000
Supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	30,000
Fort Sam Houston, Tex.:	
2 machine-gun company barracks	50,000
2 supply company and Quartermaster Corps barracks	60,000

FIELD ARTILLERY.

Fort D. A. Russell, Wyo., supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	29,000
Fort Riley, Kans., supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	29,000
Fort Sill, Okla., supply company and Quartermaster Corps barrack	29,000

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should not be adopted. The War Department submitted estimates to the extent of $7,000,000 for barracks and quarters, based upon the necessities arising under the national-defense act. The committee requested the War Department to prepare and to submit a statement showing the barracks and quarters that would be required to accommodate the five increments under the national-defense act.

The national-defense act provided for an increase of 168,000 men in the Regular Army, and a memorandum prepared by the War Department disclosed that it would require more than $95,000,000 in order to provide the accommodations deemed necessary. When the memorandum was submitted to the Secretary of War, he declined to approve it, and directed the Quartermaster General to prepare plans for a cheaper form of construction for the purpose of housing those additional troops. Another scheme was adopted and estimates prepared, indicating that $30,000,000 would be required in order to house the troops under the modified form of construction. That plan has not yet been approved by the War Department. It is under consideration. The $1,700,000 referred to by the gentleman from Wyoming is based upon the original method of housing those troops, which contemplated an expenditure in excess of $95,000,000. The committee, instead of appropriating money for the purpose, inserted a provision in the bill requiring the War Department to report to Congress on or before January 1, 1918, as to the most desirable method for quartering officers and enlisted men of the Army, and to submit detailed plans and estimates of cost for the carrying out of any proposed scheme or schemes, together with the locations desired, and in particular what existing posts shall be retained, enlarged, or discontinued. For a number of years the War Department has been responsible for severe criticisms of Congress. It has asserted from time to time that a number of useless Army posts have been maintained in the United States regardless of the military necessities of the Government, regardless of the desirability of those posts from a military standpoint, but purely on account of the political influences that were back of those posts.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. The department itself, without any action of Congress, can close any post that it desires. The department has absolute authority to do that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But the department has been responsible for the charges that Congress itself has been maintaining at great expense useless Army posts regardless of their military desirability. The committee thought it was about time—to use the vernacular—to have a "show-down."

The War Department is now invited to point out to Congress what Army posts ought to be eliminated, what posts exist for which there is no military necessity, what posts exist that should be enlarged, and whether Congress should continue the present policy of providing quarters for officers and enlisted men in garrisons or whether it should adopt the plan intermittently urged by the department—that we should provide quarters for the men near large cities and house the officers in private quarters. The department should let the Congress now know what it believes should be done, and when it submits its plan, carefully worked out, with the reasons for the plan it proposes, then we can tell what we will do.

[The time of Mr. FITZGERALD having expired, he was given five minutes more.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Wyoming, however, proposes that an appropriation shall be made now in excess of $1,700,000 to provide additional facilities at 30 existing Army posts. It may be that the War Department believes that some of these posts have no military necessity and are being maintained regardless of the military necessities of the Government. If we should now determine specifically to provide for expenditure at those posts, the department would be in the position to criticize us again for maintaining the posts.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman knows that this list of posts and estimates are presented by the Quartermaster General of the Army and presumably from the War Department.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Exactly; and we have said to the department that we wish information as to whether some of those posts should be discontinued, and whether any of them should be retained.

It is apparent from the fact that the Army is on the border in temporary quarters that there is no military necessity now to increase the accommodations available. If the necessity of maintaining the Army on the border should pass away there is no special reason why the troops should be moved into permanent quarters and deprived of the valuable training they are now receiving.

Mr. KAHN. The Secretary of War or the Chief of Staff, I forget which, came before the Committee on Military Affairs and gave it as his opinion that in view of the increase of the Army he did not think it would be possible to abandon any one of the posts now utilized by the Military Establishment.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I did not catch the name of the gentleman who made that statement.

Mr. KAHN. It was either the Secretary of War or the Chief of Staff. While he was before the Committee on Military Affairs he was asked about the posts that might with advantage be abandoned, and as far as my memory goes, he said in view of the increase of the Army it would be necessary to maintain all the posts the Army now has.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If accommodations are to be provided at existing posts, and it might be, in the opinion of the War Department, much better from their standpoint to abandon some of those posts and to locate posts which from a military standpoint would be highly desirable.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission of the gentleman from New York to ask the gentleman from California a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I have understood for several years that the authorities of the War Department have recommended the discontinuing of a great many of the present posts of the Army, not because there are not soldiers enough to fill them, but because the maintaining of a great many are very expensive, and they are not located where the military needs exist; that the policy of the department is to build large posts in the center of transportation where they might be needed, where there is a necessity for the troops, and where they could be mobilized readily, and where the expense of maintaining them would be greatly decreased. Has the War Department changed in all this?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman does not require an answer to that question. He has stated so clearly and concisely what the question is that there is no need of an answer. Our proposition is to let the War Department indicate now where the quarters should be located, and to do that before we commence to expend any large sums upon any of the existing posts. Then we will have settled for the future whether Congress or some one else is responsible.

There is no pressing necessity for these quarters. The Army is in the field, on the border, in temporary quarters. If the military necessity for their presence there ends, it is still desirable from the standpoint of Army discipline and training to keep our troops there in large force. They will have to be maintained, at any rate, until accommodations are provided.

It will take some time to provide them; but to take 30 posts and spend $1,340,000 upon them would be indefensible.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, I hope the gentleman will not take up so much time as that.

Mr. MONDELL. This is an important matter, and I have not taken up much time of the committee.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Make it 10 minutes. I shall have to object to 15 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Then, I shall take 10 minutes now and 5 minutes later.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope not. I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I must insist upon enough time to discuss the matter. There have been great misstatements made.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am going to try to fix time to end debate. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Does that give me 15 minutes?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; 10.

Mr. MONDELL. I shall insist upon 15 minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We ought not to take more than 25 minutes upon this item.

Mr. MONDELL. I think the gentleman will get along just as fast if he spends less time discussing the question of how much time we shall have. There have been a lot of misstatements made about this matter, and some one ought to clear them up.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not made any misstatements, but I have cleared the matter up. I ask unanimous consent that debate close in 25 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. I shall object unless 15 minutes goes to me.

Mr. FITZGERALD. At 25 minutes past 2 o'clock I shall move to close debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming objects.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Anyone who wants time must regulate his course accordingly.

Mr. MONDELL. I want to state to the gentleman that if he does that he will have to have a quorum here to go on with this bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope we shall have a quorum here, because I want to expedite the passage of the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. I think the gentleman will expedite the bill just as fast if he is a little more reasonable.

I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, I did not vote to make the Army nearly 200,000 strong. I did not think we needed that many men in the Regular Establishment, but now we find that the gentlemen who did, and who voted for all of the increases, who wanted to whoop it up to the highest point fixed by anyone for the Army, object to taking care of the Army that they provided for, and do not want to make the appropriations for housing it. Congress having decided that we are to have a Regular Establishment of approximately 190,000 men, I am for it, and I also am for the appropriations necessary to house the Army. I knew, and everyone else knew, who knew anything about these matters at all, that it would cost about $1,000 a man to house an army in this country, in the manner in which we have been housing our men, and if we are to have big armies we must have extensive barracks, and extensive barracks cost money. Gentlemen are brave as lions in the presence of a temporary furore for enormous establishments, and vote them, and then they proceed to withhold the money necessary to house and care for them. The department asks for $7,000,000 to provide shelter for the men who are now in the Regular Establishment, or will be within the next six months. The gentlemen voted for it and provided for it, but now do not have the courage of their convictions and are not willing to take care of the men they voted for. This is the beginning of the efforts that I expect to have something to do with, to provide for the great establishment that I have not altogether been in favor of, but which, by the eternal, having been provided for, I propose to help see through the House and vote and care for. [Applause.]

When we start in on these great establishments we ought to start in with the understanding that they are going to cost money. They are expensive luxuries. If they are necessary, by all means let us have them and, having them, let us provide for them. The department says it needs $7,060,000. The committee has not granted one penny.

I have offered an exceedingly modest amendment of one million seven hundred thousand and odd dollars, and I have offered it only to provide for the headquarters companies, the machine-gun companies, and the supply companies that are provided for by the bill. Under the national-defense act we added machine-gun companies, supply companies, and headquarters companies, and having provided for them, they are being organized, and being organized when they return to their permanent quarters they must be housed. When they return they will find no accommodations for these new organizations whatever. It will be necessary to disarrange regiments and separate them and to place them, so far as their barracks and quarters are concerned, in such a fashion that it will not be economical or advantageous. Surely, whether or not we are going further than this, this far we must go.

As to the matter of dispensing with the present army posts, I know of no question that has been discussed in this country in the last few years with regard to which there have been more misstatements, with regard to which there is more downright ignorance, with regard to which there is more misunderstanding as to what certain men really propose, than in this matter of Army posts.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. It is not true that we have an excessive number of Army posts in this country. It is not true that the maintenance of these Army posts is expensive, compared with what the maintenance of these men elsewhere would be. It is not true that it would be advantageous to house and quarter all of our men in a few great cities. It is true that a few years ago certain officers of this Government, high Army officers, spent some time in Europe hobnobbing with the men who are now drenching the world in blood, attended their great maneuvers, saw the enormous forces massed and paraded to swell with pride the hearts of great military chieftains who since then have hurled those armed forces against the peaceful nations surrounding them and brought all the world to a condition more fearful and deplorable than this old earth has known since the beginning of time.

These high officers coming back from these maneuvers of royalty and militarism conceived the notion that we ought to have the same sort of thing here, and that instead of having our troops here and there out among the people where they will serve as a nucleus of organizations that are to be built up out of our citizenry, they conceived the idea of gathering all these men in a few great cities, where the officers should be quartered, as they are in Europe, not in Government buildings, but in private houses, where in the midst of all of the joys and allurements and pleasures of great cities our Army officers should while away their time, as do the army officers in Europe in times of peace, attending the opera and parading as the pets of society. That is what is at the bottom of this proposition of gathering our troops in a few Army posts in and near large cities. That is what led to the misstatements that by doing away with our present Army posts we would work economy. That is largely what has led to the sending broadcast over the country of these misstatements and this misinformation, both as to the cost of maintaining soldiers in separate posts or in great cantonments and as to the propriety and advisability of it. It matters little what our military program or policy in the future shall be, whether we shall continue the militia organization or whether we shall go to general military training and service. In either case we shall not only have to maintain the Army posts we now have, but it will be absolutely necessary to add to those Army posts, not in the great cities but in the States, where those posts can serve as the center around which we shall bring these organizations of local troops and upon the reservations surrounding which we shall have our maneuvers. Our wars in the future may be in the East, they may be in the West, they may be in the North, or they may be in the South; and troops at an Army post on a trunk line of railway anywhere in the country is as likely to be near or accessible to the point where needed as troops at great posts near great coast cities, from which men might have to be transported clear across the United States in order to reach the point when needed.

I have only asked for the sum necessary to erect the barracks and quarters the War Department has specifically asked for and at the posts they have named. I shall not offer an amendment to cover the remainder of more than five million of their estimate.

I am of the opinion that we should also provide at least a portion of the sums asked for in addition to the sums needed

for these specific buildings; but I shall not offer an amendment to do that. These items my provision is designed to care for are of immediate importance. None of these posts are, in the main, new and up-to-date posts. They will not be abandoned, and should be enlarged.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. Mr. Chairman, of course the membership of the House has long known that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is a high expert on all things military. I do not set myself up as any such expert, and, as a consequence, I shall have to ask you to take my words for what they are worth, not backed up by any great reputation as a military crank.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Did the gentleman say "crank"?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes, crank. We all know the gentleman from Wyoming, ever since he has been here, has been—perhaps laudably—opposed to a large or an increased Military Establishment. I was born in the West; I have lived all my life there and I expect to live the rest of my life in the West—at least, I hope so. I have traveled over the West pretty generally, and I think I know the West. Anybody who knows the West at all, or knows the history of this country, knows that many of the military establishments in the West were located by reason of conditions then existing that have since passed away. We were engaged in reclaiming the wilderness from the savage, and a great many of the military posts were needed at the various places where it was necessary to overcome a savage foe. The Indian has ceased to be an enemy to the Government of the United States or to the white man. It is half a century since Little Crow was buried; Sitting Bull has been gathered to his fathers now for a good long time, and even Geronimo has been Christianized and civilized and is now in the Southwest, far from being an outlaw or a savage. The Indian menace has passed away. With its passing there seems to be little need for a great many of these military posts that are now in the West. The gentleman from Wyoming grew very eloquent in drawing a picture of the horrors of those men who lived in military establishments in the European cities and who are now engaged in war. I suppose the logical deduction he expects us to draw is that the military soldier or officer who chances to live near a large city in a military post is pretty sure to get into a war. Of course, no such consequent as that can be drawn. I have know, as every other Member of the House has known for several years, that the Navy has been trying to get rid of useless naval stations. The Army has been trying to get rid of useless Army stations.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. KELLEY. In regard to naval stations, at the last session of Congress we appointed a new commission to investigate that subject, and they recommended that we retain all and build some more.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I was just coming to that. I remember that during the first session I served in this House the Secretary of the Navy came before a committee of which I happened to be then a member strongly urging the discontinuance of all naval stations on the Atlantic coast except three. We now find that policy of the Navy Department has been changed, and now the board wants even more naval stations than we then had. I do not know which is right, but I believe I have some first-hand knowledge as to many of the Army posts in the West. I know some of them are no longer needed. Though they may happen to be located in the State of Wyoming or in the State of Montana or in the State of Utah is no reason why they should be retained when they are no longer needed.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman believe that the celebrated and historic post in Minnesota should be abandoned?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. No; I do not.

Mr. MONDELL. Of course not. That is in Minnesota.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The celebrated and historic post of Fort Snelling complies with all the requirements that the Army has laid down as to an Army post.

Mr. MONDELL. So do all the others.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. So they do not, or anything of the kind. I can cite the gentleman to many an Army post that is not on a main traveled highway or on a great trunk-line railway. The gentleman said we might be attacked from the north, south, east, or west, and the army that was strategically located on a railway that can get it quickest to the point of attack is the one that will be first there to meet the enemy. Of course; and that means a small group of men isolated on a branch line are of practically no value at all in case of an emergency. These Army units when broken up into small detachments and isolated one from another are unable to secure proper military training. This applies to both officers and men.

Small isolated posts are much more expensive to keep up, relatively. The need for Army posts is greater near population centers, especially where railway terminal facilities are good. The large Army post works for better training of the men, more rapid mobilization, and economy. Some posts in the West on large reservations are needed to permit Cavalry, Artillery, and large Infantry training. Allowing for these, there remain several more posts out there that can be discontinued with advantage to the Army. Already in recent years several have been abolished out there, and more ought to be. I believe in having an investigation of this subject made and a report thereon, as provided in the bill.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the Army posts throughout the country can be abandoned by the War Department without any action on the part of Congress. The War Department has absolute authority to withdraw the troops and close any posts that it desires to close. They have closed a number of posts in recent years. Fort Walla Walla, in the State of Oregon, has been abandoned and closed. Boise Barracks and Fort Assiniboine have been closed. It requires no action whatever on the part of Congress. Some years ago there was a movement in the War Department to close quite a large number of posts, and the Committee on Military Affairs at that time put a provision into the Army appropriation bill forbidding the expenditure of any part of the appropriation at any one of the posts that it was proposed to abandon. The department itself asked, as I now recall, that the provisions of the bill be changed. When it came right down to the scratch they were not ready to have the posts abandoned by congressional enactment.

Now, in regard to the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming, it seems to me that barracks and quarters ought to be supplied at the present time, because the troops are away from their posts. They are on the border. As soon as the necessity for the troops on the border ceases they will be ordered to their respective stations. Unless proper accommodations be provided, the troops will not be properly housed when they come back to their stations from the border. I think that the present is a good time to begin the construction of the new barracks and quarters that will provide for the new units that are created under the national-defense act. The headquarters troops, the supply troops, and the machine-gun troops will have to be housed. They are new organizations. No provision whatever for housing them exists in the various posts throughout the country. I believe that a beginning should be made now, and I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] will prevail.

Mr. SHERLEY and Mr. LA FOLLETTE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] is recognized.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, there has never been a proposition made to Congress with less information to justify it than this one. The data on which the total was figured was to consider the number of officers and men that would be in the Army, if there should be a full increase up to what is authorized by law, the per capita estimates of what it would cost to house those men, and then an arbitrary distribution of that money at various posts now in existence.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman made a rather sweeping statement that no estimate had ever been made with less information, and so forth, and if the gentleman had reference to the proposition of $7,000,000, he did not refer to the item for specific posts.

Mr. SHERLEY. The item for specific posts has very little to justify it. It happened to be near to the hearts of various and sundry men. Now, I do not know whether it be true or not that our system is the most extravagant one in the world for quartering troops, though everything would indicate it. I do not know whether Gen. Wood, who was the leader of this movement, is deserving of all the strictures passed upon him by the gentleman from Wyoming or not. I do not know whether his recommendation was out of a desire that he and other officers might parade themselves in the streets in large cities and attend operas, but I do know that this Congress would not be justified in appropriating $7,000,000 or $1,700,000 for further extension of existing posts in view of what has been said touching the location of those posts and the undesirability of maintaining them.

Now, the gentleman, who has suddenly become a convert to preparedness, says that men are willing to vote to increase the Army, but they are not willing to vote to house the Army. The people of America would be infinitely more willing to vote for an Army and for the men to make a real Army if they did not believe there was unjustifiable extravagance in connection with

the maintenance of an Army. And nothing has been the subject of more criticism than the way we have maintained these posts. They create new municipalities, desirable perhaps to the real estate interests where they are created, desirable on account of local interests, but not justifiable by any other reason in the world. And here we are asked to appropriate these large sums, and the record will show it, without any real examination as to the scheme, whether these posts should be retained or even whether there is room at them for the additional buildings—in fact, whether there are any of the essentials that should determine our so doing. We can afford to wait six months. We can better afford to wait six months and have the Army present to the Congress a real program, if they are capable of presenting one. I am tired of Congress being abused as it has been abused for years past, for the maintenance of posts, on the ground of local sentiment, as has been claimed, and then finding the War Department coming in and asking an expenditure of this large amount of money without any investigation worthy of the name. Before our committee Gen. Sharpe confessed that all he knew was the result of the mathematical calculation based upon unit cost and upon data as to the amount of available space at different forts.

Mr. ANTHONY. Did not the War Department ask the gentleman's committee for $7,000,000?

Mr. SHERLEY. They did; but they did not get it.

Mr. ANTHONY. Did they not show the committee the reasons why they should have it?

Mr. SHERLEY. They did not. They showed nothing that could be defined by the greatest stretch of imagination as a reason. They showed that under the new Army law certain additional men were provided for; they didn't even show whether they would be obtained; and then they showed that, assuming that number of men, there would have to be, on the present system of quartering them, certain additional buildings for quartering officers and men. They then stated it would cost so much per unit, and therefore they figured that at these various places buildings should be erected costing so much.

If the gentleman thinks that that is the kind of information that warrants the expenditure of this great sum he is welcome to his view. I do not share it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto be closed.

Mr. MONDELL. I would like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a little time. I will make the point of order that there is no quorum if I can not get some time. I have not taken up any time hitherto on this bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. Very well; make it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I make the point of no quorum, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto be closed.

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

Mr. MONDELL. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 36, noes 18.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on the point of no quorum?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five gentlemen are present, a quorum. The Clerk will read.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The question is on the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 16, noes 33.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is dilatory.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman has just counted, and 105 gentlemen are present.

Mr. MONDELL. But the vote has disclosed that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule that the point is dilatory.

Mr. MONDELL. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that the point is dilatory.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HOUSTON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the following titles:

H. R. 20451. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 9533. An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 8295) 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.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles, asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Maine, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. SMOOT as the conferees on the part of the Senate:

S. 8296. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

S. 8120. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolutions:

House concurrent resolution 79.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 26th day of February, 1917, at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make them.

House concurrent resolution 73.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That 10,000 copies of the immigration law (Public, No. 301, 64th Cong.—H. R. 10384) be printed for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives, to be distributed as follows: 1,500 copies for the use of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization; 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate Committee on Immigration; 4,500 copies to be distributed through the folding room of the House; and 3,000 copies through the folding room of the Senate.

House concurrent resolution 78.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the reenrollment of the bill (H. R. 9533) to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to strike out the words "and who does not own in his individual right taxable property in Porto Rico to the value of not less than $1,000," as the same appears on page 21, lines 22 and 24, in the engrossed bill of the House of Representatives.

House concurrent resolution 59.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed and bound in the form of eulogies, with accompanying illustrations, 17,100 copies of the proceedings upon the unveiling of the statue of Count Casimer Pulaski in Washington, May 11, 1910, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, 2,000 to be delivered to the National Polish-American Alliance for such distribution as said alliance may desire to make, and the remaining 100 copies shall be bound in full morocco and distributed through the Department of State to the descendants of Count Casimer Pulaski and the speakers who took part in said celebration.

The message also announced that the President had, on February 23, 1917, approved and signed bills of the following titles:

S. 703. An act to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture and the trades and industries; to provide for cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure;

S. 2222. An act for the relief of the heirs of Antoine Bayard;

S. 5899. An act to punish persons who make false representations to settlers and others pertaining to the public lands of the United States;

S. 6850. An act authorizing transfer of certain retired Army officers to the active list; and

S. 7757. An act authorizing a further extension of time to purchasers of land in the former Cheyenne and Arapahoe Indian Reservation, Okla., within which to make payment.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate express its profound sorrow on account of the death of the Hon. DAVID E. FINLEY, late a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the business of the Senate be now suspended in order that fitting tributes may be paid to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives and to the family of the deceased.

Also:

Resolved, That the Senate express its profound sorrow on account of the death of the Hon. SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE, late a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Georgia.

Resolved, That the business of the Senate be now suspended in order that fitting tributes may be paid to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives and to the family of the deceased.

Also:

Resolved, That the Senate express its profound sorrow on account of the death of the Hon. HUNTER H. MOSS, Jr., late a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That the business of the Senate be now suspended in order that fitting tributes may be paid to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives and to the family of the deceased.

Also:

Resolved, That the Senate express its profound sorrow on account of the death of the Hon. WILLIAM G. BROWN, Jr., late a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That the business of the Senate be now suspended in order that fitting tribute may be paid to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives and to the family of the deceased.

Also:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of Mr. FINLEY, Mr. TRIBBLE, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MOSS the Senate do now adjourn.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military post, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: For completion of the construction, at a total cost not exceeding $2,077,000, of the necessary buildings, water and sewer systems, roads, walks, etc., required to complete permanent accommodations not already provided for two regiments of Infantry, one regiment of Cavalry, and one regiment of Field Artillery, $1,077,000.

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

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

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the Army of the United States is supposed to be organized and maintained for the protection of the United States. In order that the increase of the Army provided for by the Congress last year might be partially housed and partially cared for, the Secretary of War asked of the Congress this year the sum of $7,000,000 for barracks and quarters. The committee in its wisdom saw fit to deny that request in toto, and in place of it interrogated the Secretary of War as to whether he really wanted the money he said he wanted, and if so, why. I offered a very modest amendment for the expenditure of only $1,700,000 for the erection at our present posts of the barracks necessary to take care of the machine-gun companies, the supply companies, and the headquarters companies provided for by the new national-defense law. That amendment the committee has just voted down in the absence, in my opinion, of a quorum.

We now come to an item for the housing of troops in Hawaii. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] just said we did not have any information in regard to Fort Sheridan, Fort D. A. Russell, Fort Riley, the Presidio, the fort at Des Moines, Fort Ethan Allen, and other posts in our country; we had no information in regard to them; therefore we were not justified in appropriating for them, although the Secretary of War desired that we should.

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

Mr. MONDELL. In a moment. In regard to Schofield Barracks, in Hawaii, we are informed, I presume; in the philosophy of the gentleman from Kentucky, fully informed.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. HELVERING. That is, in forts in the United States, where millions and millions of dollars have been expended in structures needed, they are now going into absolute decay on account of lack of appropriations to keep them up?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think we are keeping up even our best and most centrally located and most urgently needed posts at home as we should, but we are going to be liberal with Hawaii, far and fair Hawaii. We are providing for an expenditure there of $2,077,000. We are providing for an expenditure in Hawaii of upward of $300,000 more than I asked for the entire continent of the United States; and that, I suppose, is on the theory that we know so much more about what is needed in Hawaii than we know about what is needed for the Army posts at home.

I am in favor of this Hawaiian item. I think it is a proper item. But it serves to emphasize the mistake that the committee made in failing to make any appropriations whatever for the posts at home. Millions for the defense of distant isles, but not a cent for the defense of continental America. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word. The provision in regard to Hawaii is carrying out a detail of the scheme, the limit of cost of which is already fixed. There are none of the problems of location in an island of that size such as are presented in continental United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of 76 superintendents of national cemeteries, $63,120.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANTHONY. Why this liberality?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I am a member of the committee. I have not talked on this bill as yet.

Mr. Chairman, because there seems to be some doubt as to the power of superintendents of national cemeteries, the Senate has passed a resolution, joint resolution 143, granting permission for the erection of a monument in the Arlington National Cemetery to the memory and in honor of the members of the various orders of sisters who gave their services as nurses on battlefields, in hospitals, and on floating hospitals during the Civil War.

The exact language of the resolution is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That permission be, and is hereby, granted the Ladies' Auxiliary, Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, to erect a monument in the Arlington National Cemetery, Va., to the memory and in honor of the members of the various orders of sisters who gave their services as nurses on battle fields, in hospitals, and on floating hospitals during the Civil War, records of whose services are authenticated and in possession of said ladies' auxiliary; and that the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to select a suitable site or location upon which to erect said monument: *Provided*, That said monument shall be erected at no expense to the Government and shall be presented to the people of the United States by the said Ladies' Auxiliary, Ancient Order of Hibernians in America.

That resolution passed the Senate unanimously, and I regret exceedingly to say to the House that it lies buried in the Committee on the Library of this House.

Because we are in the closing hours of the session, and it does not appear that this bill will be brought out, I think this is an opportune time so call to the attention of the country the fact that in all national crises—and we are on the verge of one—in days of war—and we may be on the verge of war—in days of foreign aggression or domestic strife, the pain and anguish incidental to the upheaval of the life of a nation fall heaviest on woman. To her must come the agony of seeing her husband and sons march away to the dangers of the conflict, the dirt and disease of the camp, the peril and pestilence that follow the march of armies and the disasters of battle.

To her must come the duty of maintaining the home, of battling for the little ones dependent on her love and energy, and the long days of waiting for that sad hour when her maimed and wounded dear ones will be brought back to her.

To the man in days of war come action and the excitement of the conflict; to the woman the waiting hours, the anguish of uncertainty, the agony of doubt, of love struggling with the pains of separation, and the pangs of silence and its unknown possibilities.

It needs no great courage and patriotism in the days of public excitement, when the Nation is seething with emotion, when the call and clamor of war is all around us, when bands are playing and soldiers are tramping in the streets—it needs, I say, no unusual stimulus for the man to answer the call to arms. To him come the smile of fair women and the applause of fellow men; and the waving banners, the stirring music, the cheering crowds, and the strange psychology of a nation in arms all unite to send the man into the marching ranks, into the scenes where glory awaits the patriot and hero.

But who in these burning days remember the mother and the wife, surrounded by the frightened little ones, weeping in the deserted homes?

That is the tragic side of war; and in that deserted home rather than on the bloody field is to be found the highest type of heroism and self-sacrifice.

You of the South, as well as we of the North, have heard the story from mouths of mothers who in days of war labored and suffered in silence and sacrifice to preserve the homes depleted by death and to conserve and continue the civilization shattered in the shock of battle.

And these heroic women who abandoned home and all the things dear to their sex, who went out on the trail of the armies to garner the harvest of disease and suffering planted by war and glory, the ministering angels who gave the best they had to soothe the agonies and bind up the wounds of the victims of battle—what of them?

Far from the clamor and glory of battle they worked in the shuddering shambles of the conflict's aftermath, living amid the foulness and pestilence, working with a courage and calm worthy of the most heroic, they faced sights calculated to chill the hearts of the bravest. No patriotic service rendered by the best and the bravest counts higher in the estimate of Heaven than the ungrudging and unlovely toil the nurses of the Civil War were subjected to.

Those splendid and heroic women knew no North nor South in their ministrations; they only knew the wrecks of battle were men and brothers, calling for their tenderest care and noblest efforts, and who, remembering the dreadful days and awful nights of the military hospitals established in the wake of battle, will deny these women the highest recognition a grateful country can give?

Many of the patriotic dead, who felt their gentle touch and found their hours of pain and suffering made tolerable by the skill and the patience of these heroic women, sleep their last sleep under the green slopes of Arlington in sight of this Capitol. It is not a great boon these splendid women ask, merely the privilege of a memorial out there among the heroic dead whose pains they lessened and whose wounds they bound up, out there with those whose fevered brows they soothed in life and whose thirsting lips they moistened as they passed out to "fame's eternal camping ground."

"The nuns of the battle field!" Where else should these ministering angels have a monument if not out there in the cool ranks of the patriotic dead, out there rising from the grassy sod of our national pantheon? Who among us can estimate the value to our national peace, the reestablishment of our national structure, and that final realization of our national brotherhood, and our common national necessity, of the work of these and other gentlewomen? The maimed and broken soldier of the lost cause, as he marched back to his desolate home and desolated fields, must have carried in his breast the seed of kindness and reconciliation planted there by the women of mercy working in the camps and hospitals of those days; and I for one am ready to believe that that seed, in the providence of God, has blossomed and fructified into one of the instrumentalities that have made this once more a united Nation, an American people. [Applause.]

The nuns of the battle field were neither of the North or the South in their ministrations; they served humanity; and their love and labor were lavished as freely and generously upon the wounded soldier in gray as upon him who wore the blue. They recognized and served all without distinction.

Arlington, in the shadow of the home of the first and greatest of Americans, is the last, the final camping ground of those who fought and died for the American idea; their brothers in arms sleep in a hundred valleys and hilltops from the Lakes to the Gulf, and thousands sleep in nameless graves forgotten of man, yet here of all places should rise a memorial to those noble women, whose hands and hearts, devoted only to mercy, helped to heal the wounds of war and close the rift that separated brother from brother.

They have earned the title to this little bit of space out there among those whose hours of pain they lightened, whose dying hours they made happier and sweeter; and if there be gratitude among men and honor among soldiers, the boon they ask will be theirs. [Loud applause.]

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks, the time of Mr. GALLIVAN having expired,

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for three minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Does the gentleman think he will need all of the three minutes to conclude?

Mr. GALLIVAN. About two minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have two minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent to interrupt the gentleman's very beautiful remarks long enough to make this statement: I want to call attention to the fact that a few moments ago the chairman of the committee objected to any extension of the discussion of the items of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman will proceed for three minutes.

Mr. GALLIVAN resumed and concluded his remarks as above.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

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

On February 21, 1917:

H. R. 11474. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to permit the construction of a public highway through the fish-cultural station in Unicoi County, Tenn.;

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; and

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.

On February 22, 1917:

H. R. 12541. An act authorizing insurance companies and fraternal beneficiary societies to file bills of interpleader.

On February 26, 1917:

H. R. 9288. An act providing for the refund of certain duties illegally levied and collected on acetate of lime;

H. R. 12463. An act for the relief of Meredith G. Corlett, a citizen and resident of Williamson County, Tenn.;

S. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution giving authority to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make special regulations for the occasion of the reunion of the Confederate Veterans' Association, to be held in the District of Columbia in the year 1917, and for other purposes incident to said encampment;

S. J. Res. 205. Joint resolution authorizing the removal of the statue of Admiral Dupont in Dupont Circle in the city of Washington, D. C., and the erection of a memorial to Admiral Dupont in place thereof;

S. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to grant citizenship to Joseph Beech;

S. 1697. An act to declare Ollala Slough in Lincoln County, Oreg., nonnavigable;

S. 2543. An act for the relief of the State of Kentucky;

S. 5450. An act to provide for an additional judge in the State of Texas;

S. 5672. An act for the relief of sundry building and loan associations;

S. 5716. An act to establish the Mount McKinley National Park in the Territory of Alaska;

S. 7644. An act to create a new division of the northern district of Texas, and to provide for terms of court at Wichita Falls, Tex., and for a clerk for said court, and for other purposes;

S. 7796. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and convey to the Great Northern Railway Co. certain lands in the State of Montana for divisional terminal yards and other railway purposes, and for other purposes;

S. 8044. An act providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act; and

S. 8079. An act to amend the first and seventh paragraphs of section 4414 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act of April 9, 1906.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of 76 superintendents of national cemeteries, $63,120.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the fact that the committee have failed to make any provision for increasing the salaries now paid to the superintendents of national cemeteries. It is notorious that the salaries paid to these men are exceedingly low. For instance, at the 31 first-class national cemeteries in the country the superintendents are getting $75 a month. This is the rate of pay that has been in vogue for a great many years.

There are 83 national cemeteries, classified as follows:

	Per month.
31 first class, pay of superintendents	$75
18 second class, pay of superintendents	70
6 third class, pay of superintendents	65
28 fourth class, pay of superintendents	60

Of the fourth-class cemeteries, 7 are under the charge of the Depot Quartermaster, leaving 21 in charge of superintendents. One of the first-class cemeteries is located in Mexico City, Mexico.

The superintendent of the Arlington National Cemetery receives $100 per month, being the only superintendent of a first-class cemetery who receives more than $75 per month. This superintendent is provided with an office clerk, and the landscape gardener is there and looks after flowers, trees, and so forth, leaving little for the superintendent to look after, whereas the superintendents of all other cemeteries must look after all of that work besides all other work connected with the cemetery. With the exception of Arlington, the salaries of the superintendents have not been adjusted for many years, notwithstanding the continual advance in living cost, and I do not believe there is a superintendent in the service who would not gladly exchange place with the one at Arlington because of above-mentioned assistance given that cemetery.

Now, taking the pay of the superintendent of the Arlington Cemetery as a standard or base, it would seem only a fair deal to make the requested readjustment of salaries as follows:

	Per month.
Superintendents of first class	$100
Superintendents of second class	95
Superintendents of third class	85
Superintendents of fourth class	75

A superintendent who is a success usually goes to at least a second-class cemetery in a comparatively short time.

I have had my attention called for several years to the necessity for raising the pay of these men, and I had hoped that the committee would take some action which would relieve the necessities of the men holding these responsible positions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Burial of deceased indigent patients: For burying in the Little Rock (Ark.) National Cemetery, including transportation thereto, indigent ex-soldiers, ex-sailors, or ex-marines of the United States service, either Regular or Volunteer, who have been honorably discharged or retired and who die while patients at the Army and Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs, Ark., to be disbursed at a cost not exceeding $35 for such burial expenses in each case, exclusive of cost of grave, $200.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read in my time a very short article from the New York World.

The Clerk read as follows:

SATURDAY'S FOOD DEMONSTRATION.

From the appearance of the men and women who took advantage of a half holiday Saturday to hold a food parade and engage in some disorder on Fifth Avenue, they were in no great danger of perishing from hunger. Whoever organized the demonstration showed little judgment in the class of persons offered for exhibition as victims of starvation. They had the lung power for first-class agitators, not the poverty-stricken look and pinched faces that are the outward badges of extreme privation.

It is reasonable, therefore, to ask how far by this demonstration was a single needy family anywhere helped to secure more food. There is always distress on the east side and elsewhere and it is always deserving of sympathy and help. But it is not by the maneuvers of professional mischief-makers who incite crowds to raise disturbances in the streets that more food will be produced or placed within reach of those most in need of it. Nothing occurred Saturday to indicate that the leaders who staged the spectacle had any practical plan to suggest or were interested in putting into operation a system of distributing relief among the destitute.

The managers of this outpouring of the well fed, well clothed, well shod, and well gloved were Socialist politicians, most of whom, figuring as orators, spoke to an inattentive, smiling, jostling crowd out for a lark, with no regard for the pitiable misery which they pretended to represent.

There is suffering in New York; there are many needless deaths in New York; there is hunger in New York. These are terrible truths, but they will not be met by the frivolous captains of Socialism on parade.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, for once in my life I agree with the New York World. I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Gettysburg National Park: For continuing the establishment of the park; acquisition of lands, surveys, and maps; constructing, improving, and maintaining avenues, roads, and bridges thereon; fences and gates; marking the lines of battle with tablets and guns, each tablet bearing a brief legend giving historic facts and compiled without censure and without praise; preserving the features of the battle field and the monuments thereon; compensation of civilian commissioners, clerical and other services, expenses, and labor; purchase and preparation of tablets and gun carriages and placing them in position; and all other expenses incidental to the foregoing, $42,500.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 71, line 12, after the figures "$42,500," insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"The Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, for the Gettysburg National Military Park the land composing the right of way of the Gettysburg Railway Co. (the rails, ties, and superstructure of same to remain the property of the Gettysburg Railway Co. and to be removed by the said company as required by the Secretary of War), said right of way embracing the tracts known as the Amos Leister tracts, the F. G. Pfeffer tracts, the Jacob Benner estate tract, the Simon J. Godori tract, the Jacob Masonheimer tract, the Annie E. Beecher tract, the Rosanna E. Wible tract, the James W. Timbers tract, the S. W. Crawford tracts, the William H. Tipton tract, the Calvin P. Krise tract, the George Bushman tract, and the Peter D. Swisher tract within the limits of the battle field of Gettysburg and within the limits of the Gettysburg National Military Park for the sum of $30,000, that being the amount awarded in condemnation proceedings in the eastern district of Pennsylvania, which sum is hereby appropriated and made immediately available for such purchase.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman reserve it for a minute?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will reserve it for five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this amendment relates to a proposal to take over the property and rights of way of the Gettysburg Railway Co., which operates a line through the Gettysburg battle field. The Government instituted proceedings some years ago for acquiring this property. These proceedings were concluded by a verdict and an award of $30,000 as the price of the property to be taken.

This amendment proposes to make an appropriation for the amount in accordance with the award. It was stated in the proceedings that it desired this property because it feared that the use of these trolley roads would ultimately become objectionable, and there is now the thought that unless the Government does take the property over in accordance with its own proceedings and award that has been made that additions may be made to the trolley railroad that will be still more objectionable and still more an eyesore on this wonderful property of the Government.

I know the amendment is subject to a point of order, but I offer it in the hope that the gentleman from New York will withdraw his point of order, because sooner or later the property will be taken over. It ought to be taken over by the Government, and the longer we delay it the more expensive it will be to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WEBB). Does the gentleman from New York insist on his point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order on the ground that it is new legislation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Tidal Basin bathing beach: The Chief of Engineers of the United States Army is authorized and directed to establish and maintain at a suitable place upon the shore of the Tidal Basin, in Potomac Park, a public bathhouse, with the necessary equipment, with a sloping sandy beach in the Tidal Basin, and to install a proper equipment to purify the water entering the basin so that it will not endanger the health of those bathing in it. The direction and control of said public bathing facilities shall be vested in the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, who shall prescribe such regulations for their use as may be necessary to insure the greatest benefit to the public: *Provided*, That no charge shall be made for the use of the bathhouse or beach, except that uniform fees may be collected for the hire of bathing suits, soap, towels, and such other conveniences as may be provided upon the request of persons desiring to use them. To enable the Chief of Engineers to begin construction of the bathhouse, beach, and purification plant herein provided for, $35,000, to be immediately available; and the limit of cost of such construction shall not exceed that amount.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the people of the District of Columbia on the item that has just been read. A number of years ago an estimate was made for beginning the construction of a bathing beach at the tidal basin. At that time certain gentlemen were desirous of having bathing facilities provided in connection with the playgrounds in various parts of the city, and, unfortunately both for their project and this project, they set about building up opposition against the tidal-basin project. Personally I am very much in favor of the plan of providing public-bathing facilties in connection with the playgrounds, but the carrying out of that plan should not have at any time interfered with the plan we are now proposing of a bathing beach at the tidal basin. For a number of years private parties have conducted bathing facilities at the tidal basin, and when we attempted to construct a public-bathing beach there physicians were found who claimed that the water at the tidal basin was not entirely satisfactory for bathing purposes. My understanding is that after further consideration they have concluded that that is not true, or if it is true the water as it flows in may be readily purified. Under this appropriation of $35,000—which I wish was $50,000—we will have a well-built,

well-conducted bathing beach down on the tidal basin; and every boy and a large number of girls and young women in this city, as well as some who are no longer young except in heart and their desire for an opportunity to take a swim, can be congratulated that we are now providing for this long-deferred and much-needed improvement in the city of Washington. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For extraordinary repairs and refurnishing of Executive Mansion, $60,000.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is very proper that we should appropriate liberally for the home of the Chief Executive and that we should keep the beautiful and historic mansion in which he lives in a first-class state of repair. It is true that it is costing more and more every year to do that, but so far as these repairs are necessary and the money economically expended we are all in favor of it. For the ordinary care and refurnishing of the Executive Mansion we are appropriating $35,000. We appropriate $6,000 for fuel, $9,000 for the greenhouses, and $3,000 for the repair of the greenhouses. This year we are appropriating $60,000 for extraordinary repairs and refurnishing of the Executive Mansion. This item is carried in the appropriation bill every few years. Ordinarily we carry an item similar to this at the beginning of an administration in order to make provision for the necessary restoration and repairs after four years of use. The item this year is, I think, larger than it has ever been in the past, but quite likely it is none too large. The items as given to us in committee indicated that the sum would all be needed. It costs a good deal of money to provide for so large a building as the White House and to provide for it adequately. I think one item was $8,000 for china and crockery for the White House. I think the item is proper and no doubt necessary. In connection with it I want to make this observation. The White House is the home of the President. It is also in a peculiar way the house of all the people. They take great pride in this beautiful mansion, the home of their Executive—their house.

Our constituents coming here, particularly the ladies, are more interested in seeing the interior of the White House than they are in seeing almost anything else in Washington; and while very properly the portions of the White House that are occupied by the President's family daily are not shown to visitors, yet visitors are allowed a great deal of freedom in going through a large portion of the building, particularly the public rooms. A great many people enjoy this view of the home of the Presidents, and I can not refrain from expressing a regret that in providing as we are proposing to do for restoring the crockery and the curtains and the hangings and the furnishings of the White House that Congress, which provides for the White House and provides for the President and for all of the departments of the Government, including in the term "Congress" every Member of Congress, can not all say of their own knowledge whether or no these repairs are needed. The Representatives of the people of the country are supposed occasionally at least to receive an invitation to the house of the President. There is a special reception for the Congress, and it would seem proper that on this occasion at least a Member's credentials as a Member should bring him an invitation to the headquarters of the Nation. So far as I am speaking from actual experience, it does; but I understand that is not always the case, and that there have been Members of Congress and that there are now Members of Congress who could not tell you from their actual knowledge, gained through the invitation to the White House, whether or no even the public rooms of the Mansion need repairs and restoration. At one time and another we all of us, most of us, differ from the honored gentlemen who are at the time at the head of the Nation. Sooner or later most of us who try to do our duty find ourselves somewhat in disagreement with these distinguished gentlemen, but it occurs to me that that fact should not in any wise affect the status of a Member of Congress when it comes to the matter of the ordinary official invitation to the home of the President, the house of all the people, the Executive Mansion in Washington. At least on those occasions when the Congress is officially invited I do not think the Members suffer by such treatment. I do think whoever is responsible for it has an exceedingly peculiar notion of what is due to a Representative of an American constituency.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I was out of the Chamber for a moment and I do not know what statement was made in reference to this item for the extraordinary repairs and furnishing of the Executive Mansion, amounting to $60,000. It strikes me as a rather liberal allowance. Of course it has always been the custom whenever there is a change in the President to make some appropriation for repairs and refurnishing at the beginning of an administration, and I have no objection to making any appropriation that is necessary. Sixty thousand dollars is quite a bunch of money for the size of the White House. We appropriate $5,000 for the care of the grounds of the White House; we appropriate for the White House itself; we appropriate for the care of the White House $35,000; we appropriate for the fuel which is burned at the White House $6,000; we appropriate $9,000 for the care and maintenance of greenhouses, solely for the benefit of the White House; and, in fact, we appropriate a good deal more than that for that purpose under the Office of the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds which is not charged to the White House but which is maintained for the benefit of the White House. We appropriate $3,000 for repairs to the White House. We appropriate for the lighting of the White House. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has made comment that I think was not quite explicit enough. I have never supposed that when a Member of Congress was invited to a reception at the White House it was a personal compliment or a personal invitation. It is true the President has the right to decline to invite anyone. It is his home. He pays some of the expenses in connection with it; but Congress pays most of the expenses. An invitation to a Member of Congress is an official invitation. When any President draws the line and refuses to invite a Member of Congress because he does not like what the Member of Congress has done, he has descended away below the dignity of a President or anyone else. I think it is a disgraceful thing to have go uncontradicted in the newspapers statements that a certain Member of the House and a certain Member of the Senate were not invited to a congressional reception at the White House, a reception given in honor of Congress, because the President or some of his underlings did not like the color of the hair of the Member or because the President did not like what he had said, particularly when we maintain the White House at public expense. I think it is the most disgraceful episode as far as little things go that has occurred in the country for a long time; and I suppose that will bar me from an invitation in the future, but if it is a personal invitation I am quite content. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it has been the policy of Congress to maintain the White House in that condition that is befitting the dignity of the American people. The last general overhauling of the White House was in 1902, when almost half a million dollars was expended upon it. In 1913, $15,000 was expended for special repairs, and in 1909, $15,000. This item of $60,000 is almost entirely to refurnish those parts of the White House to which the public has general access. Between 1,500 and 2,000 people visit the White House daily. A constant stream of people walking over and sitting on and touching the various furnishings in the White House results in very heavy wear of the furnishings. Everyone believes that they should be replaced and put in proper repair. It is true that the Congress maintains the White House as the home of the President. That is in accordance with the established policy of the country, but even though the Congress does maintain a home for the President of the United States it does not and it should not and it can not insist that the President extend social invitations or maintain social relations with people with whom for any reason he is disinclined to do so. We have no right to compel the President to invite any man to his home, even though he happens to be an official of the Government, or to some official function in his home, official home though it be.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In just a minute. I have no knowledge that any official has been excluded from the White House. I know that gentlemen on that side of the House are intimating that some such practice as that has been indulged in. I do not know——

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman has seen the newspapers suggesting that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If it is, it may be that the President has justifiable grounds for declining to associate with some officials. Occupying a much humbler position than the President, I would not permit Congress or anyone else to insist that I maintain social relation with everyone who happened to occupy an official position in the Government. I reserve that right to myself, and I should do so even if the Government supplied me with an official home.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. If the President should refuse to give an invitation to one of the diplomatic representatives here, and all the other diplomatic representatives were invited, does the gentleman think nothing would be done or said about it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, our relations with other Governments are different.

Mr. MANN. No different——

Mr. FITZGERALD (continuing). They are not officials of the United States Government.

Mr. MANN. Are these invitations a personal matter?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I believe the President has the right to determine whom he wants——

Mr. MANN. Would he invite the minister from Haiti as a personal favor because everyone who was invited to his dinner——

Mr. FITZGERALD. I prefer to make these remarks myself——

Mr. MANN. I do not wonder.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I believe the President has a perfect right to determine whether he desires the society of the gentleman from Illinois or myself, and if he does not it is very bad taste for us to criticize him on account of it. I did not hear any criticism a few years ago when the President of the United States did the most remarkable thing of which I have knowledge. A Member of this House, in the proper discharge of his duties as a Member of this House, indulged in a criticism of the President. It offended the President and he resented it. Shortly thereafter that Member, in company with some of his constituents, called at the White House to consult with the President on a matter that was strictly within his official duties. It was a matter of some importance, and he was entitled as a Representative to present it to the President, but the President declined to meet this delegation unless the Member of Congress withdrew from it.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman justify it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it was——

Mr. MANN. I should severely condemn the action.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But it was an official act and this is a social function.

Mr. MANN. Of course they are official.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are not.

Mr. MANN. Why do we pay for it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. We pay for it because the policy of the Government has been to maintain a home for the President and to supply him with certain facilities in connection with it, but if the President of the United States can not occupy a home and enjoy the things that accompany it without the restriction that he invite into social relations everyone that everybody in Congress may deem desirable or important, I think the President would very quickly decline to accept any courtesy at the hands of Congress. No one who had any self-respect would do so. There have been times in the past when Presidents have refused to meet socially officials of the Government. I shall not criticize them. Perhaps if I were President I would have a longer blacklist than anybody ever had in the history of the Government. Perhaps I would let my prejudices sway me to some extent; it comes with very poor taste, from Members of Congress, however, to be carping at the President because he for any reason declines to maintain social relations with officials of the Government. It is a matter purely within his own control and men ought not to cavil at it. I know if any President for any special reason declines to maintain social relations with me I should not bother about it, and I should not be offended at it. I should not desire to have anyone else attempt to magnify it into an affront to me, because it would not be one. It is easy for us to criticize some one else. My experience has been that most of the Presidents have been much more generous, much more lenient in sending invitations to officials for social functions than those who are not in that position would have been under the same circumstances. With these few philosophic observations I hope we will proceed with the public business.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For traveling expenses of the President of the United States, to be expended in his discretion and accounted for on his certificate solely, $25,000.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking my colleague, the chairman of the committee, what has been the recent practice with reference to the expending of the whole of this sum?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Since Congress has provided for the traveling expenses of the President to be expended upon his certificate solely, which means to be expended without audit, the policy has been to make no inquiry whatever. Congress places this money at the disposal of the President, and he uses it or not, as he pleases.

Mr. BENNET. Well, I do not think that I understand my colleague correctly. Suppose the President only uses, we will say, $8,000. The fact that $17,000 was not used would show on some report, would it not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think not. It may show in the general statement of receipts and expenses of the Treasury Department, but I am not certain it would.

Mr. BENNET. I am sure my colleague is mistaken, because I remember one year there was a report made that was made public in Congress that the then President of the United States in that particular year had used about $8,000 of this fund.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The only time anything ever was disclosed was one year when one of the Presidents wanted to spend in excess of the amount fixed by the statute. Congress gave him the additional money, and in the inquiry that was instituted and the result of it, my recollection is, it was disclosed that in the previous year the entire $25,000 had been expended, and that was given as the reason why the appropriation for the then current year should be increased.

Mr. BENNET. Then my colleague ought to modify his statement to this extent, that anyone who makes inquiry in the proper bureau of the Treasury can find at the conclusion of a fiscal year, or within a reasonable time thereafter, just how much of this money has been spent?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think that is true; but the policy of Congress was to put $25,000 at the disposal of the President for his traveling expenses and permit him to expend it on his certificate without the embarrassment of questions arising from auditors as to whether a particular item of expenditure was within the authority. And having that broad authority, and knowing that the travel demanded of the President will pretty nearly require the expenditure of the entire sum, the policy has been to make the appropriation.

Mr. BENNET. To state it more correctly, is not the situation this, that the Appropriations Committee assumes that this appropriation will be made each year, and as the expenditure is made on the certificate of the President solely, it does not think it worth while to make inquiry of the Treasury as to how much was used the preceding year, and therefore my colleague is not in a position to inform the House at the moment whether the amount appropriated for the last fiscal year was not used?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know.

Mr. BENNET. And for the reason given.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The reason is that the policy of Congress, that the President should have at his disposal $25,000 whether he expended it or did not expend it, would not affect our action toward the appropriation the next year. We make those inquiries about current appropriations to determine whether we have appropriated more than a given service requires; but whether the President spends $5,000 or $10,000 one year was not intended by Congress to control the amount that should be available during any other year. So we pay no attention to what he expended.

Mr. BENNET. That is satisfactory. But I did not want to leave the impression on the House or the country that whether the President used this money or not it was drawn.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. We could obtain this information without any question if we notified the officials at the White House, and that information would be furnished, but it has not been a matter that has been considered of that importance.

Mr. BENNET. I understand the situation thoroughly, and I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lighting the public grounds: For lighting the public grounds, watchmen's lodges, offices, and greenhouses at the propagating gardens, including all necessary expenses of installation, maintenance, and repair, $22,300.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman a question. Between the Capitol Grounds and the Senate Building and the Union Station there was many years ago a Capitol Park provided for. A part of the buildings have been removed from two of the blocks. Does the gentleman know when it is intended to order the other buildings removed and why they have not been removed hitherto?

Mr. FITZGERALD. All of those buildings have not yet been acquired and some of the land has not been acquired. The gentleman will recall that after the condemnation proceeding was completed the law required the awards to be approved by the President before payment could be made. The President declined to approve the awards and Congress subsequently enacted legislation providing for the acquisition of the property under certain limitations. It has been impossible for the commission appointed under that legislation to acquire some of the property.

Mr. HAWLEY. What is the difficulty in the way? They have the power of condemnation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The owners of the property are insisting upon being paid the amount awarded in the condemnation proceedings, and as they can not get that money they will not part with their property for any less; and they can not be compelled to do so. We will have to pay them eventually. But some people believe that we can take the property and pay them some other sum.

Mr. HAWLEY. Do the buildings which are standing belong to any particular corporation, or a number of them?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know. We have been removing gradually and as rapidly as possible all of the buildings upon the property.

Mr. HAWLEY. Do the buildings still standing belong to a particular corporation?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Some of them belong to the United States—for instance, the Maltby Building. The Maltby Building belongs to the United States. We have been trying to have it removed for some time, and every once in a while Congress interferes with the removal of it. The Committee on Agriculture, for instance, about two years ago inserted a provision in the Agricultural bill prohibiting the removal of the Maltby Building. We got that repealed last year. But buildings have been removed as rapidly as we could remove them under existing conditions.

Mr. HAWLEY. It has been stated that the buildings now standing on either side of the street from the Capitol to the station belong to a certain railroad corporation. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. owns all of this stock in a real estate corporation which has the title to certain parcels in the tract. The objection was made to the payment of the amount awarded in condemnation for these particular tracts. The railroad company, or its holding company, will not surrender the land unless they are paid the full amount awarded in the condemnation proceedings. The commission, as I recall, is either unable under the law or is unwilling, because of what happened in Congress, to pay that price; and that situation will continue until some one finally decides to carry out the judicial determination and pay for that property what it has been determined in a judicial process shall be paid for it. There is no way we can escape it.

Mr. HAWLEY. Does not the gentleman think it would be advisable to have proper legislation instituted to clear that land of all these buildings so that the plans for the park might be carried out? At present it presents a very unsightly appearance.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; it would be very desirable; but, with my knowledge of the history of the matter, I do not care to take hold of the tail of that bear. Let me suggest that the gentleman from Oregon take that question up. If he does, he will find that he is a very busy gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Building where Abraham Lincoln died: For painting and miscellaneous repairs, $200.

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

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BARNHART). The gentleman from Nebraska moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SLOAN. On line 21 I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of submitting an inquiry to the chairman of the committee as to that item. Does the Government own the building described, in which Lincoln died?

Mr. FITZGERALD. My impression is that we own it.

Mr. SLOAN. When was it purchased?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not certain about it.

Mr. MONDELL. My impression is we do not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If we do not own it we pay the owner this money as compensation for keeping up the exhibit.

Mr. SLOAN. Then we have not title to the property, or anything of that kind?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is my recollection; I think not.

Mr. SLOAN. We have no control over it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. We pay $200 to the owner of the building who has this Lincoln collection in it.

Mr. SLOAN. How long has that item been carried in the bill? Is it a recent item?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It has been in as long as I have been in the House.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is my understanding that the Government does own the house where Lincoln died and that we allow the man who has the exhibit there the use of the building for housing the exhibit, the Government being to no expense for a caretaker. He desires before he dies to sell that exhibit to the Government, to remain permanently in the building, which the Government now owns.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Is it a fact that the gentleman who has this building charges admission to those who are admitted there?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is my impression that he does, under permission predicated by act of Congress. I may be mistaken.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendments will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. ADAMSON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 20082) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey and Mr. JONES members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Federal Trade Commission.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commission of Fine Arts: For expenses made necessary by the act approved May 17, 1910, entitled "An act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," including the purchase of periodicals, maps, and books of reference, to be disbursed, on vouchers approved by the commission, by the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds, who shall be the secretary and shall act as the executive officer of said commission, $8,000.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking my colleague [Mr. FITZGERALD], the chairman of the committee, a question, if I can have his attention.

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

Mr. BENNET. I do so in order to ask what the Commission of Fine Arts does; not what it is authorized to do, but what it actually does do for this $8,000 a year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Col. Harts, who is the executive member, or secretary, of the commission, stated to the committee that the commission has acted upon nearly 500 various subjects since it was created six years ago. To be exact, 496 subjects have been referred to it. One hundred and seventeen were sent to it by committees of Congress, 5 by direction of the President, and every department of the Government, with the exception of the Department of Labor and the Department of Justice, have had some subjects before the commission. During the first year the submissions were 41 in number. In the following year they were 37. In the third year there was an increase of 35 per cent; in the fourth year there was an increase of 50 per cent; and in the fifth year an increase of 200 per cent. During the fiscal year just closed there were 180 submissions, an increase of 200 per cent. The members of the commission receive no compensation. They are paid their traveling expenses in coming to the meetings of the commission in Washington. The appropriation enables them to have five meetings a year. The committee was asked to increase the appropriation somewhat. Under the law they are limited to $5 a day for their expenses, exclusive of their traveling expenses. I have no doubt that the commission has rendered very valuable services in connection with many matters submitted to them. Its value is well recognized.

Mr. BENNET. My impression was—and if I am wrong I know my colleague will correct me—that about anything the commission recommended to this House we disapproved. As a matter of fact, I was divided in my opinion as between the judg-

ment that we used the commission badly or that it was a useless body.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Plans for public buildings and public improvements of all kinds are submitted to them, and they have made innumerable suggestions either as to the modification of designs or at times as to the proposed location of monuments. The rule now is, I believe, that no memorial is located in Washington without the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts. It consists of Charles Moore, as chairman; Architects Charles A. Platt, Thomas Hastings, and William M. Kendall, of New York; the painter member, J. Alden Weir; the sculptor member, Herbert Adams; and the landscape architect, Frederick Law Olmsted. The former president of the commission was a very distinguished Chicago artist and architect, who designed the Union Station in Washington and other buildings.

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

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The only thing that Congress did not acquiesce in, in connection with the commission, I think, was when some misguided persons got them worked up over the central heating and power plant and objected to having smokestacks on it. That is about the only notable case in which they interfered unsuccessfully.

Mr. BENNET. I do not want to take up the time of the House, but it seems to me their judgment was questioned in relation to the location of the Grant Memorial.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was located long before the Fine Arts Commission was created. Congress actually determined it, because after the commission selected the present location an attempt was made to have it changed by action of Congress, and Congress definitely fixed the present location.

Mr. BENNET. How about the Lincoln Memorial?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They selected the Lincoln Memorial and passed upon the design. The architect of the Lincoln Memorial is now a member of the commission.

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

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment. I move to strike out all from line 25, on page 79, to and including line 6, on page 80.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWARD: On page 79, strike out lines 25 and 26, and on page 80, beginning with line 1, down to and including line 6.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee. I have no doubt in my mind that this crowd of well-meaning, misguided, and highfaluting folks have cost this Government hundreds of thousands of dollars; and, if they keep on as they have been going, I am afraid they are going to cost us millions of dollars.

In the first place, I do not believe they confine their operations to the subjects they were intended to fool with. They come down here and they dabble in all sort of contracts for this Government. I know of one case where the Fine Arts Commission cost the Government of the United States $56,000. It was on the question of material to be used over here in the new post-office building. They selected the marble and granite by the use of flyspecking technicalities rather than by their value of building materials. They go around here and pick out all sorts of sites. Just to give you an illustration of the magnificent judgment that this Fine Arts Commission have exercised, take the new National Museum down here. It takes almost a force of Pinkerton detectives and a search warrant to find the place. When you get there, it is one of the most magnificent buildings that has ever been constructed in this city. They stuck that building down there behind a lot of old commission stores, and you have to drive over cabbage and crates of rotting fruit and stuff of that sort to get there, over an old, worn-out cobblestone pavement as an approach to the building.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think the Fine Arts Commission had anything to do with locating that building?

Mr. HOWARD. That is my understanding. If I am wrong I am prepared to be corrected.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is entirely wrong in his understanding. That building was located before the Fine Arts Commission was created.

Mr. HOWARD. Let us take the Lincoln Memorial, one of the most magnificent memorials ever constructed in the history of the world to the memory of any man. If there is a worse location, I do not know where it is. It is away down here on the bank of the Potomac River, and when thousands of admirers of the martyred President come here and go down to look at that memorial, they are held up for a dollar or a dollar and a half taxicab fare, or they have got to walk a mile and a half from the center of town down there to look at it. The Fine Arts Commission is an extravagant, technical, impracticable body of folks who are governing the expenditures of this Congress, and every time they have any dealings with anything that Congress wants to appropriate money for they come back here for a deficiency appropriation. I have never seen it fail during my six years' service in this House. I have offered a bill to abolish them, and I hope and pray you gentlemen will not appropriate another cent for them. If you refuse to appropriate for them, you will do one of the best services you ever did for the prosperity and progress of the city of Washington. This commission is all the time dabbling in these things here, and there are too many of them. They are scattered too far, and they seem to impede the progress of this city rather than to help it.

Mr. BENNET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BENNET. Does not the gentleman think that possibly all the trouble is caused by the man from Boston who is on the commission? The New York men are all right, are they not?

Mr. HOWARD. I presume the New York men are all right. They mean well, just like all the other gentlemen from New York whom I have ever seen. They are all well meaning, but sometimes they arrive at wrong conclusions. But we are charitable, and have to forgive them. I do at least. But there is something wrong with this Fine Arts Commission, and I do not think they have exercised any judgment which justifies us in perpetuating them. I do not see any service that they are rendering to the Government of the United States. If so, I can not see any practical use for them or anything they do, except to meddle in the business of the Government here in the District of Columbia. As has been stated here by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], they circularized the whole United States, and had women and fanatics down in my district writing me about this power plant that it was said was going to ruin the whole appearance of one of our parks.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did not say they stirred up all the fanatics in the gentleman's district.

Mr. HOWARD. They stirred up more in the gentleman's district than they did in mine, because I have received letters from them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think we have more people of esthetic tastes in my district.

Mr. HOWARD. I am willing to admit that the gentleman has more fine-art fanatics in his district than I have; but as I started to say, they stirred up all that trouble all over the country, and had people writing here about something they did not know anything about. I am in favor of abolishing them, and I will not vote to appropriate a cent to perpetuate them in office.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not prevail. Gen. SHERWOOD at one time made a very memorable speech in this House upon the alleged works of art in the Capitol. We have right at hand a hall of horrors that indicates what happens as the result of a lack of proper esthetic and artistic supervision. This commission, for the very limited appropriation given to it, does very valuable work. We are under some obligations to do our part toward the cultivation of a proper public taste in works of art. That is our duty. We should not permit the United States Capital to be covered with all sorts of architectural monstrosities, and the only way to obtain buildings and memorials that conform to proper ideals is to have men who are trained and cultured to pass on the questions involved. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] is a very valuable Member of Congress. He is a very industrious and valuable member of the Committee on Appropriations; but neither he nor I is nearly as competent to judge of questions requiring artistic taste as are the members of this commission, whose chairman is Mr. Charles Moore, and whose architect members are Charles Platt, Thomas Hastings, and Mr. Kendall, together with J. Alden Weir, the painter; Herbert Adams, the sculptor; and Frederick Law Olmsted, the landscape architect, who is known all over the world. Compared with those men we are not at all competent to determine the questions submitted to them. I know it is somewhat unfortunate that they have from time to time disclosed a predilection for Colorado yule marble rather than Georgia marble. I do not always approve of that myself, but really that ought not to be sufficient to justify us in turning loose all the fanatics in architecture and sculpture and art to prey upon the American people. We ought to protect the

public from those wild, uncontrollable geniuses who are trying to inflict their productions upon us, and the gentleman and myself can not do it without help. We have to have the help of men specially trained for that purpose.

Mr. HOWARD. So far as the marble proposition is concerned, I will say to the gentleman that I have no interest in marble. I have not got a piece of it the size of my fist in my whole district. The matter I was speaking about was a mere waste of money, where, by the selection of a light-colored marble and granite, they increased the price $56,000. That is all a matter of taste. They did not take into consideration the cost at all. That is what I am complaining about.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They have expensive tastes.

Mr. HOWARD. That is what I say—too expensive for the taxpayers of this country——

Mr. FITZGERALD. We must all be educated.

Mr. HOWARD. That is the reason we ought to abolish this Fine Arts Commission.

One more question I want to ask the gentleman. I thought we had an architect in the Treasury Building that was drawing a pretty good salary and a splendid force of architects under him to do this work?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; he has nothing to do with this. Congress authorizes a memorial or monument to somebody. Competition is invited and a number of sculptors submit bids——

Mr. HOWARD. And the best friend of the commission gets the contract each time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hardly think that is true. Congress, at the request of the family of Admiral Dupont, has arranged to have a monument to his memory removed from the place it occupies so that one that will appeal to the esthetic taste of a cultured public may be put in its place.

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

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes. I want to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks that his colleague's time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET. I would like to ask if the Fine Arts Commission is the body that took the half-naked body of George Washington off of the Plaza at the east of the Capitol?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I think we took George Washington in out of the wet because it was found that the effects of the atmospheric conditions on the statue were such that it was likely to deteriorate completely. We took it from the Plaza and put it under cover. Everybody who had any respect for American ideals and taste was glad to have that pseudo Roman warrior who had been placed out there in a half-naked condition so many years as a representation of what George Washington was supposed to be put under cover and taken away from observation.

Mr. MANN. That was due to my activity; the Fine Arts Commission had nothing to do with it.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. A fine instance of the efficiency of the gentleman from Illinois!

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; the Fine Arts Commission organized by the gentleman from Illinois; but George Washington was represented as a half-naked Roman gladiator or warrior, and put out here for the delectation of the people, and even my plebeian taste rebelled at that awful sight, and I was glad to have it put under cover, where it would not continually be obtruding on the public.

Mr. BENNET. I agree with my colleague.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, one would not expect that a gentleman of the handsome appearance and noble mien and the fine stature of my friend from Georgia would be opposed to the fine arts. He himself is a specimen of fine art, and I regret that his old feeling, because of the kind of marble selected for the Lincoln Memorial, perhaps unconsciously, still lingers in his mind and gives him a bitterness toward the Fine Arts Commission. I am sure if the gentleman from Georgia will walk a few steps to the north of this Chamber and gaze upon the beautiful statuary presented to the United States by the great States of this Union he will then be certain that any art commission is unnecessary, certainly unnecessary for that Chamber, because no one would recognize any art there if he was on a fine-arts commission.

The gentleman further referred to the location of the Lincoln Memorial, and that is the only reason I took the floor. Mr. Chairman, here is the Capitol of the United States, the greatest Capitol building in the world. Right west of it, in a direct line, stands that lofty monument to the Father of his Country, which everyone who ever reaches Washington looks at with a feeling of love and affection for George Washington. Just beyond that to the west, in a line, stands the Lincoln Memorial; and a little beyond, across the river on a direct line with these three things, stands the resting place of America's heroic dead. Where else could better be located a place for the Lincoln Memorial than in the great park of Washington, in line with the Capitol, with the cemetery at Arlington and with the Washington Monument? I am sure that the gentleman from Georgia, when he reflects, will think, if it is due to the Fine Arts Commission that the Lincoln Memorial is over there, that we owe a debt to the Fine Arts Commission that it will take a good many mistakes of theirs to offset. [Applause.]

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriation of $5,000 made in the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, for unveiling and dedicating the memorial to Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including erecting and taking down viewing stands and putting the grounds in sightly condition, is made available for said purposes during the fiscal year 1918.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, just to ask the gentleman from Kentucky or the chairman of the commitee if there is any recent information as to when the Grant Memorial is likely to be completed?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the sculptor who has this work has been suffering from illness and has found that the task he has undertaken was much greater than he anticipated. Col. Harts stated that he had been informed by competent persons that the model of a single horse in some of those groups required a year to complete. The information he has is that the representation of Gen. Grant will be even finer than the groups and that it will be at least an additional year before he completes it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. When did we begin the construction and erection of this monument?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It has been about 12 years.

Mr. AUSTIN. Has the committee any definite information as to whether the work is progressing, and whether any definite time can be named for its completion?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Col. Harts said that the information he had from competent people was that the modeling of one of the horses in those groups might easily take a year, and there are 14 horses in those groups.

Mr. AUSTIN. Can they not model or make more than one horse in 12 months, and does it take 10 years to make a group of horses for a monument?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. A group of horses such as is to be found in those two groups can not be found elsewhere in the United States. Those are two of the finest groups that have been produced. Of course we can get a group of horses produced by sculptors in six months, but they would not remain up long after they were placed there.

Mr. AUSTIN. Was not the same statement made in reference to this matter some six months ago when this bill was before the House, or last year, namely, that the sculptor was sick and unable to prosecute the work?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is true. He has been sick. The Committee on Appropriations could not help that, and the man himself could not help it.

Mr. AUSTIN. He was sick last year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He has been sick for a number of years. He has been in ill health, so much that it makes it impossible for him to concentrate all of his energies upon the work.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then this whole proposition depends upon his rocovery as to whether it will be successfully prosecuted?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; a full-sized model of the equestrian statue of Gen. Grant has been completed. There is some little work yet to be done, and then the casting will take place. We might better wait a few years to complete it and then have something that will excite the admiration of mankind and be a credit to the American people than to have something that 50 years from now the people will rise up in indignation against and insist that it be taken away.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the gentleman from New York expect to live to see this monument completed?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes; oh, yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then the gentleman is more hopeful and expects to live longer than I thought he would.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am pretty optimistic, and there is another reason why I expect to do so. I have the utmost confidence in the sculptor's getting well. He happens to live in the garden spot of the universe, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. AUSTIN. Would it help this matter along if the committee were to send the sculptor to a sanitarium and get him well, in order that he may complete the monument within the living generation?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, I do not think the gentleman desires to indulge in remarks of that character. This man is a very eminent sculptor. It is true that for a number of years he has been so unfortunate as to be in ill health. In spite of his condition, however, he has worked laboriously upon this monument. When he started it neither he nor anyone connected with it appreciated what a tremendous task it would be. This is not a case where a man can go out and hire half a dozen mechanics to chop these horses out of a block of stone. He has to work up every little line, every little curve, every little detail with the utmost care. If some one else had taken that care out in this Rotunda, we would not have there paintings of people with six toes and three hands for the admiration and delight of the American public. These horses will have only four legs apiece.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is some comfort.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman know that the six-toed fellow that he speaks of was actually a six-toed man?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I do not.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. And that his portrait is true to life?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I was not acquainted with him. I never counted his toes; but if he was actually a six-toed Indian, there should have been some note upon the picture so that people would know that it was done by design.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, we have completed monuments or statues, two or three in Lafayette Square, one in Franklin Square, and we will complete and have the Lincoln Monument, commenced a year or two ago, before this Grant Monument is completed, and I venture the assertion that we will be passing on this same item 12 months from now and get a third sick report with reference to this sculptor.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me suggest to the gentleman that he offer an amendment making it unlawful for the sculptor to be sick during the next six months.

Mr. AUSTIN. That it absolutely depends upon the recovery of the present contractor? We will all pray for him.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, a great poet has said that art is long and time is fleeting. I think the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] imagines that statement to be well illustrated by the progress we have not made in connection with the Grant Memorial. Let me say this to the gentleman: It is infinitely more important to all of us, and to the country, now and in the future, that the monument to be erected here at the foot of the Capitol to the great captain of the Civil War shall, when completed, be one we can all take a pride in than that it shall be completed within this year or next year. He and I would like to live and be in Congress when this monument to Grant shall be completed; but it is infinitely more important that we shall have a splendid memorial to Grant when completed than that he or I shall be here when the final dedication takes place.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me ask this question—if this design was not adopted 10 years ago?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. What does time have to do with improving it?

Mr. MONDELL. Twelve years ago; but neither the gentleman from Tennessee nor I are sculptors. He is an artist along certain lines, as fine as lives, but he is not a sculptor; and splendid as are his abilities, he would be the last man that I should want to employ to erect an equestrian statue even to a man he admires so much as he does Gen. Grant.

Now, this is the fact. We have all regretted the delay in the completion of this monument. I certainly do. I hope to live to see the day—and I hope I am in Congress—when it is completed.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman will be a very, very old man.

Mr. MONDELL. But it is true that so far as it has gone it is one of the finest things of the kind that was ever executed. Has the gentleman from Tennessee given himself the pleasure of viewing those two groups now standing as the completed portions of this monument? Has he noted that artillery group? Has he noted the cavalry group?

Mr. AUSTIN. I think that all will be rusted and gone before Grant's figure is put up.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, no, no. They will stand as among the finest things of their sort many, many years after the gentleman from Tennessee and myself are forgotten.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. It is regrettable that the artist, the man who has proved himself so splended an artist in designing this work, in carrying it on so far has been ill and has been unable to carry it on as rapidly as he should, but the work, so far as it has progressed, is, in my opinion, very fine.

The Clerk read as follows:

Survey of northern and northwestern lakes: For survey of northern and northwestern lakes, Lake of the Woods, and other boundary and connecting waters between said lake and Lake Superior, Lake Champlain, and the natural navigable waters embraced in the navigation system of the New York canals, including all necessary expenses for preparing, correcting, extending, printing, binding, and issuing charts and bulletins, and of investigating lake levels with a view to their regulation, $125,000.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question. The last clause of the paragraph says:

And of investigating lake levels with a view to their regulation.

I suppose that means "for investigating" the lake levels, etc., which declares a purpose; but in the first part of the paragraph no purpose is declared. What is the purpose of that work which is described in the first part of the paragraph?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The purpose is to chart the lakes in the interest of navigation, and the surveys are also made to study the fall of the lake levels so that the information is available in connection with any recommendation that may be made toward improvements or for permitting the withdrawal of waters. We have a twofold purpose. One is the acquisition of information as to the depth and the charting of lakes for the purpose of navigation, and the other is to make and continue the study of lake levels so as to ascertain whether the lake level is being diminished, is lowering, or remaining stationary.

Mr. HAWLEY. No part of the work is for the determination of boundary lines between the United States and Canada?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; this has nothing to do with that question.

Mr. HAWLEY. While we have this matter up I would like to ask a question about another matter connected with this. We have for many years appropriated money for determining the boundary between the United States and Canada. What proportion of this boundary has been determined and marked by permanent monuments?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That commission is provided in the diplomatic bill, and I am not familiar with what the commission has done.

The Clerk read as follows:

California Débris Commission: For defraying the expenses of the commission in carrying on the work authorized by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, $15,000.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to call the attention of the chairman to this item. Why is the additional amount of $3,000 recommended not allowed in reference to the California Débris Commission, page 437 of the hearings?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was a point of order made against this item?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; does the gentleman want to make it?

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order was not made against the item.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not subject to the point of order, and it is just as well it was not. Mr. Chairman, answering the gentleman from California, the committee believed the amount of money that they had was sufficient for the work they would be called upon to do.

Mr. RAKER. Might I suggest to the gentleman the department desired $3,000 more——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. And may I call his attention to the fact that under section 5 of the act there has been practically no work done up to the present time?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Section 5 of what act?

Mr. RAKER. Of the act referred to in the bill, public act 101, approved March 1, 1893. There are two provisions, section 4 and section 5. The principal part has been done under section 4. Now, under section 5—the commission has not had the money to really carry out the provisions of section 5 of that act, and there is much need——

Mr. FITZGERALD. They did not say that, though.

Mr. RAKER. They asked for $3,000 more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know they asked for $3,000, but they did not give sufficient reason for it.

Mr. RAKER. They ought to have about $200,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know; if the gentleman had his way they would get $200,000,000, but we can not travel that rapidly.

Mr. RAKER. Further, I want to call attention to this fact: Does this simply provide for the expenses of the commissioners? Can they use any of that money in doing the work?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They do not do the work; it is merely a consulting and inspection office. This commission under the law passes upon all plans for the improvement in a river or for hydraulic mining up the river, and when anyone proposes to build any works the plans are prepared and sent to this commission, where they are examined and approved or disapproved.

Mr. RAKER. I would like to read to the gentleman from the fifth section of this act:

That it shall further examine, survey, and determine the utility and practicability, for the purposes hereinafter indicated, of storage sites in the tributaries of said rivers and in the respective branches of said tributaries, or in the plains, basins, sloughs, and tule and swamp lands adjacent to or along the course of said rivers, for the storage of débris or water or as settling reservoirs, with the object of using the same by either or all of these methods to aid in the improvement and protection of said navigable rivers by preventing deposits therein of débris resulting from mining operations, natural erosion, or other causes or for affording relief thereto in flood time and providing sufficient water to maintain scouring force therein in the summer season, and in connection therewith to investigate such hydraulic and other mines as are now or may have been worked by methods intended to restrain the débris and material moved in operating such mines by impounding dams——

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is the work they were doing all the time.

Mr. RAKER. And it says—

settling reservoirs, or otherwise, and in general to make such study of and researches in the hydraulic mining industry as science, experience, and engineering skill may suggest as practicable and useful——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAKER. It says, further:

And useful in devising a method or methods whereby such mining may be carried on as aforesaid.

Now, the work has been most exclusively under section 4, and the efficiency of the commission for the purposes of these acts would be materially enhanced in the general development, both in the valleys and the streams and in the mountains, if this $3,000 could be added to extend the work during the coming year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not needed, and the commission has not only made most of the investigations to which the gentleman refers, but it has made a report, and upon that report, if I recall correctly, the gentleman succeeded in having an appropriation of $5,000,000 included in the flood-control bill.

Mr. RAKER. That is the first appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is the first one, and that was based upon the completed report of this débris commission.

Mr. RAKER. Surely.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And instead of not having done anything called for in section 5 of the act, they have done practically everything called for in the way of independent investigations, and they simply said after that if they had $3,000 more they could do their work a little more efficiently. But the committee does not desire such indefinite information.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman's statement applies particularly to section 4.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It applies to section 5.

Mr. RAKER. It relates to the navigability of the streams, and they have done wonderful work.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I know what I am talking about. He only imagines he knows what I am talking about.

Mr. RAKER. You are looking at one end and I am looking at another.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not. The commission has been working in connection with the construction and inspection of work pertaining to mining industries, and operations in connection with flood-control projects in the Sacramento River, and they have submitted a report on that.

Mr. RAKER. Surely.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And that is finished and they do not need the money. That is why they did not get it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor of New York: For prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City:

For pay of inspectors, deputy inspectors, and office force, and expenses of office, $10,260;

For pay of crews and maintenance of patrol fleet, six steam tugs and one launch, $75,000;

For purchase and installation of a new dynamo, electrical fittings, new deck, and new boiler on patrol vessel *Lamont*, $11,500;

In all, $96,760.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. At this point of the bill last year there was an item for topographic maps for the use of the War Department. I find that there is no such item in the bill this year. In the Army bill the other day the committee attempted to carry an item for $200,000 for the purpose of assisting in the preparation of war maps, using the Geological Survey maps, Coast and Geodetic Survey maps, and so forth, as a basis for the war maps. What, may I ask, is the reason that there is nothing of that kind carried in the present bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Last year it appeared that the War Department had requested that certain maps be made and that it would require a certain sum of money to make those special maps. That item was carried in the bill. The committee last year and this year incorporated in the bill in connection with the appropriation of $350,000 for the Geological Survey for topographic maps a provision to the effect that in expending this sum preference should be given special topographic surveys for areas selected by the War Department and in securing such extra topographic data as requested by the War Department of these or other areas. I think the Committee on Military Affairs was extra generous in their recommendation. The War Department asked for $200,000 to be used, not by the War Department, but by the Geological Survey and the Coast and Geodetic Survey. It was said it was to be in cooperation with them, but the work would have been done by the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Geological Survey.

Mr. TILSON. Undoubtedly the basic work.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We have provided $350,000 for topographic maps, and we require that the work of the War Department be given preference in the expenditure of that money.

Mr. TILSON. The $200,000 asked for by the Army Engineer Office was not alone for the kind of work that the Geological Survey could do, but to place upon these maps additional information—military information.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But they wanted a lot of money to put that information on the maps. Two hundred thousand dollars for putting on their data is very large.

Mr. TILSON. There was no intention to take away any part of the jurisdiction of this committee. We shall be very glad to have this committee make as large an appropriation as possible for the Geological Survey, especially when it is required that they shall give preference to areas selected by the War Department for their work. In addition to that, however, it is necessary for military purposes to place upon these maps certain military information, and that was the desire of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This provision requires that data to be placed on them.

Mr. TILSON. That is only the topographic data; but there is other data not topographic at all and not found on the Geological Survey maps.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is the same data. They show tall buildings and towers and chimneys and bridges, and other prominent landmarks, to be placed on those maps, and it is done by the topographic survey in making the maps. The military authorities have just mystified the gentleman in this matter.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman is not mystified. The gentleman has found occasion for the use of these maps.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman thought the War Department wanted to put something on the maps that the Geological Survey did not put on——

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman is not mystified in any sense of the word. It has been the gentleman's duty to use these maps containing the additional information added by the Engineers of the Army. When this information is placed on the maps that were originally made by the Geological Survey they are marked "Confidential" and treated as confidential.

Mr. BORLAND. What they want placed on these maps is what they call "cultures"—houses, buildings, railroad crossings, embankments, and so on. Now, the Government is engaged in training student officers, and as part of this training they send them out to make a survey of a topographical section. They have done that in the neighborhood of Leavenworth a number of times, until some of them have gotten into the habit of copying from the others. Why can not the Government make these "cultures" from the surveys they already have?

Mr. TILSON. They are doing it in a small way, but they need more of it to be done, and with this purpose in view they

asked for an appropriation on the Army bill. The gentleman has hit the bull's-eye with his suggestion.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman provided for it in his bill.

Mr. TILSON. No; we tried to carry an item in the Army bill, but a member of the Committee on Appropriations objected to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Artificial limbs: For furnishing artificial limbs and apparatus, or commutation therefor, and necessary transportation, $210,000.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how frequently are these artificial limbs furnished?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Every three years the applicant gets either a limb or the money.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. How extensive is that? Is it given to every soldier who loses an arm or a limb in the service?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. The law fixes the rate which he receives; so much for an arm, so much for an eye, so much for a leg, so much for two arms or two legs, and the soldier either draws the money or the appliance. As a rule the appliance lasts longer than the statutory period, and most of them draw the money.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And that is done every three years?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; $75 is given for a leg, and $50 for an arm.

Mr. HAMILL. He would have to have an honorable discharge in order to get that?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; he must have an honorable discharge.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Garfield Memorial Hospital: For maintenance, to enable it to provide medical and surgical treatment to persons unable to pay therefor, under a contract to be made with the Board of Charities of the District of Columbia, $19,000, one half of which sum shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia and the other half from the Treasury of the United States.

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, before the passage of the rivers and harbors bill and before the passage of the public buildings bill it was generally stated that these bills would not become laws and that Congress was wasting its time in considering said bills. I rather should have said the House was wasting its time. I desire simply to call the attention of the Members to the fact, which they know, recently a bill was passed appropriating approximately $350,000,000, which said amount was raised by the Senate over $100,000,000 for a naval propaganda. In that bill there was no time limit for the completion of vessels; in other words, a vessel could be completed in 5 years or 10 years. Recently, I saw a statement showing that in the case of a coast submarine—not a superdreadnaught, but one of the smaller vessels—the contractor had been working on said vessel for about 4 years and still only 88 and some tenths per cent of the vessel had been completed.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that out of the entire amount appropriated for public buildings only about $6,000,000 goes to the rural districts of this country. It has been stated that this amount was largely "graft" and "pork," but those who tried to affix "pork barrel" and "graft" to these measures failed miserably to prove their case.

I also want to say to the Members of this House now that I am being flooded with telegrams urging me to assist in the passage of these bills. As the Members know, it is impossible for me to do anything, these bills now being in the Senate; but I desire to state, to my mind, it is a fearful indictment of Congress when all internal improvements must stop, with the United States at peace with the world, simply in order that we may contract or agree to contract for vessels to be built—just when, we do not know. I do know, however, they can not be completed in the next 6, 8, or 10 years.

Last night I read in one of the Washington papers that perhaps a proposition would be made to Congress providing for five vessels costing $50,000,000 each.

In the Washington papers, Mr. Chairman, I have read several articles condemning "pork-barrel statesmen." I am glad I do not qualify under that classification, as my items are meritorious. I do not object to newspaper criticism, but I think it is unfair to criticise Congress and in the same issue, or the next issue, ask Congress to do for their own locality what they so strongly condemned for other localities. I have voted for practically every appropriation for the District of Columbia, because I realize that this, the Capital of the country, should be the beauty spot of the United States. I do not believe the people object to reasonable and necessary appropriations for the Capital. In order that we may not forget, I desire to call your attention to a few of the appropriations for the purpose of improving the Capital which have been passed since I have been in Congress. Last year the House made an appropriation of $2,000,000 to build a bridge over the Potomac River, and now they are asking for $1,000,000 to build another bridge at or near Georgetown. We also made an additional appropriation for the purpose of completing the Lincoln Memorial. We have now paid for the "Capitol Park," I understand, about $6,000,000, and we are being urged to provide for other parks. It is remarkably strange to my mind that nothing is said about "pork" when these millions are spent in the city of Washington.

I desire now to again state I shall support all meritorious appropriations for public buildings and rivers and harbors throughout the country, and in so doing I shall feel I am not a "pork-barrel statesman," but rather that I am giving to the people who pay the taxes not only something they are entitled to but something they really need.

I sincerely trust both of the bills which I have referred to, and which passed the House by so large a majority, will become laws.

There are only three things, Mr. Chairman, that are certain—one is death; another is taxation; and the other, I regret to say, is the retirement from time to time of Members of Congress. I trust none of us will be in the latter class, but I fear unless we lose sight of the war scare that is being forced upon us and stop appropriating millions of dollars for fighting vessels, without putting a limit upon the time for the completion of same, and unless we keep up necessary internal improvements, there will be more retirements in the future than there have been in the past.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Northwestern Branch, Milwaukee, Wis.: For current expenses, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, $45,000;

For subsistence, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, $140,000;

For household, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, $58,000;

For hospital, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, $44,000;

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS. I also ask unanimous consent that the article which I send to the desk be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks to extend his remarks as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For transportation of members of the home, $600;

For repairs, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, $30,000;

For farm, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, $8,000;

In all, $325,600.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, from the hearings covering the appropriations for this Northwestern Branch of the Soldiers' Home it is evident that the board of managers think that the Northwestern Branch is no longer necessary to be utilized. They say that the buildings are old and dilapidated; that there is no real need for the further maintenance of the institution; and it occurs to me that it would be well if the Committee on Appropriations had exercised a little economy and followed the recommendations of the board, and cut out what appears to be a useless public institution. The figures given by the board of managers show that away back in 1895, when there were 7 homes, they were taking care of 16,000 men in 7 homes. Now, with 10 homes, they have only 16,000 men, and I was hoping that the committee would follow out the policy of economy recommended by the board and abandon that apparently decayed and useless branch of the soldiers' home. Therefore I offer this amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ANTHONY: Page 86, line 10, strike out lines 10 to 24, inclusive.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order on the amendment that it is not in order. In the first place, we are considering this bill by paragraphs. The gentleman's amendment is to strike out paragraphs that have been read and passed by the Clerk, paragraphs to which no objection whatever was made. The Chair knows that the gentleman can not offer an amendment to strike out paragraphs that have been read and passed and to which no objection was made at the time they were read.

Mr. ANTHONY. The Chair will note that the lines from 10 to 24 should and do constitute one paragraph. They all relate to the one home. The different items are separated by semicolons. If I remember correctly, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] argued the other day exactly the converse of his present point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman's memory is in error not only on the point he makes, but on the merits of the proposition.

Mr. ANTHONY. It shows how dexterous the gentleman is in taking both sides of the same question.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is entirely mistaken in his recollection. The other day, when the military appropriation bill was under consideration, I called the attention of the Chair to the fact that it should be considered by paragraphs as it was printed. The gentleman from Kansas, of course, is here on occasions. If he were here all the time he would be better acquainted with the rules of the House. If he has given the slightest consideration to the rule, he knows that he has waived his rights, whether purposely or not, by allowing these paragraphs to be read and passed. If he did it purposely, I am thankful to him, but in any event he has waived his rights by failing to offer a motion to strike out each paragraph as it was read, and he is now moving to strike out paragraphs which have been passed.

Mr. ANTHONY. I would rather leave the point of order to the judgment of the Chair than to the judgment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. The last line read was line 24. Under the rules of the House this bill is considered by paragraphs, and a paragraph is a well-known arrangement and division of words. Merely because all these paragraphs refer to the Northwestern Branch, the gentleman can not move to strike them out. He might just as well insist that because they all refer to national homes he could move to strike out all the items relating to national homes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without looking up the precedents the Chair is under the impression that the point of order is well taken. Each of these subdivisions is a paragraph. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ANTHONY. I offer another amendment, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. ANTHONY. On page 86, I move to strike out the paragraph contained in line 24.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it is entirely immaterial whether the paragraph is stricken out or not. It merely states the total of the items for the home. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], however, has referred to a recommendation which was made by the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers. They have recommended that the Northwestern Branch be abolished. The reason assigned was that the buildings of that home were in such a dilapidated condition that the cost of maintaining them in proper repair would be excessive, and that as there probably would be sufficient accommodations in the other homes it was advisable to abolish this home. They also proposed that Congress, in its generosity, in order to appease public sentiment in the city of Milwaukee, should donate to the city of Milwaukee the property of this home, which is valued at about $1,000,000. The board thought that if Congress gave to the city of Milwaukee this property, which is admirably suited for park purposes, the people might acquiesce with more or less grace in the abolition of the home. Some years ago the board informally very strongly recommended the abolition of the Eastern Branch, located at Togus, Me. It is pretty difficult to understand why anyone who was sympathetic with the old soldiers should ever have located a branch at the particular place where the Eastern Branch is located. But opposition developed to the attempt to abolish that home. So that Congress might be informed and act in a manner that would secure the very best possible results, the committee have included in the bill, on page 92, this provision:

The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to report to Congress, not later than January 1, 1918, what branch or branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, if any, can be discontinued without prejudice to the care of the persons entitled to admission to the home.

Under the law the Inspector General of the Army is required to inspect all the homes. The War Department has considerable information about them, and in the course of making inspections required by law the committee believed that information could be obtained by a report from the War Department, presumably disinterested and not biased in favor of any branch, and that Congress at the next session would be able to take up the question.

Mr. ANTHONY. And the next sundry civil bill will contain the result of the board's report?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The committee expects that if the War Department should recommend in the interest of economy that a certain home or homes be abolished, then it will be prepared to make the recommendation. It was believed that it was fair to adopt this policy because of the peculiar local interests involved in maintaining the homes—that it was fair to have an investigation by and report from some other body than the board of managers. Until recent years Wisconsin always had a member on the board of managers. For the last few years it has not had one, and the fact that the State was not represented, it is claimed, made it easy for the board to recommend the abolishment of that particular branch. The committee, not desiring to do an injustice or to make an error, decided that it would direct the War Department, in the belief that it was impartial, to make a complete investigation and submit its report to Congress.

Mr. ANTHONY. And so the committee had good reason for continuing the home for another year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; and even if it were determined to abolish the home, it would take six or eight months to enable the transfer and readjustment to be made.

Mr. ANTHONY. In addition to those reasons, the gentleman to my right advances another one why the home at Milwaukee should be maintained, and that is it is the only home left at which a veteran can get a drink of beer. [Laughter.] There is no question but that this is the most popular home.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the statement of the gentleman from Kansas is correct, I am surprised that there is ever any room in it at all. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas. The board of managers after very careful consideration told us that we could save $200,000 annually by dispensing with one of the soldiers' homes, and they suggested that the home that could be best dispensed with, owing to the state of nonrepair, was the home at Milwaukee. The committee, after considering the matter carefully, concluded that we ought to have other officials besides the board of managers pass on this matter. So by a provision in another paragraph in the bill the matter was put up to the War Department for a report.

Now, we can not say what the report of the War Department may be. They may report in favor of the discontinuance of the Maine home. They may report in favor of the discontinuance of the Leavenworth home; they might even report in favor of abandoning the Danville home. Whatever home they advise us to abandon should, I presume gentlemen believe, be abandoned without any further ado about it. I take it for granted that every Member of the House will favor the recommendation made in the report we now call for. I feel confident that if for the second time the soldiers' home at Milwaukee should be recommended for abandonment the gentleman representing that immediate vicinity, and a member of the Committee on Appropriations, will, with Spartan fortitude, stand for the carrying out of the recommendations of the War Department. I feel confident that he will, for he has been a very Spartan in his advocacy of economies in connection with other Government expenditures.

We have had a proposition before the country for some time for the abolition of certain mints and assay offices in the far West in connection with which it was claimed by certain officials that we could save not $200,000 but a paltry insignificant sum of $5,000 or $6,000 or $7,000. Of course, it was not plain, as in the case of this item it is plain, that you can take just as good care of every veteran and still save $200,000, but it was claimed that while there would be some loss to the public service, some people would be seriously inconvenienced, still we would save a little money.

The gentleman from Milwaukee, the true economist that he is, voted valiantly and firmly and persistently for economy in the abandonment of the assay offices and mints in the Western States in order that we might save a few dollars to the Public Treasury. Of course, the House did not agree with him. The House did at one time, in a moment of aberration, but later the matter was reconsidered and the mint and assay offices still continue to do helpful and useful work.

When I think of the gentleman's attitude of disinterestedness in insisting upon strict economy in the abolition of the western mints and assay offices, I feel confident that if this matter of saving comes a little nearer home for the second time he will acquiesce and join cheerfully in the abolition of the home at Milwaukee, although it is very dear to his heart and very near to his district. [Laughter.]

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman from New York said that the local interests were consulted about having made the determination which the gentleman has recited.

Permit me to ask, if this Northwestern Soldiers' Home should be discontinued and removed from Milwaukee, would there be any other interest left in that village?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, I think there would be much left in Milwaukee after the soldiers' home was taken away. Personally, I do not believe in the abolition or abandonment of any of these soldiers' homes, but if for the second time Milwaukee shall be chosen as the home to be abandoned, I shall reluctantly join with my friend from Wisconsin to have this done in the interest of economy.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is the soldiers' home what made Milwaukee famous?

Mr. MONDELL. I have not so heard.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to all these three gentlemen——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that all debate has been exhausted upon this amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Who seek to destroy the good name of Milwaukee and the Northwestern Branch Home.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that 15 minutes have already been consumed on this.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is nothing in the consideration of this bill, Mr. Chairman. We have consumed three and four hours heretofore on single amendments in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. In the absence of any point of order the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I can understand the motive that is back of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY]. The very distinguished gentleman wishes the Milwaukee home abolished because he wishes by the abolishment of the Northwestern Branch to gain some of the old soldiers for the home in his State, which is the least popular of any of the homes in that western territory.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I hope the gentleman does not want to ascribe any ulterior motives to the motion that I made. The gentleman is a good parliamentarian, and he surely does not consider that parliamentary language.

Mr. STAFFORD. When the gentleman uses such wild language, even when applied by the very distinguished gentleman from Kansas, that the home at Milwaukee is decayed and dilapidated, he must be suffering some sort of aberration of mind that is unusual even to him. I do not want to indulge in any psychological study as to the reason why the gentleman from Kansas——.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. STAFFORD. Why he should go to the extent of characterizing that home with such language as that, without any foundation, demands explanation. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANTHONY. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the hearings in which the statement was made by the president of the board of managers that the buildings at Milwaukee are so decayed and rotten and dilapidated——

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I challenge that statement of the gentleman. The fact is that the gentleman never saw these hearings until about five minutes before he spoke, and I challenge the gentleman to show where such language occurs in the hearings. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. ANTHONY. The president stated that he had a sample of the wood from the building——

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, the gentleman is evading the question.

Mr. ANTHONY. Was the gentleman not there the other day?

Mr. STAFFORD. I was at the hearing and I heard all of the testimony.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman shows astounding ignorance, then, if he does not know what is in the hearings.

Mr. STAFFORD. I challenge the gentleman that he can not find any such language. What are the facts? I yielded to the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman failed to bring in the testimony.

Mr. ANTHONY. If the gentleman will give me a few minutes, I will give it to him.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will give it to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has not so far. The gentleman has indulged only in persiflage of a very poor order. What are the facts? It is true that there is a Northwestern Branch located at Milwaukee. The testimony shows that the power plant, together with the steam pipes connecting that power plant, are in need of repair. It is also true that it is an old home, the oldest home of these branch homes for the care of disabled volunteer soldiers. The women of Milwaukee away back in 1868 organized for the purpose of obtaining funds wherewith to present to the Government more than 300 acres of land as the site to be used as a Home for the old veterans who would have occasion as the years would come to find a proper abiding place in the latter days of their lives. It is the parent home of all these branch homes. Naturally the people of Milwaukee are interested from a loyal sentiment begotten of all these years to have the home retained. No industry of Milwaukee nor is the welfare of Milwaukee dependent upon the retention of that home. As the hearings show, the board of managers were so biased in their recommendation that they admitted that there were other branch homes more worthy of discontinuance than even the Milwaukee home, if it can be said that it is in such a condition as to warrant discontinuance.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it was called to the attention of the committee that the home located at Togus, Me., was as old, that the buildings were as much in need of repair as those at Milwaukee, and that the cost per capita for maintenance was greater at Togus, Me., than at Milwaukee. There is no disguising the fact that the number of inmates of these soldiers' homes is becoming less and less, and the board of managers realized that sooner or later some of these homes must be discontinued. But, Mr. Chairman, they singled out, perhaps by inadvertence, perhaps by accident, that home that did not contain any representative on the board of managers. As stated by the chairman of the committee, Wisconsin did have until a few years ago a representative on the board, and the hearings show further that in the recommended expenditure of money of the Government for the care of homes at the home located in Tennessee two barracks have been constructed that have never been open because there were not enough inmates ever to fill them. It just shows the way a particular home may be established through political influence, or the like, when there is no necessity whatever for them. The Appropriations Committee thought it was wise and proper to have an impartial investigation of these various branches of the home by the War Department. I shall not stop at this time to answer the gentleman from Wyoming as to what action will be taken upon the report of the War Department.

If the report of the War Department is as biased as the report of the board of managers is upon their own admission, naturally I will oppose it, but everyone knows who knows anything about the location of these homes that the Milwaukee home is located in a district by itself. Yet there is the home at Danville, comparatively recently located on the prairies around Danville, the home city represented by the distinguished former Speaker of this House. There is the Marion home in Indiana, only 100 miles away from the Dayton home. There is the Dayton home in Ohio, only 100 miles from the Marion home, and yet the Milwaukee home is furnishing accommodations to the old soldiers of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and northern Illinois, more than 200 miles removed from any other home, and where the cost per capita is less to maintain than in some of these homes that have a larger number of inmates. Well might the committee have taken exception to the recommendations of the board of managers when they singled out the Milwaukee

home when the president of the board admitted in the testimony that the Togus, Me., home was more worthy of discontinuance than any other home, and yet he said it was not recommended for discontinuance for political reasons. What were those political reasons? Just because the board of managers happened to have a representative on the board of managers, and they feared the opposition of certain Members in another legislative body. But the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] is very well entrenched. We stayed here one night fighting for the Representative from Kansas until midnight, and I stood loyally by him, and now he tries, for some covert purpose, without any warrant whatever to support him, to discontinue the Milwaukee home so he can gain some little advantage by having a few more old soldiers go out in the wilds of Kansas and the arid districts of Kansas [applause] and remove, against their wills, the old soldiers at Milwaukee. [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to be recognized to comply with the request made by the gentleman from Wisconsin that I quote from the hearings the ground for my assertion as to the condition of the buildings at the Northwestern Branch. I had no desire to misrepresent conditions there, and I refer him to page 517 of the hearings of his own committee in which Gen. Wood said:

Our power plant at Milwaukee is old and really almost obsolete, and the underground system is in very poor condition. Last year the chief engineer talked of taking the entire underground system up and replacing it, which would be a very serious expense.

On page 516 Gen. Wood said, in reply to a question by Mr. FITZGERALD, in regard to the Northwestern Branch:

Yes, sir; it is in the poorest physical condition. The buildings there are about the oldest buildings of any of our homes.

Also, on page 515 of the hearings, before the committee Gen. Wood further said:

The Northwestern Branch at Milwaukee, Wis., where the buildings are all so old and where we have a power plant which is in very bad condition, etc.

These are extracts as to the condition of the buildings, and my advocacy of the abandonment of that home is simply due to the reason that the Government stands to save about $300,000 a year by so doing. The board of managers state they can maintain every one of the soldiers there at other homes. It is simply a question whether the Government wants to effect a saving of a third of a million dollars each year. That is the only question which is up to the committee.

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

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, let us have the amendment again reported.

The amendment was again reported.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the ayes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. FITZGERALD) there were—ayes 3, noes 26.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, $3,894,900.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether the committee granted all the estimates of the board of managers for these various branches of the home, as requested in the Book of Estimates?

Mr. FITZGERALD. We gave the amounts they requested.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. True the chairman of the committee just said, in answer to an inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin, that in the main we allowed the estimates in connection with the branches of the soldiers' home, but it is also true that we did that with the understanding that there would be deficiencies in practically all of these items. In other words——

Mr. CANNON. That is owing to the increased cost.

Mr. MONDELL. We were informed that the increased cost of coal, clothing, food, and supplies of one sort and another was such that the estimates made last October would not, if present prices continue, carry the homes through the entire fiscal year.

Mr. STAFFORD. I believe the board of managers have presented efficiency estimates to carry on their respective activities during the remainder of the present fiscal year by reason of the same condition.

Mr. MONDELL. Deficiency estimates on a considerable number of these items, and still a greater number of deficiency items, will be presented in the next Congress in connection with these items, but the committee believed it was better to give the estimates as presented, with the expectation that there would be deficiencies, than to attempt to estimate now what the total cost might be.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For reconstruction of the walls, sidewalks, tunnel, and portions of the roadways on the east side of the Capitol Grounds, including each and every item connected therewith, $30,287.50, to be available immediately.

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

I rise for information. Is this item of $30,000 providing for the reconstruction of the walls, sidewalks, and tunnel in connection with putting in repair the street in front of the Library of Congress and over the tunnel of the Washington Terminal Co.?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Sections of the roadway in the Capitol Grounds between the Capitol Building and the Library have settled. The District of Columbia is doing some work, and it is necessary because the settling has taken place to do some work in the tunnel connecting the two office buildings and do some work on the surface in the Capitol Grounds. There is some question as to whether the railroad is not liable for this sum, and the committee instructed the Superintendent of the Capitol to transmit all the facts to the Attorney General, so that if legal proceedings should be taken the Attorney General would be apprised of the fact and in a position to proceed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course all of us are acquainted with the very bad condition of the street which faces the Library of Congress for these several years past.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is due to a very peculiar condition. The excavation of the tunnel through there was by tunneling rather than by the open cut. After the tunnel was completed in restoring the material it was not tamped in tight, and lumber was left in, and by degrees the filling material settled and the surface settled. The railroad company was required by law to restore the street to its original condition. That was done. Now this further settling has taken place.

The District officials are preparing to institute proceedings to compel the railroad to pay the additional cost required to put the street in condition again. Over that portion that has settled on the Capitol Grounds the District Commissioners have no control. And in addition, our tunnel has settled considerably and is out of alignment and needs certain repairs. So that our rights, or the rights of the Government, may be protected, in so far as the work is done, as I have already stated, the committee directed the Superintendent of the Capitol to transmit a communication to the House commission, I believe——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that it may be extended five minutes.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. For the purpose of arranging to have the Attorney General fully apprised of the situation, and to take whatever steps were necessary to protect the United States.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would this appropriation cover not only the expense of putting the Capitol Grounds in repair, but also the damage that has been done by the decay of these timbers that the terminal company allowed to remain above the tunnel works in front of the House Office Building?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not in front of the House Office Building. It is the portion of the Capitol Grounds facing the Library Building.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is also some damage, by reason of the same causes, just to the northeast of the House Office Building.

Mr. TILSON. It is all the way down First Street, between B Street and C Street SE.

Mr. STAFFORD. This matter has been up in the House before, and on one occasion I tried to obtain information as to whether anything was being done by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia toward compelling the terminal company to place that street in repair.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Superintendent of the Capitol stated that the District Commissioners were preparing to initiate proceedings to compel the company to make good the expense which would be incurred, and the District is preparing to do the portion of the work which comes under the District Commissioners. It is desired at the same time to carry on the work within the Capitol Grounds that is not under their jurisdiction, but under the control of the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds.

Mr. STAFFORD. This appropriation will not prevail for putting in condition the grounds immediately tributary to the House Office Building?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not intended for that purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman recognizes that there is as much need for putting the sidewalk and street in condition there as in that portion referred to in this paragraph?

Mr. FITZGERALD. My recollection is that it is not included in this particular item.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield? Has the gentleman been at the corner of B and First Streets SE., and observed the great caving-in there? The sidewalk must be depressed a foot or more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not observed it.

Mr. TILSON. And half the way down to C Street.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That would be under the control of the District Commissioners. That is a public highway.

Mr. STAFFORD. That immediately connects with the House Office Building. Some of the abutments have fallen down. There has been damage to the property of the United States.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not familiar with that situation.

Mr. TILSON. It is the northeast entrance there.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the gentleman, the District Commissioners are instituting proceedings against the Washington Terminal Co. in order to secure restitution for the expense occasioned by that state of affairs?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The committee directed the superintendent to put the facts before the House Office Commission, so that they could transmit them to the Attorney General.

Mr. STAFFORD. Certain work is being done on the thoroughfare at the present time. I think by the street railroad company.

Mr. FITZGERALD. By the District Commissioners.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are going ahead now and putting everything in first-class condition, so that it will be in the condition it was in before the terminal was built?

Mr. FITZGERALD. We hope all the settling has taken place. No one can tell unless they open the street down to the top of the tunnel and fill and tamp it.

Mr. STAFFORD. It seems rather strange that that condition should exist when as to the portion of the Plaza which was built in properly there was no settling whatever. That was under the control of the Engineer Commissioner, and we gave them a reasonable time to have that settled, and all the improvements and sidewalks that were built upon the portion filled in have not settled at all. I have no question but that there was actual negligence on the part of the Washington Terminal Co. and that they will be liable for the expense incident to restoring the surface to its original condition.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any doubt about the responsibility of the railway company for the subsidence of the sidewalk along the line of their tunnel. I think that is one of the most extraordinary pieces of bad construction that I have ever known of. Either the railroad company made a very bad selection of an engineer or the railroad company felt that as they were injuring nothing more than one of the main streets of the city of Washington between two of its noblest buildings it did not matter much what happened.

There is no difficulty in putting through a work of that kind without subsidence of the surface if the work is carefully and thoroughly done. All that it is necessary to do is to be careful not to drive the headings too fast and back-fill thoroughly and completely and compactly. The work can be carried on anywhere without disturbing the surface if done carefully. In this case the railroad company, for some reason or other, allowed their contractor, if he was a contractor, or their employees, if they were employees, to put that work through evidently without proper back-filling. Probably they must have left cavities down there on top of their work. It was an extraordinary thing to be done even from the standpoint of a railroad company, because the subsidence of surface on top of their arch was calculated to damage the tunnel.

For a number of years the people of this city have been compelled to use a street railroad track over two blocks that has been dangerous at all times. They have been compelled to hobble along over those broken sidewalks and put up with all kinds of inconvenience, and at the end of that time we are proposing that public money should be appropriated to pay to remedy the situation. I hope the District officials are proceeding against this railroad company. They ought to be proceeded against and ought to be compelled to pay not only the cost of restoring that situation over there, but ought to be compelled to pay a heavy fine for having created and maintained right here in front of the Capitol for years the worst and most dangerous sort of a public nuisance.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question. The gentleman, I think, is a member of the commission having charge of the House Office Building. If I am correctly informed, the tunnel turns to the west as it goes down First Street and approaches more nearly to the House Office Building?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It goes under one corner of it.

Mr. HAWLEY. There has been, as has been stated, a subsidence of the land there. Between the Capitol and the Public Library the land has also subsided back a distance of 30 feet. Has any investigation been made to ascertain if the House Office Building is endangered in any way?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I was not a member of the House Office Building Commission when the building was constructed, but I understand that on account of the construction of that tunnel plans were adopted to strengthen very materially the foundations to care for the situation produced.

Mr. HAWLEY. Has the engineer in charge of that plant been consulted to see if it is sound?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think a year ago we inquired of those particularly familiar with it, and inquired if there were danger to the building, and we were told that the settlement that had taken place was the result of the manner in which the work was done. The work was done by tunneling. After it was finished there was a space between the top of the tunnel and the surface, which had been supported by beams. Some of them were removed and some permitted to remain, and the material to fill was pushed in. If all the timbers had been removed and the material tamped in thoroughly there would have been no settlement. Evidently the work was done in a careless manner. Some of the timbers were left in, and the earth was not properly tamped down. The settlement ensued in consequence of that fact. In other places where the tunnel was made by open cut the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds stated that there was no evidence of settlement.

Mr. HAWLEY. Does the chairman of the committee say that the bottom of the foundation of the House Office Building goes down below the level of the tunnel?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No.

Mr. TILSON. It happens that some of us have our offices on the east side of the House Office Building. At the northeast entrance we see that the marble is cracking by reason of the subsidence, and naturally we feel apprehensive as to whether that same condition continues all the way down from B Street to C Street SE., especially where the tunnel turns west under the building itself, as it does at the southeast corner of the building.

Mr. ALLEN. I will say to the gentleman that I read a description in a book relative to the construction of the House Office Building, stating that there was special work done from a point about 50 feet outside of the House Office Building until it was carried to a point below the House Office Building in the construction of the tunnel, and the only settling that has taken place has been up B Street, which is entirely outside of the House Office Building proper, but does include the railing to the entrance of the House Office Building.

Mr. HAWLEY. Does the tunnel go through any part of the House foundation?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know that it goes under the foundation, but it goes under one corner of the building.

Mr. HAWLEY. Under part of the foundation?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes. The construction is heavy steelwork or railroad iron.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will yield, the right of way, as the gentleman will recall, for the tunnel was authorized after the plans and even after the foundation was made for the House Office Building.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The plans were modified and special precautions were taken for the safety of the building.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Depredations on public timber, protecting public lands and settlement of claims for swamp land and swamp-land indemnity: For protecting timber on the public lands, and for the more efficient execution of the law and rules relating to the cutting thereof; of protecting public lands from illegal and fraudulent entry or appropriation, and of adjusting claims for swamp lands, and indemnity for swamp lands, including not exceeding $15,000 for clerical services in bringing up and making current the work of the General Land Office, $475,000, including not exceeding $5,000 for the purchase of motorcycles and a motor boat for the use of agents and others employed in the field service and for operation, maintenance, and exchange of same: *Provided*, That the compensation of the chief of field service employed hereunder shall not exceed $3,500 per annum and the compensation of all others employed hereunder shall not exceed $2,700 per annum each, except in Alaska, where a compensation not to exceed $3,000 per annum may be allowed: *Provided further*, That agents and others employed under this appropriation may be allowed per diem in lieu of subsistence, pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914,

at a rate not exceeding $3 each and actual necessary expenses for transportation, including necessary sleeping-car fares, except when agents are employed in Alaska they may be allowed not exceeding $5 per day each in lieu of subsistence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of getting a brief statement into the RECORD. I think this is the paragraph in this appropriation bill under which all sorts of investigators of the Land Office visit the Pacific Northwest in the summer time. Last summer there came into the Olympic Forest Reserve three investigators. They proceeded to the Quinault Valley in that reserve to learn why a settler in there had permitted a cow to cross an imaginary line and eat a little Government grass. The three investigators navigated the Quinault River; they loitered near the beautiful and balmy Pacific Ocean beach; they pursued that cow through the Quinault Valley; up and down they went; and finally their investigation led them to conclude that the homesteader's cow, which had gone over this imaginary line, in this little valley, had eaten 45 cents' worth of grass. Thereupon they rendered a bill for 45 cents for the destruction of grass on the forest reserve. They went back and forth on the railroads at this $3 a day rate, or whatever it is for subsistence, in addition to railroad and Pullman fare, and one of them made another trip in there to collect 45 cents, which the homesteader declared he would not pay. The matter has not yet been settled. The homesteader will not pay—says he will never pay. So I expect that under this appropriation this summer, when it is nice and balmy in the Olympic Mountains, there will be four or five more special protectors of the public domain who will come out there in the effort to collect this 45 cents.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It has been demonstrated that a man can live on 25 cents a day. Do you want your cow to get steady rations out there for nothing? It probably took 45 cents' worth of hay to keep that cow alive. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am quite serious about this. It is a matter of some expense to the Government to keep these investigators going back and forth, and I am sure a number of them will be out there again this summer in the effort to collect this 45 cents. It is a sample of the petty harassing of settlers.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does not the gentleman know that unless the Government kept a very rigid hand upon these trespassers upon the forest reserves large numbers of his constituents would have large herds of cattle in there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, yes; but in this case they could not put a large herd of cattle into this valley, which is only 6 miles wide and 20 miles long. It is not a grazing section at all. Why any chief of a bureau should think it was necessary to send three men after one cow I can not find out.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is a western cow. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Of course we are glad to have these gentlemen come there. They spend the Government's money, and might as well spend it out there as anywhere; but, Mr. Chairman, while this Government is getting almighty big at one end, it is getting mighty small at the other. As centralized power is increased these petty abuses are magnified.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman will recall that we sent nearly 100,000 men to catch one bandit chief.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This was not a bandit cow. It was a peaceful cow. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the illustration the gentleman has just given is a little remarkable, and yet it is not more extraordinary than some of the things that come to the notice and attention of western Members.

Mr. TILSON. Perhaps the gentleman thinks it is typical.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Connecticut says perhaps I recognize it as being typical. To a certain extent that is true. I recollect a case in my State years ago. It did not happen under a Democratic administration, but under a good Republican administration, where one timber cutting was examined six different times in one summer. Being somewhat interested to know why this timber cutting needed so many examinations, I found that the cutting was on the road to the Yellowstone National Park, and after each inspector had examined this timber cutting he went on his way rejoicing through the park, in a leisurely manner, and undoubtedly had a very pleasant time. [Laughter.] Now, I do not think the Land Office is subject to any more criticism at the present time than it has been in the past. As a matter of fact, I am rather inclined to think that in the last two or three years we have had fairly satisfactory service in the main. Yet there are certain practices that ought to be remedied, and to which I have frequently called attention. There are certain of these practices that arise under this very appropriation. Under the law a settler on the public domain is authorized to secure timber from the public lands for the improvement of his farm, his homestead. He may get posts and poles and firewood, but he must secure them under rules and regulations established by the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary's rules require the homesteader to notify the Secretary in writing what timber he wants, the kind and character, and where and when he proposes to get it. It is a little difficult for a settler to do that at times. He does not know just how many house logs or poles he may need, or just how much firewood he may want, and he does not know in just what gulch or on what hillside he may find it convenient to go and get the timber. But in the main the settlers endeavor to comply with that regulation. Sometimes they do not; and while it has not been the practice in the past, it has come to be the practice under this administration, in such a case as that, when they find a settler has secured wood without complying with all the technical rules, to compel him to pay for it, not at the ordinary stumpage value on the land, but at the estimated value of the material after he has hauled it home.

So they not only charge him for what he took from Uncle Sam, but they make him pay for the effort he expended in cutting it and taking it home. Now, it is said that that procedure is under a certain decision of the Supreme Court of the United States known as the Woodenware case, a celebrated decision governing in many matters relating to trespassing on the public domain. That decision was rendered a long time ago. Formerly the department did not hold that that decision applied to what they were pleased to call innocent trespasses, but of late they say that the Woodenware decision does apply, and that they have no option. They say that when a settler cuts timber they must charge him not only a dollar or a dollar and a half or two dollars a thousand stumpage, but also the value that he adds to it in cutting it down and in reducing it into form for his own use. These fines assessed against settlers do not ordinarily amount to large sums. They may run all the way from $20, $30, or $40 to $50 or $60; but those are large sums to men who are struggling and trying to make homes on the public domain, many of them finding it very difficult to grow enough food to keep soul and body together.

The Land Office has been unduly harsh in its treatment of settlers who get timber from the public lands and has pestered them unduly and treated them unfairly, in my opinion. I hope they will do better in the future.

The Clerk read as follows:

Opening Indian reservations (reimbursable): For expenses pertaining to the opening to entry and settlement of such Indian reservation lands as may be opened during the fiscal year 1918: *Provided*, That the expenses pertaining to the opening of each of said reservations and paid for out of this appropriation shall be reimbursed to the United States from the money received from the sale of the lands embraced in said reservations, respectively, $15,000.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the gentleman inform me what Indian reservations it is intended shall be opened under this provision?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Blackfeet Indian Reservation in Montana, 175,000 acres; the Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations, with about 850,000 undisposed-of acres; the Coeur d'Alene Reservation, 16,000 acres; the Crow Reservation, of about 70,000 acres and coal lands, 30,000 acres noncoal lands; the Flathead Reservation in Montana, about 40,000 acres; the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., authorizing the appraisement of sections 16 and 13; Fort Peck Indian Resevation, Mont., 100,000 acres classified as coal lands; Omaha Indian Reservation, Nebr.; Siletz Indian Reservation, Oreg.; Shoshone or Wind River Reservation, Wyo.; Uintah Indian Reservation, Utah; and the Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash..

The Clerk read as follows:

SURVEYING THE PUBLIC LANDS.

For surveys and resurveys of public lands, under the supervision of the Commissioner of the General Land Office and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, $700,000: *Provided*, That in expending this appropriation preference shall be given, first, in favor of surveying townships occupied in whole or in part by actual settlers and of lands granted to the States by the act approved February 22, 1889, and the acts approved July 3 and July 10, 1890, and to survey under such other acts as provide for land grants to the several States and Territories, and such indemnity lands as the several States and Territories may be entitled to in lieu of lands granted them for educational and other purposes which may have been sold or included in some reservation or otherwise disposed of, except railroad land grants, and other surveys shall include lands adapted to agriculture and lands deemed advisable to survey on account of availability for irrigation or dry farming, lines of reservations, and lands within boundaries of forest reservations. The surveys and resurveys provided for in this appropriation to be made by such competent surveyors as the Secretary of the Interior may select, at such compensation, not exceeding $200 per month each, as he may prescribe, except that the Secretary of the Interior may appoint not to exceed one supervisor of surveys, whose compensation shall not exceed $300 per month, and not to exceed 10 surveyors who may be employed in a supervisory capacity, whose compensation shall not exceed $250 per month each, except in the District of Alaska, where a compensation not exceeding $10 per day may be allowed such surveyors and such per diem in lieu of subsistence, not exceeding $3, when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1,

1914, and actual necessary expenses for transportation, including necessary sleeping-car fares, said per diem and traveling expenses to be allowed to all surveyors employed hereunder and to such clerks who are competent surveyors who may be detailed to make surveys, resurveys, or examinations of surveys heretofore made and reported to be defective or fraudulent, and inspecting mineral deposits, coal fields, and timber districts, and for making, by such competent surveyors, fragmentary surveys, and such other surveys or examinations as may be required for identification of lands for purposes of evidence in any suit or proceeding in behalf of the United States: *Provided further*, That the sum of not exceeding 10 per cent of the amount hereby appropriated may be expended by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, for the purchase of metal or other equally durable monuments to be used for public-land survey corners wherever practicable: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $25,000 of the above amount may be used to bring up the arrears of office work in surveyors general's offices upon returns of surveys filed therein prior to the passage of this act.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I direct the attention of the Chairman to the last proviso, providing for $25,000 to bring up the arrears of office work in the surveyor general's offices throughout the country. This question, I may say to the chairman of the committee, was given some consideration by the legislative subcommittee when the Commissioner of the General Land Office was before our subcommittee. He called our attention to the need of making the work current, and we provided some additional appropriations for that purpose. I wish to inquire specifically of the chairman what is the purpose of this provision of $25,000, and whether the amount will make the work current?

Mr. FITZGERALD. With the present force the surveyors general's offices are behind, and this is to enable them to make their work current. Then the force of the surveyors general's office is a fixed force for each office, and so not flexible. The result is that conditions can not be anticipated in advance, and frequently there arises a great increase in volume of work in some particular office. Under the law, clerks can not be transferred from one office to another, and to prevent a very serious congestion it is essential that some provision be made to enable the assistance to be given in those cases where this unusual situation may arise.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is assured that the Commissioner of the General Land Office with $25,000 will make the work current in all the offices throughout the country?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not certain. I am inclined to think that next year we should very seriously consider the advisability of consolidating all the forces of those offices and leave it within the discretion of the Commissioner General of the Land Office where the clerks shall be employed. We now provide, and have been for years providing, a fixed force in each office. There are times when the work in one office falls off very considerably, and there is not sufficient work to keep those clerks fully occupied, while in another office there may be a great increase in work.

If the Commissioner of the General Land Office had some discretion to shift the clerks from one office to another as he deemed necessary, I am inclined to believe that it would probably result in better administration and more economy. While the work may fall off temporarily in an office, if the force in the office is an experienced force there is great reluctance to permit any employees to go out of the service for fear when there is an increase of work in the office it will not be possible to get trained men.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, when the Commissioner of the General Land Office was before the subcommittee on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, he recommended, as I recall, the transfer of all this work to the department here in Washington. He said that it would not only be more economically performed, but they could utilize the services of these men more efficiently than to have the work performed in the offices throughout the country.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; they did not wish to transfer the work to Washington. This is field work, but he wished the forces of the various offices to be so adjusted that he could shift them from one office to another.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood that he recommended that some of the work performed in the branch offices of the surveyors general throughout the country be transferred to Washington. Whether it is this identical work covered by this proviso I am unable to say, but I have an impression that it is of the same general nature. But I rose to get the information so that the subcommittee might have it next year and to determine what the $25,000 is for.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There are times in the year when the men in the field can not be utilized, and the department has requested for some time that it be permitted to bring men from the field into the department when they could not be utilized in the field. I am inclined to believe that at the next session we should go very exhaustively into this matter, with a view to rearranging the methods by which we make provision for those offices. Much consideration and examination of the matter inclines me to believe that perhaps we can devise a method that will be of advantage to adopt over the present system, and I believe the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], who is familiar with the Land Office, having been connected with it, after much consideration has reached somewhat the same conclusion. I am not certain that he did not originate the suggestion. In the next session, when we have a little more time, we can well afford to take it up in connection with the two bills and see if we can not devise a system that will result in considerable benefit to the administration of the service.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, a number of years ago I suggested and endeavored to get the House to agree to a consolidation of appropriations for clerks in the offices of the surveyors general. In other words, I suggested that the appropriations for the surveyors general's offices should be put in a lump sum as the appropriations for the local land offices are. I expressed the opinion that by making such a lump-sum appropriation we could bring about economies in the service. The Commissioner of the Land Office believes that that would be a wise thing to do, and I hope the gentlemen who are upon the subcommittee which has to do with those appropriations next year, instead of appropriating for clerks and contingent expenses of each surveyors general's office, will appropriate a lump sum for clerk hire and for contingent expenses of the surveyors general's offices all over the country. It is barely possible that if we had a provision of that kind right now so that the Commissioner of the General Land Office could transfer clerks from one office to the other, we might be able to carry on the work of the surveyors general's offices without this additional sum. This additional sum in my opinion will not bring the work of the surveyors general's offices up so as to make it current. The work of some of the offices of the surveyors general is far behind. There has been a great deal of work done in some of the districts, and it has been but slowly prepared for the Land Office. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] referred to the fact that the Commissioner of the General Land Office, when he was before their subcommittee, suggested that they had in mind a new policy, and I would like to have the gentleman's attention in regard to that if he will give it to me.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has my attention, but I was at the moment looking for that section of the hearings.

Mr. MONDELL. I have discussed it with the commissioner, I think, since he gave you that opinion, and I have his present opinion in regard to it. As a matter of fact, you can not dispense with the offices of the surveyors general. There are many reasons why that can not be done until the land business and the surveying business of the country, mineral and otherwise, is practically disposed of. The commissioner was, however, under the impression that a good deal of the work which is now done in the offices of the surveyors general might be facilitated by being done here in Washington. The gentleman understands the modus operandi. The surveyor and his force go into the field. They make their surveys and take some notes as they go along, and those notes are then written up by the man who makes the survey, generally, immediately after the close of the surveying season. Those notebooks then go to the clerks in the office of the surveyor general, and they make the maps and plats. After that work is done it is sent on here, and the clerks in the office here go over all of that work and check it up and point out errors and send them back for correction, and when corrected satisfactorily the survey is approved, the plat issued, and the land is open to entry.

Mr. STAFFORD. When these notes are written up is the original surveyor present, or has he amplified the notes so that his presence is not necessary?

Mr. MONDELL. The field surveyor writes up his own notes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And then they are transferred to the clerk?

Mr. MONDELL. They are transferred to the clerk then, who takes them and from the notes makes an official plat.

Mr. STAFFORD. Without the aid of the original surveyor?

Mr. MONDELL. Without the aid of the original surveyor.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. The Commissioner of the General Land Office was under the impression that it would expedite matters by having these notes sent in or, at the end of the field season, brought in by the field surveyors and having the plats made here. He told me a few days ago that, after having tried that

out somewhat, he had come to the conclusion that as a general practice it is not entirely satisfactory, and his present idea, as I gathered it, was that in the main they would continue along the lines of past practice in that respect for various reasons which he gave and which I have not the time now to detail. This sum is to help the forces of the surveyors general by giving them new clerks—additional clerks—to help the force bring the work up. The new plan of survey has expedited the surveys. But if the offices of the surveyors general do not promptly make the plats from the notes and if the Land Office here does not promptly review the work and approve it, we may reach a condition under which, under the new system of survey by Government surveyors, we do not get lands surveyed and the surveys approved any more promptly than we did under the old contract system. We have been approaching that condition of affairs in some districts, doing the best they could under the appropriations. This will help some, though it is not enough. Perhaps it is enough for this year.

In addition to that, there is another difficulty, and it is a very serious one at this time, and there was a provision upon the legislative bill carrying an appropriation of $6,500, I think, intended to in a way help that situation. The survey division of the Land Office here had gotten behind with its work so that in many cases it required six months and even longer from the time the plat of survey is received at the Land Office before the survey is examined and approved, even where there were no considerable difficulties, even where it is not necessary to send the plats back for correction. Now, that condition of affairs is trying and almost intolerable, particularly with resurveys.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like the gentleman to inform the committee what policy is pursued by the Interior Department as to what lands they are willing to resurvey. I know I have had difficulty in obtaining a resurvey on some Government lands.

Mr. MONDELL. If I could get a little more time I would be glad to discuss that with the gentleman, because I have had the same trouble. There is a general provision of law, I will say to the gentleman, which gives the Secretary almost unlimited authority.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Just a minute more, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Several years ago, after Congress had given the Secretary of the Interior wider discretion in the matter of resurveys than he had ever had before, the Secretary issued an order limiting his own discretion to such an extent that it was very difficult, indeed, to get a resurvey.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. Does not the gentleman think the General Land Office gives preference in resurveys to those areas where the former surveys gave more land to the section than ought to have been given?

Mr. MONDELL. Not necessarily. It gives preference to the cases where the resurveys seemed to be the most necessary, everything considered.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I want to ask the gentleman if this is a provision in the law or a rule of the department? They now hold that land is entitled to a resurvey where more than 50 per cent of it has passed to title.

Mr. MONDELL. That is entirely a rule of the department. As a matter of fact Congress several years ago gave the Secretary of the Interior almost unlimited authority in the matter, but he has restricted his own authority by the rule to which the gentleman has just referred. However, I think that rule is waived in a good case earnestly pressed.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Well, I would like to present several——

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

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses: For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the authorized work of the Geological Survey, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, including the purchase, hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for field use only by geologists, topographers, and engineers, to be expended under the regulations from time to time prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, and under the following heads: *Provided*, That hereafter the purchase of supplies or the procurement of services outside the District of Columbia may be made in open market in the manner common among business men when the aggregate amount of the purchase does not exceed $50.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. May I ask the gentleman from New York in reference to the item authorizing the hire of automobiles.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is for the hire of automobiles in the geological field service. It was ascertained that by hiring automobiles they can go so much greater distance that it is cheaper than hiring teams in many instances.

Mr. MANN. This also applies to teams? What have they done in the past?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They have been hiring teams.

Mr. MONDELL. What are they doing now?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They have been hiring teams.

Mr. MANN. I see the same item applies to automobiles as teams. In the current law there is no provision authorizing the hire of either one.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think this is the first time we carry it in reference to automobiles.

Mr. MANN. Oh, it is the first time it is carried in reference to either teams or automobiles.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; they have had the authority for the teams.

Mr. MANN. Not by this act they have not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think the gentleman is under a misapprehension. They had authority to hire horse-drawn vehicles.

Mr. MANN. Not in this bill they have not. I do not know what authority they have. This is new language in the bill.

Mr. FOSTER. They have been hiring them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is specific provision for it.

Mr. MANN. If they can hire teams they can hire automobiles.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They could not, because of the statute which prohibits the expenditure of any money for motor-propelled vehicles.

Mr. MANN. That is right; yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was pointed out that in some places they had quite a distance to go from headquarters and by hiring automobiles they could save so much time it was economy to get the party out in the field in that way.

Mr. MANN. Do they say anything about what it will cost by hour or day to hire an automobile?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They spoke of hiring a car in which they could put two or three persons and their implements.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman happen to know how many automobiles they have?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They expected to expend $8,500 for the motor-propelled vehicles and about $1,500 for horse-drawn vehicles. And they are buying some cars. They buy a Ford car with a special body on it, in which they can put their implements.

Mr. MANN. In the current law they are authorized to use $5,300 for maintenance, repair, and operation for motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In the current law they had $7,000 for 10 motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles.

Mr. MANN. Not in this item. They had $5,300. This is on page 102, under general expenses.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; in the item this year—in the current law.

Mr. MANN. Yes; I see it. I have it here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In the current law they have authority to purchase certain machines.

Mr. MANN. They had authority to purchase——

Mr. FITZGERALD. To purchase not exceeding 10 motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles at a total cost not exceeding $7,000, and not exceeding 20 horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles at a total cost not exceeding $3,000.

Mr. MANN. And then for maintenance, $5,300.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Maintenance, $5,300.

Mr. MANN. There is no limitation at all now?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. But they stated how much they expected to spend. That was $8,500 for the automobiles and $1,500 for horse-drawn vehicles. They found out it is much more economical to purchase the small or cheaper motor cars and to utilize them in the place of the horse-drawn vehicles, and I think the results show that is so.

Mr. MANN. That is very likely. I am not posing as a special friend of horse-drawn vehicles, but there is no limitation now at all on the amount that they can expend, either for purchase or hire or maintenance.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We took the limitation off because it seemed it was pretty difficult to determine just how many parties there would be and where they would be operating. If the limitation is carried, it might so affect the work of some party that was to do important work; we thought we would trust the

director and see what would happen for one year. I know it is taking——

Mr. MANN. I have a great deal of confidence in the director, although it has not been customary to take off the limit entirely on the amount that can be expended for automobiles, either the purchase or hire of them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. For field service of this character we thought perhaps we were safe in this respect, as the parties are not permanently fixed in one place, but have to shift from place to place.

Mr. MANN. May I ask about the proviso authorizing the purchase of supplies to the extent of $50? I have no objection whatever to the provision, though it would seem to me that the limit ought to be a little higher than $50.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The request is on this account, namely, the field parties frequently find themselves without something they have to have——

Mr. MANN. That is all right.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And the director said that $50 would cover their necessities.

Mr. MANN. Very well. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For topographic surveys in various portions of the United States, $350,000: *Provided*, That in expending this sum preference shall be given special topographic surveys of areas selected by the War Department and in securing such extra topographic data as are requested by the War Department in these or other areas.

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

When the Army bill was before the House the other day there was an item of $200,000 for topographic surveys under the War Department with authority to call on the Geological Survey. I reserved a point of order upon it, which I afterwards withdrew, but the point of order was made by another gentleman in the committee. I see the proviso in here, which is carried in the current law, says that special preference shall be given to areas selected by the War Department in topographic surveys. Does this take into full consideration the needs of the War Department? The Army bill carried $200,000 the other day as reported, the authority being given to have the Geological Survey extended.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was ascertained last year that a number of surveys were desired by the War Department which the Geological Survey would not make because it was making surveys that were thought more valuable to the country. The War Department had requested certain surveys that would cost a definite sum of money—I do not just recall the amount—and that appropriation was carried in the bill last year, and with this provision compelling the Geological Survey to give preference to requests from the War Department.

Mr. MANN. I understand.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The appropriation that was in the Army bill was for a somewhat different purpose. They have a school of engineers where they are training the engineers to make these surveys, and they wish to take the surveys made by the Geological Survey and send out parties to put upon the topographical maps certain information that is not usually upon them, such as railroad cuts, crossings, bridges, distinctive marks in the nature of buildings or towers. I thought myself the amount recommended in the Army bill was somewhat large.

Mr. MANN. They authorized the War Department to call upon the Geological Survey. I was informed by people who were having it done that it was, in the main, just the method of increasing the amount which should be appropriated for topographic surveys. It may be perfectly proper. I can very readily understand the Army may want to put some things on the map that the Geological Survey does not put on.

I wondered whether there was any information before the committee as to how much of that $200,000 carried in the Army bill was expected to be expended by the Geological Survey.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; the War Department last year submitted to the Committee on Appropriations information respecting the situation, and we took care of it. This year they went to the Committee on Military Affairs. I notice that these departments prefer to go to other places than the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANN. I noticed that, too. That is the reason I make the inquiry.

Mr. FITZGERALD. For that reason, having got what they wanted in the Army bill, they gave no information to the Committee on Appropriations. So what the committee did was to carry the same provision, requiring that preference be given in the survey to the War Department, upon the theory that when we were maintaining a service to make topographic surveys for the country there was nothing more vital, if they really were needed, than the maps that the War Department actually required, and it ought to have the preference.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuation of the investigation of the mineral resources of Alaska, $100,000, to be immediately available.

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

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

Mr. MANN. Can the gentleman give us any information about this appropriation for the further investigation of the mineral resources of Alaska? Where is it designed to make the investigation? Is it a further investigation of the coal resources or the precious metals?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No particular area is indicated.

Mr. MANN. What are they doing now?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know what they are doing, except making investigations covering the Territory and attempting to locate mineral deposits.

Mr. MANN. They do not have any special appropriation for that in the current law, do they?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are attempting to survey those areas that will be considered tributary to the railroad so as to make available any minerals that may be within easy reach of the railroad, so that it can be utilized to the fullest capacity when completed. There is a very considerable portion of Alaska that has not been surveyed by the Geological Survey for the purpose of ascertaining what minerals are found in different locations. A year or two ago the matter was gone into very exhaustively, and at this rate it will take many, many years to complete the work in that Territory.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, this is the amount that has been appropriated each year for the last five or six years for this work.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes; and it is a good deal longer than five or six years.

Mr. MANN. Is it in the current law?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Where will the gentleman find it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In the long sessions of Congress it is carried in a deficiency bill, because of the necessity of arranging to get parties started early in the season. Unless they start up there before the 1st of July, a good portion of the season is lost.

Mr. MANN. I suppose the gentleman means it is carried in the urgent-deficiency bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. It is carried in some deficiency bill that is passed by the House about this time of the year.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For chemical and physical researches relating to the geology of the United States, including researches with a view of determining geological conditions favorable to the presence of deposits of potash salts, $40,000.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman where these explorations are being made under the paragraph just read?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They investigated the Nebraska lakes when they first began their work, and Searles Lake, in California. They have conducted some investigations in Utah and some in Nevada, where they put down five wells, and they are now working in New Mexico and Texas.

Mr. HAWLEY. Did they find any valuable deposits in those lakes in Nebraska?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. They have found in those various places deposits that yield about 8,000 tons a year, I understand.

Mr. HAWLEY. That is, more or less native deposits held in solution, if I am not in error?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. And they get it by evaporation from water?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. Some of it is a sulphate and some of it is a chloride.

Mr. HAWLEY. Do they find it in sufficient quantities to make it commercially profitable?

Mr. MONDELL. There are several plants now operating, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The high price in recent years has made it profitable to extract it from the brines, but the quantity found has not been very great. They are hoping that the investigations may result in the discovery of some sort of a supply.

Mr. HAWLEY. The prices now are more than a thousand per cent greater than they were three years ago, and of course the beds that were valueless then may be valuable now. The country is interested in finding a potash bed that will be valuable for commercial purposes under normal conditions. Would these be valuable under normal conditions?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I doubt whether under normal conditions it would be profitable under the present processes to extract it from the brine.

Mr. HAWLEY. In Utah and other sections they are making investigations as to extracting potash from a certain kind of rock. What success have they had in that? Does the gentleman know? Have they found a deposit that has sufficient potash in it to make it commercially profitable to work it, and have they found a method by which it can be extracted at a price that will make it profitable?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They found that alunite was a potash material that was very valuable. It has been found in Utah, and it has been largely utilized since its discovery.

Mr. HAWLEY. Can they use it commercially under a normal condition of prices?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think the potash could be extracted from this material under normal conditions. My recollection is that it was the process of extracting from the brines that was of so expensive a character that under normal conditions it would not probably be available.

Mr. HAWLEY. Did the gentleman learn from the hearings that there were in the United States or any of its possessions a sufficient quantity of those deposits anywhere that will in any way supply the demand in the United States and make us not dependent on foreign countries?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No such deposits have been found that would supply the needs of the United States.

Mr. HAWLEY. Are the survey hopeful that such may be found?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are continuing the investigations hopefully, but they do not know. This is believed to be a desirable investigation to continue, because if they should find deposits sufficiently extensive to supply our needs at any reasonable price, of course they would be invaluable.

Mr. HAWLEY. I agree with the gentleman as to that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And we recommend the appropriation, so that the investigation may be continued, in the hope that they may strike valuable deposits.

Mr. HAWLEY. Does this amount of $40,000 cover the entire amount asked by the survey for this purpose?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. It is the same as that for the current year.

Mr. MANN. I move to strike out the last two words. This item provides—

For chemical and physical researches relating to the geology of the United States, including researches with a view of determining geological conditions favorable to the presence of deposits of potash salts, $40,000.

I am very much in favor of letting the Geological Survey continue to make their investigations to ascertain if they can find any potash salts; but is that what they are doing with this money, or are they doing something else with it? Under the language of the appropriation they are not compelled to pay any attention at all to potash salts. They may expend this money for chemical and physical researches relating to geology. That means anything. Are they spending the money in searching for potash, or are they using it for something else?

Mr. FITZGERALD. My understanding is that all the appropriation is being expended in investigations endeavoring to locate potash deposits.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know how they proceed? Of course, they have discovered potash in alunite, but, of course, it was well known before that it contained potash.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are drilling wells in Texas, attempting to locate deposits in that way.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman allow me to read just a paragraph:

We are continuing work in northwestern Texas, and we have reached a depth there of 545 feet on the 20th of this month, the date of the last report from the well. The first beds that might contain potash would be between 700 and 800 feet, but we hope to be able to go, if necessary, as deep as 1,800 feet at that point.

Mr. MANN. It does not take $40,000 to dig a well 500 feet deep, does it?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, no. They have been drilling in Nevada and at other places, as well as carrying on other lines of work. This is the work that they are carrying on now, and that they propose to continue. It does sometimes cost a great deal of money to sink a deep well, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but $40,000 is considerable money. They are only using the present $40,000 appropriation to sink a well 700 feet deep.

Mr. BORLAND. They claim to have sunk five wells in Nevada—without success, however.

Mr. MANN. Is that the method they are pursuing?

Mr. BORLAND. That seems to be the method they are pursuing. They did some work in Utah and some in Nevada, and now they are working in Texas, and they are trying to locate a stratum of potash by drilling.

Mr. MANN. It seems to me that is a very wise method.

Mr. BORLAND. The evidence shows that practically all this appropriation is used in this field work of drilling.

The Clerk read as follows:

For gauging streams and determining the water supply of the United States, the investigation of underground currents and artesian wells, and the preparation of reports upon the best methods of utilizing the water resources, $175,000, of which $25,000 may be used to test the existence of artesian and other underground water supplies suitable for irrigation in the arid and semiarid regions by boring wells.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of discussing an item contained in this paragraph which is new. The provision authorizing the use of $25,000 to test the existence of artesian and other underground water supplies suitable for irrigation in the arid and semiarid regions by boring wells is a new appropriation. For a number of years efforts have been made to secure appropriations for the beginning of this work, and for a number of years past the Committee on Appropriations have not seen their way clear to undertake work of this character. I want to express my appreciation of the attitude of the committee in at last adopting this work and beginning it. I see before me the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE], who hopes that one of the first wells sunk will be in his district or thereabouts. I have no idea where the first well may be sunk. Gentlemen may ask, What business has the Federal Government to go over the country for the purpose of determining the possible location of areas furnishing artesian water supplies? As a general proposition we may say that the Federal Government is scarcely justified in undertaking that kind of work; but in the West there are very extensive areas that are known to be underlain with water-bearing strata. It is known, for instance, that the Dakota sands, stretching almost from the Canadian line to New Mexico, and extending eastward from the Rocky Mountains, carry artesian water over an enormous area. The question is, How deep is it down to these strata at any given point? How thick is the sand at a particular place? How much water does it carry at a particular point, and what is the water pressure, and what is the character of the water? Generally, the water is good, but that is not always true.

Now, it is beyond the financial means of any ordinary citizen, or any extraordinary citizen for that matter, unless he has some very large interests to serve, to sink a well to a great depth on a venture. Men sometimes do that and spend a great deal of money on the possibility of discovering a very valuable oil well, but an artesian-water well can under no circumstances or conditions be as valuable as an oil well. Therefore there is not the incentive to drill deep wells for water that there is for oil, and neither individuals nor communities can test out these great areas that may be underlain within a depth that can be reached at a reasonable cost with strata containing water, which when penetrated will rise above the surface. I think the Government may very properly undertake the work of testing out these areas, putting down wells here and there, with a view of discovering the distance to these artesian strata, the capacity of the strata and the character of the water. The work once done in a given locality by the Federal Government is a guide to private enterprise, and from that time on, if the stratum is found at a reasonable depth, and an artesian flow of considerable quantity is found, we may reasonably expect that private enterprise will drill wells and extend the artesian area; I have no doubt that in the course of time we shall in this way build up very prosperous communities where now the country is comparatively arid and almost worthless because of the lack of a goodly supply of water.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigation of mineral fuels and unfinished mineral products belonging to or for the use of the United States, with a view to their most efficient mining, preparation, treatment, and use, and to recommend to various departments such changes in selection and use of fuel as may result in greater economy, and including all equipment, supplies, and expenses of travel and subsistence, $135,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 105, after line 23, insert as a new paragraph:

"For investigation and report to the next Congress upon the advisability and estimated cost of establishing and maintaining Government fuel yard or yards and necessary handling and distributing equipment in the District of Columbia for the storage of fuel for the use of and for delivery to all executive departments, District government, and independent establishments in the District of Columbia and vicinity, $5,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, if a Government yard should be established, if it is found advisable to do so after investigation, I think it would mean a saving of at least $40,000 in the supply of coal in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman read the estimates sent in by the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; and I will say that the estimates, in my judgment, are much higher than would be necessary for the establishment of a Government coal yard. The Government buys about 225,000 tons of coal a year. It is estimated that a saving of at least 20 cents a ton could be made on this amount of coal purchased, and then there would always be a supply on hand, for we would buy the coal for a year.

Mr. MONDELL. What is the estimate in saving?

Mr. FOSTER. Twenty cents a ton.

Mr. MONDELL. Does not the gentleman think that we would save much more than that?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know, but I think it would be at least that, and would amount to $40,000.

Mr. MANN. How does the gentleman reach his estimate?

Mr. FOSTER. That has been reached through men of experience who have figured as well as they could on what can be done. I say frankly that I have not figured it, but men who know what they are talking about have.

Mr. MANN. The first thing that we would have to do if you have a municipal coal yard is to supply every Navy and Army officer in Washington with coal at the contract price, and deliver it at their houses. Does not the gentleman think that we ought to include Members of Congress and all Government employees?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know; we are not in the habit of doing that.

Mr. MANN. If we own a coal yard, why not own a coal mine?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not sure but that we might go as far as that. However, the District this year has paid $91,000 extra on account of the shortage of coal.

Mr. MANN. Of course there is a shortage of coal, owing more particularly to the transportation facilities. The House Office Commission that has jurisdiction over the power plant that supplies power to the Capitol and the House Office Building had to give directions to the Superintendent of the Capitol to buy coal wherever he could get it, not because the contractor did not have the coal to furnish, but because he could not get it transported to Washington. The Government would not be in any better position if it had a municipal coal yard.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it would; because we would buy the coal at a season of the year when we have no trouble in transporting it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman means to buy in the summer time and store 200,000 tons of coal?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; that can be done.

Mr. MANN. It would cost a good deal more to do it that way than to have a place with a smaller storage capacity. If coal is to be stored in a coal yard to the extent of 200,000 tons, that is quite a storage.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; it is.

Mr. MANN. And it costs a great deal to handle it in that way, too; it all has to be handled over twice.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to say that the Committee on Mines and Mining have recently made some investigations in reference to fuel, and we found that throughout the United States, in supplying fuel for Government needs, for instance, the Government is hauling anthracite coal from Pennsylvania to Fort Logan, Colo. It is hauling anthracite coal from Pennsylvania to the State of Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Not much of it.

Mr. FOSTER. No; but in the aggregate it makes a large amount. They are hauling anthracite coal from Pennsylvania to Texas. Anthracite coal is nice coal to burn, but it costs money when you have to transport it that distance.

Mr. MONDELL. We have a great quantity of coal in Wyoming which is considered much better than anthracite.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I am not going to discuss that. Now, I think that if the Government yard is established it can be established for a good deal less than has been estimated by the Treasury Department, and probably for one-half of that. I really believe that it is a good thing and the Government would be secure in a supply of fuel when necessary.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Of course, the gentleman knows that a very large quantity of Pennsylvania coal goes out all over the great Northwest?

Mr. FOSTER. I know; but let me give the gentleman one instance. Down here at the old Knickerbocker Hotel the Government had an office building beside it. The Government was buying coal at $6.50 a ton. The Knickerbocker Hotel was buying coal at $4.50, with a higher thermal unit than the anthracite. The hotel finally came into the hands of the Government and they changed and went to using anthracite coal. Now, that is the situation, and there ought to be some system about it. The Government could probably save $300,000 a year, if there was an economical use of coal.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, my colleague cites an instance. I have heard several times from what seemed to be fairly authentic sources that at one time a distinguished character in this country, who then occupied the White House—and I vary the story from the exact facts, so as to leave some people out of it—crumpled a curtain in the White House between his forefinger and thumb and found it left black upon his hand. That is a very natural thing. You can go out here anywhere in the summer time and draw your hand over a leaf of any plant or a spear of grass and you will find black smoke on your hand. Thinking that that was a damage to the city of Washington, the White House curtains, and other things in the city, the President issued an order that they should cease to burn soft coal and should burn hard coal. Of course, the expense was very much greater. I do not know whether that order has ever been revoked or not, but I am inclined to think that they have been burning hard coal. At that time the Potomac Power Co. had its plant down southeast of the Treasury Building, and I believe at the same time that company was notified that it would have to quit burning soft coal so near the White House and the Treasury Building, and they moved their plant away. I do not know how far we ought to burn hard coal or soft coal in the city of Washington. Everyone who comes from Pittsburgh or Chicago to Washington will not fail to notice that there is not nearly so much smoke and soot around here as there is at home.

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

Mr. MANN. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman tells a very interesting story, and he is probably correct about it; but it is a fact that they can burn soft coal without the smoke being a nuisance. I will say to my colleague that it needs more attention, it needs to be looked after more carefully than when burning anthracite coal.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will pardon me, but I referred a moment ago to the Capitol power plant. Last year the man in charge of the Capitol power plant, the superintendent or engineer, or whoever was superintendent down there, received repeated notices from the official here who has charge of doing away with the smoke nuisance that the Capitol power plant was a nuisance on account of its emitting immense quantities of black smoke. The matter was called to my attention as a member of the commission in supervisory charge. The suggestion was made that not improbably the local officials were rather anxious to put something over on Congress, taking special delight in calling attention to the fact that the power plant operated under the direct control of Congress was violating the proprieties, if not the law. I told the Superintendent of the Capitol that having charge of this power plant I did not think we could afford to maintain a smoke nuisance. Whatever private individuals might do, they could be prosecuted for it, but I thought it was our duty to do away with the smoke nuisance. It is a very difficult thing to do. I do not know whether it has been entirely done away with, because this winter I have not been watching the smoke from those chimneys as I did all last summer after this came to my attention.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it has not been done away with.

Mr. MANN. Every effort has been made to do away with it. There is no lack of anything that could be furnished to do away with the smoke nuisance there—at least I assume so, because that was the direction and that was my information.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, it is not as neat and clean to burn as anthracite coal, but with proper care, looking after the furnace, it can be done so that there is not much nuisance about it.

Mr. MANN. Oh, it undoubtedly makes a great deal of difference how the stoking is done.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will not the gentleman withhold his point of order for a moment?

Mr. BORLAND. Does the gentleman desire to discuss this?

Mr. MONDELL. I want to discuss the merits of the matter.

Mr. BORLAND. I withhold the point of order.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I want to know if the purpose is to take care of soft coal in this yard?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know as to that.

Mr. FARR. Not to discriminate against hard coal?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. FARR. Not to encourage the use of hard coal?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know what it would do as to that.

Mr. FARR. Because it would be an expensive economy if they do away with the burning of anthracite coal in this beautiful city with all of its white buildings, and utilize soft coal. The gentleman would discover that they could not handle the smoke nuisance any more than they do in Pittsburgh.

Mr. FOSTER. I will say to the gentleman that if he has ever been to the Bureau of Mines Experimental Station at Pittsburgh and seen the burning of soft coal he would find but little smoke coming out of the flue.

Mr. FARR. They have experimented very much in Pittsburgh, and have not been able to keep their houses or persons clean.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the proposition of establishing a Government coal yard here. I am not entirely converted to the idea, but I am interested in it, and for many reasons. It has been suggested that we might save 20 cents a ton on our coal. If the Government bought coal as individuals buy coal, there is no doubt but that much more than 20 cents a ton could be saved.

I buy my coal supply for a month or more at a time—a little more than that in the fall—but, like most people, I do not buy in the summer, and the consequence is I am generally caught on all increases and high tides of the winter market that come along—and the tide has been very high this winter. Now, the Government buys its coal by contract by the year, and I presume in a majority of cases the contractor tries to protect himself, and does to a certain extent protect himself, against the winter rise of prices without charging it all to the Government. But this is true. If there is any one thing that is needed in this country in an industrial way more than another, it is to bring about some system or policy under which the American people shall buy their coal in the summer. Why can not the Government set the example? Not only would it be very much to the interest of the ordinary consumer, but such a condition, if we could bring it about, would be of great benefit to the workers in the coal industry, and in the long run would cheapen the price of coal, reduce the price of coal to everybody. Gentlemen who hear that coal miners sometimes make $4, $5, or $6 per day imagine the coal miner must be getting rich. They do not take into consideration the fact that a large portion of the year he is absolutely idle, and that even when his earnings are large for the time he is employed his average yearly wage is small. That is due almost entirely to the fact that coal mining is a seasonal occupation in many places. Mines run under full head for a while in the winter; everything is crowded; and then during the long months of the summer the mines are either closed down or they are run two or three days a week. It is as uneconomical a condition of affairs as can be conceived.

It is unfortunate from everybody's standpoint that at a time when the mine could be running under the most advantageous circumstances and the most economical conditions they are not to run at all, or only part time, and the miner, accustomed to that class of work, unable to find other work or unaccustomed to other work, finds it almost impossible to make ends meet. If he has not saved up some of his winter wages, he finds himself and family in a most unfortunate condition. While the mine is lying idle some overhead charges are going on, all of which must be reckoned with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. BORLAND. I would suggest to the gentleman this is rather a very general debate.

Mr. MONDELL. I think I can conclude in five minutes, if the gentleman will allow me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all——

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not have to do that; whenever he wants to make the point of order he can do so.

Mr. BORLAND. Well, I will give notice I will make the point of order at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, all of these overhead charges that have been going on during a shutdown must be taken care of; when the mine begins to operate they must be borne by the cost of the coal then, instead of being taken out the year round. Now, if the American people can be taught to buy their coal in the good old summer time and store it so we can keep the mines running the year round, we will be doing an exceedingly helpful thing for the coal miner and we will reduce the average cost of coal.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield.

Mr. FARR. Does the gentleman refer to the bituminous region?

Mr. MONDELL. I am referring to bituminous coal; I do not know much about anthracite mining.

Mr. FARR. The anthracite miners are not receiving one-half of the sum that the gentleman suggested.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, the bituminous miner is not getting rich even in those places where his daily wage may be large. I think the miners, even in my State, have been making good wages this winter, but their annual wage is comparatively small because the mines only run a portion of the time. The man who will devise or encourage or start a system under which we will begin to buy and store coal in the summer time, will be a public benefactor. Coal can be stored cheaply and be handled cheaply in large quantities, can be unloaded with machinery that handles it for a few cents a ton, can be reloaded without great cost.

Mr. KELLEY. Can the gentleman state why the mine operators do not do the thing the gentleman suggests?

Mr. MONDELL. The mine operator has about all he can do to run the mine and take care of his business, and ordinarily he has few storage facilities. He would have, in some cases, difficulty in selling his coal after it had been stored, for while one might be perfectly willing to use coal that has been stored one might not be so willing to take stored coal from the mine. The coal must be stored at the place of consumption, or near it. The railroads store a large amount of coal. If we could establish a system under which the general storage of coal was practiced, we would find that our coal bills would be less.

We mine our coal and we ship our coal at the time of the greatest demand, at the time of the greatest congestion of traffic, at the time when traffic is most likely to be tied up, and we carry on the whole business in the most uneconomical manner possible.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Has the gentleman noticed that whereas in the past years it was impossible to store soft coal in large quantities, because it heated, or leached, and got worse for fuel purposes, that recently they have adopted the plan of storing it under water, which avoids all that difficulty, so that large stores of naval coal can be kept?

Mr. MONDELL. That is the best possible storage for bituminous or lignite coals. But there are many coals that can be stored out of doors with safety that are not subject to spontaneous conbustion.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Anthracite, of course.

Mr. MONDELL. And some bituminous coals as well.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Do not they lose very much of their oxygen and nitrogen?

Mr. MONDELL. There are many coals that do not deteriorate for months, or even years. Some of them do, however.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss] is recognized.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, the question of cooperative buying is one of the most important ones that can come before the American people. And I desire to point out the principal difficulty in bringing about the condition that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has been discussing.

Cooperative buying must be based upon the carload, because that is the unit in this country. It is easier to secure an order for a medium lot of merchandise than for a large lot. Therefore a small unit is more favorable for cooperative

buying than a large one. Yet we have been steadily going to a larger and still larger car in American transportation. Ten tons, or 20,000 pounds, used to make a carload, while now from 100,000 to 120,000 pounds make a carload. In European countries, where cooperative buying has reached its highest development—and it is the individual buying which brings the greatest glut in the market—they are able to buy in small carloads. Take the case of Germany, where cooperation has brought distribution to almost an ideal degree of perfection, 20,000 pounds is a carload. Five wagonloads of freight over good roads constitute a car lot over a German railroad. Anybody can readily see that such conditions favor the organization of small clubs or units for cooperative purchasing. It is easier to secure an order for 20,000 pounds of any staple commodity than to purchase 50 or 60 tons. The small-car lot has been one of the great factors which led to the organization of the 20,000 cooperative purchasing societies in the German Empire—societies whose purchases are chiefly coal, feed, and fertilizer, yet the trend of American railway transportation is away from the small carload and toward the large carload.

Now, it is not the very large buyers, those who buy straight through the year, who produce the glut in the coal market. It is the ordinary citizen who burns coal only in the wintertime. It would be a vast improvement, as the gentleman from Wyoming so ably points out, if society were to order its fuel during the slack season, so as to permit production to be continuous; but this condition can come only by catering to the small purchaser—to the needs of small clubs—and by making it possible for these purchases to be made when prices are lowest. The conditions must be such that they can buy in small units—that is, so a small number of persons can buy a carload. And that is true of feed, fertilizer, or any commodity which the great mass of the people buy.

I paid a greater attention to this subject during my short trip to Europe than any other one question, growing out of a proper system of distribution, namely, how they were able to organize and encourage cooperative buying. The system of distribution in Europe is very much superior to ours. My opinion is that the basic principle of their system is the small carload. Their advantage over us is that European buyers can order a smaller quantity and have it delivered at the standard price. The price at which any commodity is sold is always based on a carload, and whenever you buy less than a carload you buy at a disadvantage. The whole commercial tendency in the United States is to make the carload so large that the small country community can not order economically by the carload.

We have experienced great difficulty in building up cooperative buying among the farmers, because it requires the combined needs of so many individuals to utilize one car lot. If we want to buy cottonseed meal we have to order a large lot. If it is fertilizer the same conditions exist, while in Europe cooperation is made easily possible because of the smaller cars. I doubt if we will establish cooperative buying generally in this country unless we can secure a modification in our American system of transportation and go back to the smaller unit in shipping.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For inquiries and scientific and technologic investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances, with a view to improving health conditions and increasing safety, efficiency, economic development, and conserving resources through the prevention of waste in the mining, quarrying, metallurgical, and other mineral industries; to inquire into the economic conditions affecting these industries; and including all equipment, supplies, expenses of travel, and subsistence: *Provided*, That no part thereof may be used for investigation in behalf of any private party, $100,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My colleague from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER], who is chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining, I presume has fairly accurate knowledge of how this money is expended. I would like to get some information from him or from the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand, this paragraph provides for ores taken out of the ground, as to the treatment of those ores to extract the metal.

Mr. MANN. This paragraph provides for anything relating to any minerals. And what do they do with them?

Mr. FOSTER. They make investigations along that line. They look into the health conditions provided here, as to such means as will make mining safer and healthier, remove the dust——

Mr. MANN. This paragraph reads—and I presume it is taken from the organic act——

Mr. FOSTER. It is.

Mr. MANN. It reads:

Mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances—

And so forth, and so forth, and so on. It covers any possible activity; but what do they do?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will find in the hearings a statement from Dr. Manning as to what they do under this appropriation. He says:

Considerable progress was made in investigations of smelter-smoke problems and of methods of removing from smelter smoke the constituents injurious to vegetation and animal life.

The possibilities and limitations of the wet thiogen process for reducing sulphur dioxide to elementary sulphur were demonstrated.

A comprehensive report on the reduction of barium sulphate, of importance to paint and other industries, was prepared.

There is a list here a page long. I can give the gentleman some more items if he would like to hear them.

Mr. MANN. Yes; I would like to hear some of it.

Mr. BORLAND. I read:

Progress was made in studies of the absorption and concentration of sulphur dioxide from smelter smoke and the purification of crude sulphur and arsenic.

Considerable progress was made in the work of cyanidation and allied processes for the treatment of gold and silver ores.

Methods were developed for treating low-grade complex gold, lead, silver, and zinc ores that if commercially successful will render available millions of tons of ore that can not now be treated profitably.

Encouraging results were obtained in the application of a process for extracting zinc from low-grade oxidized ores not amenable to present processes.

Methods of mining and milling lead and zinc ores in the Joplin district, Missouri, have been greatly improved and losses reduced as a result of the investigation conducted by engineers of the bureau.

That will give a general indication of what they have been doing.

Mr. MANN. That is very interesting.

Mr. BORLAND. This is the appropriation out of which they have done the radium work; but my understanding is that that work is virtually now at an end.

Mr. MANN. Have we ceased to be a partner in the production of radium?

Mr. BORLAND. We have produced the radium, and it is in stock; and I understand they are not producing any more. We have a supply of radium now.

Mr. MANN. We have three-tenths of a thousandth of a gram. [Laughter.]

Mr. BORLAND. Well, I understand they have it, and they are not going to produce any more. We asked Mr. Manning how much they had delivered altogether, and Mr. Manning said 5½ grams. He stated further that 1 gram of that amount belongs to the bureau. The bureau will get something altogether over 1 gram. There will be probably a little over 8 grams altogether as a result of the plant's operations. They say they have a supply on hand, and it does not exhaust itself very readily. That radium is conceded to be worth about $100,000—the stock that belongs to the Government.

Mr. MANN. Of course, it is easy to say how much a thing is worth when you do not buy it. There is no reason for putting a limit on the price.

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. I am not disposed to criticize what they have done about radium, although I think it is of doubtful propriety for a bureau of the Government to take a Government appropriation and turn it over practically to a private corporation to operate. But in this case it may have been justified.

Mr. Chairman, I heard the amendment of my colleague, Dr. FOSTER, a few moments ago about a coal mine.

Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman will yield a minute, it seems the plant was devoted to the Government by this organization, and Mr. Manning said the net amount expended to date is about $335,000, of which $300,000 was expended by the National Radium Institute and $25,000 by the Government, to obtain 8 grams of radium.

Mr. MANN. I understand the Government put up its appropriation in connection with a private institution. They joined together and collaborated. The Government took a part of the radium and the private institution took most of it. I am not disposed to criticize that. I always have a little divided opinion when the question comes up as to whether a certain thing shall be done by the Government or by a private enterprise. I think it would be very injurious to lead people to believe that every-

thing has to be done by the Government and that private enterprise should be stifled. I think sometimes the occasion requires that the Government shall do things on its own account, although it may be in competition with private enterprise. I do not doubt that in the radium case, if it is profitable, a private institution would produce the radium. If it is profitable, they will continue to produce radium. If it is not profitable, they will not do it. We might go ahead and do it.

Now, the gentleman says that Mr. Manning says that we have radium enough. Where is this radium that belongs to the Government?

Mr. BORLAND. It is here in the Bureau of Mines building in Washington.

Mr. MANN. It is certainly of no value there to anybody.

Mr. BORLAND. Certainly it is.

Mr. MANN. What value is it there?

Mr. BORLAND. The testimony shows that the physicians come there and take away a certain amount of energy when conditions permit, and that it was being used constantly by the officials of the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANN. The Public Health Service goes up there to the Bureau of Mines with patients?

Mr. BORLAND. I am not technically familiar with it; but they go there and charge something with radium and bring it away.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the emanations from the radium are used, and they will be potent possibly 24 or 48 hours. They can go there and secure those emanations in water, for instance

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have two or three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

Mr. MANN. No; make it three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. In this water the emanations from the radium are even more powerful than the radium itself, but of course its power lasts only from 24 to 48 hours.

Mr. MANN. Nobody can get the benefit of it unless they come to Washington.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be good for 24 hours.

Mr. MANN. The people on the California coast can not get the benefit of it?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. MANN. We have enough of it?

Mr. FOSTER. They have not enough of it, except so far as the Bureau of Mines is concerned.

Mr. MANN. So far as the Bureau of Mines is concerned, they do not need any. It is not for their use. I do not know; perhaps they have somebody in the Bureau of Mines that needs the effects of emanations from radium. [Laughter.] I sometimes think they have.

Mr. FOSTER. There are experiments with radium all the time, as my colleague knows.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; but they are not confined to the Bureau of Mines. The experiments with radium are not confined to the Bureau of Mines. They are going on all over the world.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly; but the Bureau of Mines under this arrangement has gotten a certain amount of radium.

Mr. MANN. We have spent $35,000 and some more to get in the Bureau of Mines a gram, is it?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not remember the amount. Yes; a gram of radium.

Mr. MANN. And 8 grams went to the other fellow. The Public Health Service sends somebody down here with a bottle of water and has it charged with radium, and they make use of it somewhere in the Public Health Service or somewhere else for 24 hours. I think we need some more experiments to get the benefit of that.

Mr. FOSTER. This arrangement was entered into by the Bureau of Mines in an experimental way to begin with, with Dr. Douglas and Dr. Kelly. These two men furnished $75,000 apiece and built this institute for the extraction of the ore in Denver, Colo. They went out and leased these mines from some company to take out so much radium ore, agreeing to take out so much radium, and whatever was gotten out above that quantity was to go to the Government. It was said they did not have a process that would extract the radium, but it was found they had, and at one-third of the previous cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For inquiries and investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of petroleum and natural gas, with a view to economic development and conserving resources through the prevention of waste; to inquire into the economic conditions affecting the industry, including equipment, supplies, and expenses of travel, and subsistence, $100,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Does the gentleman know how far the Rittman process is being used by private parties?

Mr. MONDELL. I think perhaps I can give the gentleman a little information on that subject.

Mr. MANN. It is the gentleman from Wyoming to whom I am appealing.

Mr. MONDELL. A plant was started in Casper, Wyo., some two years ago, for the purpose of utilizing the Rittman process. The first construction was found to be faulty, and a large amount of reconstruction became necessary. That has taken a considerable time, as is natural with a new process of this sort, and my understanding is that up to this time they have not gotten to manufacturing in any great quantity in any very satisfactory way, though they are hopeful that the process will be found satisfactory and economical, and that it can be utilized to a large extent. My understanding is that the Rittman process is not being utilized in the production of a great quantity of gasoline at this time, but the outlook is hopeful.

The gentleman knows there are other processes than the Rittman process that produce a motor fuel from oils after all the gasoline has been extracted in the usual way. There is what is known as the Burton process, which is used by the Standard Oil Co. Under the Burton process they are producing a very considerable amount of motor spirits at various places, but my understanding is that up to this time they have not been able to develop the Rittman process very satisfactorily in very large production.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, the director of the Bureau of Mines said, among other things, that the chief of his division of petroleum had recently resigned to take charge of a large commercial company to operate under the Rittman process. He explained that with the oil at 2 cents a gallon, gasoline under the Rittman process could be produced at 6 cents a gallon, but that at the price now of petroleum the country over, gasoline could be produced under the Rittman process at from 10 to 12 cents a gallon, and that at the present wholesale and retail price of gasoline the Rittman process was a great money saver. As long as gasoline was cheap, soon after the Rittman process was discovered, probably it was not commercially attractive; but at the present price of gasoline it is said to be becoming more and more commercially attractive, and will probably come into immediate use.

Mr. MANN. If they can use the Rittman process and produce gasoline for 8 cents a gallon, why in the world do they not do it?

Mr. BORLAND. When the oil is down to 2 cents a gallon they produce it at 6 cents, but at the present price of oil they are producing it at 10 to 12 cents, and at the present price of gasoline that makes the Rittman process, which produces more gasoline out of the oil, an attractive commercial proposition.

Mr. MANN. If the Rittman process will produce so much more gasoline at a lower price, why do not the people who make gasoline use it?

Mr. BORLAND. I will explain to the gentleman why they do not.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BARKLEY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Kansas City is close to the market, and it is not so very long since gasoline was selling there at 8.4 cents a gallon at retail. As long as it retailed at 8.4 cents, nobody could employ the Rittman process commercially; but when gasoline retails at 20 cents, a very different situation is presented.

Mr. GARLAND. For the information of the gentleman I will say that I was on a subcommittee of the Committee on Mines and Mining, which had under discussion the subject of the reduction of the cost of gasoline, and the Rittman process was very thoroughly considered. The statement was made on the best of authority that the Rittman process did increase the amount of gasoline that could be secured from a certain amount of oil, but that in each case the units had to be recracked, and every time they did the recracking, the cost was as great as the first time, hence it did not decrease the cost, because every process of recracking cost as much as the first process.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There is no doubt that motor spirits can be manufactured from oils that do not under the ordinary processes produce gasoline. They can be made from oils after the gasoline has been extracted or distilled from the oil under the ordinary process of distillation. The Standard Oil Co. uses a process known as the Burton process, by which 5,000,000 barrels of gasoline were produced in 1916. The Government has been experimenting, and a number of people have been experimenting with Government encouragement with what is known as the Rittman process, and my opinion is that eventually the Rittman process will work out and be found to be as economic and satisfactory as the Burton process, perhaps, more so with certain kinds of oil. But up to this time, for one reason or another—and that is not extraordinary, I think, in view of the fact that it took years to work out the Burton process—no very considerable amount of motor spirits or gasoline has been produced under the Rittman process. While the product is called gasoline, as a matter of fact it is not exactly the same as what has been known commercially as gasoline. It is a fluid that can be used and is used for the same purposes, but it is heavier in specific gravity than the ordinary standard gasoline, and my understanding is that it gives off an odor somewhat different from that of gasoline. It is not all of it as satisfactory an article as the ordinary commercial gasoline, but it does very well, and we should certainly encourage all of these processes under which we shall increase the amount of fluid that can be utilized in internal-combustion engines.

While we are perfecting these processes, increasing the amount of gasoline obtained from oils, at the same time the inventors are working on the internal-combustion engine and gradually getting an engine that will use heavier and heavier fluids, and eventually we may be able to use much oil in this way that it is impossible to use at the present time. That is a consummation we all hope for.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not exceeding 20 per cent of each of the four preceding sums may be used during the fiscal year 1918 for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 106 strike out lines 17 to 20, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Not exceeding 20 per cent of the preceding sums for investigation as to the causes of mine explosions; for inquiries and scientific and technologic investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances; for inquiries and investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of petroleum and natural gas; and not exceeding 30 per cent of the preceding sum for investigation of mineral fuels and unfinished mineral products belonging to or for the use of the United States, may be used during the fiscal year 1918 for personal services in the District of Columbia."

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is a provision in the bill limiting the appropriation for these various activities to 20 per cent. Of the appropriation for the investigation of mineral fuels and unfinished mineral products the bureau has been spending 30 per cent, and this amendment permits that to be done in the future.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase or lease of necessary land, where and under such conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may direct, for the headquarters of mine rescue cars and construction of necessary railway sidings and housing for the same, or as the site of an experimental mine and a plant for studying explosives, $1,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept any suitable land or lands, buildings, or improvements, that may be donated for said purpose and to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 10 years, subject to annual appropriations by Congress.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. May I ask the gentleman in charge of the bill, or my colleague from Illinois, whether there have been any donations since July 1 of last year for mine rescue headquarters?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not that I recall.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, Bureau of Mines, $1,167,070.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I regret that the committee has failed to include under this department an item for the investigation of the lignite coals of the country as to their utility for the production of benzol and other light oils. That proposition was taken up last spring with the Bureau of Mines and I was led to believe that an estimate would be submitted to the committee for this work this session.

I want to say to the chairman that I believe it is a work that deserves the attention of the Committee on Appropriations. I predict now that within the next 10 years the source of the light oils used in internal-combustion engines will be chiefly from the lignite coal of the country. These light oils will be a most valuable by-product of the briquetting of the coal. I think the committee would be well justified now to make an appropriation of $50,000 or $100,000 for the investigation of that work. They are using lignite coal in Germany to-day to great advantage. They are there producing from those coals to-day, chemicals used in the manufacture of high explosives and dyestuffs. Some of the best chemists in this country take the position that lignite coals offer wonderful possibilities for the production of light oils to be used for fuel in internal-combustion engines of all kinds.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I believe it appropriate that I should make this statement: The committee is very much gratified at these repeated expressions of satisfaction upon the part of Members at the very excellent work that has been done in reporting this bill. The committee is aware of the fact that, although it has eliminated $33,000,000 from the estimates submitted to the committee and reported this bill $33,000,000 less than the total estimates, it has recommended ample sums for the proper conduct of all of the governmental services provided for in the bill. The committee is particularly gratified at the repeated indications that Members of the House are gradually commencing to realize that our judgment is so sound and our work is so thorough and accurate that, although we have cut the estimates about 17 per cent, still we have made ample provision for very effective service for the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that so far as the Bureau of Mines is concerned I am certainly gratified at the most kind treatment that the Committee on Appropriations has given that bureau.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not say "kind," but "just."

Mr. FOSTER. I shall say "just."

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Committee on Appropriations is always just but never generous.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall amend it by making it "just." I want to say this: That the Bureau of Mines has been doing most excellent work, and in the last year fatalities among miners in this country have been less than ever before in its history. Fewer men have lost their lives in this industry during the past 12 months than ever before in this country, and I hope that good work may go on until the fatalities have been reduced to the minimum. I think that the educational work that has been carried on throughout the country by means of the mine rescue cars and the literature that has been issued by the Bureau of Mines is having a wonderful effect. Not only is it doing great work in the reduction of fatalities but in the economic development of the mining industry of the country most wonderful work has been done. I repeat, the Committee on Appropriations has been just to this bureau and have shown a realization of the importance of it.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Mr. Chairman, I am aware that the number of fatalities have been less in the last year and that the department has been issuing bulletins to show the miners how to take care of themselves, but it is a fact, is it not, that a good many of these miners are men who can not read English?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McCRACKEN. And does the gentleman know whether the bulletins are printed in other languages than English?

Mr. FOSTER. They are; and are to be printed in other languages than that, so that those who are unable to understand the English language may have them in the language which they can understand.

Mr. FARR. I think this year they have done that for the first time?

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Does it not appear to the gentleman that it is possible that the reduction in the number of fatalities may come because the number of immigrants coming to the country has been very greatly reduced or almost entirely stopped within the last two years? May not that be responsible for the reduction in fatalities? As a matter of fact the largest number of the employees in the coal mines, and I think in other mining as well, come from immigration from foreign countries. May not the stoppage of that immigration have had this effect?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the gentleman is correct about that.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

King Hill project, Idaho: For beginning construction, maintenance, operation, and incidental operations, $200,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended until the Secretary of the Interior shall have determined that the said King Hill project is practicable, as provided by section 4 of the act approved June 17, 1902, known as the reclamation act, and shall have adopted the said project under and subject to the provisions and conditions of the said reclamation act.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. It is a new project, and I think it ought to be explained.

Mr. MONDELL. The paragraph is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What is the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve the point of order for the purpose of getting some information.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the King Hill project in Idaho is a Carey Act project. It was begun by a company under the laws of the State of Idaho to reclaim certain lands that had been set aside for the State under the Carey Act. A very large sum of money, amounting, I think, to $600,000, has been expended upon the project by the company. The ditches and flumes are not of very substantial character and the company went into bankruptcy and the State bought in all of the rights at a judicial sale. It is impossible for those upon the land to finance the project, and unless something is done at this time to take it up and expend the necessary money to put the system in proper shape what has already been expended will be lost.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand a large amount has been expended up to date?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Six hundred thousand dollars, if my recollection is right. It will require $400,000 to complete it, and $200,000 are appropriated here. The Secretary of the Interior stated that this project could be taken on without putting such a burden on the reclamation fund as to embarrass the progress of work upon existing projects. The committee, upon the presentation of the matter, believed that it was desirable to take this additional project. There is some question whether the Secretary of the Interior has determined under the reclamation act that the King Hill project is a practical project, and the provision was included that before any money should be expended the Secretary of the Interior should make the determination required by section 4 of the reclamation act and should provide that the project should be subject to all of the terms, conditions, and limitations of the reclamation law.

The committee wished that there should be no misunderstanding about the expenditure of this money, and if it is to be expended it should only be expended upon the condition that settlers upon those lands be subject to the same obligations and liabilities as settlers upon any other land upon which money is being expended for reclamation purposes. This is a unique case. There has not been a similar case heretofore where lands segregated under the Carey Act upon which a project has been initiated has been by judicial sale put in the control of a State and then proposed that the United States should take it over as a reclamation project. The provisions inserted in the bill in connection with the appropriation are that the Interior Department, before it can expend any money, must make certain that the expenditures upon this tract will be under the same condition and that those for whom benefits are to be made will be subject to the same obligations as persons obtaining the benefit of any other expenditures under the reclamation law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are the sponsors of this willing to accept it upon the conditions named by the committee?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The settlers?

Mr. STAFFORD. The settlers; the receivers and——

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have no information about that.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. FITZGERALD. In just a moment. But the committee has determined that before the department shall have any authority to expend any money that the department must first determine that this is a practical project under the reclamation law, and then secure agreements to bring those to be benefited within the provisions of the law before any money can be expended. The committee believes that under the circumstances while it was desirable to take this up as a new project, that it would not permit the Government to put an obligation upon the reclamation fund for expenditures upon a project under any condition by which those for whose benefit the expenditures would be made could by any possibility escape paying back to the reclamation fund the money to be expended for their benefit, and the indications are that those who have taken up the land will gladly accede to those conditions. My recollection is that the testimony shows that the settlers have complied with all the requirements which would entitle them to patents from the State under the Carey Act if the necessary reclamation project had been completed; but the State is unable to issue the patents because the land has not been reclaimed in accordance with the provisions of the Carey Act. The settlers upon the lands have done everything they could possibly do except to finance the necessary work for the reclamation project.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand, the State is not in a position to advance the funds to undertake this work.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The constitution of the State of Idaho, if I recall correctly, prohibits it from making expenditures for the purposes necessary to complete the system. All of the facts indicate this to be a very unique and unusual situation, and that if it were possible to bind those for whose benefit the project was to be initiated, that it would be highly desirable that the Reclamation Service should undertake the work.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of the Carey Act passed over 20 years ago, authorizing the reclamation of arid lands through State supervision, there were segregated to the State of Idaho in 1904 about 18,000 acres of land, and in 1909 about 9,000 acres, under what is known as the King Hill project in south central Idaho along both sides of the Snake River in the vicinity of Bliss, King Hill, Glenns Ferry, and Hammet. Glenns Ferry, a town of 1,200 population, is the largest settlement in the project. The State entered into a contract with the King Hill Irrigation & Power Co. and the King Hill Extension Irrigation Co. for the construction of irrigation works, and over $1,500,000 has been expended in the undertaking. Settlers from 23 States have entered about 16,000 acres of land in tracts ranging from 5 to 160 acres. Before the works were entirely completed the construction companies exhausted their resources, work was suspended, and the trustees for the bondholders brought foreclosure proceedings after a default of interest. In March, 1914, the property was offered for sale, the only bidder being the State of Idaho, who purchased it in order to protect the settlers from loss, since which time the State has been operating the system. Some portions of the project, especially the flumes, were so cheaply constructed that they are going rapidly to decay, and unless relief is afforded and the project rehabilitated great loss will be entailed on the settlers, many of whom have orchards and substantial improvements on their land. Because of the weakness of the flumes it is impossible to carry a full head of water, and the entrymen have refrained from cultivating the land to a large extent until a substantial water system could be completed. The value of improvements and live stock on the project will aggregate nearly $1,000,000.

The project contains over 16,000 acres of land which can be irrigated and cultivated and 2,500 acres of land suitable for orchard.

When the Committee on Appropriations made an inspection of irrigation projects two years ago, the King Hill situation was formally presented to the committee at Boise, Idaho. About a year ago the Secretary of the Interior directed an examination of the project by engineers of the Reclamation Service. The report of the engineers was considered by the board of engineers at Denver, Colo., in September last, and submitted to the Secretary of the Interior, upon which the estimates now pending before the Committee on Appropriations are based.

The State of Idaho can not, under its constitution, provide money for the purpose of reconstructing this system. Over 300 settlers are in danger of losing their investments and the benefit of their labors and the hardships they have endured, and if relief is not afforded and the project completed the land will revert to the public domain under the general law. The urgency of the matter is indicated in the report of the board of engineers and the Director of the Reclamation Service, and it is earnestly hoped that the Government may come to the relief of the settlers and take over the project and complete the same under the direction of the Reclamation Service.

I submit a statement showing the location by States of settlers on the King Hill irrigation project. There are 323 entrymen from 23 States:

Idaho	136
New York	1
Arkansas	1
Maine	1
Michigan	1
Nevada	1
South Dakota	1
Nebraska	2
Minnesota	3
Indiana	3
Ohio	3
Wisconsin	3
Missouri	4
Wyoming	4
California	4
Oklahoma	5

Kansas	11
Utah	11
Iowa	14
Washington	14
Oregon	20
Montana	21
Colorado	21
Illinois	22
Eastern States	16
Total	323

Mr. STAFFORD. May I inquire of the gentleman from Idaho whether he has any knowledge that the settlers are willing to accept this fund upon the conditions as set forth by the committee?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes; I have, and I hold in my hand here a telegram which reached me this morning in which it states that an irrigation district has been formed there, 456 voting for it and 47 against. It only requires a majority of the settlers to form an irrigation district.

[Telegram.]

GLENNS FERRY, IDAHO, *February 26, 1917.*

Hon. ADDISON T. SMITH, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

King Hill irrigation district carried by vote of 456 for to 47 against. Ready for business with Government.

ALLEN MILLER.

I have also a telegram from the governor of the State, authorizing the commitment of the State to this legislation and referring to an act of the legislature, passed March 3, 1915, two years ago, turning over the entire project to the Federal Government without any encumbrance at all and with a clear title.

BOISE, IDAHO, *February 5, 1917.*

ADDISON T. SMITH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The King Hill project came into possession of the State by foreclosure proceedings held in the United States District Court of the State of Idaho, the State land board buying the receivers' certificates with money from the Carey Act fund and eventually buying it at receivers' sale. The authority to convey was granted by the thirteenth session, senate bill 109, page 79, thirteenth session laws, as follows:

"SEC. 3. The said board is further authorized and directed to dispose of said project or any portion thereof by sale or otherwise to the United States Government or any other responsible person, firm, or corporation upon such terms and at such time as may seem to them most advantageous to the State. Said board is hereby authorized and empowered to make and execute on behalf of the State of Idaho such deeds of conveyance and all other documents and instruments that may be necessary to transfer all title which may be possessed by the State of Idaho to said projects."

Do you want any further instructions or do you want the legislature now in session to legalize the matter any further?

M. ALEXANDER, *Governor.*

Mr. STAFFORD. So there is no question whatsoever that those interested will approve of all these conditions as set forth in the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Not the slightest.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the information furnished by the chairman of the committee, supplemented by that furnished by the gentleman from Idaho, is satisfactory, and I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, in making this first appropriation for the King Hill project——

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the amendment reported again which the gentleman from Wyoming made.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman in making this first appropriation for the beginning of the King Hill project the committee in the proviso that has been referred to is not proposing to place the King Hill project in any different position or give it any different status under the reclamation law than projects now have under the law. As a matter of fact it has not authority to appropriate for a reclamation project except in accordance with the terms of the reclamation act.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. NORTON. The fact is the committee has given this a different status from most of the reclamation projects, has it not?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rose for the purpose of correcting any such misapprehension.

Mr. NORTON. It is making an appropriation of $200,000 before apparently it found whether this project is practical or not.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, no.

Mr. NORTON. Do the committee appropriate money before a project is determined to be practical or not?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, if the gentleman will give me a little time, I will try to discuss these matters, and I rose for that purpose.

If this project is undertaken, it will be undertaken just as all the other projects have been undertaken—under all the terms and conditions of the reclamation law. But this is the first project, the first new project, proposed since the Committee on Appropriations began to appropriate for reclamation projects. Hence it is necessary, or wise at least, as I think it will be in the case of every new project we may undertake, to write in the words of this proviso. We are making no new law. We are laying no unusual obligation. We are simply stating the situation and are trying to make it clear to the people of the King Hill project, and at the same time remind the Secretary of the Interior of the fact that no project can be taken up except in accordance with the terms and conditions of the reclamation act, and that no project may be undertaken unless the terms and conditions of the reclamation act are complied with. I do not apprehend any difficulty on the part of the State of Idaho or the settlers under this project to enter into the contract and to assume the obligations necessary to make this a reclamation project. But in appropriating for the first time for a new project, since we began to appropriate it, it is proper, it is wise, it is judicious, and it is a notice to all concerned, that we shall write this proviso, which is simply the declaration of the law. This law provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall not enter upon any reclamation project until after examination he has determined that the project is practicable. Then on his responsibility he undertakes the work.

Now, just one word more. This is not the sort of a project that, in my opinion, the Government would undertake as a new project, because it is very doubtful as to whether at the beginning it was a feasible project. It is very doubtful whether a project is feasible upon which $1,500,000 has been expended for the irrigation of 18,000 acres only to discover it will require an expenditure of about $35 an acre more in order to establish such permanent works as will make the project a permanently successful one.

But we are justified, I think, in undertaking it by reason of the fact that, while the project in the beginning was one of many complications and innumerable difficulties and excessive in its cost, a large portion of the expenditures have already been made; no obligation now rests on the people, except a very small obligation to the State of Idaho that will probably be waived; and the Secretary and the Reclamation Service think the project can be finished for $600,000. If it can be finished for that sum it will be a feasible project. The people are there. The land is good, the climate is good, and we are saving the project by protecting it from the danger of dissolution. It looks as though, with all the expenditures already made, that unless we take hold of it the settlers would lose their homes and all that has been spent will go for naught. With this expenditure we can make the project a permanently successful one; and we can undertake it, I have no doubt, under all the conditions of the reclamation law.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. About how many acres will it reclaim?

Mr. MONDELL. Eighteen thousand to 20,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

North Dakota pumping project, North Dakota: For maintenance, operation, continuation of construction, and incidental operations, $54,000.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire about this pumping project in North Dakota. Where is it located?

Mr. BORLAND. At Williston.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is there any land under irrigation there?

Mr. BORLAND. No. Williston is in the semiarid belt, and farming does very well without irrigation, and so they are using the pumping project almost exclusively to supply electric light to the town of Williston. The town pays for that power.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is it self-sustaining? Do they get enough revenue out of it to pay?

Mr. BORLAND. It is self-sustaining in that sense, but not paying back any consumption charges.

Mr. HAUGEN. Not getting any water for irrigation?

Mr. BORLAND. No; I think none is being pumped now for irrigation.

Mr. HAUGEN. Has it ever been tried out?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; but the main difficulty is that while the rainfall there is irregular, it comes with such frequency that they are taking chances without irrigation.

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

I want to say concerning this project at Williston that it is a project in which the United States has expended about $700,000, and the organization and construction of the project, as far as I have been able to determine by such an investigation as I have made of it, was very poor to say the least on the part of the Government. There are about 8,000 acres under irrigation on the project. Only a part of this area pays water-right

charges every rear. There should have been in the beginning an organization on the part of the Government that would have required everyone under the project to pay from the beginning a minimum water-right charge, so that the project would have at least paid operating expenses. When the area that is susceptible to irrigation is once put under actual irrigation and water is used therefor, this is going to then develop into a very splendid project and a project that will work out so that every cent of the proper construction charges will be repaid to the Government. Last year the Reclamation Service did not see fit to operate this project.

Mr. HAUGEN. Can the gentleman give any reason for not operating it?

Mr. NORTON. The reason for not operating it last year was that the Reclamation Service required a guaranty to be put up by the landowners under the project to pay for water rentals at least an amount equal to the operation expenses of the project.

Mr. HAUGEN. Has it ever been operated with any success?

Mr. NORTON. I do not believe it has ever been operated practically. Those who have had the construction work in charge and who have had the operation work in charge have not had a proper vision of the work that should be done there—of the development work and the encouragement that should be given those farmers upon the project.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. In just a moment. I want to say this: If the policy that has been pursued by the Reclamation Service for the last few years is going to be followed out it will result in a loss to the Government of the entire amount that has been expended on the project, whereas if a wise and broad policy were carried out there in the next five years that territory, which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] is acquainted with, would be developed in such a way that every dollar that the Government has put in would be paid back.

I think the committee would be well justified in this case in following a broad and liberal policy for a period covering five or six years of assisting the landowners in using this water and in developing this project. There might be a loss for four or five years of three or four thousand dollars a year in operating expenses, but at the end of that time the project would more than pay all the expenses and ultimately, within 20 or 30 years, it would then pay back the construction charges.

Mr. BORLAND. This project will cost about three-quarters of a million dollars, and the city of Williston is now paying about $75,000 a year for power. Would it not be better for the city of Williston to bond itself and take over this plant and let the Government out? Would not that be a better plan?

Mr. NORTON. It might be a better plan. It might be that it would have been a better plan from the beginning for all of certain States and municipalities in the West to have bonded themselves and carried on all these irrigation projects, but I do not think so at all.

The city of Williston is one of the most progressive little cities in the West for its population. It has about 6,000 live, active, energetic, and progressive people. The citizens of that city are willing to do everything that is reasonable within their power to assist this project, but those in charge of the Reclamation Service went on there and organized that project and made a fizzle of it at the beginning. They are making a fizzle of it now, and if they proceed as they have done in the last few years the Government will lose all it has put in it.

Mr. TILSON. What is there there to produce power?

Mr. NORTON. There are millions of tons of lignite coal. The Government has its own coal property and coal plant there.

Mr. TILSON. You pump water with this coal?

Mr. NORTON. Yes. The energy from the coal is converted into steam power, and that steam power in turn into electric power.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman think coal can be used to pump water and make it profitable as a continuing business?

Mr. NORTON. Yes; it can. There is no question about it at all.

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

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. HAUGEN. Has it not been tried out so as to establish the fact that it is a failure? About $800,000, as I understand, has already been expended on it.

Mr. NORTON. No; I do not think so at all. I think that if this project were wisely conducted and proper management used the plant would be made a paying and successful proposition.

Mr. HAUGEN. We have spent $800,000 on it, and it has been a failure.

Mr. NORTON. From the beginning it has not been properly managed and operated.

Mr. HAUGEN. Would it not be possible to unload and abandon the whole project?

Mr. NORTON. You might as well suggest it would be profitable to abandon several of our irrigation projects, for that matter. As I have said, I think that by following a broad and liberal policy in this case this project can and will be made a successful one. I do not think that the project can now be unloaded on any private concern.

Mr. HAUGEN. Williston would probably do that. I agree with the gentleman. I have been at Williston several times, but I have failed to find any evidence of agriculture in that vicinity.

Mr. NORTON. I have been over the project several times, and I am fully convinced and believe that with proper management the project will eventually prove highly successful.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Dakota says that the Reclamation Service touching the Williston project has lacked vision. If there is anything that the Reclamation Service has had in connection with that and one or two other projects, it has been vision. They have had visions, as a matter of fact, that have not developed into realities.

And yet no one is particularly to blame for the starting of the Williston project, and no one is to blame for the starting of the Garden City project, which we are now, after spending $137,000, proposing to put up at auction. We shall be very lucky, indeed, if we get a few thousand dollars for it.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, may we have the gentleman's amendment read over again?

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. MONDELL. To strike out the paragraph. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment was to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. MONDELL. When the reclamation bill passed and the Reclamation Service began its work there were a great many people along the border line between humidity and aridity who had heard the wonderful stories of the crops you can grow and the values you can produce under irrigation, and who wanted some of those blessings. In response to that demand we started a row of projects from Williston to the Hondo, along the line where sufficient rain merges into questionable moisture conditions and fades out into aridity, and we have had just the luck with those projects that most people who had been students of irrigation expected we would have with them. But we had to try that experiment. Other people have tried it. Other people have had the same experience with it. We have had our trials, and we are going through with them now, and I do not think anybody in particular is to blame for the outcome.

The trouble at Williston is this, that when Jupiter Pluvius is kindly you can grow a crop without irrigation; and if you can grow a sort of a crop without any cost except the turning of the sod and the planting of the seed, why obligate yourself to pay $35 to $50 an acre for the purpose of loading upon yourself the responsibility and obligation of paying $3 or $4 an acre per annum for water to place on your land to grow crops? It is true that if these people would use that water, and if they could grow a class of crops that would pay the expense of its application at the cost of pumping, they would do very much better than they do under the somewhat uncertain conditions of rainfall up there; but it will be a long time in this country, as it has been a long time elsewhere, before the people in a humid country will learn that it pays to irrigate.

In the valley of the Po in Italy that lesson has been learned. In Spain and in various portions of eastern Europe and northern Africa it has been learned; but we, as a people, have never learned it, and it does not look as though we were going to learn it very fast around Williston or Garden City. The gentleman says that if the Reclamation Service had compelled the people to take the water and pay for it, all would have been well. If the Reclamation Service had attempted to do that thing, there would have been riots in that vicinity compared to which the bread riots in New York would have been tame and insignificant.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is it not a fact that in that section of the country, in Dakota, they have been growing bigger crops even than in the Red River Valley, and that they have a sufficient

rainfall at the present time, and have had for the last 8 or 10 years, and are growing splendid crops?

Mr. MONDELL. I think they have been getting very good rainfall there, and they have been raising very good crops. But there were people interested in irrigation in that region who wanted to try that experiment.

In the first place, it is a very questionable experiment to pump water anywhere for irrigation. It can be accomplished successfully only where crops of large acre value can be produced, and then it can be accomplished successfully only where the lift is not too great. You can not afford to grow wheat in North Dakota with water pumped out of the Missouri River by coal power on the lift required to place that water on the land around Williston. If the people around Williston can learn to raise something that brings more per acre than wheat, they can afford to irrigate.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman knows that about 4,000 acres have been under the ditch there, and that those people have been willing to pay, and they have farmed very successfully, raising alfalfa and small-grain crops, and have paid the charges, and, in fact, have paid a large part of the constructive cost.

Mr. MONDELL. I am glad we started that project, and I for one would be perfectly willing to run this project at a loss for some time longer. We have been running it at a loss. People have not been paying the cost of maintenance while we have been furnishing the water. I think it would be well to continue to run it at a loss for a while, in the hope that we may finally get a larger number of folks to come under the project, and so that we can get out from under it without having lost too much. But we must expect a considerable loss there, the best we can do. It is not extraordinary that there should be a loss. This experiment had to be tried, and that was a fairly good place to try it.

Mr. HAUGEN. My contention is that the whole thing of having an irrigation pumping station there is a detriment to the country. It sets up a sort of a scarecrow and drives the people away, and if you do away with the station the people will move in there and cultivate the land. The fact is they have had a sufficient rainfall, and they have been growing most excellent crops on some of those farms, producing more than 30 bushels of wheat to the acre.

Mr. MONDELL. Anyone who is so simple as to be kept out of the country because some one in the country irrigates ought not to get along very well anywhere. The fact is that irrigation is carried on successfully in many regions in the world where the rainfall is 50 per cent greater than it is anywhere in North Dakota. It is done in the valley of the Po, in Italy, to which I have just referred. They irrigate there with a rainfall of 40 or 45 inches, and they make it pay because they grow a kind of crops that can not be grown successfully and surely without irrigation. But it took a long education to bring people to that idea.

As one member of the committee I would be perfectly willing to vote to approve some arrangement under which we can gradually turn over that project to the people up there, to handle it themselves, at a very considerable loss to the Reclamation Service and on terms on which the people can afford to take it.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman knows that for the past two years they have been operating, and the operating expenses have been paid.

Mr. MONDELL. Part of the operating expenses.

Mr. NORTON. All of the operating expenses, and it is contemplated now that in any future operation by the Reclamation Service the operating expenses shall be paid. My idea is that even if it did not pay the operating expenses now, it would be a good business proposition for the Government to operate for a few years at a loss, and, as the gentleman says, to develop the project to a state where it would pay operating expenses and construction expenses.

Mr. MONDELL. And to aid those people in securing that vision which they need when they take the project over. I would agree to that.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Lawton project Oklahoma: For maintenance, operation, continuation of construction, and incidental operations, $101,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 113, in line 25, after the sum "$101,000," insert the following: "together with the unexpended balance of the sum appropriated for this project for the fiscal year 1917."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For cooperative and other miscellaneous investigations (secondary projects), $50,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. A few minutes ago I had occasion to mention the long, expensive trip made by three inspectors in order to find that a cow had eaten 45 cents worth of grass. I want to give you the details of other useless Government expenditures in connection with red-tape rigmarole. King and Pierce Counties in the State of Washington run to tidewater. They found it necessary to prevent the overflow of the waters of a dead-level river which lies as a connecting link between two other low-lying bottom-land rivers. The farmers at one end of this truly named "stuck" river would throw logs into one end, and the water would flow to the other end, and then the next year the farmers at the other end would throw logs in, and it would run the other way. So the two counties appropriated $861,000 for the purpose of dredging out the river and fixing its flow permanently so that it would flow toward the Puyallup River. Before this could be done the engineer employed by the two counties had to write to various departments and bureaus and present his application. It became necessary to cross one corner of Indian land, a corner section of land of the Muckleshoot Indian Reservation, and that section had to be released by the Government, which caused an investigation trip by a Government agent, and the unwinding of lots of red tape.

Then, again, after the authorities had received the application for permission to construct the drift barrier in White River Canyon between Buckley and Auburn—a canyon in which there are no dwellings or improvements of any kind—they wrote that the application would be referred to the Reclamation engineers as to the value of water rights for irrigation. Mind you, this is in a stretch of land only 12 or 14 feet above sea level where the whole problem was to get rid of the water.

So they went through a whole investigation regarding the irrigation project and finally released that. A few weeks after they wrote that the matter had been referred to the Geological Survey, and anyone who knows the elements of geology as applied to the hills within 5 miles of Auburn will remember the vast deposits of sand and gravel overlying the ancient strata and would be amused at the suggestion of a coal deposit in that vicinity.

In the course of time the Geological Survey released or removed its objection. I then notified Engineer Roberts by wire that he could proceed with the construction of the drift barrier. He was in a hurry as he anticipated high water in November.

Then the thing was held up for investigation of the value of the timber along this river bottom which had been logged off 20 years ago. In this investigation the Government furnished a young college graduate from the East who had doubtless found in some textbook or heard in some lecture that cottonwood was valuable for paper pulp. He, therefore, began measuring the diameters of the cottonwoods growing along the river banks, and as the writer of this letter to me says:

Those of us who had spent from 20 to 50 years in the State were somewhat nonpulsed at his actions. Indeed, the Indian agent asked him of what value they were. "For paper pulp," he said. I then explained to him that after paying $1 a cord for cutting it, $2.50 a cord for hauling it to the railroad station, 5 miles, paying a transportation charge of $1.50 a cord to market, a total of $5 per cord, it would probably bring in the market $2.50 a cord. This is a sample of the protection afforded by Uncle Sam of the Indian rights, when red tape is applied in large doses.

It is right on a par with the high-priced chase after the forest-reserve cow. While I am on the subject of governmental pettyisms in the West, let me show this warrant which was paid for carrying the mail.

Here is a United States Post Office Department warrant in payment for carrying the mail in one of these mountainous routes which was broken down by the overplus of parcel-post matter going in, along with mail-order catalogues weighing more than one man could carry. This warrant is in payment from July 1, 1914, to June 30, 1915. The route is about 20 miles long, and the warrant for one year's service is for 18 cents. Just the price of an ordinary jitney ride out West. It is not surprising to me that the people out there where these Government agents come and go, where surveyors, inspectors, map makers, costly governmental employees of every kind—and I notice they all come in the summer time—go to harass the people. Look at this bill, and you find the amount appropriated for survey upon lands in the enormous forest reserve, so called, is only $75,000, which leads me again to say, Mr. Chairman, that as the power of the Government centralizes at headquarters and the bureaus become larger and larger, with their people running over the country and harassing the set-

tlers and spending the Government money, we can not help but feel that it can not result in good.

The Clerk read as follows:

All moneys heretofore or hereafter refunded or received in connection with operations under the reclamation law, except repayments of construction and operation and maintenance charges, shall be a credit to the appropriation for the project or operation from or on account of which the collection is made and shall be available for expenditure in like manner as if said sum had been specifically appropriated for said project or operation.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. I do not understand quite what this means. What is the purpose of it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this is to provide for the return to the reclamation fund of the receipts from the operation of hospitals and the messes on the works. We now furnish quarters and subsistence to the employees in many places and make them pay for them. We also furnish hospital service, for which they are charged, and this is to permit the receipts obtained from such sources to be credited to the reclamation fund.

Mr. MANN. That is where the project exists and the Government furnishes certain things to the employees, they pay for it, and that is to be covered into the fund?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how this provision will affect the rentals coming in from power purposes?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It excepts repayments of construction and operation and maintenance charges.

Mr. SINNOTT. I do not see where the power rentals are covered in that language. On some projects considerable sums of money come in from power rentals. I understand in some instances it is something like $200,000 a year.

Mr. MANN. This would apparently cover them back.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My recollection is this would permit the use of the receipts from the power so far as necessary to operate the plant to be credited to the appropriation for that plant.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think that returns——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Just one moment. I am in error there. It is not to return these moneys to the reclamation fund, but it is to credit them to the appropriation from which they are expended.

Mr. MANN. That is to the project fund?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. But apparently it would return to the project fund rentals received from the sale of power. Does the gentleman say that is not the intention?

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is what happens: We appropriate, say $100,000, for construction work on some project. We spend $10,000 in subsisting the employees.

Mr. MANN. We understand that, but suppose in connection with the operation of the reclamation project you sell a certain amount of power for which you receive a rental. That would be money received in connection with operations under the reclamation law.

Mr. BORLAND. If this is not specific enough to except receipts from power, it ought to be made specific.

Mr. MANN. I do not think it is.

Mr. BORLAND. There is no intention of permitting receipts from power to be covered into that particular reclamation fund.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This provision is almost identical with the one carried in the current law.

Mr. MANN. Oh, it is quite different from the present law. In the present law it is provided that all moneys refunded in connection with operations under the reclamation act except repayments of construction and operation and maintenance charges shall be a credit to the appropriation. This provision is that all moneys refunded or received in connection with operations under the reclamation law, except repayments of construction and operation and maintenance charges, shall be a credit to the appropriation, and so forth. Rental paid is not a repayment. It is money received in connection with the operation of the reclamation project, and I should say that under this language it would be covered into the project appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me read what Mr. Davis said.

Mr. MANN. I do not care so much what he said as what the bill says.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But having in mind what was said and done. The receipts of the power plant are part of the operation expenses and they are covered by the word "operation." The power plant is operated in connection with the operation of the project.

Mr. MANN. Undoubtedly it is part of the operation expense.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is excluded.

Mr. MANN. But rental is not repayment.

Mr. BORLAND. Rental may be paid by somebody who is not a water user or a citizen of the project at all.

Mr. MANN. It is clearly not a repayment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Davis said that what is intended is to allow them to omit from the estimates the receipts of such things as hospitals, mess houses, and mercantile stores. Unless they have this provision they must estimate the amount of money that would be expended for what is well defined——

Mr. MANN. No one is objecting to what they are asking for.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield to me for a suggestion which I think will clear this up? I think that if you will insert after the word "with" and before the word "operations," in line 23, the words "hospital messes or mercantile stores"——

Mr. FITZGERALD. But there may be other matters.

Mr. MONDELL. That is practically all of the operations that there are.

Mr. BORLAND. Why would it not be well to state "except payments for power and repayment of construction"?

Mr. MONDELL. I think that is dangerous, because then you would include everything except power, and if you limit this to certain operations that we have in mind and that we had in mind when we drew this language you are clearly not getting on dangerous ground.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the provision in the present law is, "All moneys refunded except payments." Now, there are some receipts that are not refunds. This was to obviate the necessity of having the service include in the estimates the sum of money that will be expended for these incidental operations. I think there will not be any danger——

Mr. MANN. The purpose of enacting a law is one thing, but after the law is enacted the law speaks for the purpose, not somebody who advocated the law. This is a change of law. This provides that all money received in connection——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I suggest we pass it over until to-morrow, and I will ask the director of the service with reference to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to pass over this act——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, before passing it over—I move to strike out the last word—I want to call attention to the reason for this. The language of last year was intended to accomplish what we now seek to accomplish, that is to return to the appropriation moneys that were received from hospitals, from messes, and from commissaries, little stores they run in connection with some of these projects, where they are far from town and they carry on the work by day labor; but the word used was "refunded," and the comptroller said that moneys so received were not moneys refunded, they were moneys received, and so, at the suggestion of the service, we added to the word "refunded" the word "received." I do not believe there is any possibility of any construction whereby sums received from power could be under this language returned to the appropriation.

Gentlemen will understand that this does not return any of these moneys as a credit to the project, but simply returns them to the appropriations. Power receipts now go to the project in reduction of the building charge. I do not think there is any danger of a misinterpretation, but if we were to add the provision I have suggested that would accomplish what we sought to accomplish without question.

Mr. MANN. Does not the paragraph provide for the return to the credit of the appropriation for the project or operation?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; but it does not provide for a credit to the project, it provides for a credit to the appropriation.

Mr. MANN. I do not see how you can credit a project—you have to credit the appropriation.

Mr. MONDELL. On the contrary, every payment that is made on a building charge is a credit to the project, reducing the project charge that much. It does not go to the appropriation at all. This is a credit to the appropriation. These moneys are spent out of the appropriation. They buy food, they hire cooks, they feed men, and the men pay for their board; and the moneys when paid go back into the appropriations from which they come. It does not go to the credit of the project, so that in any event any of these sums returned, whatever they might be, would not go to the credit of the project but to the credit of the appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this project be passed over temporarily.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that this project be passed over temporarily. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for the Reclamation Service, $8,227,000.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, before we leave the Reclamation Service I think attention should be called to a very important provision of this bill against which I am very glad no point of order was made. It is found in lines 14 to 21, inclusive, page 115. The act of June 25, 1910, known as the bond act, making advances for the reclamation fund by providing for a loan of $20,000,000 to the fund, provided in section 3 as follows:

That beginning the five years after the date of the first advances to the reclamation fund under this act, 50 per cent of the annual receipts of the reclamation fund shall be paid into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States until the payment so made shall equal the aggregate amount of advances paid by the Treasury to said reclamation fund, together with interest paid on the certificates of indebtedness issued under this act and any expenses incident to the preparation, advertising, and issuing of same.

Under that act the time had arrived when it would soon become necessary to withhold 50 per cent of the reclamation fund for these repayments. To withhold 50 per cent of the reclamation fund at this time, or any time in the near future, would cripple the fund and prevent our continuing in an orderly way the development of the projects, so the provision to which I refer, that a reimbursement of the money shall be made by the transfer annually of $1,000,000 from the reclamation fund to the general fund of the Treasury, beginning July 1, 1920, and continuing until full reimbursement has been made. This can be done without crippling the reclamation fund. And in this connection I want to say to the friends of the reclamation projects that this year the situation is brighter and better with all these projects than it has ever been before. I think it is clear to everyone now who has followed these projects closely that in the case of most of them the repayments now under way will continue until the projects have most of them paid back to the Government the greater portion of the sums advanced, in some cases all the sums advanced for construction, and in a majority of cases practically all.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the 25 projects you carry in the bill the appropriations are about the same amount as provided for last year. There is but one project, I believe, omitted, and there is one new one added. I would like to know when the projects will be so completed that it will not be necessary to provide these large amounts for the maintenance, operation, and continuation of construction of these various items?

Mr. MONDELL. If he will examine the appropriations closely, the gentleman will find a number of cases where the project is practically complete. For instance, here is the Huntley project in Montana. The major portion of the appropriation we are making is for operation and maintenance. It is an appropriation made, all of which will be paid back within the year. If we make the appropriation this year, it all comes back into the Treasury. In quite a number of the projects we are well on toward completion, and the major portion of the appropriation is for operation and maintenance, which is immediately returned in the payment of operation and maintenance charges.

Mr. STAFFORD. The phraseology, if the gentleman will permit, in most of these items provides for continuation of construction. If the construction was completed, it would not be necessary to have that phraseology.

Mr. MONDELL. There is no project that is entirely completed. The Salt River project is practically completed, but we are still doing a little work on that. The Huntley project is nearly completed. We are doing a little work there. The major portion of the appropriation on most of the projects is for maintenance and operation. The money comes back into the Treasury right away. On some of the projects, like the Yakima and the North Platte, we are now in the heart of heavy construction, and appropriations are large for construction and comparatively small for operation and maintenance. Some of those projects we will continue to develop for the next 10 years. For instance, take the Shoshone project. It has something like 60,000 acres of public land, for which we have already provided storage, and every dollar that we put into construction there carries water onto Uncle Sam's land to make new homes. That is a work that ought to go on rapidly.

But what I rose to say, Mr. Chairman, is that I think we have now reached a point where we may all be optimistic about the major portion of these projects, provided all we of the West stand as we have stood—for keeping faith with the Government in the matter of repaying these sums paid out for construction. We have undertaken a great work. We have really only started upon it. There are still vast areas that can be reclaimed, and they can only be reclaimed and made fit for homes by the expenditure of Federal money without the payment of interest. And we can not expect to continue that great work unless we are honest, faithful, and square and see to it that the moneys used in building these projects are returned under the very liberal terms of the reclamation law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TILSON. Can the gentleman inform me as to whether any of these projects are now actually returning money to the Treasury?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, certainly. Some of them are returning $200,000 and $300,000 a year to the Treasury, and on most of the projects——

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

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. On most of the projects, I will say to my friend, the sums due had, at the time of the last report, been almost wholly paid. I think there was one project where the amount unpaid was 5 or 6 per cent. On some projects practically all was paid, and 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 per cent unpaid, just little driblets that come in slowly; but in the majority of cases the projects are paying up promptly and fully.

Mr. TILSON. But no project is paying more than has been advanced to it, with the interest on that sum?

Mr. MANN. And not that much, either.

Mr. Chairman, we hear quite often complaints from some of our Western brothers of the harshness with which the Government treats them. Here is the reclamation proposition: First, we agreed to give them money that came from the sale of public lands. Then came along a time when we agreed to give them the proceeds of bonds issued by the Government. What was the amount? Twenty millions, to be repaid after a certain length of time at the rate of 50 per cent, was it, of the proceeds from the reclamation fund a year? Well, having given them the money, then we passed a law extending the time for the repayment of the reclamation fund by the users of water for 20 years, or such a matter, without interest. Then having come to the point where the law was about to operate requiring them to repay to the Government the value of the bonds to the extent of the 50 per cent of the receipts of the reclamation fund, we now find they want to extend the time in which to begin to make the payments until 1900, and extend the time in which to complete the payments until 20 years thereafter, or more than 20 years thereafter, because it would take 20 years to repay the principal without the interest. Where they would have been obliged to refund all of the amount of the bonds within four or five years, or less time, it is now extended to 25 or 30 years. And still they complain.

Mr. MONDELL. We are not complaining. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. You are not complaining about that, but you will probably want that changed before you commence to pay any of it back.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. We have never gotten a dollar back on account of the money advanced—not a nickel, not a sou.

Mr. MONDELL. What does the gentleman say?

Mr. MANN. All the money that the users pay back we turn over to some other reclamation project.

Mr. MONDELL. That is the law.

Mr. MANN. That is the law——

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Of course, I have to yield to the gentleman from Wyoming, although he has talked for 10 minutes on the subject without giving us much information, and I have talked for three minutes and given some information.

Now, I yield the gentleman the balance of my time.

Mr. MONDELL. I simply wanted to say this, that the best part of what the gentleman has just said is that he approves all that has been done.

Mr. MANN. No; I do not approve all that has been done, although I have always been a friend of the reclamation projects. But I think they have run us pretty hard sometimes.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ALASKA, EXPENSES IN.

Alaska Engineering Commission: For carrying out the provisions of the act aproved March 12, 1914 (38 Stat., p. 305), entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes,"

including expenses incident to conducting hearings and examining estimates for appropriations in Alaska, and including not to exceed $6,000 for claims for premiums on insurance incurred prior to October 30, 1916, to continue available until expended, $10,500,000, of which sum $3,000,000 shall be available immediately.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. NORTON. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves the point of order on the paragraph, and the gentleman from North Dakota moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to inquire of the chairman of the committee what is the meaning of the phrase beginning on line 8, page 117, "including expenses incident to conducting hearings and examining estimates for appropriations in Alaska"? That is in addition to the legislation under the act authorizing the President of the United States "to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes."

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the Committee on Appropriations should be authorized to go to Alaska for the purpose of making examinations into the work in connection with the construction of these railroads, the expenses of that trip would be paid out of this fund.

Mr. NORTON. Is it proposed that the Committee on Appropriations shall make that trip to Alaska?

Mr. FITZGERALD. If Congress authorizes it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think the committee should go to Alaska and find out something about the petty red tape that is going on there in connection with the construction of railroads in Alaska. Last winter the commission advertised for vast supplies—so many pounds of butter, so many bushels of potatoes, and so on.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think I could not spare the time to make the trip myself, but I do believe that it would be of great service to Congress if the other members of the committee elected to the next House should be authorized to go to Alaska. It has been stated by those who had control of the construction of the Panama Canal that the visits made by various committees of Congress to the Isthmus of Panama resulted in a saving that was conservatively estimated at $11,000,000. At the very beginning the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce made visits to the canal and obtained information that could not have been obtained otherwise.

Mr. NORTON. I want to say to the gentleman that they are very badly needed down there now.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We are proposing to spend $35,000,000 in the construction of these railroads in Alaska. We are also asked for large sums for certain other governmental activities there. We can do no more than take a risk on those who are presenting these matters to the committee, that they are presenting them in a manner that justifies acquiescence in their recommendations, and we have to take a great deal on faith. We decided to recommend this appropriation, and it may be that an opportunity will be presented before Congress shall adjourn to request authority for such a visit. I know not what the wish of Congress will be, but I have spent so much time in the last eight or nine years when Congress was not in session in making visits to places where the Government was doing important work in order to avail myself of the opportunity to get information at first hand, that I do not see the possibility of being able to give the time this year to such a trip.

Mr. NORTON. I hope the gentleman will find time for that work.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But I hope that other members of the committee will be able to arrange to make such a trip, because I am sure it will result in gaining much valuable information that will be of great benefit to the committee in its work.

Mr. STAFFORD. I want to inquire as to the policy of the Government in insuring its property, for which provision is made here, for the payment of $6,000 for premiums.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Alaskan Engineering Commission insured certain cargoes going to Alaska. They were sending up there large quantities of valuable supplies, and the commission took out insurance on the cargoes. The Comptroller of the Treasury decided that without specific authority, following the uniform policy of the Government, there was no warrant for the insurance of these cargoes. The commission stopped insuring further cargoes when this opinion was rendered, and this $6,000 is to meet the obligations that had been incurred before the decision of the comptroller was rendered.

Mr. STAFFORD. Were the premiums at the regular rates?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. We sent up there several million dollars' worth of material.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not the policy of the Government to insure any of its cargoes in shipments from one point to another?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. The investigation that we made of the matter showed that what had been done by the commission was done in good faith. We were sending these materials to Alaska on commercial steamers, several million dollars' worth of supplies, under conditions that were more than ordinarily hazardous. The commission saw fit to insure the supplies. They did it after consultation with other Government officials; but when the opinion of the comptroller was rendered, to the effect that they had no authority for such an expense, authority was asked to pay for such obligations as had been incurred up to that time, and the committee believed, under the circumstances, that we should authorize them to pay the premiums which were actually earned.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would like to offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman, to the paragraph. Since this bill was reported accounts have been rendered for about $500 additional for premiums that had not been received at the time; this amendment is to enable the commission to pay these additional obligations for premiums rendered for this service.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand the commission will not incur additional obligations in the future?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. But this is to meet obligations incurred before the decision of the comptroller was rendered.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FITZGERALD: "On page 117, line 10, strike out the sum of '$6,000.' and insert in lieu thereof '$6,588.92.'"

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. WINGO. I did not want to start making my remarks until the Chair had recognized me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington has been endeavoring to get recognition of the Chair for some time. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Arkansas presently, but he will first recognize the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the item in this bill which will give an opportunity for the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and other members of that committee to go to Alaska for the purpose of making a study of the building of the Alaskan Railroad and of conditions generally in that vast Territory may be retained in the bill.

By the expenditure of a few hundreds of dollars we all know that Chairman FITZGERALD, with his wonderful facility for the grasping of details, can do much to hasten the building of the railroad and for the general practice of economy. I do not mean to infer that the commissioners appointed by the President to build the road are not doing good work. They are. But it is generally admitted that the sending of a congressional commission to the Panama Canal during its construction resulted not only in increased speed but in greater value for money expended, and in changes in the plans which were for the best. Chairman FITZGERALD intimates that he will not be able to find time to go. I hope that he can find time, or, if he can not make the trip, I hope that the ranking member of the committee, Mr. GILLETT, of Massachusetts, can proceed to Tacoma and Seattle, thence to Juneau, Seward, and to Anchorage, and out to the end of the Alaskan Railroad, which has been constructed as far as the Matanuska coal fields.

I had the pleasure of going over the Alaska Railroad last fall. Many big things were happening and some little ones. Among the odd things I noticed was one call for bids for supplies for the winter camps on the railroad. In one advertisement they called for four or five thousand pounds of butter, several thousand pounds of potatoes, thousands of pounds of canned peaches and apricots, and then they wound up their advertisement by calling for five pounds of maccaroni and two pounds of tobacco. I wondered why they had cut it down so small.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not possible that they may have had working up there a gentleman from some other clime who has a cultivated taste that they want to take care of?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not know, but that is merely one of the incidents. Now, a committee going to Alaska

will find among other things that they have built a Government town there called Anchorage, run by a Government agent, a very pretty town on a very good town site, on a harbor where I believe the range of the tides is about 33 feet. When the tide is in the water is very deep, and when it is out the water is very shallow. Now the people who have gone there to make the Government town, who have built fine bank buildings and other buildings and who are running daily newspapers and making a lively city, are determined to have that harbor perfected and made into a safe harbor at a cost of about half a million dollars to be paid for out of the Alaska Railroad funds.

Now, here is a half-million-dollar proposition coming up for the making of a harbor that will be a halfway point on the Government railroad. There will be no report on it through the ordinary channels through which river and harbor reports come, because it is proposed to take the money out of the Alaska Railroad fund. That in itself would send a delegation from Congress over the Government railroad in Alaska.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to stop the very rapid progress with which this bill is being considered, but I have sat here two or three days not using any time. I appreciate the evidences of a desire on both sides of the aisle to press these appropriation bills, especially at this particular time. But there is some information I should like to have, and for that reason I have craved the indulgence of the committee long enough to ask the chairman of the committee for that information. That is, how much has been spent already on this project of the Alaska Railroad?

Mr. FITZGERALD. About $11,000,000.

Mr. WINGO. How much of that has been spent for administrative expenses?

Mr. FITZGERALD. My information is not in such form as to show that.

Mr. WINGO. How many miles of railroad have been constructed as a result of that $11,000,000 expenditure? How much of the $11,000,000 has been for supplies?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I can not tell that. I can state what it is proposed to spend next year for supplies, and what they spent last year; but I have not the figures for the total expenditure thus far.

Mr. WINGO. How much did they spend for supplies during the last year for which the gentleman has a report?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In the last fiscal year they spent for material, equipment, and supplies $1,406,000.

Mr. WINGO. Is that for maintenance supplies, or does that include material to go into the permanent construction?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That includes material. Next year they expect to spend $4,945,000.

Mr. WINGO. How much has been spent for salaries paid to employees, including the administrative officials?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Last year for salaries they expended $255,000 and for wages $699,000. Next year it is anticipated that for salaries they will expend $896,000 and for wages $2,449,000. I may say to the gentleman from Arkansas that they differentiate those items in this way: Under salaries they include purchasing agents, engineers, transit men, and all the engineering force, as well as the hospital and clerical forces. Under wages they include what might be called the construction force, locomotive engineers, trainmen, and mechanics of all kinds.

Mr. WINGO. How many miles of railroad have been built?

Mr. FITZGERALD. We bought the Alaska Northern Railroad, which runs from Seward to the head of the peninsula. That was not in shape to be operated, even for light equipment. That road for 71 miles has been put in shape for that equipment. Then, from Mile 71 the road——

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman recall how many miles of new construction there have been?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; from Mile 71 to Anchorage, along Turnagain Arm, a distance of 45 miles, where there is very heavy rock construction, they have graded from Anchorage southeast about 13 miles. From Anchorage north the road is now practically completed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WINGO. I ask that my time be extended five minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The road is graded and the track laid to within 13 miles of the Matanuska coal fields. The distance from Anchorage to the Matanuska coal fields is 62 miles, and they have finished 49 miles. In addition to that, they have done considerable grading and track laying from Matanuska Junction. They have graded about 24 miles, and that is practically ready for the rails. Then, in addition, they have graded another section on the way to Fairbanks, between Mile 207 and Mile 245.

Mr. WINGO. What was the estimated cost per mile of the work done last year on the railroad that was already constructed and was rebuilt? Was any estimate given of what that cost, and what was the cost per mile on the new construction?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The work done last year was done for less than the estimated cost.

Mr. WINGO. What was the estimated cost per mile of the new section?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not recall. I will have to look that up. Does the gentleman from Wyoming remember the estimated cost per mile?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is a map of the Alaskan Railroad. This is the Alaskan road from Seward to mile 71. This road was constructed but was in very bad condition. They put in ballast, culverts, bridges, and are running some light trains.

Mr. WINGO. Can the gentleman tell what that reconstruction cost?

Mr. FITZGERALD. About $600,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And that included roundhouses, office buildings, and so forth.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We bought it very cheap.

Mr. WINGO. That did not include the purchase price?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; the purchase price was a little over $1,000,000, and the valuation was $2,000,000.

Mr. WINGO. What does the gentleman say that this reconstruction work cost?

Mr. FITZGERALD. About six hundred and odd thousand dollars. This part of the road here [pointing on the map] to Turnagain Arm is heavy rock construction. They have graded this for a distance of about 13 miles. From Anchorage we have graded down to Turnagain Arm and laid track for about 10 miles. That is heavy rock construction. We have graded and laid track from Anchorage Junction 42 miles up toward the Matanuska coal fields. They have just touched the edge of the field and are getting coal which they are using. Thirteen miles remain to be done into the coal fields. They have graded the roadbed for 28 miles in this section [indicating], and they have graded some up in this place beyond [indicating]. They are operating trains carrying passengers and freight on this portion of the line.

Mr. WINGO. What about this lower portion of the road?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are operating that with combination gasoline cars on which freight and passengers are carried. Coal is not now available there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. A cheaper grade of coal is available.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The type of combination cars they are using is much lighter than ordinary construction, and they only have a 70-pound rail. Until they replace their rails with 90-pound rails they could not use the heavier equipment. The work is progressing more rapidly than was anticipated. Within the past year there has been an exceptional increase in the cost of materials and also in the cost of labor, but the work has progressed, nevertheless, within the original estimate of the cost per mile. Does the gentleman from Alaska recollect what the estimated cost per mile was?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think it was $50,000 or $55,000 a mile.

Mr. WINGO. Have they built a portion of the railroad complete for $50,000 a mile there?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; for less than $50,000. We have completed 49 miles, and I think 13 from Anchorage to Turnagain Arm; and, as I say, they are operating this portion with a light equipment, and they have graded about 70 miles in addition, and it is well within the estimated cost. The estimated cost of the 450 miles from Fairbanks to Seward was about $28,000,000, and the commission does not expect that it will spend more than that in completing this road and equipping it, though there has been a great increase in the cost of material.

Mr. TILSON. How many miles intervene yet down between the coal fields and Seward?

Mr. FITZGERALD. When they reach the Matanuska coal fields they can ship it out of there for seven months in the year through Anchorage and Cook Inlet. The Turnagain Arm section is 45 miles long. That is heavy rock construction, and they have constructed and laid 10 miles of track and graded 3 or 4 miles additional, which would leave 32 miles.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is the most expensive of all the work along this line of road, but when that is completed the road will be done from Seward to the Matanuska coal fields. That work ought to be done this fall. I was informed by the engineering commission that all of the work was well within

their estimates. So it may be fairly assumed that the railroad will be completed this next fall from Seward to the Matanuska coal fields, and that we will then be able to secure the naval coal which is found in great abundance at that point, being the end of the branch line running out from Matanuska. So far as we could discover, and so far as I could discover from the investigations I made along the line of that road when I was there, the work was being well done and the country is to be congratulated upon the success that the Alaskan Engineering Commission is bringing to this project. We may look forward to its completion within the estimates as promised by this commission and as we who supported this project promised it to the House; but there is one thing that is not being done as it ought to be done. We promised the building of this road for the purpose of securing naval coal for this country. We told this House at that time that there was an abundance of naval coal there; that if this road could be built and put into operation our Navy upon the Pacific could have a cheap naval coal. The coal is there and substantially the road is completed and not a hand has yet been turned to secure that coal. There has been no action taken on the part of the Navy Department to secure the opening of this naval coal. There has been nothing done toward securing its transportation to Seward or to Anchorage, and its delivery to the Navy on the Pacific coast, and I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that while the Alaskan Engineering Commission is doing its work well, and well within the estimate, and while everything is going with respect to the building of the railroad as we promised, yet that branch of the Government which has to do with taking out the naval coal is doing nothing, and it ought to take notice of the situation and do it immediately.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. What kind of a harbor is Seward?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Seward is a great fine harbor 15 miles long, 2 or 3 miles wide, deep and commodious, with not a rock or a sandbar in it, and open all of the year around.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. How about the ballast? What do they do for ballast on the road that is completed?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There is rock and gravel, plenty of gravel, fine gravel, and rock ballast.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And they get good ties?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There are plenty of ties along the line of the road, but the ties along there are not of the best, and many of them are being imported from the State of Washington, because they get better timber down there.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman does not anticipate that the Government shall mine the coal? He would not advise that, I assume?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Well, I do not advise particularly with respect to that. I am simply calling attention to the fact that the Government has reserved all of our Alaskan coal lands, and the Government will not let us open those mines, and the Government seems not inclined to do it itself. I am calling attention to the fact so that the country may understand why this naval coal is not taken out, that it is not the fault of the men who are building the railroad, nor the fault of the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. MONDELL. I did not understand that all of the coal land or anything like all of the coal land had been reserved. I had supposed that only a small area had been reserved. Have they not left large areas that are subject to lease?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having assumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the 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.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments 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, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that he may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWITZER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Have there been any applications from private enterprises, individuals or corporations, to lease any of these lands to develop the coal?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I have heard rumors that there have been one or two applications, or probably more; but I do not know.

Mr. SWITZER. Is that all the gentleman knows about it—that there have been rumors of an effort to develop the coal land?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is all that I know has been done toward the development of the coal fields. I say something ought to be done with respect to the development of the coal fields. If you will not do it yourselves, let some of this land loose and let us do it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that only a couple of days ago the Secretary of the Interior stated to me that he believed an arrangement had been made by which a railroad rate could be offered cheap enough from Matanuska to Anchorage to induce those who will be entitled to make coal leases to make the leases and get busy. The trouble has been that those who propose to lease could not find out what they would be likely to pay for railroad rates.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. What does the gentleman suggest will be done in advance of the time that the railroad is opened from the Matanuska coal field to Seward, or in advance of the time that it is opened from the fields to Anchorage and the harbor at Anchorage is put in condition to receive colliers and ship the coal from that point? In advance of those two periods, what should be done toward opening the coal fields?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. As I said a moment ago, this road will be completed from Seward to the Matanuska coal field next fall, and nothing has been done in the way of putting up coal bunkers or securing naval coal in any way. The Government is neglecting its duty on the Pacific coast. No provision is being made for taking out this naval coal and putting it into our colliers upon the Pacific coast where it is needed. There is no Navy coal on the Pacific coast or along the Pacific coast anywhere from Mexico to Japan except this at the Matanuska coal field in Alaska. The Government is now shipping Navy coal clear around the Horn from Norfolk to supply these naval vessels in Alaska, when it can get it 180 miles from Seward all the year around if we open up that field.

Mr. BORLAND. My understanding is the railroad now runs to the edge of the Matanuska coal field, where there is a rather inferior grade of coal.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is correct.

Mr. BORLAND. Good for naval and domestic purposes to some extent; but they think there is a better coal farther on which has not yet been opened up?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. A large amount has been opened up and brought out and tested and reported on by the Navy Department as being equal to Pocahontas naval coal.

Mr. MOSS. I have understood that the Navy Department rejected the Alaska coal and claimed they wanted and needed a better coal.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The Navy Department brought out hundreds of tons of the Matanuska coal and made very complete tests on the naval vessels in the Pacific and reported that it was equal to and as good as the Pocahontas coal which they get from Norfolk.

Mr. MOSS. As I recollect the debate on this matter, I voted for the appropriation largely because of my personal regard for the Delegate from Alaska——

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MOSS (continuing). And not on my faith in the railroad enterprise, but, as I remember the debate at that time, it was stated that the coal that had been tested by the Navy Department had been rejected and so reported on by the Navy.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman is correct as to the first part of the debate, but before the debates were concluded the Navy had finished its investigations and made its final report.

Mr. SHERWOOD. It was stated in the debate that the tests made of that coal showed it was not suitable for the Navy. That was stated in the debate when the Alaska bill was under consideration.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I think that was correct up to that time, but afterwards and before the bill was finally passed—I am not sure it was before it was passed, but about that time—the Navy Department made its final test upon a large quantity of that coal and reported that it was equal to the Pocahontas coal for naval purposes. But what I am trying to point out

now is that neither the Navy Department or any other department of the Government is making any effort to secure this coal in Alaska for which we largely built this railroad, and we want to hold them responsible because we are going to need this coal for the use of the Navy at a very early day.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have some remarks I would like to offer on this paragraph to-night, though I think I would not care to offer them to-morrow.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did not hear what the gentleman stated.

Mr. MANN. I said I felt as though I would like to offer some remarks on this paragraph to-night, and I think the chances are, if I sleep over it, I would not care to offer them to-morrow, and I hope in consideration of such a suggestion, and the fact it is now more than half past 10 and that a Democratic caucus is going on in the Chamber, that the gentleman will move to rise and give everybody a chance. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it is only half past 10, and I hope we will work for an hour or two yet.

Mr. MANN. Well, as far as I am concerned, I have three hours' work yet to do after I get home to-night.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have, too.

Mr. MANN. It is on account of the gentleman's health; I wish to conserve the gentleman's health.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I shall be glad to be able to progress with 25 or 30 pages of the bill to-night, so we may finish this bill to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. I sincerely hope we shall finish it to-morrow before noon.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We will have a number of conference reports to-morrow. I am being pestered to death all day long and all night long by gentlemen who wish me to give way with this bill so other matters may come up.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman we are in very good shape as far as appropriations are concerned and as far as other matters are concerned. Undoubtedly we will pass a good many things before the end of the session, hurriedly, hastily, sometimes with good effect, but generally bad legislation, but we work 12 hours a day in the Chamber and then 4 or 5 hours outside.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have worked 14 hours to-day, and I want to put in two full shifts, and in another two hours I can do it.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman and I both do more than 16 hours a day; I know I do and I know the gentleman does, and there are others.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The only recreation I get is working at night. I hope the gentleman will not interfere with my pleasure, but will let us go on for an hour or two.

Mr. MANN. This is the only easy work we have. I want to quit this and get to hard work.

Mr. BORLAND. Suppose we go down to national parks.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Suppose we get down to national parks.

Mr. MANN. No; otherwise I will have to get down to this proposition.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is nothing in between that will incite any opposition.

Mr. MANN. Then it will not take long to read it in the morning.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Nobody will object to the gentleman getting that speech out of his system in the morning, although it would not be in order—his system, I mean.

Mr. MANN. I do not like to do it, but I am willing to take the responsibility; so I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In view of the fact that these Republicans will not stay here and permit us to do business——

Mr. MANN. Three-fourths of those who are here are Republican Members. Without them there would not be the semblance of a quorum.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARNER, 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. 20967) making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. CONRY was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. FITZGERALD. 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. The gentleman from New York asks unanimouse consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a conference report on 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, for printing under the rules.

The conference report is as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1567).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to 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, 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 8 and 88.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and 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 lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert 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, $25,000, 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."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 16, 76, and 98.

ROBERT N. PAGE,
JAS. MCANDREWS,
C. R. DAVIS,
Managers on the part of the House.

JOHN WALTER SMITH,
JOE. T. ROBINSON,
WM. P. DILLINGHAM,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION TO ENROLLING CLERK.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Sepaker, I desire to submit a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 501 (H. Rept. No. 1566).

Resolved, That the enrolling clerk of the House, so long as that office is held by the present incumbent, be paid additional compensation at the rate of $1,000 per annum, payable out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing certain brief resolutions passed by the corporation of Yale University.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the sundry civil bill.

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

OLD-AGE PENSIONS—CORRECTED BILL.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1917, I introduced a bill (H. R. 20576) providing for pensions for all American citizens who have reached the age of 65 years who are incapable of performing manual labor and whose incomes are less than $300 per year.

This bill was referred to the Committee on Pensions, and I find that, through some inadvertence, possibly a clerical or typographical error, certain words and figures of the bill as originally drafted were omitted from the bill as printed. I have supplied these words and figures in another bill, giving the bill the same date and number.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 20576 be reprinted, inserting the language and figures omitted from the first print, and that the copies now on file in the document room and in the Committee on Pensions be destroyed and the correct reprinted bill and copies thereof take the place of the original bill and copies.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would suggest to the gentleman that he introduce a new bill and get a new number, and with this statement in the RECORD the change will be made. I should not try to substitute.

Mr. MANN. This would be the star print of a bill, that is all. That is done every once in a while.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will not object.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Speaker, I make a similar request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

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

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 8222. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the National McKinley Birthplace Memorial Association, approved March 4, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED 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 bills.

H. R. 12195. An act to amend section 17 of the United States bankruptcy law of July 1, 1898, and amendments thereto of February 5, 1903;

H. R. 14426. An act to amend section 6 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American National Red Cross," approved January 5, 1905;

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. 18720. An act permitting the building of a railroad bridge across the Mississippi River at Bemidji, in the State of Minnesota;

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. 18894. An act to amend the public-building act approved March 4, 1913, authorizing the acquisition of a suitable site for a public building at Pittston, Pa.;

H. R. 16855. An act for the relief of Riverside Military Academy;

H. R. 18181. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 19937. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 27, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of the Interior submitting an item for inclusion in the general deficiency bill (H. Doc. No. 2091), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HOUSTON, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21020) to authorize the Legislature of Alaska to establish and maintain schools, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1560), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20721) to extend the time limit of the timber-cutting rights of the Saginaw & Manistee Lumber Co. on lands in the Coconino and Tusayan National Forests, Arizona, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1561), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENRY, from the Committee on Rules, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 309) to investigate Ellis Island, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1562), which said resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. FIELDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 7433) for the relief of Winfield S. Solomon, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1557), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MORIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 7598) for the relief of John H. Kidd, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1558), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 2465) for the relief of James Anderson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1559), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CRAGO, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 698) for the relief of John L. O'Mara, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1563), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 6251) for the relief of John F. Kelly, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1564), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FIELDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 6690) for the relief of Americus A. Gordon, reported the same without amendment, accompained by a report (No. 1565), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 21043) to amend sections 4402, 4404, and 4414 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the appointment and salaries of the Supervising Inspector General, supervising inspectors, inspectors of hulls, inspectors of boilers, assistant inspectors of hulls, assistant inspector of boilers, and clerks in the Steamboat-Inspection Service; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HEATON: A bill (H. R. 21044) to amend the public-buildings act approved March 4, 1913, authorizing the acquisition of a suitable site for a public building at Tamaqua, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 21051) to purchase land adjoining the Naval Training Station at Great Lakes, Ill.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 21052) authorizing the President of the United States to supply merchant ships, the property of citizens of the United States and bearing American registry, with defensive arms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 21053) providing for pensions for all American citizens who have reached the age of 65 years and who are incapable of performing manual labor and whose incomes are less than $300 per annum; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KITCHIN: Resolution (H. Res. 535) authorizing the Clerk of the House to pay to Joseph S. McCoy the sum of $50 for services rendered the Ways and Means Committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. RUCKER of Georgia: Resolution (H. Res. 536) authorizing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to deliver the portrait of Gov. Howell Cobb to Mary Ann Lamar Erwin, of Athens, Ga.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Resolution (H. Res. 537) directing the Comptroller of the Currency to inform Congress regarding amounts loaned on food and other necessaries of life held in storage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHERLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 538) providing for the consideration of amendments to H. R. 20967, the sundry civil appropriation bill; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FESS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 382) fixing the time for the next meeting of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLING: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania favoring the passage of the Volunteer retired bill, giving Civil War Volunteer retired officers the same aid according to rank as that given retired officers of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, disapproving the Federal taxes on profits of corporations, joint-stock companies, associations, and partnerships; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, favoring an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, giving Congress power to regulate the hours of labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania in support of the Volunteer retired bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring the Townsend bill (S. 392) to create a Volunteer retired-officer list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, favoring the uniform regulation of the hours of labor in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of Pennsylvania, favoring Senate bill 392, Civil War Retired Volunteer bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIEGEL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring the passage of Senate bill 392, known as the Civil War officers' retired-list bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, petitioning the Congress for the enactment of the so-called volunteer officers' retired-list bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, favoring the passage of Senate bill 392, known as the Civil War volunteer retired bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 21045) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 21046) granting an increase of pension to William A. Gibbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 21047) for the relief of Charles D. Shay; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 21048) granting an increase of pension to A. H. Shears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21049) granting a pension to Charles E. Cortright; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 21050) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Barber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of United Male Singing Societies of Chicago, protesting against war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), resolution of general court of the Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, expressing to the President their desire to give the President and this Government the most loyal support; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of the executive committee, National Association of Life Underwriters, appealing to Congress to exempt from taxation in the proposed revenue law all life insurance premiums and funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of various residents of New York, against so-called espionage legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of the Public Service Commission Association Rifle Club, favoring the immediate establishment by the Federal Government of a suitable rifle range near the city of New York to be used by civilian rifle clubs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DILLON: Petition of sundry citizens of South Dakota, favoring a referendum vote in case war should be declared; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of South Dakota, opposing war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial adopted by meeting of 3,500 citizens of Minneapolis, praying for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, favoring the migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Wine and Spirit Importers' Society of the United States, New York City, protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 84; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of Viroqua Advancement Association (Inc.), Viroqua, Wis., urging the necessity of the early designation, construction, and maintenance of a system of national highways, to be built and maintained by the National Government; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of several citizens of Illinois, protesting against the country becoming involved in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of George Foley, of Oglesby, Ill., favoring prohibitory bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Rockford (Ill.) Baner Lodge, No. 138, S. F. of A., favoring an embargo on food products; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chicago Preparedness Conference, favoring universal military training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Rockford (Ill.) Wholesale Grocery Co., favoring the Webb bill, House bill 17350; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., protesting against mail-exclusion bill and prohibitory legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Dorchester and Waltham, Mass., favoring a referendum vote before a declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Emergency Peace Committee of Massachusetts, indorsing the President's efforts to keep the United States out of war with Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Papers to accompany House bill 19020, a bill for the relief of Mart Bradshaw; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of Joshua Brantingham and 28 other citizens of Columbiana County, Ohio, protesting against compulsory military training in any form; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of members of Woonsocket Council, No. 113, expressing confidence in the President in these days of international uncertainty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of George M. Fedrick and three others, Anaheim; J. W. Donovan, Perris; Charles J. Perkin, Upland; Charles W. Hedges, Anaheim; I. N. Freeman, I. E. McMahan, and J. L. Gierunup, Riverside; and James C. Fritts, Yucaipa, all in the State of California, favoring passage of a bill to grant rural carriers a reasonable allowance for equipment maintenance, also to fix compensation of carriers upon an equitable and specific basis; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of E. D. Cunard, Order of Railway Conductors of America, Division No. 392, E. E. Dillard, James J. Blackburn, G. F. Beach, Gus Taylor, and E. L. Bussey, all of San Bernardino, Cal., protesting against passage of House bill 19730; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Mrs. L. F. Golay, San Diego, Cal., favoring passage of House bill 17806, the Madden reclassification bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Clarence E. Austin, secretary State Rural Letter Carriers' Association, Chula Vista, Cal., favoring passage of bills for protection of rural carriers from being discharged for trivial matters; one that will define what shall be considered a day's work for a rural letter carrier; one providing a maintenance or a replacement fund of $300 a year like the mounted city carriers receive; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of 1,388 names of persons residing in San Diego County, Cal., protesting against passage of House bill 18986, Randall mail-exclusion bill; Senate bill 4429, Bankhead mail-exclusion bill; Senate bill 1082, Sheppard District of Columbia prohibition bill; House joint resolution 84, Webb nation-wide prohibition bill; House bill 17850, Howard bill to prohibit commerce in intoxicating liquors between the States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Newton S. Gandy, Coronado, Cal., urging support of national prohibition and District prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of secretary California Christian Endeavor, Riverside, Cal., favoring strict prohibition amendment without words "for sale"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Mr. J. O. Corbett, secretary of the Rotary Club of Pittsburgh, Pa., requesting legislation by Congress by which the surplus turned into the Treasury of the United States by the Commissioner of Naturalization may be used in educating the aliens and preparing them for citizenship; also urging support of amendment to the sundry civil bill, by which the Bureau of Naturalization will be authorized to publish a standard textbook for use of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OLNEY: Memorial of Men's Club of Atlantic and citizens of Dedham, Mass., indorsing action of the President in severing relations with Germany and pledging support in international crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Rockland and Dedham, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of Roy Bird and others, favoring prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of public meeting at Mahoningtown, Pa., supporting antipolygamy amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Croton Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, supporting antipolygamy amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of citizens of Daysville, Ky., against war with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of the executive committee, National Association of Life Underwriters, urging Congress to exempt from taxation in the proposed revenue law all life-insurance premiums and funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Clara Miller and 22 citizens of Detroit in favor of House bill 20080, migratory-bird treaty bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petitions of citizens of Worcester, Mass., in behalf of national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Worcester, Mass., on behalf of national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of citizens and taxpayers of West Virginia, protesting against delegating and investing constitutional prerogatives and powers in the Executive of the Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *February 27, 1917.*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

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

Almighty God, Thou who hast led us through all the troublous times of the past and to the ever-increasing sphere of influence and prosperity and greatness as a Nation. We still look to Thee for Thy guidance. We pray that these men in this honorable Senate may catch the inspiration of the history written large with Divine purpose, that they may see clearly the path of duty to accomplish that which has been begun for the good and for the permanent blessing of this land. We pray that the inspiration of the Lord God Almighty may be with us that nothing which we undertake may exclude from it the thought of God, but that Thy purpose may be the guiding and controlling motive and thought of all our acts. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SIMMONS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (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; further insists upon its amendment to the amendment of the Senate No. 58; further insists upon its disagreement to the residue of the amendments of the Senate to the bill still in disagreement; requests a further conference with 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 further conference on the part of the House.

SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA.

Mr. CUMMINS. I present the credentials of Hon. HOWARD SUTHERLAND, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of West Virginia a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1917. I ask that the credentials may be printed in the RECORD and placed on the files of the Senate.

The credentials are as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1916, HOWARD SUTHERLAND was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of West Virginia as Senator from said State, to represent such State in the Senate of the United States, for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1917.

Witness his excellency our governor, Henry D. Hatfield, and our seal hereto affixed at Charleston this the 20th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1917.

[SEAL.] HENRY D. HATFIELD.

By the governor:

STUART F. REED,
Secretary of State.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask that the action of the House be laid before the Senate on the legislative, and so forth, appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on 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