importation of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of voters of Keeseville, N. Y., favoring the submission of the national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Peru, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Resolution of the Utica, N. Y., home-defense committee, favoring the enactment of more stringent legislation against certain persons, organizations, etc., in this country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of members of the Red River Valley (Minn.) Medical Society, favoring bill to increase the rank of medical officers in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Federal Employees' Union of White Earth Indian Agency, Minn., favoring increase in pay of Federal employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lawrence County, Pa., favoring national prohibition amendment to the Constitution and protesting against use of grains in manufacture of all intoxicants as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Women's Missionary Society of New Bedford United Presbyterian Church, New Bedford, Pa., favoring national prohibition amendment to the Constitution and prohibition of all grains for the manufacture of intoxicants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution adopted at mass meeting of citizens of New Bedford, Pa., favoring prohibition amendment to the Constitution and protesting against manufacture and sale of wine and beer for the period of the war as a food conservation measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of members of Second United Presbyterian Church of New Castle, Pa., in favor of prohibition amendment to the Constitution and a law to prohibit the use of grains in the manufacturing of intoxicants during the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution adopted on November 17, 1917, by Upper Buffalo Presbytery, representing a congregation of 182 people, favoring an antipolygamy amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of inmates of Summer Street Jail, Worcester, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of members of the Seventh Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, Huntington, W. Va., urging the national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *December 15, 1917.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Father in Heaven, incline our hearts to Thee, that amid the terrible ordeal through which we are passing, the clash of arms, the destruction of life and limb, the untold misery which follows in its wake, our faith in Thee may not be impaired nor our confidence in the overruling of Thy Providence may not be diminished.

It is written, "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts. For as the rain cometh down, and the snow, from heaven and returneth not hither, but watereth the earth and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return to me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I send it."

Thus we are assured that Thy will is supreme, though men may depart from the paths of righteousness. In the dispensation of Thy Providence Thy purposes and plans shall not be thwarted. Thus continue our faith and confidence in Thee.

In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea,
With a glory in His bosom that transfigures you and me;
As He died to make men holy, let us die to make men free
While God is marching on.

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignations from committees, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

DECEMBER 15, 1917.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation from the Committee on Rules, the same to take effect immediately.

WILL R. WOOD.

—

DECEMBER 15, 1917.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, the same to take effect immediately.

WILL R. WOOD.

—

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 14, 1917.*

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hand you herewith my resignation as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Yours, very truly,

ALLEN T. TREADWAY.

—

DECEMBER 15, 1917.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

W. C. HAWLEY.

—

DECEMBER 15, 1917.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Yours, very truly,

RICHARD P. FREEMAN.

—

DECEMBER 15, 1917.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, and respectfully request that same be accepted, effective immediately.

Sincerely, yours,

W. A. RODENBERG.

—

DECEMBER 15, 1917.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, to take effect immediately.

Yours, very truly,

FREDERICK K. LEHLBACH.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, these resignations will be accepted.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 1419. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of 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. 1419. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUR OF MEETING—11 O'CLOCK ON MONDAY.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock next Monday morning. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman inform the House as to what the plan will be for a vote on the consideration of the prohibition amendment?

Mr. KITCHIN. After I get unanimous consent to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday, I am going to make another request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

VOTE ON THE PROHIBITION AMENDMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, since a great many Members live so far away from Washington it will take two or three days, and maybe longer, to get home, and they wish to leave, some of them, on the 6 o'clock western train and some on the 8 and 9 o'clock trains, and there are some Members who live in the New England States who would like to come down and be present and leave on the 7 o'clock train in the evening, I believe——

The SPEAKER. On what day?

Mr. KITCHIN. On Monday. I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the prohibition constitutional amendment be taken at 5.30, or not later than 5.30, o'clock Monday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the vote on the prohibition amendment be taken not later than 5.30 on Monday.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does not the gentleman think it would be better to fix it definitely at 5.30? I noticed once before, when we were expected to vote at 5 o'clock——

Mr. KITCHIN. I meant we would begin to vote on all amendments on the bill at 5.30.

Mr. LITTLE. You said "or sooner."

Mr. KITCHIN. I said if we get through.

Mr. LITTLE. I noticed the other day that when we were expected to vote at 5 o'clock, and did vote at 4 o'clock, quite a number were not here. If we should fix it definitely at 5.30 we could all be here.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I amend my request by making it at 5 o'clock; that we begin to vote under general debate and five-minute debate at 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that any sort of debate, general debate or five-minute debate, shall close at 5 o'clock next Monday, and that the voting on the submission of this amendment and all amendments thereto shall begin at 5 o'clock.

Mr. WEBB. That includes the debate on all amendments?

The SPEAKER. Of course; it cleans up the debate entirely. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CLERKS TO CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I submit a resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 192 (H. Rept. 223).

Resolved, That clerks to committees of the House during the session provided for by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, be, and they are hereby, assigned for the present session of Congress to the following committees, to wit: Committee on Education, Committee on Railways and Canals, Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, Committee on Invalid Pensions (assistant clerk), Committee on the Judiciary (additional assistant clerk), Committee on Enrolled Bills (assistant clerk), Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I submit another resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 190 (H. Rept. 220).

Resolved, That the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries be allowed an assistant clerk, at the rate of $6 per diem, during the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MADDEN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. MADDEN. I rise to oppose the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARK] has charge of the time.

Mr. PARK. The gentleman can have five minutes if he wants it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I think that for the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries one clerk is all that should be allowed. There is no justification for appointing an additional clerk for that committee. The business of the committee is not very onerous; not very voluminous; and if one clerk can not do the work of that committee the clerk is not qualified.

Of course, this side of the House is not responsible for the extravagant expenditures that will be made as the result of the resolutions which have been reported. If the gentlemen on the other side of the House who are chairmen of these committees are willing to state on their honor that clerks are needed for committees that have no business, we really ought not to complain much.

Mr. PARK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. PARK. I wish to state that the chairmen of these committees did state that these clerks were necessary.

Mr. MADDEN. I realize that. Under that statement I do not know what the chairman of the Committee on Accounts could do except report in favor of the clerks that have been asked for by the chairmen of these committees; but it does seem to me that when clerks are named for committees that never meet and committees that ought not to have clerks, it is a species of extravagance that ought not to be indulged in. There ought not to be any appointments made simply for the purpose of giving somebody a job, and that is all this amounts to. I protest against it. Of course, my protest will not amount to anything. I realize that the resolution will be passed.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Does the gentleman know anything about the work of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. MADDEN. I know enough about the work of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to know that it does not need an extra clerk.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The gentleman does not know enough about it, or he would not express his opinion in that arbitrary way.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman has no right to scold me for expressing my opinion.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman ought not to express an opinion unless he has information on the subject.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not recognize the gentleman's right to read me a curtain lecture when I express my opinion about the injustice of these expenditures. I propose to express my opinion, and the more he reads me a curtain lecture the more strongly my opinion will be expressed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for five minutes more, if I may have it.

Mr. PARK. All right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia yields to the gentleman from Illinois five minutes more.

Mr. MADDEN. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries never has had an extra clerk and never had anything for an extra clerk to do. The committees for which clerks were authorized a few moments ago never had need for any clerks. They never meet. They have no business. They are ornaments, created to give some Member of Congress the title of chairman. Not one of these committees has had a meeting for I do not know how long, and when they do meet they do not meet to transact business. They have no business. Otherwise they probably are all right. [Laughter.] Why should we indulge in the expenditure of the public money just to accommodate the chairman of some committee that has no business, so that he may be able to appoint one of his constituents to a job, not to a place where employment is to be found, but to a job where he has an opportunity to sign the pay roll once a month? I do not think it ought to be done. I submit that the House ought not to do it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What do these clerks get per day?

Mr. MADDEN. Six dollars per day, 30 days a month, if it happens to be a month of 30 days, and 31 days a month, if it is a month of 31 days; and if by any chance the committee has a meeting and there is any business done, then they come in with a bill for extra pay for the clerk because he has done something. [Laughter.] That is true. Nobody will deny it. Every gentleman who has served here in the House long enough to know what the practice is will have to admit it. I remember one chairman of a committee in the last Congress came in here with a bill for $500, I think it was, for extra compensation for a clerk to one of these committees. I think he had worked about 15 minutes at something during his occupancy of the office of clerk, and because he had exercised himself in the interest of the public for a short time extra compensation was requested for his services. Of course he was not expected to perform any service for the regular compensation. That was a gratuity; but

if by any chance on earth he was ever called upon to do any work, why then the compensation which was given to him as a gratuity by action of the House was considered inadequate. I hear somebody say that it was given to him in the nature of a retainer, in order to keep him at the service of the committee, so that he would be on call. I have known clerks appointed to these committees who never came to their committee rooms in all the time that they occupied the position. Many of them never came to the city of Washington. I have known a case where the chairman of a committee drew the compensation of the clerk. Whether he divided it with the clerk or not I do not know, but I have some doubt about it; and I want, with all the vigor that I possess, to go on record as protesting earnestly, sincerely, and unequivocally against the rottenness of this practice of appointing clerks to positions where there are no duties to perform. [Applause.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield to me five minutes?

Mr. PARK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] five minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois intends his remarks to apply to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, they are based on a total lack of information. There are few committees of this House more active than the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. There are few committees in this House that consider more bills. There are few committees in the House that have more hearings or meet oftener each week. Our regular meeting day is on Thursday. We often have meetings on other days. We report out, and the Congress passes, more bills of a general character than most of the committees of this House. Every member of that committee will bear testimony to that fact. Myself and Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, who was chairman of the committee when I first became a member of it and who is now the ranking minority member of the committee, appeared before the Committee on Accounts and gave all the information upon which this resolution is based.

If there is any suggestion that this additional clerk is simply to make a place for some constituent of mine, it is absolutely untrue. We have needed an additional clerk for some years past. I had a clerk to that committee who worked more hours than any other clerk in Congress, I believe. He has gone from me now, and if the House intends that the work shall be efficiently done, if it is intended to provide the committee with an efficient organization, we are entitled to a session clerk. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and I will venture to say that my committee does twice as much work as that committee, and I do not disparage the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. It is not a question of mere clerical work alone, but an organization should be efficient, so that the clerkship may be of service to the members of the committee in many other ways.

There may be committees in the House that do not need additional clerks, but that criticism does not apply to this committee, as I think the testimony before the Committee on Accounts will show. This committee is one of the most efficient committees of the House. We have reported out much legislation of a comprehensive nature. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] is the ranking minority member, and he appeared before the Committee on Accounts with me, and we made a sufficient showing to warrant that committee in reporting this resolution.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANFORD].

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is probably unnecessary, as far as the passage of this resolution is concerned, for me to repeat what I had to say yesterday. The committee that had charge of this resolution gave to this matter about 40 minutes of consideration, and in that consideration we weighed the facts as this House can not pretend to weigh the facts. We heard the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking member of the committee, and we felt that we were obliged to take the statement of facts they made on this subject.

So far as I am concerned, I think this House should follow the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on Accounts without too much consideration, for the reason that the House is incapable within the time it is willing to take of giving to each of these separate questions, involving the expenditure of public money, the consideration that it should have. My attitude on the committee is that when we report a matter of this kind to the House the House, if it would act wisely, should follow our recommendation. The House yesterday saw fit not to follow the recommendation of the committee, but provided a clerkship for a committee where there were no facts to justify the expenditure of any money, taking the position that because some committees are given clerks others should have them also, regardless of the facts. In that matter yesterday and in this matter to-day I feel that the House should follow the action of the committee that has considered the matter, because it can not know and weigh the facts itself. I think this resolution should pass.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE].

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am the senior member in service on the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, having been a member ever since I entered the House 19 years ago. I want to say that during the last two years that committee has done more work than it did in the five previous years. The members of the committee are faithful in attendance, and it takes about all of our time. I serve upon no other committee in the House. I retired from another committee of which I was a member because this committee took all of my time, and I could not give attention to both committees. I appeared before the committee and approved of this application made by the chairman of the committee, and I think the request should be granted for an additional clerk. It is almost impossible to find a man of the ability of the former clerk of the committee, who had a better assignment elsewhere and gave up the position of clerk of this committee. I doubt whether we shall be able to complete the business with one clerk, he practically being a new man to the business which engages the attention of the committee. We have had a number of changes in the membership of the committee, and the clerk has a great deal of work to do and the committee itself has a great deal of work to do. It seems to me that no one having acquaintance with the facts can have any objection to granting the request. I hope that the Members of this body will consent unanimously to granting the request embodied in the pending resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House resolution 180 for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 180 (H. Rept. 224).

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be allowed an assistant clerk, at the rate of $100 per month, during the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, beginning the 3d day of December, 1917, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PARK. I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin five minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. This is a proposition for an assistant clerk to the Committee on Rules. I am frank to say that in my opinion it may become necessary, but it is extremely improbable that it will become necessary unless the Committee on Rules should be called upon to enter into some investigation such as we had last year. The membership must recognize that in the nearly equal political division of the House there can not be many contests as far as the rules are concerned, but in all probability during this entire session there will be very few rules from the Committee on Rules, and such as there are will probably be unanimously, or nearly so, reported from that committee. Now, when we are asking the poorest people in the land to buy liberty bonds, to put up $50, to take it from their hard-earned earnings, it seems to me that the House ought to set some example with reference to economy.

This resolution can well be deferred until it is determined whether or not the Committee on Rules will have any work that makes it necessary to have an assistant clerk. No one will say that with the present duties imposed on the Committee on Rules, or that with anything that is pending before the committee, there is the slightest necessity for an assistant clerk, and if an assistant clerk is appointed he will have a sinecure, and absolutely nothing to do.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, if he happens to be present. He does not seem to be here; but I wish to state that the chairman of the Committee on Rules appeared before our committee and made such statements as caused us to believe the assistant clerk was necessary. We therefore recommended it without a dissenting vote.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARK. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not think it is any reflection upon the chairman of a committee that he asks for an assistant clerk when he sees other committees getting assistant clerks irrespective of the need of such clerks, as was stated by the gen-

tleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] yesterday with reference to his committee. He said he would be glad to get along without a clerk if other committees situated as was his would do the same; but it must be recognized that there is a piece of patronage for the chairman of the committee, and he has that in mind, and if other committees are to have these sinecures, very naturally he wants it for himself also. But I do think the Committee on Accounts should go into the question of what work a committee is called on to perform, and not merely take the bald statement of the chairman that he wants a clerk or an assistant.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for five minutes?

Mr. PARK. I yield to the gentleman for five minutes.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry for the apparent necessity that compels me again to speak about a matter of this kind. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is absolutely in error, I think, with reference to the method that is being followed now by this Committee on Accounts. Our committee does not take the word of the chairman as to his need for anything whatever, but we do take the facts that he states, governing the situation. The chairman of the Committee on Rules with great detail was heard, I dare say, for half an hour, and he described the particular work that the clerk has to do and stated it as his opinion that the clerk now assigned to the committee absolutely could not do the work effectively now or at any other time without the assistance of this assistant clerk in the work he has to do. We were not influenced by any desire of the chairman of the committee, but by the statement of the facts that he made. It happens at this time that the responsibility in the Committee on Rules is on that chairman and not on the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], where I perhaps would much prefer to have it be, but the responsibility is upon the present chairman, and he stated the facts concerning the work under his control.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I think the House is entitled to have those facts so that the House can form some judgment as to whether the facts justify this.

Mr. SANFORD. The facts were all brought out in the testimony and the testimony is in the committee room. We have not gone to the expense of having the hearings printed, but if the House wants the facts from the proper source, the House would have to hear them from the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman knows them. Can not the gentleman state to the House the facts that influenced his judgment?

Mr. SANFORD. I can state them to the House if I desired to do so, but I prefer to take the position that this House should follow the judgment of this committee. I take this position because I know from experience that I have had already with the House, that the House will not listen to the facts in reference to each one of these clerkships, and I will not make a particular exception with reference to this case, because it would be perfectly futile to examine this one case. I tried to get the House yesterday to examine one case, only to find in the end that the House said in effect that our system is such that if one man gets a clerk all the rest must have one. I will not take that position. I take the position that with reference to each case it is a question of proof.

Yesterday I found the House was disposed to say, "You have given it to so many committees, give it to another." I will not take that position with reference to the expenditure of public money, nor will I attempt to come here and state all the reasons with reference to all of the 20 or 30 clerkships in question when I know that the House will not listen to or consider the particular reasons if they are brought forth.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman is unwilling to state the facts to the House. May I ask him this? Was the gentleman impressed that the business now pending before the Committee on Rules was of such character that an assistant clerk was necessary?

Mr. SANFORD. I was impressed from the testimony of the chairman of the Committee on Rules with the facts that he stated to be true, and I said that if those facts did exist it was proper, so long as the system of doing legislative business that now prevails in the House continues to prevail to allow this clerk.

Mr. LENROOT. I am sorry the gentleman could not answer the question.

Mr. SANFORD. It is my opinion from what I have learned already that the clerical work of the House could be done with about 10 per cent of the disbursement that is now made for that work, but it would be inconsistent with the system that now prevails to deny to this important committee the help the chairman says is absolutely necessary.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman refers to the present system. What is the present system; providing places and clerkships whether they are absolutely needed or not?

Mr. SANFORD. The present system provides, as I recall it, for an expenditure of a half million dollars for clerical help in the House, and it is my idea that a large proportion of it is unnecessary.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Did it develop in the hearings before the committee that there was an unusual amount of business before the Committee on Rules at this time? That is, that the committee had before it, and was likely to have before it in the immediate future, more business than it has had before it in the past?

Mr. SANFORD. I think there was no unusual condition claimed to exist, but, as I recall this particular committee, the testimony was that the character of work is such that there is need for collaboration between two men.

Mr. MONDELL. But that has been the situation always in the work of that committee, has it not?

Mr. SANFORD. I understand so.

Mr. MONDELL. So that it is the gentleman's opinion, as I understand it, that there is no more necessity for an additional clerk now than there has been at any time in the past?

Mr. SANFORD. I do not know anything about the past. I take the statement of facts that the chairman gives me without respect to the past.

Mr. MONDELL. As I understood him, the gentleman has no information that there is an unusual amount of business before the committee?

Mr. SANFORD. I think there is not.

Mr. MONDELL. Conditions are as they have been in the past?

Mr. SANFORD. As far as I know.

Mr. MONDELL. The committee has gotten along without this clerk in the past?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes seem to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. PARK) there were—ayes 31, noes 84.

So the resolution was rejected.

WIDOW OF E. L. CURRIER.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I offer another resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 178 (H. Rept. 221).

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized to pay to the widow of E. L. Currier, late a messenger on the soldiers' roll of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to six months' salary and funeral expenses not exceeding $250, the same to be immediately available.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

In line 5, after the word "be," insert the words "paid out of the contingent fund of the House."

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

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PARK, a motion to reconsider the votes by which the several resolutions were passed was laid on the table.

ATTORNEY'S FEE, CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I offer another resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 189 (H. Rept. 222).

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized to employ counsel at a reasonable fee not to exceed $500 to represent him in the matter of suit brought against him in his official capacity as Clerk of the House by Aaron P. Prioleau, the same to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. NORTON. May I ask the gentleman what is the occasion for the employment of counsel?

Mr. PARK. I understand from the Clerk, Mr. Trimble, that Prioleau claims that the papers sent were not filed by the Clerk, and he is bringing suit for $20,000 against him. This resolution provides that so much of the $500 as may be needed may be used to meet that suit. It may be knocked out on demurrer, with a cost of $50 or $100.

Mr. NORTON. What claims were not filed?

Mr. PARK. His contest papers.

Mr. GILLETT. Does the gentleman say the papers were not filed?

Mr. PARK. No; I do not say anything. He said that they may have been filed.

Mr. GILLETT. Is the gentleman cognizant of the fact as to whether or not they were filed?

Mr. PARK. No, sir; the Clerk, Mr. Trimble, said they were not filed with him, and he gave him notice in plenty of time to file. I do not know anything except what the Clerk says about it.

Mr. GILLETT. I understood from the gentleman's statement that he admitted that the Clerk of the House was negligent.

Mr. PARK. No, sir.

Mr. GILLETT. And if that was so I think we might consider whether we should allow this or not.

Mr. PARK. The gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. GILLETT. I understand the gentleman did not admit that?

Mr. PARK. No.

Mr. GILLETT. Then I misunderstood the gentleman. Has the committee made an investigation to determine?

Mr. PARK. Nothing, except Mr. Trimble appeared before the committee and made a statement about it.

Mr. GILLETT. He just asked for $500, on the ground that it was for an attorney's fee?

Mr. PARK. No; he asked so much of $500 that might be necessary to defend him be allowed, because it was against him as Clerk of the House. It may be disposed of by general demurrer.

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman think this suit ought to be defended by the Government?

Mr. PARK. I think the Clerk is entitled to this fee, as the suit is brought against him officially.

Mr. GILLETT. Suppose the Clerk is in fault? Did he give the committee any explanation as to that?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, Mr. LANGLEY, and Mr. STAFFORD rose.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARK. To the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Has the suit been brought?

Mr. PARK. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Does the gentleman know in what court?

Mr. PARK. I only have the Clerk's word.

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, my understanding is that the Clerk contends there was not an error on his part. I understand that to be his contention, and I do not think myself that he was at fault. He is too conscientious, painstaking, and efficient to have done what the plaintiff alleges.

Mr. PARK. The Clerk contends there was no error on his part.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARK. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand it summons has been served upon the Clerk of the House in his official capacity by a former contestant in an election case, claiming large damages against the Clerk of the House. It has been customary in this House whenever such conditions have obtained heretofore to allow officials of the House to employ counsel and pay the counsel fees. As I understand it, this is merely an authorization to the Clerk of the House to employ counsel and pay a fee to the extent of $500 to defend the Clerk in the suit brought against him in his official capacity.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARK. Yes.

Mr. GILLETT. As I understand it, the gentleman said he knows nothing about the merits of the case as to whether the Clerk was negligent or not. Now, it seems to me——

Mr. PARK. I stated to the gentleman awhile ago I only had the Clerk's statement before the committee about it. The Clerk stated, as I remember, that no contest papers were filed with him. If they were, he does not know anything about it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman allow me to ask a question of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. PARK. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANFORD].

Mr. SANFORD. I want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he thinks the Committee on Accounts should try the case first before we decide whether or not we will allow the Clerk to have counsel?

Mr. GILLETT. I certainly do not.

Mr. SANFORD. How else can we find out the truth and facts of the case?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not see why, unless all precedent is that way, the House should in advance of the case furnish the money. It seems to me the Clerk should defend himself and pay his own bills, and when it is over, if he should prove he was not negligent, we should reimburse him. Now, you are assuming that the Clerk was not negligent. I hope he was not. If he was, I do not see why the House should pay his resulting expenses.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARK] yield so that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. PARK. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman recall that some 10 years ago, when the Committee on Printing was sued by an outside party an authorization was asked of the House to employ counsel and defend it? The House did not determine the merits of the controversy. We naturally voted authority to employ counsel. Here is an official of the House with summons brought against him in a matter arising out of the performance of his official duties. Naturally he should have some counsel, and the sum of $500 is not large, to protect him in a suit arising out of the performance of the duties as an officer of this House.

Mr. GILLETT. As I remember that case it was against a committee of the House, and it seems to me that would make a distinction. But, at the same time, what occurs to me is that if you make his appropriation now and it proves that it was the Clerk's own fault and his carelessness, we are protecting him in that. It seems to me the proper way would be to wait.

Mr. STAFFORD. We are only protecting him to the extent of the counsel fees, and not the damages that may be awarded against him.

Mr. GILLETT. If he is subject to damages, why should he not pay his own counsel fees? It seems to me the proper way would be to wait. The Clerk would be under no financial embarrassment in advancing this money. Let him pay the expense and let us reimburse him if it is proper that he should be reimbursed. It seems to me that would be the natural way. If all precedent is on the other side, perhaps we should not do it.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield?

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

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me if the Clerk is sued in his official capacity and as an official is not at fault—that is, if in any action for which he has been sued he has used reasonable care and diligence in the performance of his duty—it is only just and right that the House should pay his reasonable attorney's fees.

ADJOURNMENT FOR THE HOLIDAYS.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman from Georgia will yield, I wish to say that I have an engagement at 1 o'clock, and I would like to offer a resolution.

Mr. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 29.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Tuesday, the 18th of December, 1917, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian of Thursday, the 3d day of January, 1918.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

COUNSEL FEES FOR CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution proposes to authorize the Clerk of the House to employ counsel at an expense not to exceed $500. The chairman of the committee tells the House that the committee has made no investigation to determine whether the Clerk has been grossly at fault in this matter or not. It seems to me that to pass this resolution without more facts before the House would establish a very dangerous precedent. I understand that the case of Aaron P. Prioleau is one of these cases from the South where a negro candidate for Congress has brought a contest for a seat in this House after every biennial election for many years. As a result of these contests he has received several thousands of dollars for attorney fees and expenses. With this colored man these election contests seem to have been a sort of a biennial Christmas present.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. What district is that from?

Mr. NORTON. I am not advised of the district this man Prioleau is from, but one of the Members of the House acquainted with the facts in the case, as I have stated them——

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it from South Carolina?

Mr. NORTON. He is from South Carolina, I believe. Any attempt that may have been made by the Clerk to shut off the payment to this man of the attorney's fees that he has received year after year is commendable. However, it seems to me that the payment of attorney's fees in cases like this without any

more information than is now before the House establishes a bad precedent on the part of the House. I do not know whether, as a matter of fact, in this case, attorney's fees should be authorized for the Clerk, but the Committee on Accounts, it seems to me, should be able to come into this House and say to the Members that they know from investigation that the facts are such that it is only fair and reasonable on the part of the House to grant these attorney fees.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. DYER. Is it not presumed that the Clerk has properly attended to his duties in connection with this matter, and it is not necessary for the Committee on Accounts to bring in an inquiry as to that?

Mr. NORTON. I take it the gentleman is an attorney learned and experienced in the practice of the law. Does the gentleman think it is a good precedent for this House to establish to employ an attorney for any official of the House who may simply ask the House to authorize the employment of an attorney, at an expense not to exceed $500, in a suit for damages brought against the official in his official capacity?

Mr. DYER. I do. I take it that the law presumes that the public official has discharged his duties correctly and faithfully, and that when he needs counsel it is the duty of the Government to employ that counsel and pay for it.

Mr. NORTON. Then the gentleman would say that the Doorkeeper here, or any official or servant of this House against whom an action is brought, would only need to come to this House and say, "Permit me to employ an attorney at an expense not to exceed $500," and the request would be granted. I want to say, as a Member of this House, that such would be a bad precedent and one that should not be established.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not think the gentleman would be willing to stand entirely by that statement as he has just made it.

Mr. NORTON. I stand strictly by that statement, that I would not set the precedent for every employee of the House to come before the House and say that he had an action brought against him and should have counsel at the Government expense on the presumption that he has performed his duties properly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman would not accord to the Doorkeeper the right to make an obligation to agree to certain expenditures. That kind of case bears no relation to such a matter as this. Now, I will say frankly that I do not know about this case, but——

Mr. NORTON. It seems to me the better precedent would be this: To have the Clerk employ counsel and defend his case, and then, if it was found that he was not negligent, the Congress should reimburse him for reasonable expenses incurred.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I do not think that principle is right at all. I do not think the Clerk of the House ought to be required to advance money out of his own pocket to defend an official act of his, if correctly taken. I think that he ought to have a fund for use in his official capacity without having to pay it out of his own pocket.

With the details of the case now before the House I am not at all familiar. I asked the gentleman a few minutes ago for information. I do not think that an official of this House ought to be required to advance the money out of his own pocket to defend his own official acts. If there is anything involved in it that is personal, that is an entirely different proposition; but he ought not to be required to make whatever sacrifice may be involved in advancing the funds out of his own pocket and out of his own personal account to pay for the defense of that action which he has taken as the official representative of this House.

Mr. NORTON. Let me proceed. I contend this——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, may I have about two minutes more time.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. NORTON. I contend this, that before the House should authorize an appropriation for attorneys' fees for the Clerk or any other official of the Government, sued in his official capacity, a showing should be made to the Committee on Accounts, such that the committee could come to the House and say that the committee believes from that showing——

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. In just a moment. Let me complete my statement—that the committee believed from that showing that the House was justified in granting that request made by the official for an appropriation for attorneys' fees.

Mr. PARK. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. PARK. I have made the statement twice. I can not speak loudly, because I am suffering from a cold this morning; but Mr. Trimble came before the committee, and Mr. Trimble stated that no contest papers had been filed with him, so far as he knew; that he had made investigation among the officials in his office and that they did not know anything about it. He is presumed by the law to do his duty. He is presumed in this case to have done his duty. What investigation can the Committee on Accounts make beyond that? Can it go into his office and into the files? Let the gentleman make some suggestion as to what they ought to do besides what is being done.

Mr. NORTON. He made the statement that no papers had been filed in his office, so far as he knew.

Mr. PARK. Yes; that no papers had been filed in his office, so far as he knew, and the clerks say the same thing to him.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Georgia allow me a question?

Mr. PARK. Yes.

Mr. GILLETT. Does the gentleman think if it had been proved that the Clerk had been negligent and had not performed his duty we should still pay?

Mr. PARK. That is for the court to decide.

Mr. GILLETT. If we paid it now, it would not be decided by the court. That is the point.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has again expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. PARK. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I understand the facts in this case to be these: A contest was filed, or alleged to be filed, against the sitting Member holding the certificate. The Clerk had rumor of it. He wrote the contestant that his papers were not on file. The contestant then sent his papers to the Speaker of the House. The Speaker of the House referred them to the proper committee. It was done in time. The committee decided against the contestant. The House agreed with the committee. The contestant then asked for his usual $2,000 fee, that he had been receiving biannually for many, many years. The Committee on Accounts allowed him $1,000, and brought their report upon the floor, and in a hotly contested hour here the House refused to give him even the $1,000.

These are the facts in the matter; and now, three years after, suit is brought in damages in the home State of the contestant against the Clerk of the House. The Clerk of the House will have to employ counsel to file his answer and make his defense. Under these circumstances I think there is no question but that the House should stand by its Clerk and furnish the counsel. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Kansas will permit, what is the charge which the contestant makes in his complaint against the Clerk? What is the charge that he made? What is the ground of his action?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. He sets out as the measure of his damages the salary for two years $15,000.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What does he allege against the Clerk?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That the Clerk failed to file his papers. But his papers were not offered to the Clerk, but to the Speaker, and the Committee on Elections and this House decided against him.

Mr. ELSTON. I should like to ask the gentleman a question if he will yield.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a question.

Mr. ELSTON. Do the duties of the Attorney General cover a case of this kind, of the defense of an officer of the House?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Not at all.

Mr. ELSTON. There is no question as to that?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No.

Mr. JUUL. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think that if we fail to stand by the Clerk of the House at this time, a new industry will spring up in this country, that of suing the Clerk for damages? [Laughter.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Well, that may be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield to me two minutes?

Mr. PARK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts two minutes.

Mr. GILLETT. After the statement made by the gentleman from Kansas, I certainly shall have no objection to this appropriation being made; but I wish to say that it does seem to me that as a rule when an officer of the House is sued there is no reason why the House should anticipate that he is innocent and advance money to him. It seems to me the proper method should be always to wait until the result of the suit. If an officer of the House was not negligent, of course we ought to reimburse him for anything he had to pay, as well as his counsel fees; but, on the other hand, if he was negligent, it seems to me he personally ought to be held responsible for the pecuniary results of his own negligence. In this case I am quite satisfied that this resolution should be passed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman differentiate between a suit against a committee of the House, such as the committee that went over to New York to investigate the actions of the then Representative Buchanan and of United States District Attorney Marshall, and a suit against an officer of the House?

Mr. GILLETT. I should want to think about that.

Mr. STAFFORD. In that case, though some of us believed the members of the committee to be at fault, and later the Supreme Court overruled the position taken by the committee of the House, nevertheless we voted them money for counsel.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PARK, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I have here a list of Republican assignments to fill vacancies on committees, and I move that the following gentlemen be, and hereby are, elected to the committees named.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves the election of the Members whose names will be reported by the Clerk for assignments to committee vacancies.

The Clerk read as follows:

ALCOHOLIC LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Thomas A. Chandler, of Oklahoma.
Joseph McLaughlin, of Pennsylvania.

APPROPRIATIONS.

William R. Wood, of Indiana.

CLAIMS.

Schuyler Merritt, of Connecticut.

ENROLLED BILLS.

James W. Husted, of New York.
Willfred W. Lufkin, of Massachusetts.

EXPENDITURES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

John M. Baer, of North Dakota.

EXPENDITURES IN THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

Willfred W. Lufkin, of Massachusetts.

INDUSTRIAL ARTS AND EXPOSITIONS.

Charles C. Kearns, of Ohio.
Louis W. Fairfield, of Indiana.

IRRIGATION OF ARID LANDS.

Charles B. Timberlake, of Colorado.

THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Frederick R. Lehlbach, of New Jersey.
Sherman E. Burroughs, of New Hampshire.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

Richard N. Elliott, of Indiana.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS.

Louis B. Goodall, of Maine.

REFORM IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Willfred W. Lufkin, of Massachusetts.

RIVERS AND HARBORS.

Richard P. Freeman, of Connecticut.

REVISION OF THE LAWS.

John F. Miller, of Washington.

RULES.

William A. Rodenberg, of Illinois.

THE TERRITORIES.

Schuyler Merritt, of Connecticut.
John M. Baer, of North Dakota.

WAR CLAIMS.

Burton L. French, of Idaho.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Willis C. Hawley, of Oregon.
Allen T. Treadway, of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other nominations? If not, the Chair will put the question.

The motion was agreed to.

DECEMBER SALARIES.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a joint resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read H. J. Res. 193, authorizing the payment of salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1917, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives are authorized and instructed to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, including the Capitol police, their respective salaries for the month of December, 1917, on the day of adjournment of the present session for the holiday recess; and the Clerk of the House is authorized to pay on the same day to Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners their allowance for clerk hire for the said month of December.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous vote of the Committee on Woman Suffrage, I make the following motion:

I move that the following House joint resolutions proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women be rereferred from the Committee on the Judiciary to the Committee on Woman Suffrage, with jurisdiction, namely House joint resolution No. 1, introduced by myself; House joint resolution No. 3, by Miss RANKIN; House joint resolution No. 4, by Mr. MONDELL; House joint resolution No. 11, by Mr. KEATING; House joint resolution No. 19, by Mr. HAYDEN; House joint resolution No. 34, by Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that motion is not now in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Section 3 of Rule XXII, found on page 378 of the Manual that I hold in my hand, provides that—

All other bills, memorials, and resolutions may, in like manner, be delivered, indorsed with the names of Members introducing them, to the Speaker, to be by him referred, and the titles and references thereof and of all bills, resolutions, and documents referred under the rules shall be entered on the Journal and printed in the RECORD of the next day, and correction in case of error of reference may be made by the House, without debate, in accordance with Rule XI, on any day immediately after the reading of the Journal, by unanimous consent, or on motion of a committee claiming jurisdiction, or on the report of the committee to which the bill has been erroneously referred.

Of course, the Journal was read quite a while ago and much business has intervened. I wish the gentleman from California would let this motion go over until next week.

Mr. RAKER. I will state to the gentleman that I was prepared to present this following the reading of the Journal, and have presented it at the earliest opportunity, and believe that I am strictly within the rule.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The Journal was read quite a while ago, and we have appropriated several thousand dollars since.

Mr. LITTLE. I understood the rule which the gentleman read to say that at the conclusion of the Journal it "may be" presented.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It says may be made by the House, without debate, on any day immediately after the reading of the Journal, by unanimous consent.

Mr. LITTLE. Does the gentleman from Tennessee construe that language to mean that it must be read at that moment and that it shall not be brought up at any other time?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It may be done if brought up at once.

Mr. LITTLE. It says that it "may be" brought up at that time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. No; it says that it may be done if brought up at that time.

Mr. LITTLE. That does not mean that it may not be brought up a little later.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I will say that I was here and had seen the Speaker, so as to be definite as to the rule, but I am going to leave it to the Speaker's judgment as to whether I am in time.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HELVERING. I understand that an agreement was made as to the recognition immediately after the conclusion of the reading of the Journal. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] has conformed to that agreement for recognition. The fact that the Speaker could not recognize two men at a time,

other gentlemen being recognized, prevented the gentleman from California from presenting it at that time. Am I correct in that statement?

The SPEAKER. That is a correct statement.

Mr. HELVERING. Then the objection of the gentleman from Tennessee will not lie.

The SPEAKER. Here is the situation: The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARK] had certain privileged matters that he had been trying to get up for five or six days. The Chair had put him off because there were other matters that he considered of more importance and entitled to the right of way.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question. With the creation of this new committee a few days ago, does it not create a new jurisdiction, and is it not correct that an exception can be taken at any time to jurisdiction? Would not the Committee on the Judiciary, since the formation of the Committee on Woman Suffrage, lose its jurisdiction of this question, and would not the Committee on Woman Suffrage take jurisdiction of these resolutions automatically?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I want to ask the gentleman, with entire candor, this question: The adoption of the resolution reported from the Committee on Rules on September 24 provided for the creation of a Committee on Woman Suffrage, and if the reference to it of certain matters did fundamentally change the rules of the House and fundamentally change the jurisdiction upon one of the constitutional questions, it was not created until day before yesterday, and in the meantime, if I am correctly informed, the Committee on the Judiciary has reported to the House the subject matter which is now in controversy. It seems to me that the House is entitled to vote on the report from the Committee on the Judiciary, which undoubtedly had jurisdiction within the time that it did report.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. If that be correct, then the prohibition amendment rightfully belongs to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic. Is that correct?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not think so, under the practice of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the situation. Since the gentleman from California had the conversation with the Speaker an unexpected thing has happened; that is, the Judiciary Committee has reported this bill out, and the report is now in the basket.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And on the calendar?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk says that it is on the calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I presume that the question presented to the Speaker is a question involving the business under the morning hour, which has rarely been called up in these later days.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is not the whole question. The Committee on the Judiciary has reported without recommendation a resolution providing for an amendment to the Constitution covering the question of woman suffrage. That resolution is in the basket and on the calendar of the House. How are you going to take it from the committee which has reported it when it is not before the committee and refer it to the Committee on Woman Suffrage? Do gentlemen who are in favor of the resolution desire it to be taken from the calendar and referred to the other committee?

Mr. RAKER. I take it for granted that it is in the basket. I investigated this morning before the Journal was read, looked at the RECORD, and no report had been made. If it was in the basket, it was put in while we have been waiting for recognition. It can not be on the calendar unless they have taken it from the basket and taken it to the office. Until it comes up for consideration, the House has full power to refer or transfer it. In other words, the committee that has jurisdiction does not lose jurisdiction until its report is on the proper calendar of the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I agree with the last contention of the gentleman from Tennessee; but I believe the first point made is good, because under the construction of the rule for the business of the morning hour I direct your attention to Rule XXIV, paragraph 1, which enumerates the business that may be considered.

The order of business is, first, the prayer, next the reading and approval of the Journal; then the correction of references of public bills, which, if the resolution had not been reported, would then have been in order; then the disposal of business on the Speaker's table; fifth, unfinished business; sixth, for the consideration of bills called up by committees. Bills have been considered this morning that have been called up by committees, namely, the resolutions presented by the Committee on Accounts. Therefore the order in which this matter could have been considered under the third designation—the correction of reference of public bills, has passed, and it is now too late to consider it, even if the resolution had not been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary and the matter having passed out of the jurisdiction of that committee.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if it is true, as a matter of fact, and I take it that it is true, that the bill is actually here, then this other matter being discussed is merely a moot question and has no sort of relation to anything, and there is no excuse to take up further time in discussion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Virginia is entirely correct in that.

Mr. LITTLE rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of this committee and I would like to say a word about the matter.

The SPEAKER. About what?

Mr. LITTLE. This point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. LITTLE. That is all I seek. Mr. Speaker, a correct reading of the clause read by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] does not warrant any such interpretation as he gives it.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman think about the fact that unexpectedly to the Speaker, at least, the Chair does not know how many people knew it, but after the Chair had had his conversation with the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] this morning, the Committee on the Judiciary actually reported this resolution?

Mr. LITTLE. I think I see a solution of that difficulty.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be obliged to the gentleman if he will state the solution.

Mr. LITTLE. This rule that gave these bills to the Committee on Woman Suffrage provided that any proposition with regard to woman suffrage should go to the Committee on Woman Suffrage. I take it, Mr. Speaker, that that meant just what it said. It does not need any interpretation. There is no ambiguity; there is nothing to discuss. The minute the House adopted that rule that proposition, ipso facto, automatically belonged to the Woman Suffrage Committee, and the Committee on the Judiciary had no more authority over it than the Committee on Accounts would have over a revenue bill. They had no right under our rules to report it in here. The only thing that could be done with the constitutional amendment when this rule was adopted was to send it to the Woman Suffrage Committee. That was the reason for adopting the rule. It states distinctly that all propositions with regard to woman suffrage should go to the Committee on Woman Suffrage, and that is where this should have gone.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not contend that the new rule about the Woman Suffrage Committee automatically took a bill away from a committee that already had it, does he?

Mr. LITTLE. That is exactly what I do contend.

The SPEAKER. The Chair differs with the gentleman on that proposition.

Mr. LITTLE. I would like to be heard for a moment on that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. In just a moment. It has been suggested that this is analogous to the creation of a new court, where certain cases were before the old court, and that the new court would take jurisdiction of them, but would not take cases already set in the old court for hearing unless some provision to that effect were made; but, Mr. Speaker, that is only when they have concurrent jurisdiction. The minute the old court was deprived of jurisdiction and jurisdiction was conferred upon the new court, the old court had nothing to do with those cases and could not do a thing with them, and the minute that the Woman Suffrage Committee was given full authority over this bill the other committee ceased to have any authority over it whatever.

The SPEAKER. How will the gentleman get a bill that has already been referred away from the committee to which it has been referred and have it referred to the Woman Suffrage Committee?

Mr. LITTLE. I take it that when this rule was adopted the Judiciary Committee would obey the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. But the committee was obeying the rules of the House.

Mr. LITTLE. Not when it brought the resolution in here over which they had no authority. Suppose the Committee on Accounts should bring in a revenue bill, it would amount to nothing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, will the Speaker hear me for a moment?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, the woman suffrage proposed amendments to the Constitution have been referred from time immemorial to the Committee on the Judiciary. Amendment or resolution No. 1, the author of which is the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], was referred to our committee, as usual at the beginning of this Congress. It was decided not to report the resolution out during the war session of Congress, as we did not regard it as a war measure, but we did agree to give hearings, and for a day or two both those for the Susan B. Anthony amendment and those against it came before our committee, and we sat and gave them all the time they wanted. We told them we would not report the resolution during the war session but that we would in December. The very second meeting of the committee in December we took up two proposed amendments to the Constitution, one relating to prohibition and the other to woman suffrage. The House ordered the creation of a Committee on Woman Suffrage in September. I did not want anything unseemly to occur between the Committee on the Judiciary and this new committee of the House, and I inquired of the Speaker and other Members who knew the rules of the House and told them I did not want my committee to act upon this measure if we had no jurisdiction of it. I was told universally from the Speaker down that our committee did have jurisdiction of it; that there was no intention of taking it away from us as long as we had hearings on it and was ready to report. Having the resolution on our hands, on Tuesday last we ordered it reported out as we had stated we would do. The committee ordered the report and the report has been filed and is now before the House for its consideration. Our committee properly had jurisdiction of this proposed amendment, and we had hearings upon it and we have voted the resolution out of the committee. It is now on the calendar.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. I will yield.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not also a fact, I will ask the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, that the chairman was instructed and endeavored to procure a rule from the Committee on Rules for the consideration of this resolution before the Christmas recess?

Mr. WEBB. Yes; that is true, too, Mr. Speaker. We did promise the ladies last summer that we would get a vote as quickly as possible after the war session ended. We did what we promised. Mr. Speaker, I make the further point of order that having had regular jurisdiction of this amendment, having had hearings, having determined upon a report and that report actually having been made, that under the rulings, too numerous to cite, it is now too late to ask that the resolution be taken from the Judiciary Committee. I make that further point of order and ask for a ruling on it.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I think this matter can be settled very easily, and I want to make a request for unanimous consent. It is perfectly evident, of course, that the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] is now opposed to the amendment [laughter], because it has been reported to the House and is now ready for action, and I think we can settle this matter good-humoredly and pleasantly by entering into a unanimous-consent agreement; and I therefore, pending the decision on the point of order, ask unanimous consent that the resolution providing for the submission of the question of the constitutional amendment, and all resolutions related thereto, shall lie upon the table until the end of this session of Congress. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAKER. Of course I would have to object to that.

Mr. CALDWELL. I object to that.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, without undue feeling and with perfect confidence and the highest respect for the distinguished gentleman who graces the chairmanship of the Committee on the Judiciary and all of that committee, we tried to take this baby, as the gentleman called it, from the Committee on the Judiciary before they acted on it and before they reported, so that the friends of the baby, or the women interested in this resolution, might assist the Committee on Woman's Suffrage in seeing that it had proper clothing and was brought to manhood or womanhood and given the right to participate in the functions of this Government. [Laughter and applause.] Now, as to the gentleman's statement that there was an effort to have this voted upon on the 17th or 18th of this month. All of those who are interested in this amendment—and I believe that is two-thirds of the House—asked and requested that this be voted on early in January, either the 7th or 8th of January. It was agreed upon by the leader that that would be satisfactory and that he would secure unanimous consent to take up this resolution on the 7th of January, when Congress reconvened after the holidays. These folks have been working accordingly. Only those who are opposed to the amendment, who think they can take some advantage of it, have stated now that they want, as my friend from Massachusetts, to vote on it before the holidays.

Mr. WEBB. If the gentleman will permit, I do not think the gentleman fairly represents me. I stated to my friend from California and everybody that I have no feeling about this matter. That I was willing to vote on this resolution whenever it is suitable to the women, although I am opposed to woman suffrage.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina correctly states it; that the gentleman was ready to take a vote on the 7th of January next?

Mr. WEBB. Any time.

Mr. RAKER. And in deference to him and the members of the committee I talked with, I will say they are satisfied with the request of the women who are asking for this resolution. That is the view of the majority as near as we could get on the other side, that they would fix it for the 7th of January. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. I want to state to the gentleman from California that the reason that I objected yesterday when the request was made that this matter be assigned to the 7th of January was because of the action taken by our committee, and further because on the 5th of December last the majority leader, in his place on the floor of this House, stated in a colloquy with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] that undoubtedly both of these resolutions would be voted on before the Christmas holidays, and that was done before the Woman's Suffrage Committee had been elected by this House, and in fact unanimous-consent agreement for action upon the prohibition resolution was secured in this House before the Committee on the Judiciary reported it out, and the gentleman should not assume that the only people to be considered in this matter are those in favor of woman suffrage. I submit that those who are opposed to it conscientiously should have some consideration, and that the gentleman from California and the majority leader and others interested in the passage of the resolution ought not to enter into agreement regardless of what others who may be opposed to them think.

Mr. RAKER. Would the gentleman have objection now to fixing January 7 for the consideration of this resolution?

Mr. WALSH. If that is satisfactory to the chairman of the committee, I should not object; certainly.

Mr. WEBB. If I may be allowed to make a preliminary statement, it was the general understanding, I think, among all the Members of the House that they wanted to get both of these amendments off of their hands before the holidays and that is the reason why the Committee on the Judiciary requested the chairman of the committee to ask the Committee on Rules to dispose of woman suffrage and the prohibition amendment before the holidays, and I did ask the Committee on Rules; that is, I stated that to members of the Committee on Rules.

The committee itself, however, has no objection as to any date that you want to set to vote on this amendment.

Mr. RAKER. Would the chairman ask the House now to fix January 7 for the consideration of this amendment?

Mr. WEBB. If that is more agreeable than the 18th of this month, I would be glad to vote on it.

Mr. RAKER. Those of us who have gone over the matter wanted the 7th of January.

Mr. WEBB. Is that satisfactory to all advocates of woman suffrage?

Mr. RAKER. It is. I have talked to both sides.

Mr. WEBB. Then I have no objection, and I do not think the committee has.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have anticipated the decision of the Speaker on this snarl that the matter has gotten into, and have introduced a joint resolution providing for woman suffrage that can immediately or has already been referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage. They can act on it this afternoon and report it favorably and have it on the calendar next week.

Mr. RAKER. I will say that I would not take that course as chairman of that committee. I am not going to act after one committee has acted in the House. It is not treating them fairly.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I take it the gentleman was anxious to have the matter referred to his committee.

Mr. RAKER. I want to do it under the rules, and in that way there can be no criticism from any man.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. But that is exactly under the rules.

Mr. RAKER. Under the strict reading of this rule, before that bill was filed this morning there is no question on earth but that the Speaker of the House would have transferred its jurisdiction to the Committee on Woman Suffrage. The committee made their report and put it in the box in the last 15 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman from California in good faith—and I take it he was in good faith—made his motion to refer all the matters to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. RAKER. Surely.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Bills heretofore introduced on the subject were properly referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, there being no Committee on Woman Suffrage. Now, there being a Committee on Woman Suffrage I have introduced a resolution that can be referred to that committee and reported on this afternoon, and the committee's report will take precedence of any other report on that subject.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEEKER. How is it possible for me to get recognition? I have been waiting here so patiently.

Mr. RAKER. In just a moment. Pending this matter, I am going to ask unanimous consent that the voting on woman suffrage be fixed for Monday, the 7th day of January.

The SPEAKER. In making that request you withdraw this?

Mr. RAKER. I ask unanimous consent that it be fixed on that day, of course.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], in order to settle this muddle, asks unanimous consent that the woman-suffrage amendment be considered on the 7th day of January.

Mr. WEBB. As a substitute for that unanimous consent, I ask that unanimous consent be given to vote on this resolution next Tuesday, the 18th. [Applause.]

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield to that. The gentleman is aware that the House this morning has passed a resolution to adjourn the session for the holidays on next Tuesday. Many gentlemen will be going away. Why hasten? Why not give everybody a fair opportunity, the same as the gentleman has had and the Members have had who wanted to bring up the prohibition amendment?

Mr. WEBB. I did that because the members of the committee wanted me to do it.

The SPEAKER. You can not offer an amendment for unanimous consent unless the Members agree to it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] asks unanimous consent that the woman-suffrage amendment be considered on the 7th day of January. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object.

The SPEAKER. Now, does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] want to renew his request?

Mr. WEBB. Yes, sir. In obedience to the request of the Judiciary Committee, I ask that next Tuesday be set aside to consider the woman-suffrage amendment.

Mr. LUNN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LANGLEY objected, but subsequently withdrew his objection.

The SPEAKER. In the proper conduct of the business of the House some months ago—I do not remember the date—the Chair referred this constitutional amendment to the Judiciary Committee, where constitutional amendments have usually gone for the last 125 years. There was not any such thing as a Woman Suffrage Committee at that time. Very early in September, I think it was, they passed a resolution creating the committee. As a matter of fact it was appointed in the last two or three days. When the Chair refers a bill he parts company with it, for that purpose at least. The Chair has no more right to take a bill from a committee than any other Member of the House has. Now, it would take a very narrow construction to sustain the original point of order that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] made. So there is no use to pass on that. Under the peculiar circumstances of the case, if that were the only point of order, the Chair would be very much inclined to overrule it temporarily on account of the conversation the Chair had with the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] as to the order in which the business was coming here this morning. It is not necessary to pass upon that point.

Mr. RAKER. Now, Mr. Speaker, before you rule I wish to be heard just a moment.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. RAKER. Oh, gentlemen should not be impatient with me. I have hitherto taken up very little time.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Would it not be satisfactory to your committee to let the matter stand as it is by passing a little resolution giving the Suffrage Committee credit for killing bear? [Laughter.]

Mr. RAKER. I do not quite gather the point in that elucidative remark of the gentleman [laughter], but that is all right. On the question of jurisdiction—and I would like to have the attention of the House a moment; I promise I will be short—under the rules, under the strict construction of the rules, there is no method provided for a case of this kind unless the House adopts an analogous proceeding for taking up the matter. You can transfer the jurisdiction or rerefer the bill by unanimous consent, and by vote of the committee having jurisdiction, or by the request of the committee claiming jurisdiction when a bill has been erroneously referred. That could not occur in this case.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will yield in just a moment. Let me finish this first. In this instance the House itself, since the bill was referred, amended the rules and created a new jurisdiction. There can not be any doubt about the jurisdiction conferred. The rule reads:

> All proposed action touching the subject of woman suffrage * * *, to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The House adopted this rule. There is no rule of the House now in existence by which, if you will follow it, this resolution can be disposed of to the committee having proper jurisdiction, and still at the same time the House is not so impotent that it can not conduct its business and transfer the jurisdiction of bills to a committee that it has created, particularly under the circumstances of this case. But notwithstanding that belief and understanding the situation, I this morning saw the Speaker. He stated it as it occurred. I waited to give the other gentlemen a chance, and did not follow right on the rule strictly and act immediately after the reading of the Journal and make the motion directed by the Committee on Woman Suffrage this morning. And in the meantime—and I want you gentlemen to think about that—I am discussing the rule.

In the meantime, pending the discussion, the committee filed a report, not a favorable report, but simply a report shoving it back to the House without consideration, without either a favorable or an unfavorable report; so that, legally speaking, the House having control of its procedure, where none is provided, using an analogous proceeding, as in our courts, in all courts of the land, that where there is no rule laid down you apply a procedure analogous to the usual procedure in a court of justice or court of law—therefore a motion of this kind is eminently proper and eminently fit that I should move the House to transfer this jurisdiction to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I am asking this question in all sincerity, without a disposition to be captious. What difference does it make to the House and to the country at large what committee reports out this resolution, so long as we have it here to act upon? [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. I will answer that question. The Committee on the Judiciary has reported adversely, in fact. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House on the 24th of September, 1917—and the RECORD I hold before me—said the Judiciary Committee was against this amendment. Now that a new committee has been appointed to handle this special subject, do not you believe the resolution ought to be in the hands of those who are in favor of it and not in the hands of those who oppose it, as stated by the chairman of the committee?

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RAKER. I want to finish my statement.

Mr. MEEKER. As a member of the committee, I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. RAKER. On page 7374 of the RECORD I read as follows:

> Mr. MONDELL. Did I understand the gentleman to say that his committee is ready to report favorably on the constitutional amendment in December?
>
> Mr. WEBB. No; I did not say favorably; I mean to say that the majority of the Judiciary Committee is opposed to woman suffrage, as is also a majority of the House against it.

Now, that being the case, with absolute respect and confidence of feeling, nevertheless I believe that where we have our committees appointed they ought to have charge of the matter.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. RAKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MEEKER. Are we, then, to understand that the creation of this committee, which was for the purpose of hearing this question discussed in open court, was effected with knowledge in advance that it was to be favorable to the amendment?

Mr. RAKER. I believe the committee are in favor of it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from California submit to an inquiry?

Mr. RAKER. I do.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is not the gentleman from California unique in history in this, that he is the only lawyer on earth who ever moved for a new trial before he lost his case? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. RAKER. I want to answer that. I want to say to the gentleman that when I learned that the judge was against me and had so stated on the street, I spent four months at our State capitol getting a bill introduced, so that I could take the jurisdiction from him, so that I could get a fair trial by a man who was unprejudiced in regard to the matter, and then I was ready to take my chances.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule and get rid of this.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Rule! Rule!

Mr. WEBB. I want to ask my friend from California if he has not undertaken to do just what he objected to that judge doing? Has he not undertaken to pack the committee so as to get a favorable decision?

Mr. RAKER. Oh, no!

The SPEAKER. The Chair started to state the history of this peculiar transaction. Some months ago this resolution was introduced into the House, and undoubtedly under the rules and practice it ought to have gone to the Judiciary Committee. The thing dragged along, and we had an agreement that we would not pass anything except war measures, and the Judiciary Committee, acting under that understanding, never reported the resolution. In September the Rules Committee brought in a rule to create this new Committee on Woman Suffrage, but the committee was not appointed until three or four days ago. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] talked to me. I did not have the remotest idea whether the Judiciary Committee were going to report the resolution or not, but they did report it after this conversation, and that changed the situation entirely. This new rule here about this woman-suffrage business—

All proposed action touching the question of woman suffrage, to the Committee on Woman Suffrage—

undoubtedly applied to any business coming up after that rule was adopted, and not to the business that had been started before that, even by introduction into the House. After the Speaker assigns a bill to a committee he has no more control over it than the man in the moon, not a bit. I can not take a bill away from a committee, and the rule I have just read does not act automatically and is not retroactive. It would require exactly the motion that the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] has made here. Well, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] made the suggestion some time ago that inasmuch as the Committee on the Judiciary had reported this resolution, that ended the matter. The decisions are numerous that when a committee has done that, even if it did not have original jurisdiction—which this Judiciary Committee did have in this case—it has the right to go on with it, and he further suggested that all the rest of this talk was moot business. That is about the right name for it, as far as I can find out. If the Judiciary Committee had not reported this resolution, then I would have carried out my statement to the gentleman from California; but the decisions are too numerous even to quote that where an erroneous reference is made—and the case is stronger where a correct reference was made—and the committee reports or even considers the matter referred to it, it has jurisdiction. And the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] finally crystallized the suggestion of the gentleman from Virginia into a point of order properly made. The Chair would be compelled under the circumstances of this case to hold that, as far as committees are concerned, this thing was concluded when the Judiciary Committee made its report, and the Chair so holds.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority members of the Judiciary Committee may have three days in which to file a report in favor of this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks three days in which the minority may file their views. Is there objection?

Mr. MEEKER. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. WEBB. I hope my friend will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. By request of the Committee on Woman Suffrage, I ask unanimous consent that H. R. 242 be rereferred from the Committee on the Election of President and Vice President and Representatives in Congress to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The SPEAKER. Has that bill anything to do with woman suffrage?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; it is a bill to protect the rights of women citizens of the United States to register and vote for Senators of the United States and for Members of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Where is that bill?

Mr. RAKER. I have it in my hand.

Mr. GILLETT. We would like to know what the bill proposes to do.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to know, too.

Mr. RAKER. That bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That women who are citizens of the United States and possess such qualifications of age, residence, property, or education as may be required of men to make them legal voters in the several States shall be eligible to register and vote in all States of the Union at all elections for Senators of the United States and for Members of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is that a law or a constitutional amendment?

Mr. RAKER. This is just a law.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman the first thing Monday morning after the Journal is read, to make his motion.

Mr. RAKER. All right.

Mr. MEEKER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Did I understand the Chair to say that he would recognize the gentleman on next Monday?

The SPEAKER. Yes; the Chair will recognize him the first thing after the Journal is read on Monday, to make that motion.

Mr. MEEKER. Just for the motion. It comes up in the morning-business hour only?

The SPEAKER. Yes; and it is not debatable.

Mr. CANNON. Has there not been an agreement made that the vote shall be taken at 5 o'clock Monday on the resolution submitting the prohibition amendment?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. If I had been present, I should have objected to it; but the motion of the gentleman from California is likely to lead to a roll call, and the time for debate on the prohibition amendment is exceedingly short.

The SPEAKER. Then the Chair will recognize the gentleman from California immediately after the reading of the Journal on Tuesday morning.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that January 10 be assigned as the day for the consideration in the House, and for voting upon House joint resolution 1, known as the national woman suffrage resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the 10th day of January be set aside for the consideration of House joint resolution 1 and for voting on the same. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee objects.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. A while ago under a misapprehension I objected to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina for a vote next Tuesday on the suffrage amendment, but immediately withdrew the objection. I want to know if the Chair announced that I had objected. I did not quite catch what he said. I want to be sure that the RECORD shows that my objection was withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. The Chair said there was objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. I withdrew my objection when I was assured that I was wrong in my first impression that the purpose of the request was antagonistic to the amendment. Personally, I think we ought to wait until after the holiday recess when there is a full attendance, but I am for the proposition and ready to vote at any time.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules be requested to bring in a rule providing that the House may be permitted to vote on woman suffrage on January 7.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

PNEUMATIC-TUBE SERVICE.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 114 and consider the same.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution extending the commission provided for in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1917, with the same authorities, powers, and provisions until on or before March 1, 1918.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was read.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MOON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I did not apprehend that there would be any fight against giving the Committee on Rules a stenographer. My experience has been that the chairman of the committee needs all the help that he is authorized to have under the rules of the House, including a secretary. I would like to say to the House that since I have been chairman of the committee, without any charge or suggestion of additional compensation. I have had compiled every rule and every report in the last three Congresses and have had them bound in book form for the use of the members of the committee and the Members of the House. The clerk to the committee is now engaged in the additional task of compiling every decision that has been rendered during the three Congresses on every one of the rules that has been presented to the House. If the House does not see fit to allow a stenographer I am going to continue the work. I am sorry that I could not get here in time this morning, but I was unavoidably detained in the Post Office Department on official business.

I make the statement to the House so that it may have full light on the subject.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POU. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. If the clerk was not doing this work which the gentleman alludes to, what other work would he be doing?

Mr. POU. The clerk is busy all the time. I have never seen a time when the clerk was not busy. I do not believe that there is a busier clerk to any committee of this Congress than the clerk to the Committee on Rules, excepting, of course, the great committees having charge of supply bills. He has no time to write letters. He is answering questions and serving Members most of the time while the House is in session. He is a very accommodating young man and takes a great deal of pride in answering every inquiry made by Members of the House on any subject connected with the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POU. I will.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask how many special rules are now pending before the Committee on Rules?

Mr. POU. There are 39 resolutions, of which 9 are House joint resolutions. The gentleman from Wisconsin knows that the work of the Rules Committee is not confined to pending rules. Time after time gentlemen come in and want questions looked up. The gentleman from Wisconsin must know that the work of the clerk of this committee is a full man's work.

Mr. LENROOT. The "gentleman from Wisconsin" remembers that in the past a session clerk was not provided for until the congestion of the business before the Committee on Rules was such as to make it necessary, and at that time the ordinary business of the committee did not require a session clerk. The business before the Committee on Rules at this session is less than it has ever been in my knowledge.

Mr. POU. It is exceedingly difficult to secure a stenographer, as everybody knows. In order to successfully do the work of the committee it will take every person under the control of the chairman, as the gentleman from Wisconsin will find out if his party gets in power and he is made chairman of the Committee on Rules.

FEDERAL JUDGE FOR MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing some resolutions adopted by the judicial convention of Tennessee last week in relation to the necessity for an additional Federal judge for the middle district of Tennessee, and also a resolution on the conduct of the war.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the resolutions referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolutions are as follows:

Whereas the middle district of Tennessee is the only Federal judicial district in the United States, save one, which does not have a United States district judge of its own; and

Whereas in recent years numerous laws have been enacted by Congress which have produced much additional work for such courts, and this together with the natural increase in litigation, has resulted in such a volume of litigation that no one judge can dispose of the business of the Federal district courts in both east Tennessee and middle Tennessee; and

Whereas a large amount of work is rapidly accumulating by reason of prosecutions under the selective-service law, the speedy disposition of which is of vital importance to the Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention does hereby earnestly urge all the members of the Tennessee delegation in the Congress of the United States to use all legitimate means to have created a new Federal judgeship in and for the middle district of Tennessee at the very earliest possible moment, the public welfare requiring it.

The war resolution is as follows:

CONDUCT OF THE WAR.

Whereas a world war is raging in which autocracy is arrayed against democracy, tyranny against liberty, brutality against humanity, savagery against civilization, and our Government has entered this conflict in behalf of democracy, liberty, humanity, and civilization: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we heartily indorse our President and the Congress and pledge them our loyal and unanimous support in all that has been done or that may be done by them in this crisis looking to a victorious and triumphant conclusion of this conflict so as to assure the perpetuation of our institutions and a permanent peace throughout the world; and be it further

Resolved, That we condemn Prussian militarism and denounce it as the curse of the world, which has drenched the earth with blood, violated every precept of humanity and civilization, disregarded the rights of neutrals and nonbelligerents, set at naught every principle of honor among men and nations, and now by terrorism seeks to subjugate the world.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have one further request to make. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial in the Evening Star on the services of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The editorial is as follows:

TWO HOUSE PROMOTIONS.

Mr. SHERLEY for chairman of the Appropriations Committee and Mr. SIMS for chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee are excellent selections. Both have served long in the House. Both are familiar with the subjects they will be called upon to handle. And those subjects have taken on increased importance by reason of the war. Appropriations have mounted to the skies. No such figures have ever before been considered by Congress. Interstate commerce is now a foremost problem, with war as well as peace connections.

It is noteworthy, too, that both Mr. SHERLEY and Mr. SIMS are friends of the President and supporters of his policies. They will work in harmony with him. And in war matters harmony between the legislative and the executive branches of the Government is highly important. There is so much to be done, and so much of it of unfamiliar character, working at cross purposes would be expensive to the people.

Mr. SHERLEY has long been an advocate of a budget. He has probably given more attention to the subject than any other national legislator. He has worked it out with care, and presents it persuasively. If these were peace times, his promotion might operate in the interest of the adoption of a budget plan.

But the war times are not favorable to that reform. Estimates are extremely difficult. Income and outlay fluctuate. The Government's needs must be supplied, whatever they may be. If money is lacking, more must be raised. The Government is now a heavy borrower. It can not live within its means.

Mr. SHERLEY, a southern man, succeeds Mr. FITZGERALD, a northern man. Mr. SIMS, a southern man, succeeds Mr. ADAMSON, another southern man. But section had nothing to do with either selection. Both promotions rest on merit and seniority. Both are competent men and succeed competent men. And just now sectionalism cuts much less than its usual figure. It is very little considered. All public men are to-day thinking nationally more than ever.

There is nothing disturbing, therefore, in these two changes. Rather is the country assured of good work under the direction of two men who know the ropes, and bring to their places the confidence and respect of their legislative associates.

PENSIONS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the omnibus pension bill, H. R. 7634, for consideration.

The Clerk reported the title to the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7634) 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.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this bill contains 344 names, and 90 per cent of them were in bills considered by the last Congress. The Committee on Invalid Pensions had no bill after the 1st of February of this year. The actual cost of the bill per month is $3,918. If the soldiers pensioned by this bill should live until the end of the year, the actual cost of the bill would be a trifle over $49,000. These are nearly all desperate cases. The bill will not cost in the aggregate over $40,000. The increases are all moderate. No widows are pensioned in this bill, except eight who have helpless and dependent children. For the information of the House I desire to state that the Committee on Invalid Pensions have decided that they will consider no pension bills for widows, owing to the fact that the act of October 6, 1917, provided a pension of $25 a month for all widows of the Civil War. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of William B. Hampshire, helpless and dependent child of William W. Hampshire, late of Company C, Twenty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Jefferson Cherry, late of Company C, Forty-eighth Regiment, and Company B, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wesley B. Calder, late of Company A, First Rhode Island Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Bradford, late of Company C, Forty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Russell, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James K. Jennings, late of Company D, Seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Wilkinson, late of Company A, One hundred and sixty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Logsdon, late of Company K, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Butterbaugh, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theodore S. Smith, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Carroll, late of Company A, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William M. Pace, late of Company E, Third Regiment Tennessee Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David H. Hatfield, late of Company I, Thirty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James G. Young, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Ward, late of Company K, Fiftieth Regiment New York Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter F. Baker, late of Company G, Fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander Hall, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oscar G. Robinson, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Massachusetts Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph W. Snave, late of Company E, Seventy-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph McArmstrong, late of Company H, One hundred and seventy-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew Robertson, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Choat, late of Company A, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Harris, late of Company D, One hundred and eighty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Perry A. Crandall, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah Campbell, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Philip Richards, late of Company A, Forty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Philip Liebrick, late of Company I, First Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Bachman, late of Company G, Eighty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jay P. Eddy, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Luke, late unassigned, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lemuel Cross, late of Company E, Ninety-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Heastan, late of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Moses McCleary, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis H. Bradshaw, late of Companies F and A, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Bellnap, late of Company E, Twenty-third Regiment, and unassigned, Twenty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elsden B. Stephens, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred H. Chaplin, late a first-class fireman, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Drewes, sr., late an ordinary seaman, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah A. Hearn, late of Company C, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward B. Ward, late of Company I, Forty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas R. Beasley, helpless and dependent child of John C. Beasley, late of Company A, Second Regiment Tennessee Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Sidney G. Sidner, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Sewing, late of Company B, First Regiment, and Company I, Fifth Regiment, Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adam Allwein, late of Company H, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joshua Gage, late of Company C, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jeremiah Shine, late of Company H, One hundred and sixty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Watson, late of Company C, Third Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marshall Barnes, late of Company L, Third Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander J. Souden, late of Company F, Forty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Umfleet, late of Company F, Fiftieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis J. Cundiff, late of Company F, Forty-seventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Riley A. Reeves, late of Company B, Ninety-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Ford, late of Second Battery, Minnesota Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James F. Bellew, late of Company G, Thirty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis S. Layton, late of Company D, Fourth Battalion Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Erow, late of Company A, One hundred and seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sanford Earley, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elisha W. Phillips, late of Company F, One hundred and seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel M. Reese, late of Company B, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nicholas Wolf, late of Company I, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel D. Mowrey, alias David O. Mowrey, late of Lambert's company, Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Campbell, late of Companies G and C, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Milton Cooper, late of Companies I and B, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Bishop, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Doyle, late of Company K, Sixty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Quick, late of Company K, Fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elias Cleveland, late of Company K, Eighty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ezra McIntyre, late of Company C, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, First New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Bass, late of Company E, Seventy-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. McKenna, late of Company L, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harvey Bartley, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Whetzal, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Trenter, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Atwell, late of Company F, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin Manning, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Hoskins, late of Company A, Seventy-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert S. Scroggins, alias Allen S. Craig, late of Battery H, West Virginia Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles White, late of Company G, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Hindman, late of Company F, First Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Swearengin, late of Company C, Twenty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William T. Stone, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander McGahan, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George M. Mays, late of Company D, Fifty-second Regiment Kentucky Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Enos R. Clark, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen J. Coleman, late of Company A, First Regiment East Florida Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Andrist, late of Company I, One hundred and seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George L. Davis, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Luther S. Pitcher, late of Company A, Forty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dabner D. Wright, late of Company D, Third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Henry Jenkins, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hamilton L. Karr, late of Company G, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Ambrosier, late of Company H, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Scott, late of Company D, Sixty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert B. Clark, late of Company D, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William G. Sadler, late of Company E, Third Regiment, and Fifty-eighth Regiment, Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay hm a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Foster, late of Fourteenth Independent Battery, Massachusetts Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Nutter, late of Company B, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George D. King, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Devon, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment, and Company K, Eighth Regiment, Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Cassidy, late of Company H, Twenty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Michael Greeley, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph N. Abbott, late of Company B, Ninety-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Myers, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $21 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Sanders, late of Company E, Fifty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Norman B. Yarwood, late of Company D, First Battalion Sixteenth United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Rivers, late of Company G, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Kinne, late of Company G, One hundred and eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James S. Doolittle, late of Company H, One hundred and fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel A. Maxfield, late of Company H, Forty-ninth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Mallet, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel W. Thurston, late of Company I, One hundred and ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Pary McNair, late of Company H, Third Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Shipley, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert M. Butts, alias Albert J. Stewart, late of Battery D, First Maryland Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Smith, late of Company E, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William L. Tate, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Melville F. Allyn, late of Companies E and C, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Johnson, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert N. Hawkins, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and Company E, Eleventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ananias B. Reeser, late of Company D, Hickory County Battalion, Mounted Home Guards, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel H. Wise, late of Company A, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George A. Rubush, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred M. Wheeler, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment, and Company D, Fourteenth Regiment, Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jeremiah R. Sensenich, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eli House, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James K. P. Wyman, late of Company G, Fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wilson Taylor, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christopher C. Russell, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Barker, late of Company F, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Garrett W. Freeman, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward S. Ragan, late of Company B, Baltimore Battalion Maryland Volunteer Light Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac W. Waters, late of Company K, Forty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Raines, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Shepherd M. Gaston, late of Company E, Eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christian Lock, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anderson J. Bowman, late of Company K, Ninety-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia Esther Hammond, helpless and dependent child of Israel B. Hammond, late of Company I, Twenty-eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John W. Robinson, late of Company D, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Null, late of Company E, One hundred and seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Warren, late of Company F, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Hank, late of Company F, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph A. Stephens, late of Company G, Third Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Thomas, late a seaman, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marcus L. Moore, late of Company E, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles M. Dority, late of Company K, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard M. Johnson, late of Company F, Fifty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel L. Brown, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry King, late of Company D, Forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James J. Short, late of Company H, First Regiment Alabama Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John G. Hunter, late of Company H, Twenty-fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peleg B. Washburn, late of Company C, Eighteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas H. Goodrich, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward G. Sanchez, late of Company A, First Connecticut Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles P. Cook, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David E. Godfrey, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Schwicardi, late of Company G, Thirty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Helen A. Benjamin, helpless and dependent child of John Benjamin, late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment New York Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of George R. White, late of Company B, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William B. Porter, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emmet Ellis, late of Company F, Twenty-sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin Cuddeback, late of Company B, One hundred and forty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry L. McMullin, late of Company K, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Simon Kephart, late of Companies K and A, One hundred and tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abner A. Hurt, late of Company K, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James C. Haslett, late of Company L, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Deborah Sebring, helpless and dependent child of John Sebring, late of Company F, Fifty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Monroe J. Potts, late of Company G, Thirty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Phillip P. Keller, late of Company G, Thirty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Derning, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment, and Company K, Twelfth Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alonzo Fiero, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward N. Whitney, late of Company B, Forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jasper N. Cummins, late of Company C, Eighteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Orville H. Patten, late of Company B, Twenty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David H. Crumpacker, late of Company E, Forty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Mason, late of Company E, Twenty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Calvin Custer, late of Company L, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Horton S. Calland, late of Company D, Ninety-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ephriam Bartlett, late of Company B, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Johns, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George T. Harwood, late of Company K, Ninetieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Nineteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hutcheons B. Durham, late of Company H, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jonathan H. Robbins, late of Company F, Eighty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theodore Tooley, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Dominick, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nelson Hart, late of Company D, Second Regiment United States Sharpshooters, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Israel L. Hahn, late of Company M, Fifteenth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Townsend Roberts, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry M. Cottrill, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mathew Whitford, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry G. Hixson, late of Company C, Twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Philip H. Lind, late of Company H, Seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Helms, late of Company G, Seventieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Proudfit, late of Company A, Thirty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Third New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Gridley, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles E. Knox, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eaton Kinney, late of Company F, First Regiment New York Dragoons, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Little, late of Company B, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Covell, late of Independent Company C, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Noah W. Tryon, late of Seventh Battery, Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William McClarren, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wilson J. Parker, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel H. Keech, late of Company G, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred T. Hawk, late of Company K, One hundred and fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William R. Gillespie, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi Vandervort, late of Company B, Eighty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Postlethwait, late of Company B, Two hundred and sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Pope, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel R. Easter, late of Company A, One hundred and seventy-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a

pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. McCormick, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Bollinger, late of band, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Carrie B. Wilson, helpless and dependent child of Braman J. Wilson, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of James Buchanan, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sidney E. Timerman, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Guest, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ebenezer Riley, late of Company K, First Regiment Maryland Veteran Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew York, late of Company A, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Lee, late of Company F, Stone County Missouri Home Guards, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Felix Karl, late of Company B, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Shadrack B. Johnson, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Greenbury Vickrey, late of Company I, Sixty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Sanns, late of Company A, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Callahan, late of Companies K and C, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Johnston B. Geisinger, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Myrtle Webster, widow of Norman E. Webster, late of Battery B, Second Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month.

The name of John A. Davidson, late of Company F, One hundred and sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry J. Kinney, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oliver Budd, late of Company K, Eighty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Cashman, late of Company C, Ninety-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Decanter, late unassigned, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Langley, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josiah Dock, late of Company K, Thirty-eighth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alonzo M. Hobbs, late of Company E, Sixty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob D. Peterson, late of Company M, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Wetzel, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Row, late of Company B, Forty-third Regiment, and Company H, Fiftieth Regiment, Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Willaby L. Groves, late of Company I, Thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and Company I, Thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew M. Murray, late of Sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theresa Dietz, widow of Henry Dietz, late of Company B, First Regiment United States Reserve Corps, Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month.

The name of Mary Gehres, former widow of Jacob Diehl, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment, and Company A, Forty-third Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month.

The name of Henry Garvey, late of Company D, One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Carter, late of Company I, Forty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Flint, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christian Broemer, late of Company E, Forty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amos McKinley, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Silas H. Shepherd, late of Fourth Independent Company, Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Doctor E. Davis, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Jones, late of Fourth Independent Company, Ohio Volunteer Cavalry and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dudley G. Allen, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $18 per month.

The name of Harrison Smith, late of Company H, Second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Uhler, late of Company H, Seventy-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henderson Craft, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Gibbons, late of Company M, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Ferster, late of Troop G, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William McCloud, late of Company A, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Stillman, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Green, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Augustus A. Prugh, late of Company C, Fortieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Schmidt, late of Company H, One hundred and tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Moritz C. Young, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac N. Splawn, late of Company G, First Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Fairfield Dresser, late of Company M, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Daniels, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred York, late of Company A, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frances A. Sapp, widow of Willis M. Sapp, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month.

The name of Frederick Freund, late of Company K, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Hartman, late of Company D, Sixty-third Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of James T. Hewitt, late of Company G, Forty-eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Winfield S. Gregory, late of Company E, Fiftieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander H. Lamb, late of Company B, Second Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Davis, late of Company G, Forty-eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Shields, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred G. Daniels, late of Companies L and F, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harrison W. Fox, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julius O. Deming, late of Company F, First Regiment, and Company G, Sixth Regiment, Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lafayette Barnes, late of Company I, Sixty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clark K. Denney, late of Company F, Forty-second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac N. Mahan, late of Company H, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Pelly T. Martin, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Ward, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Newton J. Wells, late of Company C, Eighty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Hoover, late of Company D, Eighty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Baker, late of Company H, Fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John I. Smallwood, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles L. Dunham, late of Company L, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Simon J. Martin, late unassigned, Fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Porter W. Roundy, late hospital steward, Thirty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William M. Gosnell, late of Company A, Thirty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Delia A. Lapham, helpless and dependent child of Alphonso M. Lapham, late of Company C, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of George C. Presley, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Fourteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Bailey, late of Company E, One hundred and ninety-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Adams, late of Company D, Twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Fesler, late of Company B, Forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Gessner, late of Company K, One hundred and nineteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josiah James, late of Company D, First Battalion Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Follette, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, First Regiment Maine Veteran Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas T. Owens, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Seventh Battalion Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Guy, widow of William Guy, alias Andrew J. Guy, alias Charles G. Artz, late of Company F, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and Company C, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month.

The name of Anna Jacobs, widow of William B. Jacobs, late of Fifty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month.

The name of Lilly Howard, helpless and dependent child of Cyrus Howard, late of Company H, One hundred and eighty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William R. Boren, late of Company G, Thirty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George H. Devol, late of Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Troxler, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Simon Bollinger, late of Battery D, Fifth Regiment United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin Griffith, late of Company E, One hundred and seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Beverly W. Brittain, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas L. Jennison, late of Company G, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles G. Ginther, alias Charles Skinner, late of Company L, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna Smith, widow of Oscar Smith, late of Company D, Twenty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month.

The name of Henry C. Livezey, late of Company I, Sixty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Warren, late of Company C, One hundredth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elisha L. Powers, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Nash, late of Company K, One hundred and eighty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George M. Loring, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and Seventy-fifth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Shaffer, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Asbery Mayfield, late of Company P, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James N. McHenry, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Gaskins, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William L. Faucett, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, First Regiment West Virginia Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi Brock, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Martin, late of Company K, First Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alonzo Whitehouse, late of Company C, Eighteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. Skeels, late of Companies I and C, One hundred and thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edwin C. Beall, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph McGuire, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Collins South, late of Company F, Twenty-ninth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josephine Freeman, widow of Charles C. Freeman, late of Company B, Sixty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Daisy B. Freeman, helpless and dependent child of said Charles C. Freeman, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Josephine Freeman the name of said Daisy B. Freeman shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of the death of said Josephine Freeman.

The name of Michael Kouth, late of Company B, Twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob L. Hinkle, late of Company G, Twenty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Houchin, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wallace Chamberlin, late of Company I, Forty-ninth Regiment Massachusetts Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John E. Stanton, alias Edward A. Stanton, late of Battery D, First Battalion Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Bardill, late of Company F, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Fagley, late of Company K, Eightieth Regiment, and Company A, One hundred and eighty-fifth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Catherine O'Connor, widow of Timothy O'Connor, late of Company H, Thirty-fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Ellen O'Connor, helpless and dependent child of said Timothy O'Connor, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Catherine O'Connor, the name of said Ellen O'Connor shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Catherine O'Connor.

The name of Ansil T. Bartlett, late of Company D, Fifty-eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick Christy, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Wright, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Kindle, late of Company B, Eighty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hobart Hamilton, late of the One hundred and second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Daniels, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander Frazier, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Lovens, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry J. Loughmiller, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Kimball, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The following amendments were severally offered and severally agreed to:

On page 31, line 8, being the case of George T. Harwood, Company K, Nineteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, insert the dollar mark before the figures "40."

On page 40, line 10, being the case of Willaby L. Groves, strike out "apension" and insert "a pension."

On page 52, line 3, being the case of Anna Smith, strike out the word "window" and insert in lieu thereof the word "widow."

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

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

On motion of Mr. SHERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to said committee:

H. R. 449. William B. Hampshire.
H. R. 455. Jefferson Cherry.
H. R. 456. Wesley B. Calder.
H. R. 459. John J. Bradford.
H. R. 510. George Russell.
H. R. 511. James K. Jennings.
H. R. 514. Edward Wilkinson.
H. R. 515. Frank Logsdon.
H. R. 521. George Butterbaugh.
H. R. 555. Theodore S. Smith.
H. R. 556. John C. Carroll.
H. R. 558. William M. Pace.
H. R. 575. David H. Hatfield.
H. R. 579. James G. Young.
H. R. 581. John R. Ward.
H. R. 583. Peter F. Baker.
H. R. 593. Alexander Hall.
H. R. 607. Oscar G. Robinson.
H. R. 634. Joseph W. Snave.
H. R. 657. Joseph McArmstrong.
H. R. 658. Andrew Robertson.
H. R. 659. Francis M. Choat.
H. R. 688. David Harris.
H. R. 689. Perry A. Crandall.
H. R. 690. Elijah Campbell.
H. R. 711. Philip Richards.
H. R. 712. Philip Liebrick.
H. R. 729. Daniel Bachman.
H. R. 738. Jay P. Eddy.
H. R. 742. Isaac Luke.
H. R. 743. Lemuel Cross.
H. R. 755. James Heastan.
H. R. 768. Moses McCleary.
H. R. 769. Lewis H. Bradshaw.
H. R. 770. David Bellnap.
H. R. 778. Elsden B. Stephens.
H. R. 779. Alfred H. Chaplin.
H. R. 780. Frank Drewes, sr.
H. R. 791. Elijah A. Hearn.
H. R. 839. Edward B. Ward.
H. R. 849. Thomas R. Beasley.
H. R. 857. Sidney G. Sidner.
H. R. 860. William Sewing.
H. R. 877. Adam Allwein.
H. R. 897. Joshua Gage.
H. R. 898. Jeremiah Shine.
H. R. 899. William Watson.
H. R. 909. Marshall Barnes.
H. R. 930. Alexander J. Souden.
H. R. 935. Benjamin F. Umfleet.
H. R. 937. Lewis J. Cundiff.
H. R. 969. Riley A. Reeves.
H. R. 971. Charles Ford.
H. R. 1011. James F. Bellew.
H. R. 1075. Francis S. Layton.
H. R. 1098. Jacob Erow.
H. R. 1105. Sanford Earley.
H. R. 1116. Elisha W. Phillips.
H. R. 1117. Samuel M. Reese.
H. R. 1133. Nicholas Wolf.
H. R. 1135. Samuel D. Mowrey, alias David O. Mowrey.
H. R. 1159. Daniel Campbell.
H. R. 1164. Milton Cooper.
H. R. 1175. Charles Bishop.
H. R. 1188. James Doyle.
H. R. 1196. John A. Quick.
H. R. 1197. Elias Cleveland.
H. R. 1207. Ezra McIntyre.
H. R. 1209. John F. Bass.
H. R. 1229. John J. McKenna.
H. R. 1230. Harvey Bartley.
H. R. 1302. John T. Whetzal.
H. R. 1308. John Trenter.
H. R. 1316. William H. Atwell.
H. R. 1327. Franklin Manning.
H. R. 1328. Joseph Hoskins.
H. R. 1331. Albert S. Scroggins, alias Allen S. Craig.
H. R. 1346. Charles White.
H. R. 1467. William H. Hindman.
H. R. 1472. William A. Swearengin.
H. R. 1480. William T. Stone.
H. R. 1482. Alexander McGahan.
H. R. 1485. George M. Mays.
H. R. 1508. Enos R. Clark.
H. R. 1510. Stephen J. Coleman.
H. R. 1544. Jacob Andrist.
H. R. 1558. George L. Davis.
H. R. 1560. Luther S. Pitcher.
H. R. 1585. Dabner D. Wright.
H. R. 1590. William Henry Jenkins.
H. R. 1591. Hamilton L. Karr.
H. R. 1593. Daniel Ambrosier.
H. R. 1604. James H. Scott.
H. R. 1606. Albert B. Clark.
H. R. 1633. William G. Sadler.
H. R. 1637. Charles W. Foster.
H. R. 1638. John H. Nutter.
H. R. 1642. George D. King.
H. R. 1823. John Devon.
H. R. 1824. James Cassidy.
H. R. 1827. Michael Greeley.
H. R. 1829. Joseph N. Abbott.
H. R. 1830. William Myers.
H. R. 1851. Henry Sanders.
H. R. 1858. Norman B. Yarwood.
H. R. 1916. John H. Rivers.
H. R. 1923. Charles Kinne.
H. R. 1937. James S. Doolittle.
H. R. 1963. Samuel A. Maxfield.
H. R. 1983. John Mallet.
H. R. 2016. Daniel W. Thurston.
H. R. 2018. Pary McNair.
H. R. 2043. Benjamin F. Shipley.
H. R. 2045. Albert M. Butts, alias Albert J. Stewart.
H. R. 2048. James Smith.
H. R. 2053. William L. Tate.
H. R. 2079. Melville F. Allyn.
H. R. 2142. John W. Johnson.
H. R. 2147. Robert N. Hawkins.
H. R. 2148. Ananias B. Reeser.
H. R. 2226. Daniel H. Wise.
H. R. 2227. George A. Rubush.
H. R. 2235. Alfred M. Wheeler.
H. R. 2272. Jeremiah R. Sensenich.
H. R. 2287. Eli House.
H. R. 2383. James K. P. Wyman.
H. R. 2403. Wilson Taylor.
H. R. 2406. Christopher C. Russell.
H. R. 2409. John Barker.
H. R. 2411. Garrett W. Freeman.
H. R. 2414. Edward S. Ragan.
H. R. 2433. Isaac W. Waters.
H. R. 2445. William F. Raines.
H. R. 2466. Shepherd M. Gaston.
H. R. 2469. Christian Lock.
H. R. 2485. Anderson J. Bowman.
H. R. 2501. Julia Esther Hammond.
H. R. 2536. John W. Robinson.
H. R. 2551. William N. Hull.
H. R. 2552. John Warren.
H. R. 2562. John W. Hank.
H. R. 2638. Joseph A. Stephens.
H. R. 2674. Daniel Thomas.
H. R. 2681. Marcus L. Moore.
H. R. 2687. Charles M. Dority.
H. R. 2710. Richard M. Johnson.
H. R. 2727. Samuel L. Brown.
H. R. 2728. Henry King.
H. R. 2740. James J. Short.
H. R. 2742. John G. Hunter.
H. R. 2828. Peleg B. Washburn.
H. R. 2857. Thomas H. Goodrich.
H. R. 2957. Edward G. Sanchez.
H. R. 2977. Charles P. Cook.
H. R. 2986. David E. Godfrey.
H. R. 3056. William Schwicardi.
H. R. 3060. Helen A. Benjamin.
H. R. 3066. George R. White.
H. R. 3067. William B. Porter.
H. R. 3069. Emmet Ellis.
H. R. 3073. Benjamin Cuddeback.
H. R. 3087. Henry L. McMullin.
H. R. 3088. Simon Kephart.
H. R. 3094. Abner A. Hurt.
H. R. 3099. James C. Haslett.
H. R. 3105. Deborah Sebring.
H. R. 3114. Monroe J. Potts.
H. R. 3161. Phillip P. Keller.
H. R. 3166. James Derning.
H. R. 3183. Alonzo Fiero.
H. R. 3205. Edward N. Whitney.
H. R. 3277. Jasper N. Cummins.
H. R. 3278. Orville H. Patten.
H. R. 3280. David H. Crumpacker.
H. R. 3306. Albert Mason.
H. R. 3308. Calvin Custer.
H. R. 3312. Horton S. Calland.
H. R. 3326. Ephriam Bartlett.
H. R. 3390. Henry Johns.
H. R. 3391. George T. Harwood.
H. R. 3392. Hutcheons B. Durham.
H. R. 3403. Jonathan H. Roberts.
H. R. 3412. Theodore Tooley.
H. R. 3413. Charles Dominick.
H. R. 3445. Nelson Hart.
H. R. 3460. Israel L. Hahn.
H. R. 3488. Townsend Roberts.
H. R. 3510. Henry M. Cottrill.
H. R. 3527. Mathew Whitford.
H. R. 3528. Henry G. Hixson.
H. R. 3542. Philip H. Lind.
H. R. 3677. Albert Helms.
H. R. 3717. George Proudfit.
H. R. 3722. Edward Gridley.
H. R. 3725. Charles E. Knox.
H. R. 3729. Eaton Kinney.
H. R. 3730. James Little.
H. R. 3735. Thomas Covell.
H. R. 3741. Noah W. Tryon.
H. R. 3752. William McClarren.
H. R. 3755. Wilson J. Parker.
H. R. 3756. Samuel H. Keech.
H. R. 3758. Alfred T Hawk.
H. R. 3816. William R. Gillespie.
H. R. 3826. Levi Vandervort.
H. R. 3849. Isaac Postlethwait.
H. R. 3866. John Pope.
H. R. 3911. Samuel R. Easter.
H. R. 3916. William J. McCormick.
H. R. 3963. John C. Bolinger.
H. R. 3966. Carrie B. Wilson.
H. R. 4138. James Buchanan.
H. R. 4224. Sidney E. Timerman.
H. R. 4297. Joseph Guest.
H. R. 4298. Ebenezer Riley.
H. R. 4319. Andrew York.
H. R. 4362. Thomas Lee.
H. R. 4420. Felix Karl.
H. R. 4454. Shadrack B. Johnson.
H. R. 4471. Greenbury Vickrey.
H. R. 4543. John Sanns.
H. R. 4646. John J. Callahan.
H. R. 4660. Johnston B. Geisinger.
H. R. 4667. Myrtle Webster.
H. R. 4672. John A. Davidson.
H. R. 4677. Henry J. Kinney.
H. R. 4685. Oliver Budd.
H. R. 4691. John Cashman.
H. R. 4712. Charles Decanter.
H. R. 4713. George W. Langley.
H. R. 4775. Josiah Dock.
H. R. 4780. Alonzo M. Hobbs.
H. R. 4788. Jacob D. Peterson.
H. R. 4798. Jacob Wetzel.
H. R. 4841. William Row.
H. R. 4842. Willaby L. Groves.
H. R. 4857. Andrew M. Murray.
H. R. 4869. Theresa Dietz.
H. R. 4900. Mary Gehres.
H. R. 4931. Henry Garvey.
H. R. 4947. David Carter.
H. R. 4966. William Flint.
H. R. 5014. Christian Broemer.
H. R. 5052. Amos McKinley.
H. R. 5053. Silas H. Shepherd.
H. R. 5058. Doctor E. Davis.
H. R. 5061. John Jones.
H. R. 5083. Dudley G. Allen.
H. R. 5126. Harrison Smith.
H. R. 5190. Francis M. Uhler.
H. R. 5224. Henderson Craft.
H. R. 5232. John F. Gibbons.
H. R. 5243. Henry Ferster.
H. R. 5298. William McCloud.
H. R. 5315. George Stillman.
H. R. 5374. Charles W. Green.
H. R. 5397. Augustus A. Prugh.
H. R. 5400. Charles Schmidt.
H. R. 5480. Moritz C. Young.
H. R. 5483. Isaac N. Splawn.
H. R. 5590. Fairfield Dresser.
H. R. 5591. George W. Daniels.
H. R. 5682. Alfred York.
H. R. 5684. Frances A. Sapp.
H. R. 5729. Frederick Freund.
H. R. 5739. David Hartman.
H. R. 5740. James T. Hewitt.
H. R. 5741. Winfield S. Gregory.
H. R. 5742. Alexander H. Lamb.
H. R. 5743. Joseph Davis.
H. R. 5781. John C. Shields.
H. R. 5803. Alfred G. Daniels.
H. R. 5851. Harrison W. Fox.
H. R. 5852. Julius O. Deming.
H. R. 6082. Lafayette Barnes.
H. R. 6085. Clark K. Denney.
H. R. 6255. Isaac N. Mahan.
H. R. 6258. Pelly T. Martin.
H. R. 6373. Thomas Ward.
H. R. 6399. Newton J. Wells.
H. R. 6620. Henry Hoover.
H. R. 6625. John C. Baker.
H. R. 6634. John I. Smallwood.
H. R. 6665. Charles L. Dunham.
H. R. 6683. Simon J. Martin.
H. R. 6699. Porter W. Roundy.
H. R. 6701. William M. Gosnell.
H. R. 6709. Delia A. Lapham.
H. R. 6729. George C. Presley.
H. R. 6739. William F. Bailey.
H. R. 6822. John Adams.
H. R. 6823. John M. Fesler.
H. R. 6824. John Gessner.
H. R. 6829. Josiah James.
H. R. 6837. John T. Follette.
H. R. 6864. Thomas T. Owens.
H. R. 6874. Mary J. Guy.
H. R. 6917. Anna Jacobs.
H. R. 6918. Lilly Howard.
H. R. 7036. William R. Boren.
H. R. 7040. George H. Devol.
H. R. 7041. John Troxler.
H. R. 7042. Simon Bollinger.
H. R. 7043. Benjamin Griffith.
H. R. 7069. Beverly W. Brittain.
H. R. 7099. Thomas L. Jennison.
H. R. 7104. Charles G. Ginther, alias Charles Skinner.
H. R. 7105. Anna Smith.
H. R. 7107. Henry C. Livezey.
H. R. 7155. William Warren.
H. R. 7195. Elisha L. Powers.
H. R. 7197. William J. Nash.
H. R. 7241. George M. Loring.
H. R. 7266. Charles Shaffer.
H. R. 7270. Asbery Mayfield.
H. R. 7271. James N. McHenry.
H. R. 7272. Andrew J. Gaskins.
H. R. 7273. William L. Faucett.
H. R. 7274. Levi Brock.
H. R. 7365. William C. Martin.
H. R. 7379. Alonzo Whitehouse.
H. R. 7384. John S. Skeels.
H. R. 7385. Edwin C. Beall.
H. R. 7390. Joseph McGuire.
H. R. 7392. Collins South.
H. R. 7399. Josephine Freeman.
H. R. 7403. Michael Kouth.
H. R. 7415. Jacob L. Hinkle.
H. R. 7427. John R. Houchin.
H. R. 7464. Wallace Chamberlin.
H. R. 7465. John E. Stanton, alias Edward A. Stanton.
H. R. 7497. John Bardill.
H. R. 7509. John Fagley.
H. R. 7518. Catherine O'Connor.
H. R. 7519. Ansil T. Bartlett.
H. R. 7520. Frederick Christy.
H. R. 7537. George W. Wright.
H. R. 7538. Charles H. Kindle.
H. R. 7539. Hobart Hamilton.
H. R. 7540. Henry Daniels.
H. R. 7553. Alexander Frazier.
H. R. 7555. John A. Lovens.
H. R. 7559. Henry J. Loughmiller.
H. R. 7560. William W. Kimball.

GARABED.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged report from the Committee on Rules, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 194.

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to the consideration, under the general rules of the House, of H. J. Res. 174, entitled "Joint resolution for the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States for lessening the expenses of the war, and restoring the loss caused by the war by providing for the employment of a discovery or invention called the 'Garabed,' claiming to make possible the utilization of free energy."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it has been very well understood that this matter would come up this afternoon. Does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] desire to enter into any agreement as to time for discussion of the rule?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I suggest 20 minutes on a side.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want about 15 minutes on the rule. I am opposed to the rule.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. If the gentleman from Tennessee desires more time than that, I have no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not desire that much time. The gentleman from Missouri is opposed to the rule?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And the gentleman from Kansas is in favor of it?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the rule be limited to 40 minutes, one-half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and one-half by myself, and that at the end of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that both these gentleman are in favor of the rule. I desire to oppose the rule and I would like to have about 15 minutes in which to oppose it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I shall withdraw the request. The purpose of the resolution, which by direction of the Committee on Rules I have called up, is to provide for the consideration, under the general rules of practice of the House, of House joint resolution 174, Calendar No. 77, entitled "Joint resolution for the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States, for lessening the expenses of the war, and restoring the loss caused by the war by providing for the employment of a discovery or invention called the 'Garabed,' claiming to make possible the utilization of free energy."

The resolution or special rule which the Committee on Rules presents is simple in its terms and requires no explanation. Its adoption is necessary, in view of the parliamentary situation, if the House is to consider the joint resolution.

I think, sir, it is highly important that we should consider and pass the joint resolution. It will be remembered that the House and Senate passed this measure at the very close of the last session of the Congress. It reached the President only a few moments before the hour that had been fixed for final adjournment of the session and was not signed by him. I assume that this did not indicate opposition upon his part, because I suppose if he had been opposed to it he would have vetoed it. My supposition has been that the President felt he should give it further investigation than the hurried and congested condition of affairs would then admit of, knowing that Congress would shortly reconvene, and that it could be again passed and submitted to him.

I have heard—and I suppose I violate no confidence in so stating—that with the amendments as adopted by the Committee on Patents, the Department of the Interior has no objection to the measure, and I feel quite hopeful that it will receive Executive approval if again passed.

A brief statement of the facts and purposes of the joint resolution will suffice, I trust, so far as debate on the rule I propose is concerned.

Mr. Garabed T. K. Giragossian, who, I understand, is a gentleman of Armenian birth, but who is and has long been a resident and naturalized citizen of the United States, claims to have developed a mechanism whereby what scientists call the cosmic or elemental forces or energies of nature may be utilized for industrial purposes. Whether this claim is well founded we do not know. If it be well founded, then, as the report of the Committee on Patents aptly says, "the possible results of the use of the means in question is beyond the power of man's imagination." It is so stupendous a thing that it is not strange that men should be frankly skeptical and openly cynical concerning it.

And yet, sir, I think all scientists are agreed that these cosmic energies do exist, that they flow in steady and unceasing streams throughout the universe. Would the successful harnessing of them be any more strange or wonderful than was the utilization of the power of steam or the leashing of the lightnings?

Mr. Giragossian claims to have the device developed and stands ready to submit it to the test, the only way in which its worth may be demonstrated. He asks no appropriation of the Congress. Unless he has something worth while, there is no contingency under which this Government will expend a penny.

On the other hand, if he does demonstrate that he has something worth while, an assignment of the right to utilize it for the Government's own use is made to the Government, said assignment "free of charge or expense," and he is to have a patent for 17 years. Certainly, the proposition of Mr. Giragossian does not have the earmarks of fakerism or fanaticism.

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

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. BORLAND. I would not want to suggest that this bears the earmarks of fake or fanaticism, but does not section 4 of the bill absolutely prejudge Mr. Giragossian's case by saying that the Government of the United States shall not issue to anyone else a patent involving or relating to the principle of Garabed, regardless of its form or shape? Does it not absolutely assume the minute we pass this bill that he is the inventor and no one else has ever invented anything else involving the same principle, and that nobody else must be permitted to have a patent on anything involving the same principle?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. No. The gentleman from Missouri is wrong in that conclusion. That is only to happen in the event the demonstration is made to the satisfaction of the board of scientists to be selected by Mr. Giragossian and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. In other words, it places him, if I construe the measure correctly, in no different shape than he would be in if he obtained his patent under the general law, except in so far as improvements are concerned.

Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman will indulge me further a moment, no such condition appears in section 4; but assuming that it did appear there and assuming that Mr. Giragossian demonstrates to these scientists that his invention will work, have we not still prejudged his case as to all other inventors of the same principle? Would he not, after the demonstration, step into the rights of all persons who claim to have invented that same principle?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Not any more than it would do so under the general patent law, except, as I have said, in the matter of improvements.

Mr. BORLAND. Let me call the gentleman's attention——

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will pardon me, I do not want to go into details. We are providing for the consideration of the bill, and I should prefer that gentlemen from the Committee on Patents discuss that matter of details with the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD. Is there anything in the bill that determines the question of priority if there is any controversy as to the first inventor of this great invention?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will say that the effect of House joint resolution 174 will be to grant to Mr. Giragossian a patent in the event he demonstrates his device to the satisfaction of the board of scientists approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD. But if there is any proof afterwards that there is a prior inventor, the door is closed to him by this bill?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That might be the effect of it, but if the gentleman will bear with me in patience I will proceed——

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit a question on the rule?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it not a fact under the rule, if adopted, the gentleman who has the bill in charge can do as he did when the bill was last under consideration, when only one amendment was offered, move the previous question and prevent any amendment to this most important question, which would give Mr. Giragossian, under section 4, the absolute right, even if the committee of experts appointed find in his favor, not to allow a patent to be given to anybody else?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman asks a question as to procedure. I answer it in the affirmative, that it will be considered under the general practice of the House and it will lie within the power of the gentleman from Ohio, the acting chairman of the Committee on Patents, at any time under the general rules of the House to move the previous question. If the House orders the previous question it will cut out amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. In view of the action before, does the gentleman think it is proper such action should be taken without opportunity to amend the bill?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is a matter which addresses itself to the discretion of the gentleman from Ohio and the taste of Members of the House. A test of its elements indicates absolute good faith. Those gentlemen with whom Mr. Giragossian has come in personal contact all testify before the Rules Committee and the Committee on Patents to his gentlemanly demeanor, his intellectual strength, and the apparent sincerity which runs through his conduct and is evidenced in his character.

I am quite conscious of the fact that there are gentlemen who indulge their gift of wit in opposing this proposition, and I have even heard it put as strongly as that Congress was rendering itself ridiculous in passing it. That remains to be seen, Mr. Speaker, and I am willing to take the chance.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield as to the statement he just made?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman kindly inform the House what test he referred to which Mr. Giragossian has made and submitted to any committee of the House?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I referred not to the test of the mechanical device. The continuity of my remarks was broken by inquiry, and what I meant to say was that the test of the proposition which he submitted, as contained in the resolution, bore the evidence of good faith. Do I make myself clear to the gentleman? [After a pause.] I meant that the proposition contained in House resolution 174, the contract involved in that resolution, bore evidence of good faith. I did not refer to the device.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, the resolution now under consideration is more drastic, as far as Government rights are concerned, than the one passed last when we had it under consideration.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course, that is aside, if the gentleman will pardon me, from the——

Mr. STAFFORD. Does that show good faith on the part of Mr. Giragossian?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, perhaps our minds do not run together on that proposition. The passage of the joint resolution in its present form can not possibly endanger a single public interest, and I feel that if the demonstration fails I can recover from the shock, and since no harm can have been done to any living person, I shall be able to go about my business, I think, without hanging my head in humiliation and shame. If it shall, on the other hand, prove a success, if it possesses even a tithe of the possibilities claimed for it, I shall be glad for my country's and for humanity's sake. I shall feel gratified to have even this small part in its advancement.

Why is it that gentlemen do so much fear to ascertain whether we really have some new blessing for mankind? [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does the gentleman ask that rhetorically or directly?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. As the gentleman chooses.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman asks why we fear. It is because before we know what the result is going to be we mortgage to this man any favorable result——

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But only in event the result is what he claims it will be.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is where the gentleman makes a mistake if I may address that remark, with all respect, to him.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. We promise beforehand that if he produces what he says he has he shall have exclusive right to the use of it except for the Government's own use, even if it should comprehend all the laws of physics known to science or hereafter to be discovered, and he can sue any man who subsequently brings in an invention which may in the consideration of some one of those laws impinge upon his own.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is a question of construction. If Mr. Giragossian has what he claims to have, I think he should have a special patent, and I think the Government would be extremely fortunate in obtaining the use of it as provided by the terms of this measure.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman again yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman undertake, in the spirit of true democracy, to argue that one man, by the terms of this resolution—which means the purchase of a pig in a poke—should utilize for himself all the royalties and profits to be had from his discovery of some great fundamental law of physics and nature?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well——

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is not the pure mechanical device——

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman and I differ in our contention of construction.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is not the mere mechanical device.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think it would be construed necessarily to apply only to the device and improvements upon the device directly related to it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Without offense, is not that begging the question, for the utilization of a heretofore unknown law of nature may be possible only through a certain device, but if you protect him in the device he is the only man who can use the law.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in that event, of course, the Government can become the owner of it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The Government in this country is not every private manufacturer.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But my construction—I may be in error about it—the gentleman from Vermont is a clearer lawyer than I am——

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am not a lawyer.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I may be mistaken about it. However, we are not discussing the measure, we are merely discussing the rule for its consideration.

My thought concerning the measure is that the limitation with reference to the patent or improvements will apply only to improvements that under common sense, which is always good law, would relate directly to this mechanism itself.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. CHURCH. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in order to prevent monopoly the Government has the right to purchase this outright from Mr. Giragossian at any time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman from California. I just stated that in reply to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. Speaker, the miracle of yesterday is the commonplace of to-day. There was a time when man was perfect in all his parts and elements. He was complete physically. The poet, the painter, the sculptor, the dreamer, in the wildest flights of superb fancy, never caught more than a fleeting vision of that beauty which was given by the Lord to the first man and first woman.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. May I ask the gentleman a question when convenient for him to be interrupted?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. At this time.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I simply wanted to ask why this gentleman did not proceed in the usual way to apply for a patent.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The report from the Committee on Patents, of which I am not a member—I am merely reporting the resolution from the Committee on Rules—states that. The difficulties which have attended every revolutionary invention in the history of our country have caused this man to ask for a special patent rather than to pursue the usual way.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Does he fear in some way that the device, for instance, might be stolen before the patent issues, or may leak out in some way?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes. Or that there may be improvements and devices suggested that will result in endless litigation, such as marked the course of the telephone and other great inventions lying within the knowledge of all of us.

I was about to proceed further when interrupted by the gentleman.

Not only was man complete physically at one time, but he was perfect mentally. He knew all philosophy and all science. Mathematical exactness was instinctive with him. He knew and could interpret bird song. He knew where the flower bloom came from, and why. He understood the passions of the tiger. He saw all problems with clear and unmistakable vision.

He was complete spiritually. He discussed with the Divine the themes of the divinity. He communed with the angels.

He was so complete in his structure that he possessed the power to destroy his own perfection, and he exercised this power. He sinned. That is to say, he violated some law of harmony. What it was we do not know. Perhaps we never shall know. But we know that it was the exercise of a power by which the integrity of his triple structure was destroyed.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Surely.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Is the gentleman proceeding upon the theory that mankind was created perfect in the beginning and has been degenerating since?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I told the gentleman privately he ought not to interrupt a speech like this.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. It is a very difficult problem the gentleman is discussing now.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There is lots of time to do it, and I am going to elucidate it.

There was some power by the exercise of which the integrity of the triple structure was destroyed. I think that touched his every phase and characteristic. It devitalized him physically. The majestic brow receded; the form became bent. Warts and vile protuberances grew upon the skin. The nerves lost control over the muscles, and these, uncontrolled, fell to hideous expression.

And it devitalized him mentally. He lost intellectual excellence. He lost that power of discerning the truth clearly amidst every confusion and complexity.

It devitalized him spiritually. He could no longer look clear-eyed upon the angels nor commune in freedom with the God. And in this condition—a physical degenerate, a moral wreck, an intellectual prostitute—he was cast into the wild amid the wild things over which he had held an unrestrained dominion. But somehow, some way, there lingered in the sin-touched brain a glimmer of what he had been. And in the sin-dwarfed soul there sprang up an aspiration to regain by labor that which had been his by gift. And the master passion of the centuries, whether men be always conscious of it or not, is this great passion to be as the first man was, to see as the first man saw, to know as he knew, to be perfect as he was perfect, to walk abroad with the angels, to commune in freedom with the God. And the development of that ambition and all the activities essential to its growth is, after all, the fundamental thing that challenges each of us. [Applause.] Throughout all the long ages it has been the fight. It has been fought amid sneers, amid criticisms, amid cynicisms. It is rather remarkable that humanity has made the advance it has made.

It has advanced spiritually. Each race has developed its moral philosopher, its Buddha, its Confucius, its Mohammed, its St. Paul. I speak only of the human, not of the divine. The grunts have been developed into a language with which poets have expressed the intimate secrets of the human heart and philosophers have explained in a wondrous way the development of human impulse. The artist has looked upon the marble, surprised the dream that lay within it, and chiseled out the figure filled with life, almost love, and wondrous beauty. The painter has mixed the pigments and spread on canvas another longing for the lost dominion to fill us with delight or thrill us with despair.

Not alone in the spiritual and artistic world, but in the material and the mechanical world, what wonders man has wrought! From the crude, dwarfed, distorted man, standing weaponless and naked in the primeval wilderness, have sprung the splendid creatures who with soul and brain and nimble fingers have moved steadily toward the restoration of the dominion lost in the long ago.

What wonders man has wrought! He has piled stones and timber into massive mansions as beautiful as the dreams of heaven. He has set the poles and strung the wires and talks with his fellows across rivers and seas and continents; aye, without the wires he sends his message through the unseeable air. He has caught the secret of steam and made it do his bidding. He has taken the web spun by the worm and woven it into a fabric fit to clothe the angels.

Why do we speak of things as being impossible? Here comes a man who says he has plucked the heart out of another human mystery. It is no reflection on him that he comes from comparative obscurity. If what he claims proves true, he will stand among the great of all ages and all times, and his place in the sun will be quite secure. He offers to submit his proposition to a fair and proper test. He offers to this Government the benefit of his genius and his industry. If indeed he has plucked the heart of another mystery, why not have the benefit of it? I am entirely at a loss to understand why this body or any other body should refuse to give to him the opportunity to demonstrate, under the terms and conditions of this measure, whether or not he has worked one of those other things that we once called "miracles," but which, as I said a while ago, have become after all common places. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas rose.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to oppose the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas, a member of the Committee on Rules, is recognized.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] 10 minutes out of my hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like first to make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. There was, and I presume there is—and I would like to have it stated publicly—an understanding that if this rule is adopted there shall be three hours' consideration of this bill?

Mr. CROSSER. Does the gentleman include in that the time that has already been consumed, or does he still want three hours?

Mr. LENROOT. I believe we could not give it proper consideration by 5 o'clock this afternoon. With this understanding——

Mr. CROSSER. Can we not finish it to-night?

Mr. LENROOT. I do not know. That will depend. There was an understanding, a private understanding, that there would be three hours' consideration of this bill after the adoption of the rule.

Mr. CROSSER. I assumed that that would include the little time we might consume on the rule. I did not assume that there would be any debate on the rule.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I did not have that understanding. The only understanding we had was that the gentleman from Kansas and I thought we would each use an hour.

Mr. LENROOT. I believe it will be satisfactory, so far as I am concerned, that if we can not finish to-night, well and good. But substantial amendments are pending——

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, would not the gentleman be willing to allow a certain amount of time for debate under the five-minute rule to consider amendments? I judge from the temper of the House that the purpose is to pass the bill, but I feel there should be time granted so as to allow discussion of the amendments.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I hope this is not coming out of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that this discussion is going on in order to promote an understanding.

Mr. BORLAND. Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that there has been an understanding entered into by anybody in regard to the limitation of debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not know that anybody has entered into any.

Mr. LENROOT. It was within the power of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] to move the previous question at any time, and I went to him, privately, as I had a perfect right to do, and had an understanding with him that the previous question would not at once be moved, and that before it was moved—or that was the effect of it—we would have three hours for full discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No understanding has been reached. If these gentlemen have made an informal agreement among themselves, it would have to be submitted to the House before it would be binding.

Mr. BORLAND. This matter can not be foreclosed in that manner.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman from Ohio had it in his power to move the previous question at any time. I bring the question up now, so that we may get an understanding.

Mr. BORLAND. The evident purpose is to foreclose the whole subject in the interest of one man.

Mr. CROSSER. So far as I am concerned, I would like to finish to-night. I am willing to stay.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman will not move the previous question prior to 5.30 o'clock?

Mr. CROSSER. No.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there will be a quorum here at 5.30.

Mr. LENROOT. Then we can raise the point at that time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am anxious that this matter be concluded this afternoon with a quorum of the House present. The discussion so far has been on the merits of the proposition. I take it that the discussion in the ensuing hour will be on the merits of the proposition rather than upon the rule itself.

Mr. LENROOT. I want an understanding as to the time for voting. I do not want to be shut off in a few minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am perfectly willing to go on, with an understanding that the previous question will not be moved until 5.30, unless we finish before that.

Mr. LENROOT. Unless we finish before that.

Mr. CROSSER. I have not consulted any other member of the committee about this. I want to satisfy everyone concerned, but I do want to finish this to-night.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It is understood that the previous question will not be moved before 5.30, unless we conclude before that time.

Mr. CROSSER. Unless we conclude before that time, and I reserve the right to move the previous question at that time.

Mr. LENROOT. With that understanding, I shall not object.

Mr. CARLIN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. CARLIN. I want to inquire whether the rule permits amendments to the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Under the rules of the House, if the previous question is not moved—and that is the purpose of getting this understanding—amendments can be offered. With the understanding that has been reached, I shall not oppose the rule, but I do want to take the time to call the attention of the House to the necessity of very materially amending this joint resolution, if the House would be true to itself and the country.

It is true this joint resolution passed in the last session of Congress, and yet we must conclude that the only reason why it passed in its present form was that Members were so tired and so worn out that they were not in a condition to give that careful consideration to measures that they usually give. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has stated that there is no public interest that can possibly be injured, nor the Government in any way made liable by the passage of this resolution in its present form. Why, Mr. Speaker, unless this joint resolution is amended, even though this committee of scientists shall find that there is nothing of value in this alleged discovery of Mr. Giragossian, nevertheless this bill provides that at no time during 17 years shall any patent be issued to anyone covering this principle of free energy, although this alleged inventor may have nothing whatever of value. There is no such condition attached to section 4 as was implied by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. This commission might unanimously find against there being anything of value in this discovery, and yet section 4 provides that the United States Government shall not issue to anyone else any patent involving or relating to the principle of the Garabed free-energy generator; and not only shall not issue a patent, but—

shall prevent the construction, importation, use, or exploitation thereof, in whole or in part, in the United States, and shall protect the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian, his heirs and assigns, in the rights and interests in the "Garabed" in the above respect for a period of 17 years in the United States and in foreign countries where such protection is afforded by treaty obligations, international law, or diplomatic representation.

In other words, although there may be nothing of value in this discovery, by this bill we agree that if some one else does discover something along this line the public shall not have the use of it or have the right to use it at all. Is it possible that the House of Representatives is in favor of any such proposition as that?

Then we come to section 5, another most remarkable section, providing—

SEC. 5. That any essential improvement or contrivance by any person or persons other than Garabed T. K. Giragossian relating to the "Garabed," or its principle, which shall prove valuable and essential thereto in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior during the period of the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian's special protection shall be bought by the United States Government for its own use in conjunction with its use of the said "Garabed," with adequate compensation to the inventor or contriver thereof. If, however, the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian wishes to utilize any such invention or contrivance so acquired by the United States Government, he or his assigns, and no other person or corporation, shall be entitled thereto upon the payment of a fair, just, and reasonable royalty therefor. In consideration of this right the United States Government shall have, without expense, the right to use for its own purpose any new improvement or device made by the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian.

Not even a patent is required upon this improvement or contrivance; and yet the Government agrees to purchase it and not permit the inventor of that improvement or contrivance to use it or the public to have the use of it except through Mr. Giragossian, although this committee of scientists might agree that there was nothing of value in this discovery. Is it possible that the House of Representatives is going to pass legislation of this nature? I am perfectly willing to vote for this bill amended, willing to take the chance that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] speaks of in giving Mr. Giragossian protection by this special patent, if this committee of scientists shall approve. I am willing that he shall have the right under this bill, upon the payment of a reasonable royalty fixed by the Secretary of the Interior to use any improvement or contrivance that some one else may invent in connection with this discovery. That gives full, complete, and ample protection to Mr. Giragossian. More than that neither he nor anyone else has the right to ask. Neither has he the right to ask, as is contained in section 4, that no patent shall be issued to anyone else, although he may have nothing, and that the Government will not permit anyone else to use the discovery or invention relating to the generation of free energy when he has not. Why, the very statement of the proposition shows its absolute absurdity. I sincerely hope that when we reach the point of amendment the committee will accept some of these amendments. And even then, although I am willing to vote for it I am frank to say that Congress will have gone further in extending a special privilege than has ever been done in the history of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, since this bill was under consideration in the House in the closing days of the last session there have been some developments that were unknown to me and unknown to the membership of the House. I have been informed that the bill passed the Senate in the closing hours of one day with a very small membership present, even after a disclosure made by one of the Senators that sometime before a person by the name of Mr. Casey had called at his office with a device that operated on the general principle proposed to be embodied in the invention claimed by Mr. Giragossian.

Since I came on the floor this morning it has been called to my attention that some person—whether Mr. Casey or some one else I do not know—demonstrated by a device to a Member of this House the very principle claimed by Mr. Giragossian. When the proposal was under consideration at the last session I attempted to point out in 10 or 15 minutes' discussion on the rule the fact that the rights of other inventors were not protected; that even if the committee of scientists that were to be appointed on the nomination of Mr. Giragossian, with the approval, it is true, of the Secretary of the Interior, should find that he had a device that was practicable, this bill took away the right of any other person, whether Mr. Giragossian was the inventor or not. Since the resolution was considered we have the positive statement in another body and also by a colleague in this Chamber to-day that there are other persons who have a similar device.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Has this other person or persons patented the device?

Mr. STAFFORD. As far as I am informed, he has not. I am not advised, nor does the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD show whether the other person has made an application for letters patent, but this resolution granting a patent to Giragossian does not hinge on whether he was the original inventor, but on whether he has a device that can utilize this energy. I have been informed that in Africa they have devices in operation that utilize the rays of the sun for generating power, not very successfully, but utilized to some extent.

Under this bill we are granting a patent to a man who may have created a device, although he may not be the inventor, and the bill will also give him an inclusive right to the use of a principle of nature. It is a fundamental principle of patent law—and I do not claim to be an expert on patent law—that a patent will not be granted for a principle of nature.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I want to direct an inquiry on that very point.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am glad to have the interruption and to have the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Has the Patent Office ever determined for patent purposes what free energy is?

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand under the patent law they have refused in all times past to grant patents on a principle of nature, like electricity or any other cosmic force, holding that that belongs to the public generally and only a device to utilize that cosmic force can be patented.

Since the resolution passed both bodies and was submitted to the President of the United States, who vetoed it by a pocket veto, I am informed only this morning, although my attention was not called to it in the public press, that a statement was given out setting forth the reasons why he refused to sign this bill. I do not know what his reasons were. Perhaps some member of the Committee on Patents may be able to inform the House. It is their duty, if they are acquainted with them, to state them to the House, for we are virtually considering a veto measure. It was the practice in early days of the Government when a bill was vetoed by a pocket veto in the closing days of a session because time did not permit the President to convey his reasons to Congress at that session, to submit the reasons to the House in which it originated at the next session. We have not the views of the President, but it may be that some member of the committee may have read the newspaper article that contained the statement of the White House as to the reasons why the President declined to approve the resolution. Certain it is that this resolution is not as favorable to the Government as the former resolution, because under section 6, if the Government wishes to purchase the exclusive right to this invention under the form as it existed when the bill passed the House, the compensation was determined by a committee of six, three to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and three to be appointed by the inventor, Mr. Giragossian. But now it provides that the finding of the committee shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and of Mr. Giragossian. Why, if the gentleman is going to obtain a patent under this bill for the use of a force of nature, and even though Congress should wish to purchase the right exclusively for all mankind, notwithstanding the committee of six have determined the amount of remuneration, he could reject it and hold the Gov-

ernment up and refuse to sell it. He could sell it to a corporation that might be capitalized at a fabulous amount. Is it possible that in this Congress we are willing to grant a man, who may not be the original inventor, the right to capitalize a principle of nature which may or may not have been discovered heretofore, and let him exact a tribute from all mankind that may amount to hundreds of millions of dollars?

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. DENT. Does not the gentleman think that one of the reasons that actuated the President in vetoing the measure was that if we gave this privilege to one man we would have to give it to every other man who discovered something relating to free energy? That is the reason that the Military Committee of the House turned down the proposition.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I was unadvised that the Committee on Military Affairs had ever considered the proposition. We now have the statement of the chairman of the committee why they refused to give any recognition to the proposition contained in this bill. Gentlemen, this is not granting a congressional patent; it is giving to a man who may not be the original inventor an exclusive right to use a law of nature. He may submit a device that is operated by electricity, something well known, a device which, if it could be utilized, would, under the terms of this resolution, grant him an absolute monopoly. This committee of scientists and the Secretary of the Interior would have no right under the terms of the resolution as it passed before and as it is presented by this committee to refuse to grant him a patent for utilizing the cosmic forces of nature, whether electricity or any other energy, but he would have that exclusive privilege for the term of 17 years.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. PURNELL. Does the gentleman think that this man could capitalize this invention or discovery if this board of scientists should discover or decide that it is not practicable?

Mr. STAFFORD. I can well understand that this man may have a device where he uses electricity, something not new.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. The situation might be such that if the device were practicable under the terms of the resolution the committee will be obliged necessarily to find in favor of it, and then under the terms of the resolution the Secretary of the Interior has nothing more to do, but is compelled to enter into contracts to carry out this law.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. In a moment. Another provision of the measure says that the Congress will have the right to purchase this patent, but it is a limited right, limited only as I wish to call to your attention to that period of time in case the Congress is in session or to a limited time thereafter in case the Congress is not in session. Certainly we know by reason of the usual procedure of Congress that that might be too limited a time. I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HULBERT. The gentleman has anticipated and answered the interrogatory I intended to propound.

Mr. STAFFORD. Furthermore, under the terms of this resolution the Government of the United States becomes a guarantor as against all prior inventors and all succeeding inventors of any improvement in the case of this principle. The history of the growth of manufacture in this country is due to the development of improvements on some basic patent, and yet under the form of this bill future improvements are estopped.

This bill, I dare say, was written by the attorney of Mr. Giragossian, for I can not conceive of any disinterested person writing it, who had at heart the welfare of the Government, as the bill, in the form in which it is before the House, grants away all of the rights—and I measure my words when I say all—of the Government except under conditions which in the ordinary application could not be fulfilled.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman stated that some other person had invented a device or an instrument which he thought was similar to the device which was involved in this resolution. I desire to ask the gentleman whether that gentleman has offered to submit his device to a test?

Mr. STAFFORD. That gentleman, as I was informed this morning by my colleague, Mr. LENROOT, who was informed by some Member of the House, stated that he was willing at any time not only to submit it to a committee of the House, but that he had showed it to this Member. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD discloses further, when this matter was under consideration one evening late in the Senate, that a gentleman came to the office of Senator NEW and demonstrated to him a similar device. Whether that person, Mr. Casey, whom Senator NEW referred to, is the identical person my colleague referred to this morning I do not know, but the man to whom we are conferring such great privileges absolutely refuses to show his device to any Member of Congress. The report in this case speaks in glowing terms of the standing of this man and of the three people who indorsed the invention. Let me call attention to the fact that while these three men may be estimable gentlemen, they are not scientists. One is a director of music in Boston, another is an artist in Boston, who has been advancing money to Mr. Giragossian, and the other is the chairman of some board of directors. They are not scientists.

I may be a little hard-headed, but before I am willing to vote away a valuable right foreclosing the public for 17 years from the use of an element of nature, even if Mr. Giragossian is the original discoverer of it, I shall demand more evidence than we have presented in this case. I am unwilling to transfer or mortgage the rights of all of the people in the United States in such a way that they can be capitalized to the tune of millions of dollars to the advantage of Mr. Giragossian and some promoter.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman says that Mr. Giragossian refused to show his device or its operation to any member of the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Or to any committee that would be appointed by the House.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to ask the gentleman whether he knows how Mr. Giragossian was able to present such convincing evidence to the committee that they brought this bill in the second time?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no evidence on that subject. I know that he called at my office, and that other persons called there in his behalf, and I presume they did upon other Members of Congress, just as they did upon me.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. In case this proposed committee should report that this device was not practicable, as it stands, would the Government, under section 4, be debarred from granting any patent to any person who might subsequently bring in a practicable device?

Mr. STAFFORD. That was brought out by my colleague [Mr. LENROOT]. The Government is absolutely debarred, whether the committee reports favorably or unfavorably. Section 4 provides as follows:

> That the United States Government shall not issue to anyone else any patent involving or relating to the principle of the "Garabed" free-energy generator, regardless of its form or shape, or for any device, improvement, process, equipment, or apparatus based upon the system or correlative principle of the said discovery or invention, or for any improvement or change developed in the use of the said "Garabed," and shall prevent the construction, importation, use, or exploitation thereof, in whole or in part, in the United States, and shall protect the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian, his heirs and assigns, in the rights and interests in the "Garabed" in the above respect for a period of 17 years in the United States and in foreign countries where such protection is afforded by treaty obligation, international law, or diplomatic representation.

I can not believe any Member of the House would permit any such ridiculous proposal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the debate on this proposition seems to be more in reference to the merits of the bill than the adoption of this rule. I listened with a great deal of interest to the objections urged by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] with reference to section 4. If this section 4 is adopted as it is, and in the event that this committee that is appointed finds that it is a fake and of no avail, why there is not a court in the land that would hold that Giragossian would be entitled for a minute to the rights sought to be guaranteed to him here, and if there are any people that doubt that proposition of law—and I state it as a proposition of law—this could be very easily remedied by a simple amendment that in the event that this committee approved after their investigation this proposition then the section shall apply.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But the bill as it now stands would absolutely bar for 17 years the acceptance by the United States Government of any invention which would be practical, no

matter whether this committee should decide in favor of or against it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No.

Mr. GORDON. No; if the gentleman will yield, it will have to be on this distinctive principle.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The distinctive principle is patented, you know.

Mr. GORDON. It is not.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. We state as a proposition of law, in the event this bill is adopted exactly as it is and the committee approved by the Secretary of the Interior would find that it was a fake, that it would not do the things that it is said here it will do, then it will become a dead law from that minute, and anyone who had any principle or invention involving this principle would not be denied the right under this bill, for the reason that it has been decided there is nothing in the proposition stated here. But I say there is no trouble about that; it can be made absolutely beyond peradventure by inserting that in the event this committee does approve then he shall be guaranteed the rights spoken of in this bill.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Suppose the committee does not find that the invention is a fake, but simply finds this apparatus, and so forth, is impracticable, but there is some principle there that other prior inventors had developed. This would unquestionably foreclose the rights of those prior inventors to that principle, as the gentleman from Ohio says.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is exactly what I have tried to bring out.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I say if there is any fake about it that the Government should be protected absolutely, and it can be very easily secured by inserting the words I have suggested, that in the event it has proved itself to be what Mr. Giragossian alleges it to be.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Then if by process of amendment to all the various sections of this bill, Mr. Giragossian is finally to come down to the estate of any patentee and take his chances under the law as to whether his invention is one of merit, why is it you bring his case in here as a matter of special resolution?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will answer the question and take pleasure in answering it. It has been demonstrated and been admitted here and even the gentleman from Wisconsin, in debating this question at the last session of Congress, that the patent laws of this country are so absolutely defective that a man who has invented an idea is very, very many times robbed of his invention. It has been repeatedly so. The records of this Capitol and the history of invention in the United States is filled with invention after invention where the man who invented it was absolutely deprived of his invention or the emoluments that came from it. The time was once in this country, and during that time a patent meant something, when the patents were granted solely by this Congress.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Exactly, and we are getting around to that same point in a vicious circle again.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I think we had better be doing that thing than be doing the injustice we are doing under the present patent laws to the men who invent these great benefactions. When this matter was under debate before I quoted the evidence of Mr. Edison, who has been a great benefactor to mankind, where he said that it cost him more money than it brought him in defending the patents he had made, and he points out very fully the many defects to which the inventor has to subject himself and that he virtually has no protection at all under the present patent laws of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I ask for one more minute; I have just gotten started.

The CHAIRMAN. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does not the gentleman think we ought to correct the patent laws we have before we fly to evils we know not of?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will answer that question by saying that there was a gentleman who came here more than 30 years ago and said to the people of the United States, "I have a great benefaction for mankind; I can send a telegraph message through the air without the intervention of wire."

He was doubted. The cynics sneered at him. Criticism was heaped upon him. And he went back to his home and died in less than three months after that time. Thirty years after then Marconi proved to the world what that man then said could be done, and he did it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman permit me to say that it is described by the old term in logic of post hoc reasoning, "after this, therefore, because of this"?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do not care what kind of "hoc" it is. I want to say to you that, in these trying times, if this gentleman has what he says why not adopt it now; if he has not, why not explode the bubble now? The Treasury of the United States is not called upon to be opened in order that this man may filch money from it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. He is evidently simply putting something in hock. We will put our money in hock if we provide the terms in the bill.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It is provided that this Government of ours may, if we find this thing proves the success that it is said it will, buy it for the benefit of all mankind.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. But we buy it for money.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Would you buy it for nothing?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, why can not we proceed with the consideration of this resolution, and if it can be amended to meet the views of Members, we can proceed with it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I think the quickest way is to adopt this resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I understand the gentleman from Ohio desires to press this resolution to a vote to-night, and we ought to go about the consideration of it if we are going to do so.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I would like to see if we can agree upon time. How much time does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] desire on the rule?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Ten minutes. I could get along with that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have requests for a certain length of time against the proposition.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That discussion can be transferred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I would like to have an agreement that we can vote after the gentleman has used his 10 minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest this: No one has spoken yet, as I understand, against the rule itself. I asked leave to oppose the rule, but the time was claimed by the gentleman on the Rules Committee who was in favor of the rule, and he has parceled it out to gentlemen who are in favor of the rule. As a matter of fact, I undertook to oppose the rule, and I think nothing yet has been said against it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman from Kansas will permit, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have 10 minutes. I asked for 15.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the adoption of this rule and am somewhat surprised at its being brought in. I am somewhat surprised that this kind of a bill is being considered under a special rule, or that it has the merit or the steam behind it to secure a special rule. From all that has been said here, it is apparent that no evidence was presented to any committee of the House in regard to the merits of this proposition. We are just simply told that this man may have something very valuable, and therefore Congress ought to revolutionize its procedure and give him a special privilege. Now, assuming that that principle were right, if it turned out that this man did not have what he claims, it is perfectly manifest that Congress would be very unwilling in the future to grant a similar privilege to any man who might have a commendable proposition. In other words, it would completely destroy the opinion in Congress in favor of such a method of procedure. But that is not the only and chief objection to the rule. This bill itself provides that Mr. Giragossian shall have a patent upon a principle, not upon any machine which he claims to have invented, not upon any device which is patented, but he shall have a patent upon a principle. It strengthens that declaration by providing that no one else shall infringe—what? His device? No. His principle. In other words, if he claims that his device operates by means of a certain principle, all other devices operating, in whole or in part, by that principle are to be utterly and completely and forever barred.

Now, that is the chief objection to this bill. As has been stated here, and is perfectly apparent upon the face of this bill, it does not base that upon the necessity of novelty, which is the primary principle of the patent law. It does not say that Mr. Giragossian shall have been the sole and original discoverer of this alleged principle. There may be 50 inventors who are

to-day at work, and who may have carried their inventions much further than Mr. Giragossian, upon the same principle. It does not base it upon the question of his novelty, of his being the original discoverer of the scientific proposition of that principle. It says there shall be no infringement of his principle. And it further strengthens that by going on to say that if the award is made to Mr. Giragossian, then all subsequent devices which operate under the same principle shall be purchased by the United States for the benefit of Giragossian and his assigns.

That is a most remarkable proposition. Now, as a matter of fact, what Mr. Giragossian claims, as near as we can discover in this maze of mystery that surrounds it, because there is nothing but mystery presented here to this House, is a name, namely, free energy. I am not a scientist and would not undertake to discuss the thing from a scientific standpoint; but, so far as I have learned, free energy is applied to the collection of electricity from the atmosphere or the earth without applied force. It is applied to the collection of electric energy by some other process than the dynamo. Now, that is free energy, as the word is generally used. I will guarantee that there are inventions in existence assuming to use the principle of free energy. And that is exactly what this invention is entitled to include.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman give the House the advantage of any information he has along that line?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes. A hearing was had yesterday morning on an invention by a man named Perigo, who claims to have invented a machine to collect electricity by free energy; that is, to collect it from the energy of the air. In other words, his invention is based upon the idea, as I gather it, that electricity can be collected from the air, where it must be collected, by some other means than by the force of a dynamo.

Now, if this is true—and I am not enough of a scientist to know—there may be many devices that are patentable for doing that particular thing, or applying that particular principle. If Mr. Giragossian has a device for utilizing free energy, his device or machine or appliance is patentable, but the principle of free energy evidently is not patentable under the existing law. Anybody else who produces a better machine for utilizing free energy is just as well entitled to use it for the benefit of mankind as the man who first obtains the patent on it. In other words, we can not foreclose that principle.

Now, we have got a machine here in the Capitol—I understood from Judge ROMJUE a few minutes ago that the machine which Mr. Perigo had demonstrated before the Patent Committee had been brought over here. It was shown to the Patent Committee. It is in a small box. I have seen it. If they opened it I would not know anything about it. It runs a dynamo or motor, and it lights certain lights. In other words, there is some power in that box. What that power consists of I have no means of knowing. The inventor says it contains free energy. In other words, this device has been brought to a state of completion. It is in actual working order.

Now, it does seem to me that this bill ought not to be passed at all unless it provides that this committee of scientists shall not only have the power but shall be charged with the duty of ascertaining whether or not this device of Mr. Giragossian utilizes the same principle of free energy

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Can not this man get a patent on his invention?

Mr. BORLAND. I have no doubt that any of these gentlemen can get patents. In my judgment what is patentable is the device, not the principle, and I have no doubt that all of them, including Mr. Giragossian, can get a patent on their device, if they have one, and be protected from infringement.

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

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This is a very weird proposition. I have been wondering why Congress should give this special privilege to this gentleman. Does the gentleman from Missouri, or does anyone, know if he is a citizen of the United States?

Mr. BORLAND. I know nothing about Mr. Giragossian. I never heard his name until this thing came up.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is nothing in the report except letters by way of commendation from three persons in Boston who have known him. Otherwise it seems to be a mystification, a question of the occult, so far as Congress is concerned.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit, it was stated before the Committee on Rules that the gentleman referred to is a naturalized citizen of the United States and has been for 26 years, I think it was.

Mr. BORLAND. I do not want to yield for that question, because it is so far removed from what we are talking about that I think it does not matter.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. SHERWOOD. The gentleman's idea is that one can obtain a patent on an invention and not on an idea or principle?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; and I feel that if this bill is passed at all—which is a very extraordinary procedure—we ought certainly to safeguard the rights of prior inventors, if there should be any. We ought not to assume, as this bill does, that Mr. Giragossian is the inventor of a machine he claims to have invented, and we ought not to agree that he shall have the entire field to himself. Suppose his machine did work, and it were ascertained that he was not the first inventor. It would be a manifest mistake, as well as a manifest injustice, for Congress to retard the development of science by providing that only he should enter that field.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. PURNELL. As a matter of fact, would the gentleman urge this objection if these scientists were compelled by this resolution to discover or find out in advance whether or not his invention is practicable, whether or not he is the discoverer, the original discoverer?

Mr. LITTLE. And the only one?

Mr. BORLAND. That would remove a part of my objection, but I still feel that the principle which the inventor claims to have discovered is not patentable.

Mr. PURNELL. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that I objected to that section 3 of the bill because if this committee of scientists should find that this invention is practicable the Government will consider him as the sole inventor, which does not necessarily follow. I think that an amendment will be offered, and perhaps agreed to by the committee, requiring the committee of scientists also to find that he is the original discoverer or inventor. Would the gentleman still insist on his objection if that were done?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman give me five minutes?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will yield three minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It is to be open for amendment until 5.30 o'clock.

Mr. BORLAND. That is not my understanding.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] know that that is the understanding.

Mr. BORLAND. The Chair knows otherwise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That was the understanding.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Very well, whatever it was that passed in the presence of Mr. LENROOT and Mr. CROSSER. I will not characterize it as an agreement.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, maybe we had better see if we can get an agreement. Do I understand that the agreement between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] holds?

Mr. LENROOT. The only agreement was that the gentleman from Ohio would not move the previous question prior to 5.30. Of course, that is not an agreement to vote at that time.

Mr. BORLAND. That is the only agreement that I know of. The gentleman from Ohio stated that he would not move the previous question before 5.30.

Mr. LENROOT. He has a right to move it then.

Mr. FORDNEY. I am told by gentlemen on this side of the House that there is another gentleman who is going to give a demonstration of this power, a man whose name has not been mentioned here, who is ready to demonstrate to the House that somebody else knows something about this matter. I should like to see that demonstration before we conclude this matter and vote upon it. Am I right about that?

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROMJUE] has the machine in the corridor, and is going to demonstrate it as soon as he has time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then I think we ought to proceed to the consideration of the bill itself. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] stated that he desired to discuss the rule. As a matter of fact, he has discussed the bill and not the rule. I yield to the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I think I have come as near discussing the rule as anybody else on the floor.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Nobody has discussed it.

Mr. BORLAND. I have not discussed Paradise Lost, anyhow.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is perfectly obvious that the gentleman will not discuss that. He does not know anything about it.

Mr. BORLAND. No. I might discuss Paradise Regained. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the fundamental objection to this rule is that it makes in order this particular bill, the whole purpose of which is to preclude any other inventor or any other process. Every paragraph in this bill bristles with the name of Garabed T. K. Giragossian.

I looked over this bill with the idea of amending it, to see whether these scientists could not investigate some other invention, or the general principle involved, but everything in this bill is Garabed T. K. Giragossian, showing very conclusively that it was drawn by some interested parties connected with that inventor. The bill itself ought to be entirely recast. It ought not to come before Congress in this shape. If it comes before Congress at all it ought to be in the shape of a bill providing for a committee under the Secretary of the Interior, a totally disinterested committee, to investigate the appliances supposed to utilize the principle of free energy, and under that Mr. Garabed T. K. Giragossian would have the same chance as any other man. I assume that these scientists will be above any ulterior influence, just as much so as if they were appointed solely for the purpose of investigating this gentleman's invention.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHERWOOD. The gentleman raises a very interesting and delicate question. As I understand, for instance, an improved device for recording the speech of a Congressman would be subject to a patent?

Mr. BORLAND. Certainly.

Mr. SHERWOOD. But the speech of a Congressman, even if it contained new ideas, would not be patentable, and the ideas contained in it would not be.

Mr. BORLAND. They would not be patentable. The speech would be copyrightable by the man who makes it. But the speech of a Congressman, of course, is free energy, and any possibility of utilizing it might come under the objection to this bill. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMAEL). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the gentleman desire to close? If he does, I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia. I intended to move the previous question, but I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS]. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thirteen minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia 13 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And I yield two minutes and a half.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I shall occupy all of my time, but I certainly desire to answer some of the objections urged, and difficulties sought to be created, by the opponents of this resolution.

This matter has been before this body on a previous occasion. At that time a quorum was required by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], and we did not proceed with the consideration of the bill until a quorum had arrived. A number of speeches were made on this resolution, and it passed this body something like two months ago by a vote of 234 to 14. It passed the Senate with practical unanimity. Then it went to the President, and under the circumstances which have been narrated, failed to receive his signature.

Since that time this resolution has been considered by the Interior Department, which has suggested one, or two amendments. If they are agreed to by the House the resolution will be acceptable to that department. It seems to me that this brief recital of the facts of the case ought to suffice to take the pending resolution out of that weird realm, to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] seeks to consign it.

The real, basic proposition before this House is this: Is this body willing to ascertain without money, and without price, whether this man has made a discovery which, if made, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has very justly observed, will write him down as the greatest among all those great of all the ages? That is the real proposition that confronts us. If he has made the discovery that he alleges that he has made, then the difficulties and objections that have been urged this evening are simply fantastic. If this man makes good, then we can not go amiss in giving him the benefits and protection proposed by this resolution, which contemplates the creation of a committee of scientists of the highest order of capacity, and reputation to pass on the merits of the alleged discovery.

The resolution by its terms transfers this discovery to the United States Government. In this connection I wish to point out how impossible it would be for any of the consequences to follow that have been projected into this debate by the all too vivid imaginations of some of the gentlemen who have preceded me. When this measure was considered before, it was suggested—this suggestion now appears to have been abandoned—that a perfect orgy of stock speculation would follow upon its passage. That was about as good an argument against the measure, as any that have been made to-day; and yet how could an orgy of stock speculation arise out of an alleged invention that can not go on the market, until a committee of scientists has determined its merits, and the Government has refused to exercise its option of purchase?

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman says the first operation of this bill is to transfer this invention to the Federal Government. Where does he find that? Not in section 6?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The trouble with many of the gentlemen in opposition is that they have in large measure consulted their imagination, rather than their reason, in their attacks upon this resolution. I refer the gentleman to section 1 of the bill, which provides for this transfer, and concludes in these words:

> Said assignment to and utilization of said discovery or invention by the United States Government shall be free of charge or expense.

More than this the inventor in a later clause turns over to the Government for its use any improvements that he may hereafter make upon the essential principle.

Mr. BORLAND. Then what does section 6 mean, that if after a successful demonstration the United States Government wishes to purchase it, it shall pay him for his invention, and that that option shall be exercised at the present or next session of Congress.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Precisely. The resolution first makes the Government the trustee of the discovery, thus rendering stock speculation impossible, and later provides that if the merits of the invention are established, the United States shall have the option to purchase the same, on an agreed compensation.

Mr. BORLAND. But it must do it within the session.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It matters not when the Government takes this action.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. The gentleman states that the purpose is to ascertain whether or not this gentleman has discovered something of service.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. The question of the gentleman's discovery has nothing to do with the bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. We first propose to ascertain whether this man has something worth while, and if so, the Government is given the right to purchase it.

Mr. REAVIS. Purchase it of this gentleman whether he has discovered it or not.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Oh, no. The gentleman, with some others, occupy an inconsistent position. They first maintain that the alleged discovery is incredible and impossible, and that on this ground the resolution ought to be defeated. Later they complain that Giragossian is given an exclusive right in an absurdity and an impossibility. If the committee of scientists should ascertain that this discovery has been made as alleged, then of course the Government ought to purchase it, but if the committee is of the opinion that the alleged discovery is a myth, an impossible and fantastic dream, an air bubble, why worry ourselves because the bill gives Giragossian an exclusive right in and control over the bubble?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. What is the real purpose and necessity for bringing in special legislation for this man?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That question has been answered so completely by the gentleman from Indiana that I hardly think that I ought to take the time of the House to make further answer. It has been pointed out in the report of the committee, and we know that it is true as a matter of fact, that some of the greatest discoverers have never been able to realize the benefits of their inventions on account of the defects of our patent laws. This man says that he is not willing to take his chances under a patent. He says that he has discovered something greatly worth our while. The question is, Do we want it? He puts the matter up to us. He is willing to have this alleged discovery investigated by five scientists of the highest eminence. I do not say that he has discovered what he claims. I have no knowledge whatever on the subject, but in the event that a committee of scientists capable of passing on the merits of this or any other invention, should report that Giragossian has discovered all that he claims to have discovered, or even measurably all that he claims to have discovered, the question is, Do we want it or not on the terms proposed?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. But they all say exactly that same thing when they present a claim, what evidence have we that this man has discovered this thing?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. For that we will take the report of the scientists, we will put it up to them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman pardon me?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will yield.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The scientists are to be appointed by the gentleman himself.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. With the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is all in his hands.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Not a bit of it, the gentleman misunderstands the bill. The bill says that he shall appoint them subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. Suppose he should suggest a man for the committee, and the Secretary of the Interior should say: "This man does not suit me, he does not measure up to the requirements of the position." What will happen? Why that man must be dropped. And so in succession all names must be withdrawn, until a committee is finally selected that will be acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that every man selected must be satisfactory to Mr. Giragossian?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The committee must be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior. Does the gentleman think that an official of the standing and intelligence of the Secretary of the Interior, confronted with a matter of such vital importance as this, will for a moment agree that any member of this committee shall be other than a scientist of the highest standing?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Secretary should appoint five men without regard to Mr. Giragossian.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. What is proposed amounts to the same thing. The objection is a triviality.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. In making answer to my question, I think the gentleman from Virginia misapprehended the question. I say that all inventors claim that their discovery is the most remarkable thing in the world; and in this instance you say that we must have a special legislation, because possibly he has discovered such a thing. Upon what does the gentleman base the idea that this is any more plausible than that claimed by any other man?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. This man claims that he has discovered a method of utilizing the cosmic forces to drive machinery. I do not need anyone to tell me, that if he has discovered how to do this, he has made the greatest discovery in the history of mankind. I am willing to take the chance of ascertaining by a method that will cost the Government absolutely nothing, whether or not he has made this discovery. The committee of scientists that is proposed will be amply able to pass on the scientific or other merits of this alleged discovery.

Mr. BORLAND. Does not that sound like that the intelligent gentleman picking up the right shell?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not know what this proposition sounds like to the gentleman from Kansas City. But I do know this that the gentleman from Kansas City sneers at the invention under consideration, and then indicates that some other party has discovered something equally as remarkable and incredible. That is the attitude of the gentleman from Kansas City. He has maintained upon this floor this evening that we ought not to give this man the protection proposed by this resolution, on the ground that there is somebody else who has discovered something similar, and equally as astounding.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman from Kansas City does not ask any special rights.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not say he does. But I do say that the gentleman has indicated to this body that there is another inventor who has devised an instrument that will in all respects be as extraordinary in its possibilities as the possibilities claimed for the Garabed. If this be true, if this party has discovered anything that will do what is claimed for the Garabed, then I will be willing to deal with this inventor, precisely as it is proposed to deal with Giragossian. In other words, with respect to his distinctive principle to give him the same rights, and the same protection that is proposed to be given to the inventor of the Garabed. His invention will be upon the same plane as the Garabed, and should be dealt with precisely in the same way. Surely, the gentleman from Missouri will not complain of this plan of dealing with his inventor.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned with the statement that this is an absurdity. I want the gentleman to tell me what he thinks about section 3, wherein it recites that if a demonstration should establish the fact that the device of this gentleman is practicable, then by this legislation the United States recognizes this man as the discoverer of it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It has already been indicated by a member of the Patent Committee that this suggested difficulty will be removed by an amendment to the effect that the committee of scientists shall be empowered to ascertain whether Giragossian is the original discoverer of the device which he will submit.

Mr. REAVIS. Then it will not depend upon the demonstration, but on the fact of its discovery?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The committee will be empowered to fix and report on the priority of discovery of the device utilized in the Garabed.

Mr. REAVIS. As the bill is written now that is not true.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Why trouble about the bill as it is written, when the gentleman's trouble will be relieved by an amendment that will be proposed by the Patent Committee?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the House is not in order, and I ask that the Sergeant at Arms or the Speaker restore order, and if anybody has brought an electric device upon this floor, that they be directed to take it out.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I believe that it is claimed on the part of the device referred to by the gentleman from Kansas that it too, taps the cosmic forces. If this is maintained of the device now in the House, why this attitude of incredulity toward the claims of Giragossian?

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has made an intelligent and a forceful argument. I want to know if he would be in favor of the resolution if we were not at war?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If we were not at war the circumstances would not be so exigent as they are to-day, but being at war, can we afford to take any chances?

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. This resolution would never have been brought into the House if we were not at war.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Possibly not, but what conclusion do you derive from that? We are at war, and the resolution is before us. The conditions of war are absolutely different from the conditions of peace, and justify different attitudes and different action.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Each time hereafter that a man comes to us claiming to have discovered a new principle in cosmic forces, are we to treat him as we propose to treat Mr. Giragossian?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will answer that question categorically. Every time anyone shall come before this body submitting a proposition to test a discovery which in the judgment of this body will be as mighty and transcendent as the discovery alleged to have been made by Mr. Giragossian, put him on the same plane as Mr. Giragossian and try out his alleged discovery by the same method proposed in this resolution. That answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I beg the gentleman's pardon if I dissent from that suggestion. We do not know how great the discovery of Mr. Giragossian is until it is demonstrated.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. We must leave the determination of the merits of future propositions to the judgment of future Congresses. We pass on this proposition to-day in the exercise of our best judgment.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. On what evidence?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. None whatever.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Exactly. Then what about the next man who claims to have an invention and who comes to us with precisely the same evidence—none whatever?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Very well. The gentleman thinks he has put me in a quandary. The next man who comes before this body with the unanimous report of the Committee on Patents, and a unanimous report from the Committee on Rules, providing for the consideration of his proposition, should be treated precisely as I ask this body to treat this man. That is fair.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. What evidence has the Committee on Patents or the Committee on Rules had to substantiate this man's claim?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am putting the future man on the same plane as the present man. Any man who will be able to satisfy future Rules Committees and Patent Committees without evidence or otherwise, who can so impress himself on the judgment of these men, who are capable men——

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That they are willing unanimously to report that it is in the interest of this Government to ascertain the merits of the proposition, and in the event it is ascertained that the device is meritorious to make the contract proposed, should be put precisely upon the footing of this man.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman does not wish to put the Committee on Rules in a false position. All the Committee on Rules does by a unanimous report is to give the House an opportunity to consider the proposition.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I only meant to say, so far as the Rules Committee is concerned, that this resolution is before us, by a unanimous report from that committee. The attitude of some of the opponents of this resolution is highly inconsistent. First, they say that it is in the highest degree incredible and absurd to say that any man can drive machinery by utilizing directly the cosmic energies, that is to say by putting his machinery in direct relation to the flow of these energies. Right on the heels of that statement they submit the invention of a gentleman who claims he has discovered how to utilize one form of cosmic energy. I believe the statement is made that this machine derives its power from the utilization of cosmic electrical force. So that at the very moment when the effort is made to laugh the claims of Giragossian out of court, another inventor bobs up to maintain that he has done the very thing claimed on behalf of Giragossian, that he too has related machinery to the cosmic forces, and using the free electricity of the universe, has turned it to the uses of man.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But is not there this difference, that this man is willing to go to the Patent Office under the laws made by the Congress, whereas Giragossian is not willing to go there? Is it not a question of regularity of procedure?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. No, he is here impeding the passage of the Giragossian resolution.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not at all. No one I have heard has said that what Mr. Giragossian has is fantastic, except he does not want to conform to the law in this case as other inventors are obliged to conform to it; but he wants to take a short cut through Congress and get a patent right for 17 years, and if his bill is passed the other man has no right to bring his invention forward.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If Giragossian can make good, and he asks to be allowed to make good, I favor giving him the short cut, or any other cut. I hope he will get it. The Government will not lose anything, if this man's claims prove to be fantastic and absurd.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But the other man is cut out.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Not at all. Giragossian is not given any indefinite rights. He is only protected for 17 years in his distinctive principle. If there is anything in this discovery the Government will buy it. If the committee reports there is nothing in Giragossian's contentions, and that his device is worthless, will the gentleman tell me how this man will be able to capitalize a proposition so decisively condemned?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I would rather proceed without interruption. It is the easiest thing in the world for a Member to find fault and criticize. Fault is found with Mr. Giragossian because he has not gone to the Patent Office and taken his chances under the general patent laws of the United States on his invention, whatever it may be, and that the Congress should not give him special consideration.

Mr. Giragossian, in section 1 of this bill, offers the free use of his invention to the Government of the United States on its battleships, its aeroplanes, and wherever it may be utilized for all time. The improvements on this device provided for in section 3 may be made by anyone, and they may be taken over by the Government, and if Mr. Giragossian desires to sell them to Tom, Dick, and Harry, or the public, he must pay the inventor for their use in connection with his device.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman wishes to be accurate. He does not pay the inventor. The Government must take it over, and then he pays the Government.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. He pays for it is what I assert.

Mr. LENROOT. Pays the Government for it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. At a reasonable price. I have not been able to get any definite information as to what this device is. I am told that it is so important, that it is so simple, that if its nature were disclosed it would give the key to other inventors to complete devices which they may have been working on or had in mind and almost grasped, but did not grasp, and he would lose his 25 years of labor and intelligent energy which has been expended on his device. The inventor of this discovery, if it will do what he says it will do, is what the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Virginia have said, a benefactor to mankind such as few men have been.

He offers this device to the Government of the United States for nothing, and no doubt the people of the United States will reap from it whatever benefit there is. More men and women are interested in this and are looking forward to its use, or what it is claimed the inventor has, than have looked forward to any discovery in years. There has been a subconscious feeling that the time is ripe for some great discovery. It is believed that that discovery is being now offered to the Government and to the people of the United States by the inventor, Mr. Giragossian. If he has nothing, we have but given the time of Congress and nothing else for a demonstration of the matter. If he has what he claims he has, Congress will have never done a more important thing than to give consideration to the resolution that permits the Government and the people of the United States to reap the benefit of the invention.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I would like to suggest if these matters suggested by the Interior Department——

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. They are now in the bill. The only amendment suggested by the Interior Department is in the bill by way of amendment—in section 4, I think. As a Member of this House I do not want to take the chance of putting an obstruction in the way of the passage of this resolution so that the people of the world may have the benefit of this discovery. I believe there are wonderful possibilities. I do not know whether we are to realize them or not. But if there should be something in the claims of Mr. Giragossian, it is not for this Congress at this time to say to him and to the world, and to the people of the United States, "no." There may be some one in Missouri, there may be some one in Indiana, there may be some one in Michigan, there may be some one in Kansas, who has something just as good. Indeed, I have men in my district who claim they have something just as good as this man has. I am more interested in the welfare of the world, the people of the United States, and the Government of the United States than the interest of any inventor, whether the inventor of this electrical device that was brought in here on the floor, or any other. This is no time to consider the welfare of a particular inventor. This man has a device in the use of which he says he can not be protected under the general patent laws of the United States. And everybody knows that is true. And he offers the Government of the United States, for the action of Congress in this special patent, the free use of his device. No other patentee makes such offer under the general patent law to the Government or people of the United States. The consideration for our action here to-day is the free use of this device for the Government, of untold value, if it is what he claims, with no loss to the Government or the people of the United States if it turns out to be a farce.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, as a citizen of the United States, as a Member of this House, I am not going to take the chance of voting against this resolution. I want to try out this device and see whether or not there is behind the claims of Mr. Giragossian such a device as would utilize the free energy that surrounds the earth. I am in favor of the rule and of the resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the rule.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the rule.

The rule was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is now on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I want to have the resolution read.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading, as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 174) for the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States, for lessening the expenses of the war, and restoring the loss caused by the war by providing for the employment of a discovery or invention called the "Garabed," claiming to make possible the utilization of free energy.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Farr	Kennedy, R. I.	Riordan
Bacharach	Fess	King	Robinson
Bathrick	Fields	Kinkaid	Rogers
Beshlin	Fitzgerald	Kitchin	Rowe
Blanton	Flood	Kreider	Rowland
Bowers	Flynn	LaGuardia	Scott, Pa.
Brand	Frear	Lazaro	Scully
Britten	Fuller, Mass.	Lee, Ga.	Sears
Brodbeck	Gallivan	Lesher	Sisson
Browne	Gard	Lever	Slemp
Browning	Garner	Linthicum	Smith, Mich.
Bruckner	Goodall	McArthur	Smith, C. P.
Brumbaugh	Goodwin, Ark.	McCormick	Smith, T. F.
Butler	Gould	McCulloch	Snyder
Capstick	Graham, Pa.	McKenzie	Stedman
Carew	Gray, N. J.	McKinley	Steele
Carter, Mass.	Gregg	Maher	Stephens, Nebr.
Cary	Griest	Mann	Stevenson
Chandler, N. Y.	Griffin	Mason	Sullivan
Chandler, Okla.	Hamill	Merritt	Swift
Clark, Fla.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller, Minn.	Switzer
Coady	Hamlin	Miller, Wash.	Tague
Cooper, Wis.	Harrison, Va.	Mondell	Talbott
Copley	Haskell	Montague	Taylor, Colo.
Costello	Hayes	Mudd	Templeton
Curry, Cal.	Heintz	Neely	Thompson
Dale, N. Y.	Helvering	Nelson	Tinkham
Davidson	Hilliard	Nolan	Towner
Dewalt	Hollingsworth	Olney	Vare
Dickinson	Howard	Osborne	Walton
Dies	Hull, Tenn.	O'Shaunnessy	Watson, Va.
Dooling	Husted	Overmyer	Webb
Drukker	Hutchinson	Parker, N. J.	Whaley
Dunn	Johnson, Ky.	Polk	White, Me.
Eagan	Johnson, S. Dak.	Porter	White, Ohio
Eagle	Johnson, Wash.	Powers	Winslow
Edmonds	Jones, Va.	Pratt	Wise
Ellsworth	Kahn	Price	Woodyard
Estopinal	Kearns	Ragsdale	Young, Tex.
Fairchild, G. W.	Kelley, Mich.	Reed	

During the roll call the following occurred:

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of no quorum.

Mr. FOSTER. It is too late now.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my point of order.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the gentleman withdrawing his point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The roll call will proceed, the absence of a quorum having been ascertained.

Thereupon the Clerk resumed and completed the calling of the roll.

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 270 Members answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] is recognized for an hour.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the reading of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept, as trustee for the United States Government, from Garabed T. K. Giragossian an assignment of the right to utilize for the Government's own use a discovery or invention to be known as the "Garabed." Said assignment to and utilization of said discovery or invention by the United States Government shall be free of charge or expense.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to perform any and all acts, and to make such rules and regulations, and enter into such contracts as may be necessary to carry this resolution into effect: *Provided, however*, That the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian shall demonstrate the practicability of his discovery or invention to a commission of five eminent scientists, who shall be appointed by the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian and be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The United States Government shall be under no expense in connection with the demonstration of the "Garabed."

Mr. BORLAND rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. BORLAND. I rise to offer an amendment to section 2.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk has not finished the reading. The Chair thinks the Clerk had better read the bill through and then the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That if such demonstration shall in the opinion of the said scientists prove the practicability of said discovery or invention, the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian shall be recognized by the United States Government as the original discoverer, inventor, and legal owner of the invention or discovery and of any improvements pertaining thereto that may be made by the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian. The certificate of said commission of scientists, to the effect that said discovery or invention is practicable, shall constitute the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian the legal owner of and entitle him to all the rights and benefits of said discovery or invention for a period of 17 years. The right is reserved to the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian, his heirs and assigns, to take out patents for his aforesaid discovery, invention, or for any improvement or device pertaining thereto.

SEC. 4. That the United States Government shall not issue to anyone else any patent involving or relating to the principle of the "Garabed" free-energy generator regardless of its form or shape, or for any device, improvement, process, equipment, or apparatus based upon the system or correlative principle of the said discovery or invention, or for any improvement or change developed in the use of the said "Garabed," and shall prevent the construction, importation, use, or exploitation thereof, in whole or in part, in the United States, and shall protect the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian, his heirs and assigns, in the rights and interests in the "Garabed" in the above respect for a period of 17 years in the United States and in foreign countries where such protection is afforded by treaty obligation, international law, or diplomatic representation.

SEC. 5. That any essential improvement or contrivance by any person or persons other than Garabed T. K. Giragossian relating to the "Garabed," or its principle, which shall prove valuable and essential thereto in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior during the period of the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian's special protection shall be bought by the United States Government for its own use in conjunction with its use of the said "Garabed," with adequate compensation to the inventor or contriver thereof. If, however, the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian wishes to utilize any such invention or contrivance so acquired by the United States Government, he or his assigns, and no other person or corporation, shall be entitled thereto upon the payment of a fair, just, and reasonable royalty therefor. In consideration of this right the United States Government shall have, without expense, the right to use for its own purpose any new improvement or device made by the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian.

SEC. 6. That after the successful demonstration of the "Garabed," if the United States Government wishes to purchase the right and title for the exclusive use of said discovery or invention, the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian will comply with the request of the United States Government: *Provided*, That he shall be remunerated to the extent commensurate with the value of his discovery or invention, which shall be appraised by a committee of even number, one-half of the membership of which shall be selected by the Secretary of the Interior and one-half selected by the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian, and the finding of said committee shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and of the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian.

If the United States Congress in session at the time of the demonstration, or at the latest during the following session, does not decide to avail itself of this privilege, the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian's legal rights and powers shall continue unimpaired as prescribed and set forth in this resolution.

SEC. 7. That any sale, or attempted sale, by the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian, or by his representatives or assigns, of any interest in or any title to said discovery or invention, or any part thereof, prior to the approval of the same by said commission of scientists, shall be illegal, invalid, and void.

SEC. 8. That the United States Government will have the right to exercise the aforesaid right to utilize said discovery or invention for its own use simultaneously with the beginning of the public and general use of the said "Garabed" system.

With committee amendments as follows:

On page 3, line 5, insert the word "distinctive."

On page 3, line 7, after the word "the," strike out the words "system or correlative" and insert the word "distinctive."

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio has addressed the Chair and is entitled to an hour.

Mr. BORLAND rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. BORLAND. I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Ohio before he proceeds, and that is whether there will be opportunity to offer an amendment?

Mr. CROSSER. I expect to move the previous question at about the time suggested. There will be one or two amendments.

Mr. BORLAND. I will ask the gentleman if he will object to this amendment?

Mr. CROSSER. The gentleman may send it up. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that this be not taken out of my time.

Mr. BORLAND. I join with the gentleman in asking that this be not taken out of his time. The amendment is to section 3, requiring that "the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian is the

sole discoverer and inventor thereof" and that "it does not involve any known principle." Has the gentleman any objection to that?

Mr. CROSSER. The committee has an amendment bearing on that same subject. I will discuss it during my time. The gentleman from Missouri has taken a great deal of time upon the question already.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House——

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a brief inquiry?

Mr. CROSSER. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I want to know whether it is the purpose of the gentleman, by moving the previous question, to prevent any amendments being considered other than those that the committee having the bill in charge bring in?

Mr. CROSSER. Not necessarily. We want to conclude the debate here to-night.

Mr. SHERLEY. That does not answer the question, and I am asking it in good faith. I want to know just what the gentleman's purpose is, and I think the House is entitled to know that.

Mr. CROSSER. We have discussed certain amendments with Members of the House, which we are willing to accept, and some others we can not.

Mr. LENROOT. Is the gentleman willing to have the House consider those amendments?

Mr. CROSSER. Gentlemen have consumed the time in calling the roll, in debate, and so forth, and we can not agree to any further delay.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is not a question of personal wishes. The House is entitled to know.

Mr. CROSSER. I am going to try to explain when I get the floor here, if I ever get it.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman has it now.

Mr. CROSSER. I have not taken any time thus far, and I want to make a few remarks.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this bill came before the House during the latter part of the last session, was quite fully considered, and passed the House by a vote of 234 to 14. It went to the Senate, and there were not half a dozen votes against it there. It reached the President's hands a few minutes before the expiration of the time fixed for the adjournment of the last session of Congress. I am not sure whether there was any misapprehension about it, but since that time we have had suggestions from the Secretary of the Interior as to two slight modifications, with which the committee are satisfied and with which the author of this discovery or invention is satisfied. Those amendments have been read by the Clerk. We have also a report upon the resolution from the Secretary of the Interior, and I want to read that. His letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, December 12, 1917.

Hon. CHARLES B. SMITH,
Chairman Committee on Patents, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: I am in receipt of your letter of December 7, 1917, asking for early report upon H. J. Res. No. 174, relating to the invention or discovery of Mr. G. T. K. Giragossian.

It appears that the resolution is, with the exceptions hereinafter noted, practically identical with the resolution passed by both Houses of Congress during the first session, 1917. In the present resolution section 4 has been so amended as to limit the protection extended to the inventor to "any patent involving or relating to the principle of the 'Garabed' free-energy generator" instead of "for any kind of free-energy generator," as in the original resolution.

Section 6 has been amended so as to give to the United States the option of acquiring the right and title for exclusive use of the discovery or invention anywhere instead of "within the boundaries of the United States," as originally proposed.

I know nothing of the invention or device to which the resolution relates, and can therefore express no opinion as to its feasibility. The resolution contains provisions designed to insure an investigation and examination as a prerequisite to the vesting of any right in the inventor or the imposing of any obligations upon the United States. The results claimed for this invention would be of such vital importance that I am inclined to the view that opportunity should be accorded for a trial thereof.

I suggest, however, that in order to afford opportunity to other inventors to secure patents upon discoveries which do not infringe the distinctive principle of the Garabed invention, that line 4 of page 3 be amended by inserting the word "distinctive" at the end of the line, and that lines 7 and 8, page 3, be amended by striking therefrom the words "system or correlative" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "distinctive." So amended I have no objection to interpose to the passage of the resolution.

Cordially, yours, FRANKLIN K. LANE, *Secretary.*

Now, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CROSSER. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. On account of the confusion on the floor I could not fully hear all that the gentleman read. Do I understand that is a letter from the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. CROSSER. That is a letter from the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. And he is the head of the Patent Office?

Mr. CROSSER. Of course the Secretary of the Interior is the head of the Patent Office.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. And with respect to this resolution that we are now considering he has suggested that certain amendments ought to be agreed to?

Mr. CROSSER. He has suggested the amendments which have been indicated.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. And his department is satisfied with the bill if those amendments are agreed to?

Mr. CROSSER. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Has your committee reported these amendments?

Mr. CROSSER. Yes. His department is not only satisfied but he says he is inclined to the view that opportunity should be accorded for a trial thereof.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the committee has approved these two amendments. Personally, I think the same meaning was conveyed in the original resolution. That resolution provided that no patents should be granted based upon the principle of the Garabed. The whole question is whether or not the words "distinctive principle" make it any more definite than the term "principle."

We are glad to accept the amendment, and we are glad to have the Secretary of the Interior approve the idea.

When this bill was considered by the House before there was a great effort made by certain all-wise, very humorous gentlemen, who imagined that nothing good could come from an obscure source, that nothing good could come out of Nazareth, to ridicule this proposition out of court.

That effort failed ignominiously, as it should have failed. If this gentleman has what he claims he has, he is bringing to mankind something greater than all the discoveries, greater than any material thing ever brought to the human race in this or any other country. I can not see how men can stand here and quibble about the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee when it is possible—and I am almost inclined to say probable—that this man is holding out to the United States Government and to the people a thing of as great importance as this. I say that if there is even slight probability that such a discovery has been made, then quibbling about little details is, to say the least, not laudable.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the gentleman if the President has approved of the bill?

Mr. CROSSER. I have explained that the Secretary of the Interior has sent to the committee a letter expressing the opinion that with two slight amendments, which we have adopted, opportunity should be afforded for a trial thereof.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. No; I have not much time before the time suggested for a vote. Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that it may be that this man may have something which is practicable but which he did not discover. The members of the committee themselves, since this report was directed, finding that such objection had been raised, while they did not believe it to be likely, have agreed to incorporate in the bill, after the words "that if such demonstration shall in the opinion of said scientists prove to be practicable," the following language: "and that he is the discoverer or inventor of the same."

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. CROSSER. No; I can not yield; I want to finish my remarks. Now, this would make it absolutely impossible for anyone to be injured in any event. If this man is the original discoverer and inventor, and his discovery or invention is practicable, and if the commission of five scientists who are to be agreed upon by the gentleman and the Secretary of the Interior declares such to be the fact, protection is given to him, and he would be entitled to it if he has what is claimed.

It is the opinion of your Patent Committee, expressed on two occasions, that this man is worthy of the greatest confidence. He has impressed me, after hours of talk, as being one of the most intelligent and scientific men I have met, and no one who has ever talked with him will dispute the statement. Even if this man is able to dispense with the use of fuel of any kind, we nevertheless find men here objecting that he will get too much protection. In my opinion the United States Government could not give him enough protection during a period of 17 years to equal the benefit and blessing that such a discovery or invention would bring to the people of this country and the entire world. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. No; I do not yield, and it is useless to ask me until I have finished speaking. Now, gentlemen, why should there be any serious opposition to a proposition of this nature?

In the very first section of the bill he makes an assignment of whatever he has to the Government for its own uses everywhere free of charge and expense. Is any better evidence of his good faith required than that; if so, I would like to know what it is. Then it was suggested that it might be to the advantage of the people of this country that the Government should control even the private sale and use of the discovery or invention and permit it to be used by the people of the United States. He even provides that the Government shall have the right to buy the exclusive right to control its public and private use not only in the United States but throughout the world. Could there be any better evidence of good faith than that? And yet we have men standing here saying, "Oh, perhaps he may have made such a discovery, but why not tie him down still tighter." Do you realize that what we are considering is not an ordinary statute? This man has the right to some consideration in the determination of the terms of the proposed agreement.

I would like to know why it is that if these gentlemen who are now said to have discovered the same thing that Mr. Giragossian says he has discovered, if they have had it in mind all these years, they have never come forward before to announce their discovery to the public until it seemed likely that this man would be given the opportunity he asks to demonstrate his proposition? Does it not seem rather strange that just about the time he is to have the opportunity to demonstrate, and only to demonstrate, for if he does not prove anything he gets nothing, that then all these claimants should come forward saying that they had it also? A man in Cincinnati, in my own State, said to me, "I have something, but I need $1,000 to complete it, and if the Government would help me I can solve the mystery."

Mr. BORLAND. Has the gentleman time to yield now?

Mr. CROSSER. Not now. I yielded before and was deprived of time necessary to conclude my remarks. This resolution gives this man no rights whatever unless he has made a discovery and that discovery is proven to be practicable. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has eloquently described the possibilities of the human mind and who knows but that Mr. Giragossian has learned one of nature's secrets; and how can men justify the obstruction of an effort to prove his contention when it costs the Government not a penny?

Mr. Speaker, may I yield some time now and offer an amendment later without losing the floor?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can yield time for debate, and reserve the balance of his time. If he yields for the purpose of amendment he loses the floor.

Mr. CROSSER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to apologize to the Members who were here during the former discussion of this matter, for taking the floor again and would not further trespass on the time of the House but for the fact that a very large proportion of the gentlemen who are now present were not here during the discussion on the rule. For the benefit of those not then present, I simply wish to epitomize and emphasize the features of this resolution that appeal to me, and which I think will appeal to other Members, so that they will be in mind, when the time arrives for voting. In the first place, this matter was fully discussed when it was last before this body. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], and many others spoke in favor of it. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] and others spoke against it. There was a full debate. A call of the House was demanded before the discussion was allowed to proceed. Hence a quorum was present at the discussion.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it not a fact that when the bill was under consideration for amendment only one amendment was permitted and the previous question was then moved, without any opportunity to offer other amendments?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Doubtless the gentleman in charge of the bill was irritated by the extent to which the available time was frittered away, in useless contention, instead of upon the merits, and did move the previous question. He may have done that. But there was ample discussion of the bill and opportunity was given, if it had been availed of, to offer amendments. The gentleman from Wisconsin, as the RECORD will show, occupied the floor twice in the course of that debate, and spoke at length.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I can not yield. I have but five minutes. I have not stated other than what the RECORD shows. I see before me the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. He I think, is in a position to support the statement that I have made.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman state what the vote was on that occasion?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Two hundred and thirty-four to fourteen.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not true that the President has since declined to approve this?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, for the satisfaction of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] who has already asked that question once, if not twice, and received the answer which I will now make, I will say that the President did not sign the resolution. Is the gentleman now satisfied? Has he put the precise matters he wanted, before the House? I admit that the resolution went up to the President one-half hour before the time of adjournment, and that he did not sign it. It was a pocket veto. The fact of that pocket veto affords the reason for bringing this resolution again before the House.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Has the gentleman any information as to the President's attitude now?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The President of course does not give out any information as to his attitude. All that I can say in this connection is that the Secretary of the Interior has had this particular resolution before him, and has indicated two amendments that he favors. Should these amendments be adopted by the House, he writes that he will not be opposed to this resolution.

Now for the benefit of my friend from Pennsylvania, having stated the attitude of the Secretary of the Interior, I will again make the statement, that the President did not sign this resolution when it was before him at the last session of Congress.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will.

Mr. KNUTSON. I voted for this resolution when it was up in the last Congress, and I wish the gentleman would tell the House what the status of the matter would be in case Mr. Giragossian has not got what he claims to have?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Should the committee report that Mr. Giragossian's alleged discovery is without merit, then this bubble will be exploded. That is all. The Government will incur no risk or liability, in that event.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will it bar out other inventors?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Absolutely not. This report will merely serve to explode the Giragossian bubble. I want to be frank about this matter. It may be that we are pursuing a bubble, it may be that Mr. Giragossian does not possess what he claims to possess, but we will not buy a bubble. Should the committee of scientists report favorably upon the merits of this proposition we have an option upon the invention, but even then we are not compellable to buy it. Should the report of the committee be adverse, we will of course go no further in this matter.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. The gentleman has looked this resolution over carefully, can he see any harm in allowing this to be amended so this board of scientists would have the right to look at any other invention if they so desired?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Of course the committee will take the claims of others into consideration in making their inquiries. They will have the right to determine the priority of discovery, if a counterclaim is submitted. I am perfectly willing to say that I see no objection to a number of amendments that might be offered, but on the other hand no particular reason why they should be adopted. I have never seen a bill before this body that could not be amended without any prejudice to the real merits of the bill. But on the other hand, these amendments could be omitted. That is true of the amendment suggested by my friend. Indeed another amendment will cover that point. Time presses. Hence I insist that this resolution should be passed with the committee amendments for the reason that it will then be in the form that is approved by the Secretary of the Interior. I undertake to say, of course this is merely my personal judgment, that the interests of the Government are amply protected by this resolution with the amendments, and in the form in which it will be voted on.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will.

Mr. JUUL. Has any other inventor appeared before the committee with a similar claim to the one here presented?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I understand not. Mr. Giragossian does not claim (I think I understand what the gentleman refers to) that his discovery has anything to do with electrical energy. I believe there is a gentleman who has come forward in the last two or three days who claims to drive machinery by the use of free electricity. But his claims do not conflict with the claims of Giragossian in any way whatever. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer several committee amendments.

The SPEAKER. There are two in the bill.

Mr. CROSSER. I wish to have those acted upon first.

The SPEAKER. Which?

Mr. CROSSER. Those in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time has not come yet, unless the gentleman yields the floor.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say this before I conclude, that there are other people in the world, and I do not want to be too definite about it, although I know of what I am speaking, who will not sputter and quibble about terms. The failure of this resolution to become law last October was noticed very quickly, and less than two weeks ago there were very clear and definite suggestions made to Mr. Giragossian. I do not think I need to say anything further.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin? Has the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] yielded the floor?

Mr. CROSSER. No; I have not. I want to have these amendments read first.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the amendments in the time of the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 3, line 5, insert before the word "principle" the word "distinctive."

Page 3, line 7, after the word "the," strike out the words "system or correlative" and insert in lieu thereof the word "distinctive."

Mr. CROSSER. Those are committee amendments.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. CROSSER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, does the rule permit debate upon this amendment—argument for and against?

The SPEAKER. After the amendment is read in the time of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, does that preclude argument against the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] still holds the floor.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] a question?

Mr. CROSSER. I have yielded to a number of questions.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman intend to permit debate against any of these amendments?

Mr. CROSSER. I can not answer everybody. I am trying to confer with everybody here at once.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman rose to a question of information. That is the end of it, unless he can get the consent of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the gentleman from Ohio refuses to answer?

Mr. CROSSER. I am yielding to another man.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BORLAND. The Speaker has stated that these amendments were offered to be read in the time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. Does that mean that they are offered and are now before the House?

The SPEAKER. It means that they are pending; yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Then they are to be debated and voted on?

The SPEAKER. They will be voted on; yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Will they not also be open to debate?

The SPEAKER. Of course, if you can ever get the floor.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRISP. Does this rule permit amendments to be offered by anyone else?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], whenever he gets ready, moves the previous question, and it is carried, that is the end of amendment.

Mr. CRISP. An amendment can not be offered by anybody else?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Has the chairman of the Committee on Patents the right to submit amendments, and if so, to be heard on them?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has stated three or four times that the gentleman from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. HULBERT. Do I understand that the only method by which a Member can discuss amendments is by defeating the previous question?

The SPEAKER. That is precisely the situation. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] can do whatever he wants with the hour. He can move the previous question at the end of the hour, or at any time, if he does not lose the floor.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] in his own time submits an amendment, which is read in his time from his desk, he does not lose the floor by that action?

The SPEAKER. He has not lost the floor now; no.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. So that he can offer in his own time any amendment that he thinks proper?

The SPEAKER. He can have anything read in his own time that he wishes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the gentleman from Ohio has the right to offer an amendment or amendments when he pleases, but the moment he offers an amendment he must either then move the previous question or lose the floor. He can not offer amendments and afterwards debate them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is entirely correct.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That is not my inquiry, Mr. Speaker. My inquiry was, when he offers his amendments it will be competent for him to order the previous question then and there on the bill and amendments.

The SPEAKER. That is right. He must occupy the time or surrender the floor. There is no dispute about that.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. LENROOT. To ask the gentleman from Ohio if he will yield for a question. I desire to ask whether it is the gentleman's intention to move the previous question on the bill and amendments thereto?

Mr. CROSSER. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Without giving the House opportunity to discuss the amendments or offer other amendments?

Mr. CROSSER. It is 5.30 o'clock p. m., at which time I was to offer amendments. If I thought it was going to serve any purpose to go on indefinitely with this——

Mr. LENROOT. The only opportunity the gentleman proposes to give the House to consider amendments is to vote down the previous question?

Mr. PURNELL. Will the gentleman yield for the purpose of allowing me to offer an amendment in his time?

Mr. CROSSER. Send the amendment to me. I think I have the same amendment the gentleman has.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield to me to ask a question?

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

Mr. BORLAND. I ask the attention of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOWELL. If the gentleman from Ohio desires to keep the floor, he must proceed instead of holding caucuses.

The SPEAKER. The Chair just stated a minute ago that there is no sort of controversy on that proposition.

Mr. DOWELL. Then I insist that he has surrendered the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to follow the gentleman's advice. Here are two amendments that I offer.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CROSSER. Those are amendments that I intended to offer a while ago, and I have not had any opportunity.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question before he does that?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CROSSER: Page 2, line 14, after the word "invention," insert the following: "and that he is the original discoverer or inventor of same," and insert, after the word "practicable," the following: "and that he is the original discoverer or inventor of same."

Mr. CROSSER. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman withhold that motion for a moment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio moves the previous question on the bill and amendments. Those in favor of the previous question will say "aye"; those opposed will say "no."

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GILLETT. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts demands a division.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of taking this vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Sixty-eight gentlemen have arisen, a sufficient number, and the Clerk will call the roll. This vote is on agreeing to the previous question.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 163, nays 105, not voting 166, as follows:

YEAS—163.

Adamson	Dill	Jacoway	Raker
Almon	Dixon	James	Ramsey
Ashbrook	Dominick	Jones, Tex.	Randall
Aswell	Doolittle	Juul	Rose
Ayres	Doughton	Keating	Rouse
Baer	Drane	Kehoe	Rubey
Bankhead	Eagan	Kettner	Russell
Barkley	Emerson	Key, Ohio	Sabath
Barnhart	Ferris	Kincheloe	Saunders, Va.
Beakes	Fields	Larsen	Sears
Bell	Fisher	Lea, Cal.	Shackleford
Black	Focht	Little	Shailenberger
Blackmon	Foss	Littlepage	Sherwood
Booher	Foster	London	Shouse
Buchanan	Freeman	Lonergan	Siegel
Burnett	French	Lundeen	Sims
Burroughs	Fuller, Ill.	Lunn	Sinnott
Byrns, Tenn.	Gallagher	McAndrews	Slayden
Caldwell	Gandy	McKeown	Small
Campbell, Kans.	Garrett, Tenn.	McLemore	Smith, Idaho
Campbell, Pa.	Garrett, Tex.	Mansfield	Smith, Mich.
Candler, Miss.	Glass	Mapes	Snook
Cannon	Godwin, N. C.	Martin	Steagall
Caraway	Gordon	Mays	Steenerson
Carlin	Gray, Ala.	Moon	Stephens, Miss.
Carter, Mass.	Greene, Mass.	Moores, Ind.	Sterling, Pa.
Church	Hadley	Morin	Switzer
Clark, Pa.	Hamilton, Mich.	Nicholls, S. C.	Taylor, Ark.
Claypool	Harrison, Miss.	Oldfield	Thomas
Collier	Hastings	Oliver, Ala.	Tillman
Connally, Tex.	Hayden	Oliver, N. Y.	Venable
Connelly, Kans.	Heflin	Overstreet	Vinson
Cox	Helm	Padgett	Walker
Crisp	Hensley	Paige	Walton
Crosser	Hersey	Park	Watson, Pa.
Currie, Mich.	Holland	Phelan	Weaver
Dale, Vt.	Hollingsworth	Polk	Williams
Dallinger	Hood	Pou	Wingo
Darrow	Houston	Purnell	Wood, Ind.
Dempsey	Igoe	Quin	Young, N. Dak.
Denton	Ireland	Rainey	

NAYS—105.

Alexander	Green, Iowa	Magee	Snyder
Anderson	Greene, Vt.	Moore, Pa.	Stafford
Bland	Haugen	Morgan	Sterling, Ill.
Borland	Hawley	Mott	Stiness
Byrnes, S. C.	Heaton	Nichols, Mich.	Strong
Carter, Okla.	Hicks	Norton	Sumners
Classon	Huddleston	Parker, N. Y.	Sweet
Cooper, Ohio	Hulbert	Peters	Temple
Cooper, W. Va.	Hull, Iowa	Platt	Tilson
Crago	Kelly, Pa.	Ramseyer	Timberlake
Cramton	Kennedy, Iowa	Rankin	Treadway
Decker	Kennedy, R. I.	Rayburn	Vestal
Dillon	Kiess, Pa.	Reavis	Voigt
Dowell	Knutson	Robbins	Waldow
Dupré	Kraus	Roberts	Walsh
Dyer	La Follette	Romjue	Ward
Elliott	Langley	Rucker	Wason
Elston	Lehlbach	Sanders, Ind.	Watkins
Esch	Lenroot	Sanders, N. Y.	Welling
Fairchild, B. L.	Longworth	Sanford	Welty
Fairfield	Lufkin	Schall	Wheeler
Francis	McArthur	Scott, Iowa	Wilson, Ill.
Garland	McClintic	Scott, Mich.	Woods, Iowa
Gillett	McFadden	Sells	Zihlman
Glynn	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sherley	
Good	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sloan	
Goodall	Madden	Snell	

NOT VOTING—165.

Anthony	Beshlin	Britten	Bruckner
Austin	Blanton	Brodbeck	Brumbaugh
Bacharach	Bowers	Browne	Butler
Bathrick	Brand	Browning	Cantrill
Capstick	Gard	Lee, Ga.	Rowland
Carew	Garner	Lesher	Sanders, La.
Cary	Goodwin, Ark.	Lever	Scott, Pa.
Chandler, N. Y.	Gould	Linthicum	Scully
Chandler, Okla.	Graham, Ill.	Lobeck	Sisson
Clark, Fla.	Graham, Pa.	McCormick	Slemp
Coady	Gray, N. J.	McCulloch	Smith, C. B.
Cooper, Wis.	Gregg	McKenzie	Smith, T. F.
Copley	Griest	McKinley	Stedman
Costello	Griffin	Maher	Steele
Curry, Cal.	Hamill	Mann	Stephens, Nebr.
Dale, N. Y.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mason	Stevenson
Davidson	Hamlin	Meeker	Sullivan
Davis	Hardy	Merritt	Swift
Denison	Harrison, Va.	Miller, Minn.	Tague
Dent	Haskell	Miller, Wash.	Talbott
Dewalt	Hayes	Mondell	Taylor, Colo.
Dickinson	Heintz	Montague	Templeton
Dies	Helvering	Mudd	Thompson
Dooling	Hilliard	Neely	Tinkham
Doremus	Howard	Nelson	Towner
Drukker	Hull, Tenn.	Nolan	Van Dyke
Dunn	Humphreys	Olney	Vare
Eagle	Husted	Osborne	Volstead
Edmonds	Hutchinson	O'Shaunessy	Watson, Va.
Ellsworth	Johnson, Ky.	Overmyer	Webb
Estopinal	Johnson, S. Dak.	Parker, N. J.	Whaley
Evans	Johnson, Wash.	Porter	White, Me.
Fairchild, G. W.	Jones, Va.	Powers	White, Ohio
Farr	Kahn	Pratt	Wilson, La.
Fess	Kearns	Price	Wilson, Tex.
Fitzgerald	Kelley, Mich.	Ragsdale	Winslow
Flood	King	Reed	Wise
Flynn	Kinkaid	Riordan	Woodyard
Fordney	Kitchin	Robinson	Young, Tex.
Frear	Kreider	Rodenberg	
Fuller, Mass.	LaGuardia	Rogers	
Gallivan	Lazaro	Rowe	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BATHRICK with Mr. ANTHONY.
Mr. BESHLIN with Mr. AUSTIN.
Mr. BLANTON with Mr. BACHARACH.
Mr. BRAND with Mr. BRITTEN.
Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. BROWNE.
Mr. BRUCKNER with Mr. CAPSTICK.
Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.
Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. BOWERS.
Mr. CAREW with Mr. CARY.
Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. BUTLER.
Mr. COADY with Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma.
Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. VOLSTEAD.
Mr. DENT with Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin.
Mr. DEWALT with Mr. COPLEY.
Mr. DICKINSON with Mr. COSTELLO.
Mr. DIES with Mr. CURRY of California.
Mr. DOOLING with Mr. DAVIDSON.
Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. DAVIS.
Mr. EAGLE with Mr. DENISON.
Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. DRUKKER.
Mr. EVANS with Mr. DUNN.
Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. EDMONDS.
Mr. FLOOD with Mr. ELLSWORTH.
Mr. FLYNN with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.
Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. FARR.
Mr. GARD with Mr. FESS.
Mr. GARNER with Mr. FORDNEY.
Mr. GREGG with Mr. FREAR.
Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts.
Mr. HAMILL with Mr. GOULD.
Mr. HAMLIN with Mr. TOWNER.
Mr. HARDY with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
Mr. HARRISON of Virginia with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.
Mr. HELVERING with Mr. GRIEST.
Mr. HILLIARD with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.
Mr. HOWARD with Mr. WHITE of Maine.
Mr. HULL of Tennessee with Mr. HAUGEN.
Mr. IGOE with Mr. HAWLEY.
Mr. JONES of Virginia with Mr. HAYES.
Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. MANN.
Mr. LAZARO with Mr. WINSLOW.
Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. HUSTED.
Mr. LESHER with Mr. HUTCHINSON.
Mr. LEVER with Mr. JOHNSON of Washington.
Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
Mr. LOBECK with Mr. KAHN.
Mr. MAHER with Mr. KEARNS.
Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.
Mr. NEELY with Mr. KING.
Mr. OLNEY with Mr. KINKAID.
Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. KREIDER.
Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. WOODYARD.
Mr. PRICE with Mr. MCCORMICK.
Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. MCCULLOCH.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. MCKINLEY.
Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana with Mr. MASON.
Mr. SCULLY with Mr. MEEKER.
Mr. SISSON with Mr. MERRITT.
Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.
Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. MILLER of Washington.
Mr. STEDMAN with Mr. MONDELL.
Mr. STEELE with Mr. MUDD.
Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. NOLAN.
Mr. STEVENSON with Mr. OSBORNE.
Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. PARKER of New Jersey.
Mr. TAGUE with Mr. PORTER.
Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. BROWNING.
Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. PRATT.
Mr. THOMPSON with Mr. REED.
Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. RODENBERG.
Mr. WATSON of Virginia with Mr. ROGERS.
Mr. WEBB with Mr. ROWE.
Mr. WHALEY with Mr. ROWLAND.
Mr. WHITE of Ohio with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.
Mr. WILSON of Louisiana with Mr. SLEMP.
Mr. WILSON of Texas with Mr. SWIFT.
Mr. WISE with Mr. TEMPLETON.
Mr. YOUNG of Texas with Mr. TINKHAM.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 5, at the beginning of the line, insert the word "distinctive."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "system or correlative" and insert the word "distinctive."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Were those amendments offered, or were they simply read?

Mr. CROSSER. They were offered.

The SPEAKER. They were offered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CROSSER: Page 2, line 14, after the word "invention," insert the following: "and that he is the original discoverer or inventor thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CROSSER: Page 2, line 20, after the word "practicable," insert the following: "and that he is the original discoverer or inventor thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BORLAND. Is it not possible to offer amendments after the previous question is ordered?

The SPEAKER. It is not. The only way to get at that is to beat the previous question. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. LENROOT: I move to recommit House joint resolution 174 to the Committee on Patents with instructions to forthwith report the same back to the House with the following amendments:

On page 3, line 3, after the word "That," insert "if the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian shall receive the special protection provided for in section 3 of this act, then."

On pages 3 and 4, strike out section 5 and insert:

"SEC. 5. That any essential improvement or contrivance patented by any person or persons other than Garabed T. K. Giragossian relating to the 'Garabed' or its principle which shall prove valuable and essential thereto in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, evidenced by such finding by him filed in the Patent Office, may during the period of the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian's special protection, if the same shall become effective, be used by the United States and the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian or his assigns upon the payment of a fair, just, and reasonable royalty therefor, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, and every patent issued for any such improvement or contrivance shall be upon such express condition.

"In consideration of this right the United States shall have, without expense, the right to use for its own purposes any new improvement or device made or invented by the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian."

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LENROOT) there were—ayes 69, noes 101.

Accordingly the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken, and the joint resolution was passed.

On motion of Mr. CROSSER a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The SPEAKER. There are three vacancies on the Board of Regents for the Smithsonian Institution, and the Chair announces the following appointments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FERRIS, to succeed himself;
Mr. GREENE of Vermont, to succeed Mr. Roberts of Massachusetts; and
Mr. PADGETT, to succeed Mr. Lloyd of Missouri.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday next, December 17, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of urgent deficiency appropriation, "Quarantine service, remodeling buildings, Cape Charles Quarantine Station" (H. Doc. No. 574); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting amended estimate of appropriation (p. 5, Book of Estimates for 1918) for "Salaries, office of the Coast Guard" (H. Doc. No. 575); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. Letter from the Inspector General and chief surgeon, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and Sailors, transmitting report of inspection of State soldiers' and sailors' homes for the year ended June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 576); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4. Letter from the president of the board of managers National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, transmitting annual report for the year ended June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 577); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

5. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 578); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate required for the service of the War and Navy Departments (H. Doc. No. 579); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from Hon. Newton D. Baker, chairman of the Council of National Defense, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 580); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8. Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a detailed statement showing the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation (H. Doc. No. 623); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9. Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a detailed statement showing the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation (H. Doc. No. 582); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

10. Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of the commanding officer of Watertown Arsenal of "tests of iron and steel and other materials for industrial purposes" made at that arsenal during the fiscal year ended June 30,

1917 (H. Doc. No. 619); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

11. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement from the sundry offices and bureaus of the Treasury Department showing in detail what officers and employees traveled on official business to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 624); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

12. Letter from the secretary of National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, transmitting record of changes in membership of the home during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 577); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. LONDON, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 189) to provide for a commission to inquire into the advisability of establishing national insurance against unemployment, invalidity, and sickness, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 218), which said resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7697) to authorize the calling into the service of the United States the militia and other locally created armed forces in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 225), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CARLIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 219), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 188) extending until January 1, 1919, the effective date of section 10 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 227), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GLASS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7731) amending section 32 of the Federal farm-loan act, approved July 17, 1916, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 228), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SEARS, from the Committee on Education, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 110) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational education," approved February 23, 1917, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 229), 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,

Mr. FIELDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1418) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint Harry Graham captain of Infantry, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 226), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2206) authorizing the payment of salary due to J. A. McCreary, of Forestville, Cal.; Committee of Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 4889) granting a pension to Mrs. Harriet Alexander; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6990) granting an increase of pension to Edgar C. Martin; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7560) granting an increase of pension to William W. Kimball; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7416) granting a pension to Fred D. Marshall; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 7731) amending section 32 of the Federal farm-loan act, approved July 17, 1916; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 7732) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide revenue to defray war expenses, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1917, so as to exclude from the excess-profits tax income derived from personal services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROSSER: A bill (H. R. 7733) to provide better sanitary conditions in printing offices within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHITE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7734) to provide for an increase in the compensation of rural free delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 7735) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War,' approved April 19, 1908, and for other purposes," approved September 8, 1916; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 7736) extending the franking privilege of the Government to the members of the Council of National Defense, and to the chairman of the several councils of national defense in the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 7737) to increase the rates of pensions of certain widows and Army nurses; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7738) to increase the rate of pension allowed to Army nurses; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 191) amending section 201 of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue to defray war expenses, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1917; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. GLASS: Resolution (H. Res. 197) for the consideration of House bill 7731; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 7739) granting an increase of pension to Irene Reid Ervin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7740) granting a pension to Lucy M. Roby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7741) granting a pension to Dartha Swihart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 7742) granting an increase of pension to Edward Durbin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7743) granting an increase of pension to Green P. Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7744) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Layton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7745) granting an increase of pension to Calvin A. Hutchinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7746) granting an increase of pension to Marion F. Willis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7747) granting a pension to Samuel Ash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7748) granting a pension to Mary J. Titus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7749) granting a pension to Margaret A. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7750) granting a pension to Herschel Spainhour; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 7751) to grant a gold medal to James F. Walker for conspicuous bravery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 7752) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Donnells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7753) granting an increase of pension to Ross Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 7754) granting a pension to Catherine F. Reinert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 7755) granting an increase of pension to Horace W. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7756) granting an increase of pension to Belle W. Dexter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7757) granting an increase of pension to D. W. Farington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7758) granting an increase of pension to James H. Kabrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7759) granting an increase of pension to George Kint; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7760) granting an increase of pension to John Keefe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7761) granting an increase of pension to Silas W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7762) granting an increase of pension to Albert Vantassel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7763) granting an increase of pension to George W. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7764) granting a pension to Joseph Karr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7765) granting a pension to Christian A. Baldwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7766) for the relief of Albert T. Huso; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7767) for the relief of John C. Kathan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7768) for the relief of Edward Looby; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7769) for the relief of Robert McFarland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7770) granting a pension to Wedding Colgate; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7771) granting a pension to Hiner A. Rawlings; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 7772) granting an increase of pension to John Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7773) granting an increase of pension to Jacob C. Stupp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 7774) granting an increase of pension to Fannie M. O'Linn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 7775) granting an increase of pension to Noah Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7776) granting an increase of pension to James L. Stover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7777) granting an increase of pension to Charles McCarthy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 7778) to amend the military record of George W. Laland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 7779) granting an increase of pension to William E. Kirkpatrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7780) to correct the military record of Thomas Fogle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7781) correcting the military record of Daniel H. Prunk; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 7782) granting an increase of pension to Emanuel B. Silcott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7783) granting a pension to George W. Sampson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 7784) granting an increase of pension to Enoch E. Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7785) granting a pension to Ophelia F. Covert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7786) granting a pension to Hamilton B. Pate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7787) granting a pension to Anna E. Pagett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7788) granting a pension to Franklin B. Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7789) granting a pension to William H. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7790) granting a pension to John J. McGinley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7791) granting a pension to Laura A. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7792) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester C. Loveless; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 7793) for the relief of Dr. George W. Flynn; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of congregation of the First Christian Church, Webb City, Mo., urging the passage of Senate resolution No. 17; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of California, Colorado, Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New York, Pennsylvania, and Texas, favoring the passage of the Moore Purple Cross bill, H. R. 5410; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of F. Terry and 166 other students of Teachers' College, Columbia University, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND: Evidence in support of bill for increase in pension of Green P. Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of bill for increase in pension of Samuel Ash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of bill for increase in pension of Thomas C. Layton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of bill to increase pension of Calvin A. Hutchison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of bill to increase pension of Mary J. Titus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of bill to increase pension to Marion F. Willis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of bill to increase pension of Margaret A. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of bill for pension for Herschel Spainhour; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of bill for increase in pension of Edward Durbin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: Telegrams from Edward A. Uphrig, president Milwaukee Western Fuel Co.; Fehrer & Meyer Co.; Benjamin Wells & Sons Co.; Blumenfeld Locher Co.; William Marnitz Co.; Vilter Manufacturing Co., H. P. Andrae, treasurer Julius Andrae & Sons Co.; the Boston Store; O'Neil Oil & Paint Co.; Joseph J. Kozourek; Richard Philip; W. H. Upmeyer, president Bunde & Upmeyer Co., all of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against passage of national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, telegram from William F. Luick, treasurer Luick Ice Cream Co.; Fred F. Luedke; L. W. Bunde, of Bunde & Upmeyer Manufacturing Co.; E. P. Hunkel; Dr. F. J. Gaenslen; O. R. Pieper; Edwin Wollaeger, of the Wollaeger Manufacturing Co.; Arthur Wenz; and Peter Brust, all of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, telegrams from the Kurth Manufacturing Co.; Hoffman & Bauer; Leedom Miller & Noys Co.; Hoffman & Billings Manufacturing Co.; H. S. Hadfield; Frank Luensman Co.; John L. Klinger, president Milwaukee Association of Commerce; and Biersach & Niedermeyer, all of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition from Frank B. Metcalfe, secretary-treasurer Trades Union Liberty League of Wisconsin; Otto E. Schulz; and F. T. Andrae, secretary Julius Andrae & Sons Co., all residing in Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Joseph Dehan, secretary Labor's Emergency Liberty League, representing 60,000 men, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of the executive committee of the Manufacturers and Dealers' League, of the city and

State of New York, and of the general counsel of the Malsters' Bureau of Statistics, Chicago, Ill., protesting against the submission of the prohibition amendment; also, resolution of the Brewery Workers' Internat'on Union, representing 60,000 workmen, protesting against the prohibitory amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the National Council of American Cotton Manufacturers, urging Congress to make liberal appropriations for the support and development of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and the creation and maintenance of a bureau for the extension of American foreign trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DYER: Memorial of Republican city central committee, St. Louis, Mo., favoring the Anthony suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Memorial of Woman's Auxiliary to Local 130, National Federation of Post Office Employees, favoring increased salaries for clerks and carriers in first and second class post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolutions by the county board of supervisors of Monroe County, Wis., favoring the suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. FREEMAN: Petition of First Baptist Church, Stonington, Conn., urging the submission of the prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Streator, Ill, opposing the prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Anti-Saloon League of America, urging the adoption of the prohibitory amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. HILLIARD: Memorials of Local Union No. 18, Journeyman Cooks and Pastry Cooks; Sheet Metal Workers' International Alliance; Local No. 68, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Local No. 1874, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; Local Union No. 930, Glass Workers and Glaziers; Buildings Laborers of Denver; Local Union No. 634, Meat Cutters' Union; Local Union No. 3, Plumbers' Apprentices; Division No. 451, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; Local Union No. 111, Electrical Workers; International Workers' Defense League; Local Union No. 25, International United Brotherhood of Leather Workers on Horse Goods; Journeyman Barbers' International Union of America; Lodge No. 35, Switchmen's Union of America; Local Union No. 79, Painters' Union; Local No. 577, O. P. & C. F. I. A.; Mile High Lodge No. 680, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; Local Plumbers' Union No. 3; Bricklayers', Stonemasons', and Marblemasons' Union; Local Waiters' Union No. 14; Denver Lodge No. 47, International Association of Machinists; Snowy Range Lodge No. 30, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; Local Union No. 7, Retail Clerks' International Protective Association; Local Union No. 40, International Broom Makers' Union; Denver Council No. 539, Knights of Columbus; Denver Buildings-Trades Council; Golding Fairfield, Esq.; W. C. Castwright; and Central Labor Union of Boulder and vicinity, all in the State of Colorado, urging the passage of House bill 1654, granting an increase of pay to post-office clerks and letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Mrs. J. A. Easton and three others; C. J. Morley and seven others; Interdenominational Committee, representing 60,000 women; Women's Foreign Missionary Society of Methodist Episcopal Church of Colorado, comprising 21,000 women; Interchurch Council of Denver, representing 34,000 protestant church members, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. M. W. Morrison, of Colorado Springs, Colo., urging the adoption of a constitutional amendment providing for woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of citizens of San Francisco, Cal., in favor of the Madden bill, granting an increase of pay to the letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Sayles B. Steere, of Chepachet, R. I., favoring national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Bottlers and Drivers' Union No. 245, of Providence, R. I., against national prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Mrs. B. Wallace Comstock, of Providence, and Mrs. Helen Hazard Bacon, of Peace Dale, in the State of Rhode Island, in opposition to passage of woman-suffrage legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Laurel Grange No. 40, of Gloucester; Daniel Partridge, of Pawtucket; Henry A. Sayles, of Chepachet; C. R. Martin, of Pawtucket; Neighborhood Auxiliaries to the Woman's Home Missionary Society; Providence Woman's Christian Temperence Union; and Providence County Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of Rhode Island, favoring national prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Sunday school of Embury Methodist Episcopal Church, of Central Falls; adult department of the Fourth Baptist Sunday School, of Prov'dence; First Methodist Episcopal Church, of Pawtucket; and Rhode Island Glass Division, of Central Falls, all in the State of Rhode Island; also 518 citizens of Rhode Island, favoring national prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Letter of George C. Balton, of Baltimore, Md., urging that new clerks be not discriminated against in providing increases of salary; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Arthur E. Slagle and 62 other citizens of Baltimore, Md., and a memorial from the Maryland legislative committee, Antisaloon League of America, favoring submission of the prohibition amendment; also letters and telegrams from the Baltimore Enamel & Novelty Co. and nine other firms and organizations of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the submission of the prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Baltimore Branch No. 4, United National Association Post Office Clerks, and Local No. 181, National Federation Postal Employees, indorsing House bill 1654; also a letter of the same import from L. C. Perkins, of Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MEEKER: Resolution adopted by the American Federation of Labor in favor of an increase in salary of the postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of surviving officers of the Civil War praying for the passage of the officers' retired bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Locals No. 3, No. 37, No. 91, and No. 148, of the Coopers International Union, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and approved by the Manufacturers' Association of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of the establishment of a foreign exchange department in the Federal reserve banking system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of St. Louis, Mo., asking for time extension for the completion of the municipal bridge across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PAIGE: Petitions of George R. Wallace and 300 others, of Fitchburg, Mass., against woman suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petitions of 395 persons in various cities of Massachusetts in favor of woman suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the Waterport Woman's Christian Temperance Union, urging the passage by Congress of the joint resolution for the submission of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution to the several States for their ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Barre Center Presbyterian Church, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union Missionary Society, the Red Cross, the Ladies' Aid, the Christian Endeavor, Loyalty Class, and Men's Bible Class, all of Barre Center, N. Y., urging the passage by Congress of the joint resolution for the submission of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution to the several States for ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Epworth League, and Women's Home Missionary Society, all of West Barre, N. Y., urging the passage by Congress of the joint resolution for the submission of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution to the several States for ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the women of the First Presbyterian Church of Albion, N. Y., urging the passage of the joint resolution for the submission of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution to the several States for ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 45 male voters and of 63 women voters of the West Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, of Rochester, N. Y., urging the passage of the joint resolution for the submission of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution to the several States for ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 73 male voters and 115 women voters of the Calvary Baptist Church, of Rochester, N. Y., urging the passage of the joint resolution for the submission of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution to the several States for ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the First Baptist Church, the First Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Lake Avenue Baptist Church, all of Hilton, N. Y., in joint assembly, urging the passage of the joint resolution for the submission of a prohibition amendment to the Constitution to the several States for ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 65 women voters of Rochester, N. Y., urging the passage by Congress of the joint resolution for the submission of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution to the several States for ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the women of the Press Club of the Young Men's Christian Association Auxiliary, of Rochester, N. Y., urging the passage by Congress of the joint resolution for the submission of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution to the several States for ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Willing Workers' Circle, the World Wide Circle, and the Emily Barrett Circle, of Rochester, N. Y., urging the passage of the joint resolution for the submission of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution to the several States for ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of postal clerks and carriers at St. Cloud, Minn., urging early and favorable action on House bill 1654; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STINESS: Letters and telegrams from East Greenwich Baptist Church, Rev. Theodore C. Gleason, pastor, East Greenwich; Rev. W. H. Lane, Shawomet; Christian Endeavor Society, Alice M. Farrow, secretary, North Scituate; Bradford Y. P. B., Ruby E. Collings, secretary, Bradford; Providence Young Men's Christian Association, John G. Olmstead, acting general secretary, Providence; Niantic Baptist Sunday School, Ray B. Kenyon, secretary, Bradford; Phenix Baptist Sunday School, Frank Gardner, pastor, Phenix; Lutheran Bethany Church (950), Joel Ol, pastor, Auburn; First Baptist Church, F. Stewart Kinley, minister, Westerly; Advent Christian Sunday School, W. F. Bliven, superintendent, La Fayette; First Methodist Episcopal Church, Francis H. Spear, pastor, Warren; First Seventh Day Baptist Church of Hopkinton, George B. Shaw, pastor, Ashaway; Lutheran Conference of the Providence District (Pontiac, R. I., Nov. 12, 1917), Providence; Sunday School of the East Baptist Church of Hope Valley, E. T. Spencer, superintendent, Hopkinton; and church and congregation and Sunday school, Oak Lawn Baptist Church, Oak Lawn, all in the State of Rhode Island, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letters and telegrams from St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, Frederick E. Hawkins, superintendent, and Providence Epworth League Union, Myrtie A. Brown, secretary, Providence; St. Luke's Episcopal Church Sunday School, Ida Collette, secretary, East Greenwich; St. Stephens Church, George McClellan Fiske, rector, Providence; Sunday schools in North Scituate held in the Free Baptist Church, Philip Shippee, C. A. Durfee, and Ernest M. Spencer, superintendents, North Scituate; Sunday School of the First Baptist Church, Joseph E. Matteson, secretary, Allenton; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, through Mrs. H. E. King, North Scituate; Mary J. Locke, Narragansett Pier; Eunice B. Clark, Wakefield; Emma B. Potter, corresponding secretary, North Scituate; Mrs. R. J. Griffin, Mrs. G. A. Griffin, and Fannie E. White, Wakefield; Apponaug Woman's Christian Temperance Union, through Mrs. W. C. Pierce, secretary, and 300 representative citizens, Nathan M. Littlefield, chairman, Providence; Quonocontaug Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, No. 48, Anne L. Waite, secretary, Westerly; and Oak Lawn Grange, Edgar A. Wood, grand master, Oak Lawn, all in the State of Rhode Island, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, telegrams from John A. Tandwin, Bertha A. Bissell, Horace G. Bissell, Everett Messinger, Mrs. Thomas Uray, E. P. Bogert, Florence A. Moulton, Emily B. Aldrich, H. Cutler, Harry A. Slocumb, W. D. Olson, Elizabeth Joynt, Rev. E. F. Jones, Frank C. Dudley, Mrs. W. C. P. Faunce, William A. Farren, Francis Gallagher, Mary A Gifford, Henry A. Fifield, Alfred M. Thompson, Jesse V. Dudlong, Mr. and Mrs. H. A. Whitmarsh, Ellen G. Hunt, W. H. Faunce, Mrs. William L. Coop, Rhode Island State Federation of Women's Clubs (39 clubs, representing 3,000 women), Maude Evelyn Bradley, and Rhode Island State Grange, Clara L. Chase, secretary (representing 3,500 patrons of Rhode Island), Providence; Mrs. David Harley and William Rogers, Pawtucket; William D. Chickle, East Providence; and Charles Knowles, Lillian Knowles, Julia Knowles, Asa Humphrey, and Marshall Young, Wakefield, all in the State of Rhode Island, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, telegrams and letters from Sarah Champlin, John Champlin, C. Hill, Emma Humphrey, Mrs. E. E. Hill, and Mrs. William G. Sweet, Wakefield; Men's Club of Cranston Community, H. B. Coombs, and T. W. Waterman, Providence; Herbert M. Clarke, Arctic; and New England Coal Co., Harry E. Davis, Woonsocket, all in the State of Rhode Island, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letters from Mrs. Eva H. Smith, Washington; F. L. Fowler, Oak Lawn; J. F. Archibald, Providence; Chester Donelly, Oliver W. Sherman, Clifford A Woodmansee, and Edward E. Kenyon, West Kingston; Charles L. Johnston, Auburn; Alston W. Knowles, N. K. Hazard, Charles J. Tucker, Charles W. Hall, Joseph A. Boss, Stephen B. Gardiner, Charles H. Knowles, Louisa H. Knowles, William Young, and Moses Young, Narragansett Pier; Chesman O. Childs and John A. Allen, Peace Dale; Marshall Young, Harry S. Champlin, Asa H. Humphrey, Leon M. Champlin, and John R. Champlin, Point Judith; Leon L. Holland, and W. A. Pollock, Saunderstown; and Hartford P. Brown, Robert P. Graves, Everett E. Jones, Mrs. E. G. Babcock, Charles C. Armstrong, Ransford Collins, Oliver H. Jones, J. Haskell Edson, John B. Peck, W. F. Congdon, L. W. Tucker, Charles E. Mitchell, James H. Buton, John E. Ross, and Oscar T. Dykstra, Wakefield, all in the State of Rhode Island, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letters from Johnson Hoyle, Daniel C. Watson, Joseph B. Tucker, Stephen B. Gardnier, jr., Benjamin W. Palmer, Mrs. B. W. Palmer, James G. Champlin, L. D. Miner, W. Luther Bates, Henry W. Partelow, and Howard R. Tucker, Wakefield; William P. Brownell, Miss Annie B. Arnold, E. M. Docherty, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Mary E. Olney, corresponding secretary, of the State of Rhode Island, and members of the parish of the Church of the Mediator, Providence; Potter Hill Sunday School, Potter Hill; and Rowland W. Gilbert, Louis R. Houston, Charles G. Houston, Story E. Johnson, B. P. Pollock, and Walter J. Westlake, Peace Dale, all in the State of Rhode Island, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, telegrams, letters, and petitions from Tabernacle Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, G. W. Amison, superintendent, and Liberty B. Greene, Providence; A. J. Webster, Auburn; Henry B. Trinkhover and Ada Blinkhom, Providence; Mrs. E. O. Benson, Auburn; Charles E. Westcott, Christie C. Crowe, and Olly R. A. Jillson, Providence; Thomas J. Clarke, Charlestown; Harlon A. Page and Albert E. Titchener; Mrs. Jennie F. Smith, representing 45 members of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Wakefield; William Entwistle; Ethel Johnston, Arlington; Carrie O. Brown, John D. Miner, and Alice O. Miner, East Greenwich; Robert McGhee, Providence; John Siswick, manager Mystic Woolen Mill, Hope Valley; Broad Street Christian Church (385), Samuel Glivven, clerk, Archie Meikle and 22 citizens, and John C. Stanton and 35 citizens, Westerly; 58 members of People's Church (Baptist), Rev. William O. Keirstead, Providence; and Frank Hill and 13 other citizens of the town of Westerly, all in the State of Rhode Island, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letters and petitions from A. J. Schultheiss and Joint Local Executive Board of the International Union of the United Brewery Workmen, William H. Lovett, secretary, Providence; Jacob Mack, Rudolph Mitschke, and Joseph Wacker, Cranston; Paul Wermuth and John Grasslin, Providence; Christian Ackermann, Arlington; Albin Hertzsch, Providence; Gotthard Wemmer, Arlington; Mathias Kormann, Providence; Michael Bosko and Melchior Buck, Cranston; Nicola M. Loudoti and Paul Kaleen, Providence; Louis Gentile and William L. Reichert, Cranston; Frederick W. Weise, Salvatore Pullano, Lewis L. Cushman, Ernest R. Williams, John J. Brennen, and Alex J. Langlois, Arlington; Benjamin R. Jepson, Thomas F. McMahon, T. J. Tiernan, Fred H. Bartels, John W. Nolan, Roderick McGary, Bernard McCabe, William J. Guest, I. Precourt, and M. Hercov, Providence, all in the State of Rhode Island, opposing prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolutions of Shields Court No. 63, Massachusetts Catholic Order of Foresters, Holyoke, Mass., and by Holyoke Council No. 90, Knights of Columbus, of Holyoke, Mass., in support of legislation to draft alien ally population into the military service of this country or have them deported; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of the Pennsylvania Woman Suffrage Association requesting the passage of the suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.