

Miss RANKIN, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 933) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain land to school district No. 9, of Sanders County, Mont., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 613), which said bill 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. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11479) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of Nat W. Fant, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 614), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12240) granting a pension to Scott Colegate, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Miss RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 12334) appropriating money for the use of the tribal council of the Flathead Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12335) to regulate the citizenship of married women; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 12336) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse officers, enlisted men, nurses, and civilian employees in the Naval Establishment, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard for certain disbursements while on furlough necessitated by disabilities originating in the service and in line of duty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 12337) to authorize the establishment of a bureau of farm-risk insurance in the Agriculture Department; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 12338) to amend an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended by the act entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes," approved March 28, 1918, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SULZER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 298) extending to the Territory of Alaska the same rights and privileges as are accorded the several States under the act of February 23, 1917, providing for the promotion of vocational education; to the Committee on Education.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 12339) for the relief of Warren C. Isham; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BRODBECK: A bill (H. R. 12340) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Sloat; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12341) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12342) granting an increase of pension to Craig M. Geiselman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12343) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12344) granting an increase of pension to William Low; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 12345) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Giles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODALL: A bill (H. R. 12346) to amend and to correct the military record of Thomas Decker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 12347) granting a pension to Alice E. Marvin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 12348) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius S. Munhall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 12349) granting a pension to Nancy J. Chambers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 12350) granting an increase of pension to Nathan C. Dobbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 12351) for the relief of David L. Marks; 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): Memorial (inclosing arguments and evidence) of the International Association of Machinists, against the so-called Taylor system; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also (by request), resolutions of the Allied Printing Trades Council of St. Joseph, Mo., urging the amendment of the war-revenue act by eliminating the section dealing with second-class postage rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), memorial of the Chicago Alumni of Northwestern College, asking for enactment of war prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Resolutions forwarded by Dr. Dewey R. Powell, secretary of 76 physicians and surgeons of San Joaquin Valley, favoring drafting medical men for surgeons in the Army Medical Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of the German Methodist Church of Alta Vista, Kans., for the enactment of war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWELL: Petition of 987 citizens of Ames, Iowa, urging emergency war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Buckley, Dement & Co. and Coyne Bros., of Chicago, and the East St. Louis Lumber Co., of East St. Louis, Ill., opposing repeal or postponement of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Memorial of Hartford Christian Endeavor Union, favoring war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCLINTIC: Petition of Oklahoma City (Okla.) Chamber of Commerce asking that everything possible be done to better public highways; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: Memorial of Slovenian Republican Alliance of America, asking that the Slovenese be released from bondage of the Austrian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of Mr. E. T. Marsh and 11 other residents of Rochester and vicinity, protesting against the zone system for second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Hartford (Conn.) Clearing House Association against the guarantee of deposits on national banks, which puts a premium on incompetence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

MONDAY, June 3, 1918.

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

Almighty God, our trust is in Thee. We pray Thee to help us appreciate the supreme importance and value of spiritual things. We are in the midst of a world struggle which calls for the delivery of every element of force and power that we have at our command; may we not be tempted to leave the path that leads to God, for our dependence is upon the mighty arm of God. As we turn to Thee this morning at the beginning of this day's work give us, we pray Thee, power to make better distinctions, and to value spiritual things in their place as God would give us the light to see the sources of power for a mighty conflict like this. We pray that Thy spirit may guide us in the duties of this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 31, 1918, was read and approved.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION (S. DOC. NO. 229).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting

a revised estimate of appropriation for certain employees for the public schools of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1919, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 12281) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12280) making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I send to the desk a telegram from the Texas Equal Suffrage Association in reference to the Federal suffrage amendment, which I ask to have set out in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUSTIN, TEX., May 31, 1918.

HON. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
Washington, D. C.:

The Texas Equal Suffrage Association, in annual session assembled, directly representing 20,000 members and indirectly 500,000 women voters of Texas, do hereby vigorously protest against the Senate's delay in passing the suffrage amendment denying enfranchisement to 20,000,000 American women. As southern voters we ask Democratic Senators to register their belief in equality, intelligence, and loyalty of American women by passing at once the suffrage amendment. The Nation more than a year ago pledged itself to democracy both at home and abroad, and we respectfully ask Congress to now redeem this pledge. We ask you to present our protest to the Senate and have it read into the RECORD. Please answer.

MINNIE FISHER CUNNINGHAM, President.

Mr. GRONNA presented a petition of the North Dakota Medical Society, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide advanced rank for officers of the Medical Corps of the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the fourth district of the North Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs, of Hope, N. Dak., praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Woman's Club of New England, N. Dak., pledging support to the increased postal rates legislation recently enacted, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMOOT. I present a telegram addressed to the Senate of the United States in my care. It is short, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, June 1, 1918.

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
(Care Senator REED SMOOT), Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The Young Ladies' National Mutual Improvement Association, numbering 35,000 young women in Utah and surrounding States, urges you to legislate for nation-wide prohibition.

MARTHA H. TINGEY, President.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I have received several resolutions to Congress in the form of memorials from the Universal Franchise League of Huron, S. Dak., sent me by Mrs. Arla E. Willard and Verna T. Meyer; also a letter from Mrs. John L. Pyle, State president of the league, inclosing several editorials from South Dakota newspapers, requesting that the memorials and clippings be read into the RECORD. I also have a letter from Mrs. C. N. Herreid, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., inclosing a memorial from the Sunday Musical Club of Aberdeen on the same subject. I would like to have had these memorials printed in the RECORD, but knowing the recent rule adopted by the Senate and being advised that objection would be made, I desire to offer them and have them referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage for serious consideration.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I desire to have read a telegram addressed to the United States Senate in my care from Hon. W. H. Patten, speaking for the Southern Baptist Convention.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

SHUBUTA, MISS., May 31, 1918.

UNITED STATES SENATE
(Care Hon. JAMES K. VARDAMAN),
Washington, D. C.:

Over 2,000 members at the Southern Baptist Convention, Hot Springs, urge the passage of war-time prohibition to hasten and insure victory. The enormous waste of men, money, food, fuel, and other war necessities through the liquor traffic is a crime against the men at the front and our God and puts our victory in jeopardy. Patriotism demands action at once.

W. H. PATTEN.

Mr. CALDER. I present a petition from the Religious Society of Friends in favor of woman suffrage, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS,
New York, Fifth Month, 30th, 1918.

To Hon. WILLIAM M. CALDER, of New York:

The Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, representing Friends in the States of New York and eastern New Jersey, in annual session at Fifteenth Street and Rutherford Place, New York City, is deeply concerned that the United States should recognize the right of women to a voice in her own government, particularly at a time like this, when other nations are enfranchising their women.

And therefore calls upon the President of the United States and the Senators from the States of New York and New Jersey to do all within their power to urge the immediate passage of the Federal suffrage amendment.

And directs that a copy of this minute be sent to President Wilson, Senator JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr., and Senator JOSEPH S. FRELINGHUYSEN and Senator DAVID BAIRD, of New Jersey.

ELLWOOD BURDSALL, Clerk.
JOSEPHINE H. TILLEN, Assistant Clerk.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I have received two telegrams addressed to the Senate in my care in regard evidently to the amendment to the Agricultural appropriation bill with reference to prohibition. I ask that the telegrams be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUCUMCARI, N. MEX., May 31, 1918.

THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
(Care Senator A. A. JONES), Washington, D. C.:

Americans of Tucumcari are praying in great union service that God will give you grace and power from on high to exercise your vast authority in freeing America from the sin of the liquor traffic; that the national iniquity which may prevent Almighty God from hearing our prayers for speedy victory may be removed. Sent by resolution of mass meeting in session Memorial Day.

Harry H. McElroy, V. M. Dyer, H. M. Doughty, Ed Hall, J. Gresham, Thos. Coshaw, E. Clark, L. Major, C. Cushman, O. D. Ferguson, Ed Saxon, H. Herndon, P. Headerlitt, Ira Furr, Mark Brown, C. Herndon, J. Ritz, Annie Hicks, F. M. Smith, A. Maddox, Roy Smith, F. Caruthers, O. Hixie, Walter W. Dobson, M. Walter, L. Jackson, L. Z. Payne, C. Hittson, Cora Hittson, President Woman's Christian Temperance Union, N. Reasoner, G. Ellis.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., May 31, 1918.

THE UNITED STATES SENATE
(Care Hon. A. A. JONES), Washington, D. C.:

We, the people of Santa Fe, N. Mex., assembled on this national day of prayer, urge the passage of the Randall amendment to the administration food-production bill passed by the House, believing God will hear when the Nation ceases to do evil.

J. A. WOOD,
F. E. LOCKRIDGE,
C. E. LINNY,
Committee.

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Eldora, Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the faculty of the Leland Stanford University, of California, praying for the repeal of the present zone system of postage rates on second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Equal Suffrage League, of Newton, Mass., and a petition of the College Equal Suffrage League, of Boston, Mass., praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of A. D. Weld Post, No. 148, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Massachusetts, of Winchester, Mass., praying for an increase of pensions for veterans of the Civil War, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MYERS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hamilton, Mont., praying for the fixing of prices of substitutes for wheat and wheat flour, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 4005) providing for the survey of public lands remaining unsurveyed in any of the surveying districts of Florida, with a view of satisfying the grant in aid of schools made to said State under the act of March 3, 1845, and other acts amendatory thereof, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 478) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2171) to abolish the United States land office at Springfield, Mo. (Rept. No. 477);

A bill (S. 2715) to authorize an exchange of lands with the State of Montana in connection with Muddy Creek Reservoir site, Sun River project, and Nelson Reservoir site, Milk River project, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 476); and

A bill (S. 4221) for the relief of private owners of lands within or near the Bitter Root National Forest, Mont. (Rept. No. 475).

Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (S. 4444) to pension widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men who served in the War with Spain, Philippine insurrection, or in China, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 479) thereon.

THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 256, submitted by Mr. OWEN on the 31st ultimo, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized, during the Sixty-fifth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 4639) granting an increase of pension to John Doughty;

A bill (S. 4640) granting an increase of pension to George W. Martin;

A bill (S. 4641) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Robison; and

A bill (S. 4642) granting a pension to Margaret S. Pruyn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 4643) to increase the compensation of bookbinders in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 4644) granting a pension to Daniel H. Anker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 4645) authorizing the conveyance of the United States jail and land on which the same is located at Guthrie, Okla., to Logan County, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 4646) to create a rural credit society and general insurance league to facilitate the increase in farm production, to create two fiscal and financial agents for the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 4647) for the relief of Rinald Bros., of Philadelphia, Pa. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4648) for the relief of Mary E. Bingham (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4649) granting a pension to Julia A. Hoffner; and

A bill (S. 4650) granting an increase of pension to John H. Wood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 4651) granting an increase of pension to Bessie A. Dichman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 4652) requiring the filing of copies of all contracts for services rendered or materials furnished to the United States or certain contractors and agencies of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) admitting into the United States 1,000 cases of chartreuse ordered by Batjer & Co., of New York, before the passage of the food-control act prohibiting the importation of distilled spirits, the delivery of which was delayed on account of war conditions until after that act went into effect; to the Committee on Finance.

RETIREMENT OF CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. McKELLAR. I introduce a bill for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

The bill (S. 4637) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record for the information of Senators, and in connection with the bill I ask also that a summary of its provisions be printed to follow the bill.

There being no objection, the bill and the matter referred to were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, beginning on the 1st day of July next following the passage of this act, all employees in the classified civil service of the United States who have on that date or shall have on any date thereafter reached the age of 68 years shall be eligible for retirement on an annuity as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That mechanics, city and rural letter carriers, and railway mail clerks shall be eligible for retirement at 65 years of age: *Provided further*, That postmasters shall not be included in the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. That for the purpose of determining the amount of annuity which retired employees shall receive the following classifications and rates shall be established:

Class A shall include all employees to whom this act applies who shall have served the United States for a total period of 30 years or more.

Class B shall include all employees to whom this act applies who shall have served the United States for a total period of 25 years or more, but less than 30 years.

Class C shall include all employees to whom this act applies who shall have served the United States for a total period of 20 years or more, but less than 25 years.

Class D shall include all employees to whom this act applies who shall have served the United States for a total period of 15 years or more, but less than 20 years.

The annuity to a retired employee in class A shall equal 50 per cent of such employee's average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation from the United States for the 10 years next preceding the date on which he or she retired: *Provided*, That in no case shall an annuity in this class exceed \$600 per annum.

The annuity to a retired employee in class B shall equal 40 per cent of such employee's average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation from the United States for the 10 years next preceding the date on which he or she retired: *Provided*, That in no case shall an annuity in this class exceed \$540 per annum.

The annuity to a retired employee in class C shall equal 30 per cent of such employee's average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation from the United States for the 10 years next preceding the date on which he or she retired: *Provided*, That in no case shall an annuity in this class exceed \$480 per annum.

The annuity to a retired employee in class D shall equal 25 per cent of such employee's average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation from the United States for the 10 years next preceding the date on which he or she retired: *Provided*, That in no case shall an annuity in this class exceed \$420 per annum.

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of this act and subject to the provisions of section 10 hereof the period of service of an employee in the classified civil service shall be computed from original employment, whether as a classified or unclassified employee in the civil service of the United States, and shall include periods of service at different times and services in one or more departments, branches, or independent offices of the Government, and shall also include service performed under authority of the United States beyond seas or honorable service in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States, either Regular or Volunteer: *Provided*, That in the case of an employee who is eligible for and elects to receive a pension on account of disability incurred in the line of duty the period of his military or naval service shall not be included for the purpose of assignment to classes defined in section 2 of this act.

It is further provided that in computing length of service for the purposes of this act periods of separation from the service shall be excluded, and that in the case of a substitute city carrier, postal clerk, or railway postal clerk only periods of active occupation in the duties for which he or she was employed shall be included.

SEC. 4. That the provisions of this act shall include employees of the Library of Congress and the Botanic Gardens, excepting such persons as may be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and may be extended by Executive order, upon recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, to include any employee or group of employees in the civil service of the United States not classified at the time of the passage of this act. The President shall have power, in his discretion, to exclude from the operation of this act or include therein any employee or group of employees whose tenure of office is intermittent or of uncertain duration.

SEC. 5. That all employees to whom this act applies shall, on arriving at the age of retirement as defined in section 1, be automatically separated from the service: *Provided*, That if not less than 90 days before the arrival of an employee at the age of retirement the head of the department, branch, or independent office of the Government in which he or she is employed certifies to the Director of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance that by reason of his or her efficiency and his or her willingness to remain in the civil service of the United States the continuance of such employee therein would be advantageous to the public service, such employee may be retained for a term not exceeding two years upon certification by the Director of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, and at the end of the two years he or she may, by similar certification, be continued for an additional term of two years, and so on: *Provided, however*, That at the end of 10 years after this act becomes effective no employee shall be continued in the civil service of the United States beyond the age of retirement specified in section 1 hereof for more than four years.

SEC. 6. That each employee who may become eligible for retirement as provided in this act shall, not less than 60 days before reaching the retirement age, file with the Director of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, in such form as he may prescribe, an application for an annuity, and said application shall be supported by a certificate from the head of the department, branch, or independent office of the Government in which the applicant has been employed, stating the age and period or periods of service of the applicant and salary, pay, or compensation received, as shown by the official records: *Provided, however*, That in the case of an employee who is to be continued in the service of the United States beyond the retirement age as provided in section 5 of this act no application for retirement and annuity as herein prescribed

shall be filed with the Director of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance: And provided further, That failure to apply for retirement and annuity within 60 days after reaching the retirement age because of the pendency of an application for retention in the civil service shall not be construed to deprive any person of retirement and annuity.

Upon receipt of satisfactory evidence the Director of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance shall forthwith adjudicate the claim of the applicant, and, if title to an annuity be established, a proper certificate shall be issued to the annuitant under the seal of the Treasury Department, and such certificate shall become evidence of the right of the annuitant to the annuity as therein defined.

SEC. 7. That every employee to whom this act applies who shall continue in the civil service after the passage of this act, as well as every person to whom this act applies who may hereafter be appointed to a position or place, shall be deemed to consent and agree to the deductions made and provided for hereinafter, and payment with such deductions shall be a full and complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands whatsoever for all regular services rendered by such person during the period covered by such payment, except his or her claim for the benefits to which he or she may be entitled under the provisions of this act, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 167, 168, and 169 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and of any other law, rule, or regulation affecting the salary, pay, or compensation of any person or persons employed in the civil service to whom this act applies.

SEC. 8. That, beginning on the first day of the second month after the month in which this act is approved, there shall be deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of each person to whom this act applies a sum equal to 2½ per cent of such person's basic salary, pay, or compensation. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause the said deductions to be withheld from all specific appropriations for the particular salaries or compensation from which the deductions are made and from all allotments out of lump-sum appropriations for payments of such salaries or compensation for each fiscal year, and said sums shall be transferred on the books of the Treasury Department to the credit of a special fund to be known as "the civil-service retirement fund," and shall be credited, together with interest thereon at 4 per cent per annum, compounded annually, to the individual account of the employee from whose salary or compensation the deduction was made. Such "civil-service retirement fund" is hereby appropriated for the payment of annuities, refunds, and allowances as provided in this act. There is also appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum which, when added to the deductions herein provided and transferred from other appropriations under the provisions of this act, shall be sufficient to make payments provided by this act: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and empowered to invest, from time to time, in interest-bearing securities of the United States, such portions of the "civil-service retirement fund" hereby created as, in his judgment, may not be immediately required for the payment of annuities, refunds, and allowances as herein provided, and the income derived from such investments shall constitute a part of said fund for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 11 of this act.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and empowered in carrying out the provisions of this act to establish special funds supplementing individual contributions by the employees and to receive, invest, and disburse for such purpose all moneys in the form of donations, gifts, legacies, bequests, or otherwise, which may be contributed by private individuals or corporations or organizations for the benefit of the civil-service employees generally or any special class of employees.

SEC. 9. That annuities as herein provided shall be paid monthly, and checks shall be issued and mailed to the last-known address of the annuitant on the first business day of the month succeeding the month in which the annuity becomes due: *Provided*, That where an annuitant is laboring under legal disabilities the annuity in such cases may be paid to the duly appointed guardian.

SEC. 10. That upon the transfer of any employee from unclassified to classified status, or upon the reinstatement of a former employee to the service, credit for such past service or for any part thereof shall be granted only upon the payment to the Treasurer of the United States, within 90 days of such transfer or reinstatement, of the amount of such deductions with interest as provided in this act as would have been made for the periods of actual service or part thereof for which credit is to be given. Interest shall not be computed, however, for periods of separation from the service.

SEC. 11. That in the case of an employee in the classified civil service of the United States who shall be transferred to an unclassified position, and in the case of any employee to whom this act applies who shall become absolutely separated from the service before reaching the retirement age the total amount of deductions of salary, pay, or compensation with accrued interest computed at the rate of 4 per cent per annum compounded annually, shall, upon application, be returned to such employee; and in event of the death of an employee before he shall have received in annuities an amount equal to the total amount of the deductions from his salary or compensation together with interest thereon at 4 per cent per annum compounded annually up to the time of his death, the excess of the said accumulated deductions over the said annuity payments shall be paid in one sum to his or her legal representatives upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor.

SEC. 12. That for the purpose of administration, except as otherwise provided herein, the Director of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to perform, or cause to be performed, any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into full force and effect.

SEC. 13. That payment of annuities, refunds, and allowances as herein provided shall be made by the disbursing clerk for the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, and with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, checks in payment of annuities may be drawn without separate vouchers or receipts, but in such form as to protect the United States against loss: *Provided*, That vouchers shall be required in all cases in which payment of annuities, refunds, or allowances are to be made to some person other than the annuitant, and in all other cases in which the Secretary of the Treasury may deem it necessary.

SEC. 14. That it shall be the duty of the head of each executive department and the head of each independent establishment of the executive branch of the Government not within the jurisdiction of any executive department to report to the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in such manner as said bureau may prescribe the name and grade of each employee to whom this act applies in or under said department or establishment who shall be at any time in a nonpay status, and the amount of basic salary, pay, or compensation lost by the employee by reason of such absence. The Bureau of War-Risk Insurance shall keep such record

of appointments, transfers, changes in grade, separations from the service, and losses of pay as shall enable it at all times to determine accurately the amount of salary, pay, or compensation deducted and withheld from any individual under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 15. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and keep all needful tables, records, and accounts required for carrying out the provisions of this act, including data showing the mortality experience of the officers and employees in the service and the rate of withdrawal from such service, and any other information that may serve as a guide for future valuations and adjustments of the plan for the retirement of officers and employees. The Secretary of the Treasury shall make a detailed comparative report annually to Congress showing all receipts and disbursements, together with the total number of persons receiving annuities and the amounts paid them.

SEC. 16. That none of the moneys mentioned in this act shall be assignable, either in law or equity, or be subject to execution, levy, or attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

SEC. 17. That for clerical and other services and all other expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of this act, there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$100,000, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, which sum shall be immediately available and continue available until the end of the fiscal year next after the passage of this act; thereafter the Secretary of the Treasury shall include in his annual estimate of appropriations a sum sufficient to continue this act in full force and effect.

SEC. 18. That all laws and parts of laws inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

PROVISIONS OF RETIREMENT BILL.

Section 1: Classified civil employees covered. Postmasters excluded. Eligibility age for retirement, 65 for mechanics, city or rural letter carriers, railway postal clerks; 68 for others.

Section 2: Service required and life pension provided: Thirty years or more defines class A, pension 50 per cent, maximum \$600; 25 up to 30 years defines class B, pension 40 per cent, maximum \$540; 20 up to 25 years defines class C, pension 30 per cent, maximum \$480; 15 up to 20 years defines class D, pension 25 per cent, maximum \$420.

Section 3: All United States Government service counted (subject to sec. 10 deduction adjustment if necessary). Military or naval service counted unless receiving military or naval pension. Periods of separation not counted. The substitute postal employees covered credited with only periods of active employment.

Section 4: Library of Congress and Botanic Garden employees included, except presidential. Executive order may cover in employees not now classified. President may exclude or include employees of intermittent or uncertain tenure.

Section 5: Successive two-year continuances. Upon certification by head of department or branch at least 90 days prior, of efficiency. Ten years after passage of act, absolute age limits 69 and 72.

Section 6: Application for annuity, unless continued under section 5. Made to Director Bureau of War-Risk Insurance at least 60 days prior to retirement. Certification by head of department or branch as to age and pay. Treasury Department certificate evidence to right to annuity.

Section 7: Continuance of employment deemed consent to deductions. Return of deductions and payment of pensions shall be full acquittance of claims for service.

Section 8: Deductions 2½ per cent of (basic) pay. Withheld from salary appropriations. Transferred on Treasury books to "civil-service retirement fund." Credited to individual account with 4 per cent compound interest. Secretary of Treasury to invest funds not immediately payable.

Section 9: Annuities payable monthly.

Section 10: Deductions at interest to be made up for credit desired for service for which deductions had not been made.

Section 11: Total return to employee or legal representative in no case less than total deductions accumulated at 4 per cent interest.

Section 12: Administration by Director Bureau of War-Risk Insurance.

Section 13: Payments made by disbursing clerk of Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in such form as to protect United States against loss.

Section 14: Records of appointments, transfers, separations, non-pay periods, and pay thus lost to employee. Head department or branch to report. Director Bureau War Risk to record.

Section 15: Secretary of Treasury to keep all other needful tables and records for future valuations or adjustments. To report annually to the Congress on conditions of the fund.

Section 16: Moneys not assignable or attachable.

Section 17: Appropriation for clerical and other services: One hundred thousand dollars first year, then such sums as necessary.

Section 18: Repeal of inconsistent law.

INCREASE OF NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. FRANCE. I introduce a bill for further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States, which I ask to have read and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (S. 4638) making appropriations for the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States the President of the United States is hereby authorized to undertake, prior to September 1, 1918, the construction of the battle cruisers enumerated below:

Twenty battle cruisers, carrying suitable armor and, when fully completed, as powerful armament as any vessels of their class, to have the highest possible or practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action, at a cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$22,000,000 each: *Provided*, That work upon these shall be begun as soon as practicable in order that they may be utilized at the earliest possible date, even before they shall be fully equipped with armament, for the purpose of facilitating or protecting the transport of troops or for other services.

SEC. 2. That the President be further authorized to undertake the construction of 10 scout cruisers, carrying suitable protection and armament suited to their size and type, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action, at a cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$9,000,000 each, to be begun as soon as practicable but not later than January 1, 1919.

SEC. 3. That there be, and hereby is, appropriated, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$600,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the carrying out of the provisions of this act.

CONSIDERATION OF TREATIES—AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. BORAH. I submit a proposed amendment to Senate resolution 235 with reference to amending the rules of the Senate. I ask that the proposed amendment be read and lie on the table, to be offered as an amendment when the matter comes up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Add the following as a new section:

That all treaties shall be considered and acted upon by the Senate in its open or legislative session unless four-fifths of the Members of the Senate by yeas and nays vote shall determine to close the doors during the consideration of the particular treaty upon which the vote to close the doors is taken.

That this rule shall not be limited to the period of the war.

AMENDMENTS TO ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHAFROTH. In behalf of my colleague [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which I ask may be printed and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

Mr. McCUMBER. I submit a proposed amendment to the Army appropriation bill. It is very short, and I ask that it may be read by the Secretary.

The amendment was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Add at the end thereof the following:

"That the President is hereby authorized and directed to immediately proceed to increase the National Army to not less than 5,000,000 enlisted men and such additional officers as may be necessary for such force, exclusive of noncombatant forces that may be employed either in the United States or abroad; and the President is further hereby requested to report to Congress what additional legislation and what additional appropriations will be necessary to carry this provision into effect in the shortest possible time; and, as nearly as may be, what time will be required to raise, equip, and put such force in the service in France or elsewhere outside the United States."

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on May 31, 1918, approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 152) to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 12281. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DATA RELATIVE TO PROFITEERING AND THE REVENUE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Has the morning business been disposed of?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no concurrent or other resolutions, the morning business is closed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to call up for consideration Senate resolution 235.

Mr. BORAH. May I make an inquiry before that is done with reference to resolution 233, coming over from a former day?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator wishes to call it up, he has a right to do so.

Mr. BORAH. I ask that it may lie over without prejudice, due to the fact that a Senator has suggested that he might desire to offer an amendment to the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The present occupant of the Chair has heretofore ruled that there is no rule which requires the Chair to lay before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day; that it is a matter within the control of the Senator who introduced it, and he has a right to call it up just before the close of morning business; that such resolutions do not go to the calendar until after they have been called up and discussed.

Mr. BORAH. I shall defer calling up the resolution until the Senator who spoke to me is ready to proceed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not exactly understand the inquiry of the Senator from Idaho or the ruling of the Chair as to the status of the resolution. Does the Chair hold that Senate resolution 235 is in order at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. BORAH. I was speaking with reference to another resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, with reference to another resolution.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE—AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolution No. 235, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. The amendment of the Committee on Rules is to substitute for the resolution the following:

Resolved, That during the period of the present war the rules of the Senate be amended by adding thereto the following:

"That no Member shall occupy more than 1 hour in debate, unless by unanimous consent, on any bill or resolution and not over 20 minutes on each amendment proposed thereto."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I do not propose to make any extended argument upon the resolution offered by the Senator from Alabama, which has been reported from the Committee on Rules. I simply desire in a very few words to express my opinion as to the very great importance of the adoption of this rule.

I certainly have no disposition, Mr. President, nor do I believe there is any disposition on either side of the Chamber to curtail legitimate debate on any matter that may come before the Senate, but I do feel that the time has arrived when the Senate ought to assert some authority, some influence on the debates which take place here.

When the Senate was a smaller body and the sense of responsibility of each Senator more direct and more acute the Senate got along practically without any rules, but with the growth in numbers in the Senate and the development of a disposition to debate elaborately most questions that come before the body we have at times found ourselves seriously embarrassed by the lack of some rule to control the debates.

I have been in the Senate, Mr. President, a little more than 23 years. Of course, I may be mistaken, and I do not speak with any dogmatic idea, but on few occasions, if any, since I have been in the Senate during the 23 years has there been a time when a Senator might not have expressed his views fully under the rule now reported from the Committee on Rules—1 hour on the main question and 20 minutes on each amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the Senator from Virginia his opinion about the construction of the rule. As I heard it read it simply provides that no Senator shall speak longer than one hour. I should like to ask the Senator whether, if the rule were adopted, he thinks a Senator under that rule would have the right, provided, of course, he could get the floor in the regular way, to talk, say, 30 minutes on a bill and at another time, if the bill were still before the body, talk another 30 minutes. In other words, would he have to use his entire hour at once or could he speak as often as he pleased within the limit fixed if he divided up the time?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, my judgment is that under the proposed rule presented a Senator would have a right to speak as many times as he saw fit, so that he did not in the aggregate occupy more than one hour on a bill or more than 20 minutes on an amendment. If there is any doubt on that subject, I should be very glad if the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] would so modify his resolution as to remove from the minds of all Senators every doubt on that subject.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia will allow me, I desire to call his attention to the fact that I think there can be no doubt on that question. The rule provides:

That no Member shall occupy more than one hour in debate, unless by unanimous consent, on any bill or resolution.

The limitation is one hour in debate; there is no limitation on the number of speeches a Senator may make.

Mr. NORRIS. I had not read the resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. So I do not think there would be any question in the world that a Senator might make a speech for 30 minutes, then yield the floor, and then, in the usual procedure, again get the floor and again speak upon the pending measure for 30 minutes; but, except by unanimous consent, of course he would be limited to one hour in the aggregate of speeches made.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I do not myself believe there is any doubt about it.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not think it would be possible to put any other construction upon it.

Mr. NORRIS. I presume that of course the same construction would apply as to the 20-minute limitation of debate on an amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. I think there is no doubt as to that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Virginia said a moment ago that in his long service in the Senate he could not remember a time when a Senator could not properly express his opinion upon a bill within one hour; but can not the Senator remember that on many occasions it would be absolutely impossible for a Senator to express his opinion or his judgment upon certain amendments in 20 minutes? Sometimes, may I say to

the Senator, an amendment offered is infinitely more important than is the bill itself?

Mr. MARTIN. I think a Senator can state in 20 minutes his reasons for supporting or opposing any amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. As an example, Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] this morning introduced an amendment to this very resolution, which would revolutionize the methods pursued by the Senate for 120 years in the discussion of treaties; and under this resolution, were it in force, no Senator could speak over 20 minutes on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. MARTIN. That proposition is one that extends to a very limited scope, and I am sure that any Senator can say all that he needs to say on that subject in 20 minutes.

Right here I will say, able as is the Senator from Idaho, and cogently as he presents his reasons from time to time on matters before the Senate, I doubt if he has ever occupied more than an hour on any bill since he has been in the Senate. His speeches are short; he rarely occupies so much as 20 minutes on an amendment, and rarely, if ever, as much as an hour on a bill. Senators who have occupied more than that time have done so by reason of the latitudinous rules of the Senate, not that they could not, if they saw fit to do so, condense their views within the limits fixed by this proposed rule.

As I have said, I do not believe the Senator from Idaho has ever delivered a speech here occupying more than an hour or on an amendment made a speech occupying more than 20 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, the fact that the Senator from Virginia favors this resolution proposing a radical amendment of the Rules of the Senate is in itself very significant. I think I am violating no confidence among the Senator's friends when I say that he is rather a new convert to the doctrine of applying a rigid rule in debate.

Mr. MARTIN. If the Senator will excuse me right there, I will say he was never wider of the mark than that. After I was elected to the Senate, and before I qualified, I made a speech in Virginia at a college commencement in which I urged that the rules of the Senate be modified in order that the Senate should control its business; and I have never departed from that idea one single instant in my twenty-three years of service as a Senator in this body.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I know the Senator from Virginia was committed to that proposition as he entered the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN. And I have adhered to it since I came to the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There is not a single Senator who is not committed to it before he enters the Senate, and every Member of the other House comes here committed to a more rigid rule in debate. My friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] got his ideas, undoubtedly, from the procedure of the House of Representatives, where real debate is practically unknown and the individual Member, no matter how able, is from every point of view minimized, while over here, where the membership is smaller, he is maximized, and the State he represents can not be imposed upon without his consent. Generally speaking, this latitude in debate is not abused and desirable results can always be obtained.

I had the pleasure of coming to Congress at the same time the Senator from Virginia entered the Senate, and during all that time I have been one of his admirers. I have watched his course with a great deal of interest, and his rise to party leadership has been a matter of profound satisfaction to me. But this is the first time I have ever heard him say anything about the necessity for a drastic cloture in Senate procedure on the floor of the Senate. I have occasionally heard expressions of regret when delays became vexatious, but I want to say to the Senator from Virginia that the rule under which we are now operating has in the main been most wholesome. I hope I am not intruding upon the time of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MARTIN. I have yielded, but not for a very long speech.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If I am intruding I will gladly wait until the Senator has finished.

Mr. President, such cloture as is now proposed would have minimized the sacred rights of States, and I have seen the rights of States successfully defended by the latitude of debate. The Senator from Virginia will recall, I have no doubt, the fight which I made 10 years ago, standing in my place in this Chamber, against the British-American waterway treaty, which would have deprived my State of valuable water rights along the Canadian border which belonged to the State of Michigan, and which there was no possible way of preserving except by the power to delay a vote and an appeal to the fair-mindedness of

Senators upon both sides of the Chamber. Senators upon the other side of the Chamber, then in the minority, came to my relief and saved my State from being grossly imposed upon by a treaty with Great Britain, Senators from other States would have been guided by the Executive, who had no interest in Michigan, but only in the Nation as a whole.

But, sir, as the specially commissioned representative of my State it fell to my lot to protect her interests, and through our unbridled procedure amendments to the treaty were made on the last day of the session, for which service the legislature of Michigan and the people of our State were truly grateful. Surely, Senators, you are not now to forego for all time this powerful weapon against injustice and wrong, reestablishing the party caucus decree as the binding rule in legislation in the Senate.

I think—and I say it with very great respect for the Senator from Virginia—it would be a great mistake now to adopt such a rule, when there is no possible confusion, when his wishes as majority leader in all war measures are our wishes, when the wishes of the leader on the other side of the Chamber and of the dominant party here on the conduct of the war are our wishes upon this side of the Chamber. We have never interposed in any way our right to unlimited discussion and have not thwarted the purposes of the other side at any angle, and if there is a reason now why we should make this radical departure from established custom, surely it should be so cogent and so powerful as to command respect from both sides of the Chamber.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, referring to the personal allusions made by the Senator who has just taken his seat, I want to say that I realize, so far as my official duties here have been concerned, that I have been treated with just as much consideration by the Republican side of the Chamber as I have been by the Democratic side of the Chamber. I appreciate the kindness and the consideration which have been shown to me more than words can express. This, however, is not a matter that is brought forward from one side of the Chamber, but it is brought forward for the consideration of the Senate as a body. It is not a cloture rule; it is not stringent in any of its aspects. It allows a Senator 1 hour on any bill or resolution and 20 minutes on each amendment. A Senator may divide that time up—he need not speak all at once—just so that in the aggregate he consumes no more time than that.

Referring to the matter of such importance to the State of the Senator from Michigan, suppose it had been before the Supreme Court of the United States, how much time would have been allotted to him to argue it there?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator's question is not quite fair. This is the forum of the people in a representative Government. They have commissioned us here to do their bidding. The bar of the Supreme Court have only been commissioned to proceed under the law with briefs and limited latitude, but here we make the law; and there should be no such restrictions and restraints as appertain to court procedure.

Mr. MARTIN. It need take no longer to argue a question here than it takes to argue it before the Supreme Court of the United States, in my humble judgment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, the Senator is wrong. The time we spend here is mostly spent in adjusting differences of opinion, exchanging views, and bringing together the divergent views of many States. The Supreme Court sits together in judgment upon our work, and could, if they desired, restrict argument entirely to written briefs; but here we have to get an audience of Senators, and if they are busy in committee a quorum must be obtained and we must prolong our discussion until we can reach their ears. It is an altogether different situation from that suggested by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the object of this rule is to get an audience for Senators. Under it debate is to be limited to an hour on the main question and 20 minutes on each amendment; and, if that is done, Senators will sit in their seats and listen to the arguments of Senators as they are made.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish the Senator would explain wherein the present cloture rule will fail to procure the desired results. I wish to agree with the Senator; I want to shorten debate; but we adopted a rule only a very short time ago for cloture, and I wish the Senator, who has given this matter great consideration, would explain to the Senate wherein that rule of cloture is inefficient and will not meet the present requirements.

Mr. MARTIN. The proposed rule is not, strictly speaking, a cloture rule. If it is adopted it will limit the time to be consumed in debate.

Mr. McCUMBER. I know that; but the purpose of it, I assume, is to hurry legislation, to advance legislation as rapidly as possible through the two branches of Congress; and, as the purpose of the resolution is exactly the same as the purpose back of the adoption of the cloture rule, I again ask the Senator to explain wherein the cloture rule will fail to secure the rapid enactment of legislation?

Mr. MARTIN. It is an entirely different proposition. As my friend from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] suggests, the cloture rule was primarily intended to prevent what we call filibusters. The proposed rule now pending is to limit the time consumed in debate; and the limitation is to apply only to the period of the war.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President—

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HARDING. Right at that point, if, in arguing for the adoption of the amended rule, the Senator from Virginia will tell the Senate why we should adopt a rule for the war time and not continue it in the aftertimes of peace, I will be very much interested. I ask him to do that because, in my judgment, the work of the United States Senate will never be more important than now; and it seems to me that if the rule is a good thing in these most extraordinary times it ought to be the permanent policy of the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, experience may lead to that conclusion. Certainly during the war there may be occasions when expedition is vitally important. I think it is vitally important right now. I am drifting into more extended remarks than I contemplated. I did not intend to do more than briefly express my opinion about this resolution; but its importance and the questions that have been propounded have led me into a more protracted discussion of the matter than I had contemplated.

Just at this very moment, Mr. President, we are confronted with a very serious situation. Senators are worn out with their long and arduous work, and it is very important that the necessary legislation shall be expedited as much as possible. I want every Senator to have all the opportunity that is necessary to present his views to the Senate on every question that may be brought before it; but I do want him held to the narrowest limits that are compatible with a fair and reasonable expression of his views and arguments.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I would suggest to the Senator from Virginia, with his consent, that in cases like the one cited by the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] a moment ago, under this rule the Senate could always be relied upon to hear a Senator for an indefinite length of time, because the proposed rule provides that a Senator may speak, with the consent of the Senate, beyond the limit fixed in the resolution; and in a matter affecting a Senator's State, as in the case mentioned by the Senator from Michigan, there would be no trouble, I apprehend, about the Senator being accorded all the time that he might desire.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the Senator from Virginia pardon an interruption?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi that it would have been simply impossible to have gotten unanimous consent in this Chamber in that treaty fight. The session was ending under the Constitution. I was at odds with all the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations upon this side of the Chamber, and I got my strength from the other side of the Chamber; and it would have been impossible for me to have obtained unanimous consent to delay ratification. If the proposed amendment had been the rule of the Senate, it would have passed quickly and unjustly. Such has been the experience of other Senators.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I do not see how a Senator could get his consent to refuse another Senator the right to debate fully a question of the character mentioned by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, as I have said, at this particular time Senators are weary bodily and mentally; they have been under great pressure for a long time; and, so far as I am personally concerned, I am exceedingly anxious to see the necessary legislation disposed of, and that then the Senate may recess, either for a long time or at intervals, while the Finance Committee, which has the laboring oar on the revenue bill, devotes itself to the formation of that measure.

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

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. HARDWICK. Since the war began has there been any unusual debate or delay in connection with any war measure?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not recall that there has been.

Mr. HARDWICK. There has been nothing that would have been done more rapidly under the proposed rule than without it?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not recall the history of all these matters; but, as I say, it is not from any spirit of complaint that this proposed rule springs. I have no doubt about the attitude of the Senate.

Mr. HARDWICK. What I have in mind, if the Senator will pardon me, is that even if there might be a reasonable argument for this rule in that there is necessity of speeding up legislation, our past experience does not prove any necessity for it at all, for we have gotten along all right without it; there has been no unusual debate; and no long arguments have been made.

Mr. MARTIN. Oh, well, Mr. President, we have gotten along in a way, but we have gotten along very badly, not as to war measures, perhaps, because the Senate is ultrapatriotic. I do not question the patriotism of any Senator on this floor; and I believe they are all ready to make sacrifices and to do what is necessary for the conduct of this war; but I believe that this rule will facilitate the dispatch of business, and do no injustice to any Senator or to any State. I think right now there is more than ordinary reason for speeding up legislation in order that Senators may have a much-needed rest. The proposed rule is a very simple one, but it is not a rigorous one; it does not interfere with the reasonable rights of any Senator, and, as I have already stated, there is not likely to be any question about which a Senator can not give his views reasonably and sufficiently in an hour on the main bill and 20 minutes on each amendment. I have never known a case where more than that time was actually needed—I will not say I have never known a case, for there may have been a few—but if more time is really needed than afforded under the proposed rule, there will be no difficulty about getting unanimous consent whenever a Senator has not concluded his remarks and desires additional time in order to give essential views on an important measure. There is no trouble in the Senate about that. If there is one thing that the Senate is more liberal about than any other body in the world, it is in the courtesy of its Members to each other. It would be a very peculiar situation when a Senator could not get unanimous consent for a reasonable extension of his remarks when he asked it. There is no difficulty about that. The rule is a reasonable one and a just one; and under it, with the opportunity for unanimous consent on extraordinary occasions, I say the fullest possible necessary debate can easily be had.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. OWEN. I see no reason why unanimous consent should be required to give an extension of time. If the Senate desires to give an extension of time to any Senator, it ought to be capable of being done by a motion, if the Senate controls itself.

Mr. SMOOT. One vote would stop it under this resolution.

Mr. OWEN. One vote ought not to stop it. That is the point I make.

Mr. MARTIN. When a Senator has had an hour on the main question, and has had 20 minutes on each amendment, I think he might very readily put up with the rule as it is written and not expect to proceed further unless he can get unanimous consent. I think the rule is a reasonable one; I think it will help in the dispatch of business, and I sincerely hope it will be adopted by the Senate.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Certainly.

Mr. GRONNA. I share the Senator's opinion that the Senate ought to expedite its business, especially during the war. I have been here only a very short time, but I can remember that on one or two occasions it would have been impossible for the Senators who were chiefly interested in the matters that were pending to present to the Senate in an hour what they ought to have presented. I know that the Senator from Virginia has had occasion oftener than I have to observe matters of that kind. I could call attention to certain resolutions which have been introduced in this body, and which have been acted upon, where it would have been absolutely impossible for any Senator to present his views properly in an hour. Does the Senator think that on any question affecting a Senator's personal liberty, or on a question of personal privilege, there should be such thing as a limitation of time?

Mr. MARTIN. I will say to the Senator that I do not believe there has ever originated in the history of this country a question of personal liberty or of personal privilege when the views of a Senator could not have been presented in one hour.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not care to name the cases, but the Senator knows that there have been cases here where it would have been absolutely impossible for the Senator, I might say, whose position was challenged, to present his views in the time allowed by this proposed rule. We had before us here two

or three years ago a case of that kind, and the Senator from Virginia knows that it took several days for the Senator involved to present his case.

Mr. MARTIN. Several days were consumed, but I do not think it should have taken several days.

Mr. GRONNA. If the resolution is adopted, and the rules are changed, I think a Senator should have in his own right the privilege to speak on a question of personal privilege without reference to this limitation. I believe that the proposed rule ought to be amended in that respect.

Mr. MARTIN. The Senate will never deny a Senator the privilege, if there be occasion for him to occupy more than an hour. It is hard to conceive of a case that would require more than an hour. Too much talk is not argument. There is no case, though it involves the rights of a citizen or the rights of a State or the constitutional liberty of the people of this country, in which the Supreme Court of the United States allows more than one hour. It does not take so much time to present the views on these questions. Of course, the time can be consumed, but the time is not necessary. The argument can be condensed. A great deal may be said in one hour. I do not recall a single instance when all that was necessary to be said might not have been said in one hour.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. I offered an amendment to this resolution this morning providing for open sessions of the Senate with reference to treaties coming before the Senate. Has the Senator concluded how he feels about that amendment, whether it would be acceptable to those who are advocating this resolution or not?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I hope that will be eliminated and will be presented as a separate proposition. Personally, I am opposed to open debate on treaties. I think we have gotten along very well during the entire history of the Government under the rule of secret sessions in the consideration of treaties. There are times when they should be considered in open session, and the Senate can so order whenever it sees fit; but speaking personally, and not having exchanged views with a single Senator on the floor, I do not think it desirable to change that rule, and personally I shall vote against an amendment to that effect. I should like to have it go over to some other time, and let this come up as a plain, simple, narrow proposition, and not be embarrassed by bringing in other questions.

Mr. President, I have consumed more time than I intended. I have strong convictions, I have sincere feelings, about this matter. I believe this rule will facilitate the dispatch of business in the Senate and that it will afford every reasonable opportunity for legitimate debate, and I sincerely hope it will be adopted.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I am anxious that we may have an opportunity to get a vote on this question and have the Senate decide affirmatively whether it intends to adopt a rule or not to adopt a rule for the limitation of debate during the war period.

Mr. President, the basis of our Government is the rule of the majority. Of necessity, the rule of the majority must be the basis of all government that is organized and not autocratic. Of course, I do not mean by that to say that the minority ought not to be represented, that the minority has not the right to be heard, that the minority has not the right to have its proposals considered; but in the last analysis, if we are to have a government the majority must rule. That is the whole spirit of our Republic.

In my judgment, the reason why a rule establishing limitation on debate in the Senate never has been adopted up to this time is not because the country is in danger if the power of the minority to cause unusual delay is not continued in the Senate. When the present rules of the Senate were adopted and the procedure, so far as debate is concerned, became a part of the rules of this body, there were 26 Senators of the United States; and for many years afterwards, for nearly a half century, the membership of this body was not largely increased. It must be apparent to all that the question of a parliamentary body conducting its business resolves itself entirely into a question of the number of men who must transact business in the body. As the report in this case says, if you had a triumvirate consisting of three men there would be no difficulty in their transacting their business without a chairman, without rules of procedure, and without limitation on the time of debate; but if you had a legislative body composed of a thousand men, of necessity you could not do business without having a presiding officer, without having rules of procedure, and unless the majority of that thousand men were authorized to close debate and proceed to transact business and dispose of it at any hour and any time.

The condition in the United States Senate has materially changed since the adoption by the original Senate of the United States of this rule providing for unlimited debate. Twenty-six men could transact their business, and do it efficiently, without a rule limiting the time of debate. To-day there are 96 Members of this body. It must be apparent to all that a small minority can stop the legislative wheels, slow down the machine, and prevent business being transacted, unless some limitation is placed on debate.

The Rules Committee, instead of proposing to the Senate a resolution authorizing a majority of the Senate by motion to order the previous question and cut off debate, have concluded that the same result may be obtained and that the legitimate transaction of business may be expedited without a gag rule, without placing in the hands of the majority the power to cut off all debate, but by merely limiting to a reasonable time the power of a single Senator to occupy the floor of the Senate.

If this resolution should not be adopted, why not? In the first place, it is not proposed to ask the Senate to adopt it as its final conclusion for all time to come. The terms of the resolution itself limit its operation to the period of the war.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. SHIELDS. Just at that point I should like the Senator to explain whether or not this resolution would affect legislation after the active hostilities had ceased, not relating to the prosecution of the war—for I apprehend that to be the main reason for introducing it now—but looking toward the settlement and adjustment of the relations of this country with our allies and with all foreign countries. Very important measures may then come up that ought to be debated very elaborately. And a further question: Would it affect the deliberations of the Senate in considering any treaty of peace that might be negotiated and upon which the Senate would be compelled to pass?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The resolution says "during the period of the present war." I take it that the period of the present war will last until a treaty of peace is signed, and therefore that the resolution would be effective until that day; and I see no reason why it should not be effective until that day. The after-the-war business of the Congress undoubtedly will not present itself until a treaty of peace is signed, because the Congress must know with surety that the war has been concluded and peace has come to the country before it can attempt to adjust its legislation to peace conditions.

As to the question whether there should be a limitation on the power of debate in considering a peace treaty, I see no reason why there should not be a limitation of debate. It may be most important to have a limitation of debate. More than that, I take it that when the hour comes that a final treaty of peace is signed by the President of the United States and submitted to this body for its ratification, when the world is ready to make peace, when the nations of the world through their executive heads have signed a treaty of peace, it would be a very bold man indeed who would stand in the Senate to stop the consummation of such a treaty. The probabilities are, of course, that when that final treaty of peace comes before the Senate, there will be many things in it that will not meet with your approval or my approval. If we waited until we got a treaty of peace on which we could all agree as being exactly what we wanted, we might wait forever.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does not the Senator think that the cloture rule which is now incorporated in the rules of the Senate would take care of the situation which he is now describing in connection with the discussion of a treaty of peace?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It would take care of it in one way; yes. It would take care of it with a gag proposition.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Would it not take care of it in all statesmanlike ways?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; not at all. It would not accomplish the purpose of this proposition.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the Senator what would be the purpose of this proposed rule as applied to the debate in the United States Senate on the treaty which shall end this war?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state the question. I think it very pertinent to the whole rule. If we had a rule authorizing the ordering of the previous question that was effective, that could be put in operation so as to limit debate and at the same time have a thorough consideration of the questions before the

Senate, it would be far from my purpose to offer an amendment to change it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will allow me to answer the question of the Senator from New York first, then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But the rule that we have now in the Senate, adopted at the beginning of this Congress, is ineffective except for one purpose, and that is that when there is a deliberate, systematic filibuster on, when a small minority is attempting to prevent the majority from doing business, then, in the course of time it can be put into operation and made effective so far as concerns bringing the main question to an issue and voting on it; but it does not bring the main question to an issue with fair and just consideration of the questions involved. In other words, it is not at all probable that you could get the previous question ordered under the present rule of the Senate until there had been unlimited debate for a long time.

As a general rule, that debate would be confined to the main question, it would be confined to the main purpose, and would not come down to a real consideration of the amendments or a proper shaping of the legislation before the Senate.

Then when 16 Members of this body sign the petition and send it to the desk and it is read, the Senate would have to wait over a day before it could consider it, with practically 48 hours intervening between the time when the Senate was prepared to order a cloture and when it could make cloture effective. And when it did order cloture, what would be the effect? It would cut off debate on the original bill, cut off debate on the amendments, prohibit the offering of future amendments, and bring the Senate to a direct vote on the measure as it stands before the Senate, with the amendments that are already proposed, without an opportunity to discuss them. It cuts off any opportunity to further amend or further modify amendments before the Senate. It takes an ax and drives it through the consideration of legislation, without perfecting it, because there is no other way to accomplish the result. Now, that rule may be necessary, it may be effective at times, but it is not the way to perfect legislation and bring about a desirable result. I now yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Speaking of the treaty which shall conclude this conflict, in which the people of the United States would be more directly interested, perhaps, than anything upon which the Congress will have to pass for many years, does the Senator believe that it is more important to limit debate upon the treaty than it is that the treaty shall be heard in open session before the people of the country?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection to the consideration of the treaty in open session when it comes, as far as I am individually concerned. Of course, the Senator knows what the rules of the Senate are. I do not know whether those rules would provide for that at the time or not.

Mr. BORAH. I have offered an amendment which will put it beyond question that the treaty shall be heard in the open.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not sure that I am not in favor of the consideration of treaties in the open. I am not at all averse to the consideration of the great peace treaty in open session, as far as the lights before me now. I can call to mind some questions that for international reasons it might be wiser for the Senate to consider behind closed doors, but that is not involved in this question. That is an entirely different question.

Mr. BORAH. It is involved in the fact that I have offered an amendment to the resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I hope the Senator will not encumber this resolution in that way.

Mr. BORAH. No; I am trying to add strength to it.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. To make clear the situation, may I ask the Senator, is there anything in the resolution that could not be abrogated by the Senate in the discussion of different matters, so as to leave that open to any future rule?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Nothing at all. When we reach a treaty of peace for consideration, the Senate can adopt a further rule, if the majority wants to do it. There will be no difficulty if this rule is adopted, and the Senate wants to adopt a rule providing that there shall be unlimited debate upon it. As a matter of

fact, I have no doubt that in the consideration of a peace treaty the Senate itself, by unanimous consent, will agree to a lengthy and unlimited debate, if the Members of the Senate desire it when that time comes.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know that I understood the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]. Did I understand the Senator to say that there is nothing in the Senate rules now which would prevent an open session of the Senate upon treaties?

Mr. LEWIS. No; Mr. President, I queried the Senator from Alabama whether there is anything in the present proposition that could not be abrogated when the time came to consider a peace treaty. In other words, I wish to have it manifest that the proposed rule, if passed, would not affect in the way of a barrier or obstruction any rule that we might choose to adopt for the purpose of discussing the peace treaty in open session.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I think there is a very good reason why the Senate should adopt this rule. I do not believe that there is any possibility of there being a filibuster in the Senate to prevent legislation that the majority wishes to enact during the period of this war. There has been an undoubted disposition in the membership of both sides of the Chamber to enact the legislation that the executive branch of the Government desires, in order to carry on the war. But we have had very long and almost interminable debate on several questions that have been before the Senate. If there was anything for the good of the country that was accomplished by long debate I do not know it. I do not mean to say there is a condition that is not benefited by the debate, and amendments were not adopted that improved the legislative condition; but in my judgment the length of the debate did not improve the legislative situation.

Before this Congress adjourns, nay more, I will say before this war is over, because that is the length of this resolution, a great many questions of vital importance to the people of this country and to the civilization of the world are coming before the Senate for its consideration. They are questions not only that must be voted upon, but they are questions that should be considered, and I want to say that I am one of those men in the Senate who believe that our unlimited right of debate is the leading cause of the lack of consideration by the United States Senate of most of the bills that come before it for enactment.

It is said sometimes, and said with pride, that the Senate of the United States is a great deliberative body. That may be true, but the further you extend the field of deliberation the narrower you draw the scope of legitimate consideration of general legislation that comes before this body, because it must be apparent to all who consider it that when the Senate of the United States takes months for deliberation and debate on one measure, which it many times has done in the past few years, it cuts off the consideration of other legislation that must be passed by this body.

I can recall an instance that occurred some years before I became a Member of the Senate, when a measure then pending was debated for months in a short session, and in order to prevent an extra session of Congress it was necessary to pass practically all the accumulated legislation of the session—appropriation bills and other bills of vast importance—by unanimous consent without consideration within the last few days of that session. And that will occur continually.

I think in order that we should have wise legislation, safe legislation, there should be a fair and reasonable opportunity for every Member of this body to present his views and the position of his constituency to this legislative body and to propose such amendments as he thinks are in the interest of his constituency and for the benefit of the country; and when he has done that he has no right to further delay legislation. He has no right to stop the legislative machine, and if he does so by additional debate he is merely preventing the consideration of other important business, sometimes during the existence of the Congress.

I see no reason why this rule should not be adopted. It is reasonable in its limitations. There are very few questions that ever come before the Senate of the United States where proper preparation is made that can not be discussed within the period of an hour, and if those questions are of such vast importance that they require more than an hour for legitimate debate I have no doubt that the Senate will agree itself for an extension of the time, as it can under this rule.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does not the Senator mean that every Member of the Senate present must agree?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It can be done readily by unanimous consent. If any gentleman on the other side, or on either side, desires to offer an amendment which will provide that the time can be extended, either by unanimous consent or a vote of a majority of the Senate, I shall be very glad to agree to it, as far as I am concerned. There would be no objection in the world.

The whole object of this rule is merely for the purpose of allowing the majority of the Senate to transact its business, and if the majority of the Senate are not prepared to bring the Senate to a vote but are willing to extend the time I can see no objection to allowing the majority to control the situation. I do not think it is necessary, but there could be no objection to that proposition if that is all that stands in the way of the adoption of a reasonable rule, but that a reasonable rule is necessary there can be no doubt.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator whether under this proposed rule a condition of debate which I am going to describe could take place? We adopted a unanimous-consent agreement while a bill was pending that debate should be limited to 20 minutes on the bill and 5 minutes on each amendment. The ruling of the Chair was that although the Senator had not spoken upon the bill, yet when he rose an amendment was pending and he had to be limited to five minutes. It seemed to me at the time that that was a great injustice, but nevertheless that was the ruling of the Chair and, if I remember correctly, there has been no overruling of that decision.

I believe in the pending resolution there ought to be a limitation of one hour to debate on the bill; but if a Senator has not exercised his privilege of one hour of debate and an amendment is pending he ought not to be confined to 20 minutes but should be confined to the 1 hour of general debate and the 20 minutes in addition, if he desires. I ask the Senator whether such a privilege would be given under the resolution as reported by the committee?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think there can be any doubt about that. The proposal merely says that no Member shall occupy more than one hour in debate. That is a negative proposition. It does not say when he shall occupy it or how he shall occupy it; it merely says that he shall occupy no more than one hour. Undoubtedly under that language he could occupy that hour at any time he pleased in any way he pleased, but when he had occupied that hour in general debate his time for general debate would be over and he would be confined to 20 minutes on amendments after that time.

Mr. SHAFROTH. After he had used his one hour?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think there can be any question about the way the rule reads and that a Member could occupy one hour in general debate at any time he saw proper.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator state whether it is the purpose of his amendment of the rules to have it apply to the consideration of treaties?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator calls my attention to a point that I started to answer a moment ago and I did not fully consider then what occurs to my mind now. I am inclined to think the rule does not apply to treaties. I stated a while ago that I thought it did, but the rule reads this way:

That no Member shall occupy more than one hour in debate, unless by unanimous consent, on any bill or resolution.

I do not know whether a treaty would be considered a bill or resolution; probably not. I would have no objection to having it apply to a treaty resolution, but I doubt whether the terms of the resolution are broad enough as it is now written to cover a treaty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. My recollection is that the Senate in executive session generally adopts a resolution ratifying a treaty, and that might come within the term of this amendment of the rules for that reason. I suppose the Senator would be willing to except the consideration of resolutions ratifying treaties.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would have no objection to that. When I come to consider it I do not think the resolution is broad enough to cover treaties in executive session. The purpose of the resolution is primarily to give the Senate a chance to give legitimate consideration to all the legislation that comes before the body and not undue deliberation to a part of the legislation that comes before the body. I think it will accomplish the result. I think this is the only way we can accomplish the result. I do not think there is a particle of harm that can come out of this resolution. There is no issue that is coming here during the war period that is going to be decided along partisan lines, that is not going to be passed, if the executive branch of the Government concludes that the legislation is necessary to carry on the war. On the other hand, the question of the Senate considering all the bills and considering them carefully does mean a reasonable limitation on debate. It can not mean anything else.

As a distinguished Senator said awhile ago, many delays in the Senate are caused by the fact that it is necessary to have a quorum present in the Senate. Mr. President, in my judgment the reason for the delays on that score is the fact that we have unlimited debate. Members will listen to a speech for a reasonable length of time, they will listen to speeches when they know there is action going to be taken in a reasonable time and the measure is coming to a vote, but when you have unlimited debate, speeches running four, five, and six hours in length, Members will not stay in the Chamber, and they do not stay in the Chamber except under very exceptional circumstances. If the debate is limited to an hour Senators will wait and listen for the conclusion of the speech.

Mr. President, we are not winning on the western front; our enemy's vessels are at our very doors to-day, destroying our commerce. The American people must awake to the fact that they must win the war and that on them alone depends the result of winning the war. The Senate of the United States may as well realize now that we are just beginning our war legislation. To fight this war out to an ultimate conclusion may mean a period of four or five years to come; it will mean the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of lives; it will mean the levying of billions on billions of taxation. It will mean the appropriation of the vastest sums of money that this country has ever known.

Those great questions coming before the Senate are entitled to its serious consideration, its earnest consideration, and its full consideration. That can not be accomplished by unlimited debate. It may be pleasing on some questions to run the debate to a last analysis, but it will not accomplish results. To fairly consider the questions coming before us and to fairly dispose of them we must have a reasonable limitation of debate on the main question and then reasonable and fair opportunity to consider amendments offered to legislation coming before the Senate.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Just one moment, and I will yield to the Senator.

I want to challenge Senators here to point me to the time when there has been a great measure before the Senate in recent years open for consideration when it was not necessary, finally, by reason of unlimited debate, either to adopt the cloture rule, that cut off all consideration of amendments, or to agree to a unanimous-consent rule, and practically cut off the consideration of vital and important amendments at the conclusion of a general debate that led nowhere and went nowhere.

Now I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama has just adverted to the fact that we would be called upon to make heavy appropriations. The Senator will recall that during the past year large appropriation bills have come before the Senate for consideration, and I recall that in nearly every instance those bills, calling for staggering amounts of seven or eight billion dollars, including the bonding bill, were passed with but very limited debate; there was no opposition. So it has been with practically every measure that has come before the Senate since we embarked upon this war.

Does the Senator from Alabama think, in the light of the experience that we have had during the past year, there is any necessity for this rule? Does not the course of the Senate argue and prophesy that there is no necessity for it; that the patriotism of Senators here is such that they will not indulge in any debate that is unreasonable, that will delay important and imperative legislation; that they are ready to enact such laws as may be required to meet our foe and to meet the great crisis that now confronts us?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I am not impugning the patriotism of the Senate; I do not say that it is unpatriotic for any Senator to speak six hours in debate if he thinks six hours are necessary; but when 10 or a dozen Senators each speak six hours it very materially delays public business. I will say to the Senator from Utah that in the consideration of the appropriation bills immediately after the war broke out, none of us knew much about the contents of those bills, not even the members of the committee, because they were new matters, and we did not know where they led. I will also say that one reason for the lack of consideration of those bills was in the fact that the Senate's time was taken up by other matters, and it did not desire to occupy time on appropriation bills on which, in many instances, time could be wisely and well spent for at least a reasonable length of debate and consideration.

But we are approaching a summer, probably the most historic summer in the history of our country; possibly the most critical summer in the life of this Nation; a summer when we must get our men to the firing line; when we must provide the supplies that are going to win this war, and when we are going to levy on the American people a system of taxation that will be right,

that will be just, that will be necessary; but that in all probability will hurt. The taxation that has fallen on the American people up to this time has not in the main hurt; it has not been taxation that men had to make sacrifices to bear in the main; but, in my judgment, we are approaching a condition in this country when a tax will be levied heavily enough and drastically enough, and must be levied in that way, when the people of the United States will feel it. To levy that class of taxes and pass those bills in a reasonable time it will be necessary for some proper limitation on debate in the Senate to be adopted, and to be adopted at this time, unless it is proposed and expected that the great revenue bill to support this war and to maintain our armies in the field is to be pending between the two Houses until next fall. That is not necessary; we have got to do the work; we have got to do it well. There is no reason why the revenue bill that is approaching should not be disposed of in the early summer, and yet be ably written and carefully considered, if there are reasonable rules and reasonable opportunities for its consideration presented to the Senate of the United States.

I very much hope, Mr. President, that this resolution will be adopted, and that we may have an early disposition of it by the Senate.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. Suppose the same thing should happen in reference to the next revenue bill which happened as to the last revenue bill? Of course the Senator from Alabama recollects that the last revenue bill came from the Finance Committee to the Senate, but it did not seem to be approved by a majority of the Members of the Senate. It was therefore sent back to the committee, but it was argued at length before it was so sent back. After its recommitment it was again reported to the Senate, having been very materially changed. Supposing such a thing as that again happens, does the Senator from Alabama believe that an hour's debate by each Senator would be sufficient on the entire bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can say to the Senator from North Dakota that, of course, the question of what each Senator thinks is the time necessary for him in order to present his views to the country on a legislative measure is a question of personal equation. I can, however, say to the Senator that I once reported a great revenue bill to the House of Representatives, which is on the statute books to-day, and I presented the views of the Ways and Means Committee to the House of Representatives within an hour. I did it satisfactorily to myself, and, I think, to the satisfaction of the House, and I have never heard any complaint as to the length of debate on that subject.

Mr. GRONNA. I presume the Senator did so; but I am afraid I have not made myself clear to him. I wanted to know if a Senator would have but one hour on a bill when it was first reported, and then, supposing it was recommitment and that an entirely new bill should be written, would he have but one hour altogether?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not understand the proposed rule in that way.

Mr. GRONNA. But it would be the same bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If there is any question about that, I would be glad to have the resolution modified so as to cover it.

Mr. GRONNA. I am very glad to hear the Senator say that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But, of course, if a bill up for consideration before the Senate is recommitment to the committee and subsequently reported back, I would regard it as having a new legislative status, and that each Senator could debate it for an hour. If, however, as I have said, there is any question about that, I should be glad to see the resolution modified.

Mr. GRONNA. I made the inquiry merely for the purpose of understanding the resolution. I think it is very important we should understand it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would have no objection to a modification on that score.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I have no doubt that a Senator reporting a bill, even a great revenue bill, could compress all that is necessary to be said in an hour; but in regard to a great revenue bill, suppose the chairman of the committee reporting the bill makes no speech at all, the man does not live who in carrying a great revenue bill through the Senate can cover as little as an hour merely in answering questions that are asked him.

Under this rule he would be deprived of an opportunity to explain his bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I have said, I do not think there is any question that if additional time were needed the Senate, by unanimous consent, would grant it; but when questions are asked the chairman they are asked and answered in the time of some other Senator, and if the chairman responds to questions of other Senators it is not a consumption of the time of the chairman, but a consumption of the time of the Senator who asks the questions.

Mr. LODGE. He may have to take the floor in order to make the explanation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, in the case of an amendment that may be so, but in my judgment—and I think the Senator from Massachusetts will bear me out—a great deal of unnecessary time is taken up in explaining amendments. On the idea that the country may not understand or the Senate may not understand the real objection to an amendment, although it is foreordained to defeat, as everybody knows, even if nothing in the world is said on the subject, I have seen it discussed for hours. Everyone knew when it was offered that it was not going to pass, but, nevertheless, the time of the Senate was occupied in that way.

Mr. President, that is all I desire to say on the question at this time.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I desire to present an amendment at this time so that the matter may be discussed. I ask that the proposed amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a pending amendment.

Mr. FALL. I understand that, and I simply wish to have read for information the amendment I intend to propose, and I will offer it formally at the proper time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add the following proviso:

Provided, That this rule limiting debate to one hour upon the main question and 20 minutes upon any amendment shall not apply, except by unanimous consent, to any bill, measure, or question which has been determined upon or agreed to by or in a party caucus or conference of Senators of the majority party.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I have, since my entrance into this body been in favor of a reasonable limitation upon debate, and I yet entertain that feeling. I may say, however, that this now being the only body in the United States in which debate can be carried to an informing extent to the people of the United States, I have to some extent modified my views, as we have changed many of our opinions during the course of the war.

From what has been said by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], having in charge the resolution, I have no doubt that he will accept the amendment. He remarked just before taking his seat that as to measures necessary to carry on the war there would be no partisan determination. I think that has been true so far.

Mr. President, I have, as I have said, favored a limitation upon debate, but I have believed that debate to the very limit was perfectly legitimate, and that a filibuster was perfectly legitimate as against a caucus measure. If the caucus simply meant, for instance, at this time that the entire 52 Democrats, composing the majority of the Senate, agreed that they were to put through a measure, that would be, of course, government by the majority party, spoken of by the Senator from Alabama; but the fact remains that, with 52 Members upon the majority side, in a caucus of those Senators 27 Senators can bind, as I have heard Senators upon the other side say, they have been bound against their will to a certain line of conduct, and to a certain vote upon a proposition.

So, Mr. President, not only can 27 Members control the legislation of the 96 Members of this body, but with 27, constituting a majority of the Democratic Senators present, and 14 constituting a majority of the 27, it is perfectly possible, by bringing into operation the party whip and calling a caucus of the majority at this time, for 14 Senators to control the legislation, war or otherwise, to be enacted by 96 Senators. Therefore as against the weapon of a party caucus debate carried to the extent of a filibuster is perfectly legitimate, and, in my judgment, is in the interest of the people whom we are supposed to represent here, not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Senators of the United States Senate. So much for this amendment. I conceive that the Senator from Alabama will see the justice of it, and, in view of the fact that we are not legislating on war measures upon party lines, that there will be no objection to its adoption.

Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], now pending, proposing that debate upon treaties

shall be in open session of the Senate, to my mind, is one which should be adopted. If there has been no necessity for it heretofore, there is the utmost necessity for it now. The President of the United States has said in a message to the world that when the different nations shall sit around the peace table the proceedings should be open; that nothing should be secret; that the treaty which he signs, as the Senator from Alabama states, should be considered openly. On the other hand, the treaty which we ratify, under the objection made to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho, must be considered secretly.

Mr. President, in the consideration of treaties presented to this body I can recall at least 25 treaties which, in my judgment as a Senator, would never have been ratified had they been discussed in the open. In my judgment, the people of the United States would never have allowed the ratification of the so-called Bryan peace treaties; and the people of the United States yet do not know what they are, because the people were not furnished with copies of those treaties to carry home and read. I opposed every one of them upon the ground that, instead of being a peace treaty, it was a challenge to war, and that the people of the United States would never allow the question of their national honor or of their national interests to be submitted, not to an arbitration tribunal, but to the other party in interest; that the adoption of the treaties meant that they would be torn up when the first occasion arose; and in my judgment, as I say, they never would have been adopted had they been discussed openly and the people informed as to what those treaties contained, as they have never yet been informed.

In my judgment had the treaty with Nicaragua been considered openly, as it was considered in secret session, while under the same statements made with reference to it, it would have been ratified, in my judgment, I think correctly—I think the Senate in ratifying it acted for the best interests both of Nicaragua and of this country—but had the reasons for its ratification been discussed openly, so that the people of the United States could have understood it, there never would have been the exceedingly great injustice done to Costa Rica and Honduras which has ensued from the ratification of the Nicaragua treaty. There never would have been the consequences of the ratification of that treaty as it was without the carrying out of pledges which some of us had that a similar treaty, or one along the same lines, satisfactory to Costa Rica and Honduras, was in course of preparation and would follow.

Had the policy as announced to some of us then been carried out you would have seen a different result. The world would not have witnessed the dissolution of the Supreme Court of Central America, which was inaugurated at the invitation of the United States, and which, I may say, we forced upon those people. With our delegates present during all their sessions we prevailed upon them to agree that instead of fighting and carrying their continual difficulties to the sword's point with one another they would leave matters in dispute between themselves to a high tribunal to be constituted by each of the States. For years we had no difficulty among the Central American States. This court, the Supreme Court of Central America, was inaugurated. The plan was formed in the State Department at Washington. Those people were summoned here, and the representatives of the State Department attended their conferences and assisted in the formation and working out of the plans forming the Supreme Court of Central America, to which all difficulties should be relegated. We knew here, and we discussed here, the fact that there were serious difficulties between Costa Rica and Honduras upon the one hand and Nicaragua upon the other, and that we were ratifying a treaty with Nicaragua knowing that we were doing an injustice to Costa Rica, particularly; knowing that the President of the United States—President Cleveland—had decided the very point in issue with reference to the Nicaragua route, for which we were paying \$2,000,000, in favor of the Costa Rican Republic.

Knowing that Costa Rica had an equal interest in Fonseca Bay, as did Honduras, we purchased from Nicaragua rights upon Fonseca Bay; and so far as I am concerned, sir, I will say frankly that my vote in favor of the ratification of the treaty with Nicaragua was cast because I had personal assurances that treaties with Costa Rica and with Honduras of a satisfactory nature would be carried along with it and presented to us for ratification, settling all the difficulties between this country and Costa Rica, Honduras, and Nicaragua, respectively.

What was the result of that act of injustice, which never would have been perpetrated had this treaty been discussed openly here in the Senate? The result was that Costa Rica and Honduras appealed to the high court which had been established for them at our instigation, and there each of them secured a judgment against Nicaragua, based upon this treaty

of ours; and then Nicaragua, hiding behind the provision in the treaty that we would protect her with our armed forces, defied the judgment of the Supreme Court of Central America, refused to abide by it, and no recourse was left or is left to Costa Rica or Honduras; and not one word yet has this Senate had to the effect that the State Department is undertaking to do justice to those two countries, which have been robbed of their territory by the ratification of a treaty by this body.

Mr. President, all the good work done by Elihu Root in Latin America has practically been done away with because we have not discussed Latin-American affairs here openly and knowingly, and have not understood them; and in our consideration here of treaties or propositions concerning Latin-American countries we do not understand Latin America, and never will understand it. Open debate is more necessary upon matters of this kind than upon any other matters pending before this body or which may pend before this body, in my judgment. I know that a majority of the older statesmen upon this side of the Chamber do not agree with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from New Mexico and others here who have voted upon every occasion for open consideration of treaties; but, Mr. President, I say again, as I have said here before, that the people of the United States are entitled to know all about their foreign affairs. They are entitled to know whom we send to foreign countries now to negotiate for us, and they are entitled to know what character of negotiations are carried out. The people of the United States are entitled to know what agreement has been made with the allied countries and is being carried out through the deliberations of the allied war council, in which Clemenceau represents France, and Lloyd-George represents Great Britain, and the minister of foreign relations represents Italy, and we know not who represents the United States.

In strictly war matters we have a Chief of Staff representing the United States; but in the other matters which are being constantly passed upon we have no one representing us, as I understand, except a Mr. Crosby, whom I have not the pleasure of knowing, officially or otherwise, or knowing of, I may say. We were all acquainted with the name of Col. House, who apparently attended this council at one time, but we are informed that he is now in the United States. We know nothing of the report which he has made. Our foreign affairs are not being carried on through the officials named in the Constitution and in the laws of the United States, but apparently all our foreign relations are in the hands of men unknown to the law and unknown to the Constitution.

"No secret diplomacy," Mr. President? There never has been, at any previous period in the life of this great country of ours, the secrecy that exists now with reference to foreign relations, both with neutral countries and with belligerents and with our allies. I defy any of you, even during executive sessions, to give to the Senate any information of any kind or character with reference to the relations of this Government with foreign countries. In no instance in the history of this country, prior to this administration, has a President, in addressing the Congress of the United States when great foreign affairs were pending, failed or refused to give the Congress all the information which could be made public with reference to the details of the conduct of the foreign relations of this country, and to send in privacy to the respective bodies the data upon which the information was given. I defy you to look through the messages and documents of the Presidents of the United States, from the day of George Washington to that of Woodrow Wilson, and challenge the statement which I have made here. Now, above all times, are we justified in overturning the practice of the Senate for the last hundred years or more, and in demanding, in all foreign relations with which under the Constitution this body has anything to do, that at least through this body shall the people of the United States, whom we represent, be informed as to their affairs.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, this morning I offered an amendment to this resolution which reads as follows:

Add the following as a new section:

"That all treaties shall be considered and acted upon by the Senate in its open or legislative session, unless four-fifths of the Members of the Senate, by yeas-and-nays vote, shall determine to close the doors during the consideration of the particular treaty upon which the vote to close the doors is taken.

"That this rule shall not be limited to the period of the war."

I insert the latter clause by reason of the fact that the main resolution has a clause which limits the other proposed amendment to the period of the war; otherwise, it would have been unnecessary to insert that clause.

Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary for me to say that this amendment is offered in good faith, and will be urged to a final conclusion. It is a proposition which some of us

have been advocating for the last 10 years, and with which, so far, we have not made very rapid progress. Several months ago I offered a resolution asking the Committee on Rules to report concerning the advisability of discussing treaties in the open—a committee of which the honorable Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is a member, and others—and it shows really that the delay in this body is not in the open sessions, but in the committee. That resolution has been with the committee for several months, and so far no report whatever has been made upon it. I assume it is by reason of the fact that they have no limitation upon debate in the committee. So it necessitates offering the amendment upon the floor of the Senate in order that we may have a hearing at all upon the subject.

Mr. President, six minutes is not sufficient time in which to present this amendment and the reasons why it should be adopted; but I want to say to the Members upon the majority side of the Chamber that the Senator from Idaho ought not to be the one called upon to advocate this amendment. It ought to come from the majority side of the Chamber. It ought to be supported upon that side by reason of the fact that it is the carrying out of the repeatedly pronounced policy of the President. We shall not be able to satisfy those with whom we are dealing abroad, nor our own people, that our many asseverations with reference to open policy concerning foreign affairs are in good faith if we defeat this amendment.

I was surprised to hear the leader of the majority say this morning that he was opposed to this amendment; and I trust that upon fuller investigation and fuller consideration of the resolution the leader upon the majority side will conclude that it is in harmony with the program which has been outlined by the President, and not only in harmony with the program which has been outlined by the President, but in this instance thoroughly in harmony with the general trend of affairs with reference to foreign matters.

The President, in his message upon the 8th of January, 1918, among other things, said:

The program of the world's peace, therefore, is our program; and that program, the only possible program, as we see it, is this:

1. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

No other provision or clause among the 14 separate propositions which the President submitted to the country and to the world as prerequisite to a permanent and abiding peace received more consideration and discussion in the literature of the world, particularly abroad, than the one which I have just read. There were many publicists in England who were open advocates of this policy prior to the beginning of this war, and they have repeatedly stated facts which, to my mind, justify their conclusion that if this policy of open diplomacy, of inhibition against secret understandings among different nations, of open consideration of all negotiations between nations had obtained for the last 40 years in Europe this war would have been avoided. It was the secret and sinister combination of those who did not represent those who now must pay the taxes and carry the burdens and fight the battles of this war which finally, in their entangling understandings and agreements, brought on this great conflict. The most marvelous thing, sir, of the twentieth century—a time when the trend is toward open, candid, democratic government—is that a few men have been permitted to sit about secret council tables and barter and trade in the lives, not only of individuals and peoples but of nations, and to enter into treaties, alliances, and engagements which must ultimately result, if their ambitions were to be satisfied, in just such conflicts as the one in which we are now engaged. Anyone who is familiar or who desires to familiarize himself with the history of diplomacy, the secret alliances and combinations and understandings of the supposed leaders or of the real leaders of Europe during the last 40 years, will find therein the secret of this conflict which is now approaching our very doors. And yet, sir, the most pronounced democracy of the world hesitates to close in upon this proposition and to announce, once and for all, that the people who pay the taxes and fight the battles and suffer and die shall know the kind of contract which we make with other peoples during the time that it is being made.

It is a travesty upon common sense, it is a grim piece of humor, to say to the people of the United States: "You shall know the contents of the treaty after it has been made, after it has been ratified. After you are tied and bound, shackled by the agreement, you shall know the contents of it, when you have no power to reject it."

The time in which to turn on the light of public opinion and to put the negotiators who deal in the affairs of nations upon record is when public opinion will be upon those who are

closing the negotiation and where public opinion will have the power to stay the combinations which are to gratify the individual ambitions of diplomats and leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WOLCOTT in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 9959.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the unfinished business if he will be willing to allow this resolution of the Senate to be considered to a conclusion?

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to accommodate the Senator, but I am quite sure the discussion would take the balance of the day. I allowed this bill to go over last week until to-day with a distinct understanding that it should be proceeded with at this time. I desire to proceed with the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wish to say that I shall endeavor tomorrow to bring up the resolution and secure a vote upon it at some reasonable time.

INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9959) increasing rates of pensions of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War.

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

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

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

Bankhead	Hardwick	McKellar	Shields
Beckham	Henderson	McNary	Simmons
Borah	Hitchcock	Martin	Smith, Ga.
Brandegee	Johnson, Cal.	Myers	Smith, Md.
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson	Smoot
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sutherland
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Swanson
Curtis	Kellogg	Page	Thompson
Dillingham	Kendrick	Penrose	Townsend
Fall	Kenyon	Phelan	Underwood
Fernald	King	Pittman	Vardaman
France	Kirby	Poinceter	Wadsworth
Gronna	Lenroot	Ransdell	Warren
Guion	Lewis	Saulsbury	Wolcott
Hale	Lodge	Sheppard	
Harding	McCumber	Sherman	

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] on business of the Senate. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

I should like also to announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] is absent on business of the Senate, and I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. LEWIS. May I be permitted also at this time to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] and the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL], detained on public business? I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

I desire also to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] occasioned by illness in his family, and of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] by personal illness.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], is absent on account of illness.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the extreme nature of the substitute reported by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] from the Committee on Pensions. Where an injury takes place in the service I believe in most liberal care for the injured. Where there is simply service without any injury and the party is mustered out sound, I do not believe in giving a pension at all. I have expressed that view quite often, and I had the privilege of urging it against Spanish-American War pensions. Where the widow is the widow of a man who was a soldier, married before he went into the Army, I can see an excellent reason for providing for her, but where he was mustered out and subsequently married I do not understand why, because he has been in the service, it should cause pensions in vast quantities for widows.

The only excuse that I understand there is for a pension to one who leaves the Army sound and without injury grows out of the fact that if a man has rendered gallant service in battle for his country, and misfortune should subsequently overcome him, it makes a strong case of appeal to his country to see that he is guarded against misfortune. But that is not the substitute of the Senator from Utah. That is the bill, in a sense, as passed by the House. The Senator from Utah proposes to pay as much as \$480 a year to men who served in the Army, who came out without a scratch, who rendered no special service, who have been prosperous in life, and who perhaps have in-

comes of \$50,000 a year. Without an injury in the service, without any special claim, without actually reaching the front or being in a battle, from the mere fact that they are on the roll, without exception, no matter how rich, the pension may go to \$480 a year.

I can not justify, I can not excuse, a charge, especially in the present condition of the Treasury, of between \$30,000,000 and \$40,000,000 a year for such a purpose.

It has been the custom of the committee where there was a special burden of sickness and want resting upon the soldier to carry the pension up to something like this sum.

Now, let us see the provision in the House bill.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator might state at that point, too, that a large number of those served only about 90 days, or a few days over that—from 90 days to 6 months.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Some of them never got to the front at all. You do not limit it to men who got in reach of bullets. You put it in the same class as the effort which was made to pension the Spanish-American soldiers. Many of them were citizens of my State who never got to Cuba, who never were shot at.

I have seen no excuse for going into the Treasury in behalf of those men, and I have, with a sense of duty performed, sought to check pensions of this character for them.

Now, mark the distinction. I do not wish to be misunderstood. If they were injured, even in camp; if they were wounded in the service; if their services have brought scars or lessened their capacity for future usefulness to themselves and their families, I think it is right that the country should bear the loss and not the injured man. This Smoot amendment, however, is a service pension, without regard to injury.

Mr. SMOOT. So is the bill passed by the House.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I know; but the House bill has a limitation on it.

I started to say that I am opposed to all service pensions, but yours is much worse than the House bill, because the latter is put on the theory that where a man has served in the Army and has not any substantial income, the Government will help him, but you do it without regard to his needs. The cry has been always heretofore that you can not afford to let a man who served gallantly in the Army, and who has become needy subsequent to the war, suffer. There is something in that appeal; but this provision of the Senator from Utah gives \$480 a year to men who perchance never heard the roar of musketry, who were never within the line of battle, and who may be worth to-day their thousands and thousands.

I can see no excuse for it except that there are a large number of them, and it is mighty hard to stop an appropriation when it reaches a great many people. I have found that a small appropriation touching only a few people is much easier to stop than a large appropriation touching a great many people, an appropriation which will carry from the Treasury money into the pockets of a great many people. Here is the House provision:

Sec. 3. That no pensioner shall be entitled to receive any benefits under the provisions of this act for any period during which he shall be an inmate of any State or National soldiers' home; and the provisions of this act shall not apply to any pensioner whose net annual income from all sources, including his pension, is \$1,000 or more.

A man with a thousand dollars a year is certainly protected from want. The chief object of the substitute of the Senator from Utah is to strike out that provision. More people are reached if we strike that out; the distribution is broadened.

The House bill carries a pension, if the party has served 90 days, of \$27 per month, six months \$29, one year \$31, one and a half years \$35, two years \$39 per month. The proposal of the Senator from Utah as to amount is that anyone on the pension roll who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service \$30. The service in the Navy was without the slightest danger. They were just as safe as any man on an ordinary boat before the submarine was known, and yet for 90 days' service on board a vessel, with no opposing ship, with no navy against them with which to contend, the person is to have for the balance of his life \$360 a year, no matter how much he is worth, no matter how successful he has been in business, no matter how much his little 90-day trip contributed to his health and strengthened him for future activity. It is an unreasonable proposition.

Then it says six months \$32, one year \$35, one and a half years \$38, two years \$40: "Provided, That this amendment shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private." It is vastly more objectionable than the House bill.

I confess that when a man has worn the uniform of his country and stood up for it and fought for it, even if he comes out sound and in his old age is poor and needy, I have not much heart to object to helping take care of him, but why not be satisfied with the provision of the House bill? That carries the income up to a thousand dollars a year. Do not undertake to give this sum to men who left the service without a wound, without a scratch, without an injury, and who were never in reach of a bullet and who have now more than they need.

Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate. I merely felt that if I did not express my conviction on this subject I would be rather running from a responsibility. If the Senator from Utah had a list of men who had suffered from the service, if he had a list of men who had been wounded, men who had losses from the service, I think the case would be strong to make them sound. I wish it distinctly understood that my objection is to pensioning in this way those who were not hurt at all and who do not need the money.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, in the pension legislation of 1907, 1908, and 1912 we eliminated, and it was hoped that we had eliminated for all time, every thought of the pension roll being a roll of poverty-stricken soldiers. It was supposed that at that time we had made the pension roll a roll of honor, that any soldier who had fought for his country, battled for the Union and saved his country, could accept as an expression of gratuity from a grateful Government. I hope to God we will never go back upon the record we made at that time, so that any one of these old men, now from 75 to 90 years of age, can accept that expression of gratefulness on the part of a great rich Government without feeling that by so doing he is placing the stamp of pauperism upon his honorable record.

I hope that we will sustain the record that we made at that time, and I shall suffer the disappointment of my life if the Senate of the United States shall ever go back upon the record that it made then in eliminating this objectionable provision of our pension laws.

We applied that same rule to all soldiers. We applied it the same to the Mexican veterans. We did not ask whether they had a thousand dollars income a year or whether they had any support whatever. We said you served your Government, and now, being from 75 to 90 years of age, you shall receive this gratuity from your Government without feeling a pang of shame for having entered your name upon the pension roll.

Again, Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia says the only reason why we propose or seek to justify this bill is that it affects a large number—that it is so unjust we would only pass it in view of the fact of the great number, intimating probably the voting strength it might carry. Let me call the attention of the Senator to the fact that it does not cover anywhere near the number that the Adamson bill covered, which we passed in 1916, and which showed its good effect in the voting strength of those affected in the succeeding fall election. It does not cover anywhere near the number covered by the \$300,000,000 which will now be put on top of the benefits derived from the Adamson bill and which we submit to without reference to what effect it may have upon the numbers or upon the voting strength of any particular number of organizations in the United States.

Mr. President, before beginning this war \$40,000,000, the equivalent of 40 cents per capita of all the men and women and children in the United States, would have been a very large sum of money. Before our entry into this war no such appropriation would have been made without the greatest and most careful deliberation and forethought. But since our entry into the war we scarcely give any consideration to an appropriation of anything less than a billion dollars. We vote for \$640,000,000 for airplanes, and when the year goes by and we have not any planes in sight we vote for another billion dollars, without obtaining the slightest information as to what has become of the \$640,000,000 or whether we are to get anything out of that appropriation.

Again, we place \$40,000,000 in the hands of a censor, without even an inquiry as to what use he is going to make of it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The second sum for aeroplanes has not been before the Senate yet, has it?

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, it has already passed the House of Representatives to the amount of almost \$900,000,000, and it will probably go through the Senate without much consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is highly probable that it will, but I hope we shall be able to give the Senator some informa-

tion about it. The Senator said it passed without information. As I am on the subcommittee which is trying to get the information, I had just wondered if it had slipped through without my knowing it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am afraid that the Senator will not have a great deal of information for us by the time that bill gets here. It will pass with about the same consideration which was given the other appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. At least, however, I should like to know that it was passed. I should be embarrassed if, according to the suggestion of the Senator, it had slipped through and I did not even know that it had passed when I was thinking I was watching it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, the Senator from Georgia probably remembers that \$640,000,000 slipped through, and the Senator will probably also remember that we do not know what has become of it at a time when we are asked for nearly \$900,000,000 more.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The bill did not slip through. Both bodies understood that they were appropriating the money and thought we were going to have airplanes. Before we vote upon the additional billion dollars, if we need so much, and can build airplanes and help whip the Germans with them—and I am going to vote for it—I hope I shall know more than I now know about what has been done with the previous appropriation. I think we shall have considerably more information upon that subject, not all of it satisfactory—some of it very unsatisfactory—but still we want the information as to what became of the money, however it went.

Mr. McCUMBER. And may I join the Senator from Georgia in the hope that the Senate will also find out what is going to be done with the other billion dollars, whether we shall get anything out of it, and how it is to be expended? Nothing of that character was attempted in the previous bill. But to proceed:

We placed \$40,000,000 in the hands of a censor, the whole equivalent of what is to be voted for the old soldiers, without the slightest inquiry as to what was to be done with it, and if that censor spends \$10,000,000 circulating socialistic literature—a literature which is calculated to destroy any government upon the face of the earth, the same as it has already destroyed Russia—we make no inquiry, but we submit to it and sit quietly by, without a murmur, because the censor is a part of the war administration.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

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

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator from North Dakota in the criticism which he is now making refer to Mr. Creel and his committee?

Mr. McCUMBER. I refer to the censor committee; and the Senator from Utah, of course, understands, as every one who listens to me does, who is the head of that committee and who is the real censor.

Mr. KING. If I may be pardoned, I hope the Senator from North Dakota will not impute to me any improper motive in interrogating him, because I am somewhat in sympathy with some of the criticisms he has made at various times, and have sometimes felt that the committee referred to was subject to just criticism, and I rose for information and not for the purpose of provoking any controversy.

The Senator has referred to the fact that certain literature, socialistic in character, has been promulgated by this committee. I should be very glad, as none of it has come to my attention, to be advised of that fact, because if it is true, and I could be convinced that this committee was disseminating literature of the character referred to, I would be one of the first to demand the abolition of the bureau or committee, whatever its title, Mr. Creel and all, because they have no right to take the money of the people of the United States and utilize it to advocate a change in our form of government or to promulgate the un-American and disastrous doctrines that have destroyed Russia.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will call upon that committee for a statement of their expenditures and the number of thousands of tons of literature of a socialistic character which have been sent broadcast over the country, he will perhaps secure the information he now desires.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield for just one further question?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. KING. Acting upon the suggestion of the Senator, I shall take the first occasion to request of the committee a copy

of everything which they have sent out aside from the daily publications.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish the Senator would do so, for I know, if I should offer such a proposition on this side, I should never get it through.

Mr. KING. And if it is of the character suggested by the Senator, I shall join him and shall ask his aid in working such reforms as will prevent a repetition of that evil.

Mr. McCUMBER. But, Mr. President, we are considering the awful extravagance of expending \$40,000,000 to relieve the sufferings of the few remaining soldiers who made it possible for us to have a Government to-day. When we appropriate \$150,000,000 for food control; in other words, when we spend \$150,000,000 to drive the price of the farmers' wheat below the market value, we scarcely scan the amount or stop to contemplate that we spend \$150 where we save \$1 by this Food Commission.

Again, when we vote \$150,000,000 to control the price of coal, and then decrease the coal output to such an extent that people freeze, we smile, and we take our medicine, because we say "this is one of the burdens of war." When we take over the railroads of the country and allow the Director General to appropriate \$300,000,000 to increase wages—and thereby increase his own popularity, thus killing two birds with one stone—and then charge this same \$300,000,000 back to the farmers who must ship over the railroads and compel them to pay 25 per cent more than they have been in the habit of paying for their freight, while you cut down their income 25 per cent, we grin and bear it as a part of the miseries and inequalities of this war.

As I said, Mr. President, when we appropriated \$640,000,000 for aircraft—enough to have furnished all the craft we could possibly use in 10 years if it had been expended honestly and efficiently—and when after wasting that we are asked to vote another billion dollars, we are told that we must expect extravagance in war times and that we must expect a great amount of graft!

I drove down Sixth Street the other evening, Mr. President, where employees were constructing Government buildings. I saw two pieces of timber 2 by 8, 14 feet long. They were nailed together by two little slats at the ends. Two men could have taken hold of those two slats and have carried those two pieces of timber anywhere. How many men were handling them? There were 6 men on each side—12 men altogether—carrying those two little pieces of timber, and there were 5 more men standing idly by because there was not any room for any more to get hold of the pieces of timber that they were removing.

A few rods from there a number were unloading a load of lumber composed of boards 1 inch thick by 6 inches wide and about 14 feet long. Any able-bodied man could have taken three of those boards and carried them. It took two men to lift one board of that size off the wagon, and then three men got hold of it, one in the middle and one at each end, and carried it away, while three other individuals stood idly by because there was no work for them to do. That is the way the Government's work is being done here during this war, when we demand more than has ever been demanded before in the history of the country, the physical efficiency of every man who performs labor for the Government.

Mr. CALDER rose.

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. CALDER. Is that a cost-plus job, I will ask the Senator?

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course it is all cost plus; the more men it takes the greater the profit. But you can get at the man who makes the profit, because you can tax him and you can get any per cent of that profit back into the Government coffers, but you never can get the 90 per cent waste of time.

Mr. CALDER. And waste.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; the waste of man power; that is lost forever.

Mr. President, I repeat when we employ five men to do the work of one and pay each of those five men three times his normal wages, we are asked to control our sense of indignation because these are war times and we must expect inefficiency and extravagance.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

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

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator from North Dakota was speaking a moment ago about the waste in the construction of buildings here in the city of Washington. While the Senator is of the

opposite political faith from myself, and I have not always agreed with his utterances, it has been a source of pleasure for me to hear him and to listen to his splendid outspoken Americanism. I want to corroborate what he has been saying as to the inefficiency of the administration that is charged with the building of public structures in this city. Repeatedly I have gone to the places where public buildings are being erected, and I desire to say that the waste there is inexcusable. If Mr. Sterrett, who is in charge of these contracts, as I am told, is responsible for their performance, his record calls for criticism. Whoever is constructing those buildings deserves to be denounced and condemned, not only here but elsewhere, for the waste and extravagance which they permit. I join with the Senator from North Dakota in his condemnation of the methods employed by some of these cost-plus contract men. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. CALDER. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] used the name of Col. Sterrett. In justice to Col. Sterrett, whom I know, I desire to say that he has nothing whatever to do with superintending the construction of buildings. He is a member of the committee that has to do with awarding contracts, but which has nothing whatever to do with managing the work on the jobs.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from North Dakota permit me to make an inquiry of the Senator from New York?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. KING. If Col. Sterrett has the letting of these contracts, he must know that some of the men who are performing the work are slackers and profiteers, and why does he not correct the abuse?

Mr. CALDER. I have no knowledge, Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will permit me, of just what method is pursued in handling this work, but I know that vast sums of money are being wasted because of the inefficiency of the management under the contracts. I was at the great quartermaster's base in Brooklyn on Saturday last, and I talked to a carpenter whom I know, and he said he was working 10 hours a day 7 days a week. For the 10 hours a day on week days he was receiving 12 hours' time, and for the 10 hours on Sunday he was receiving 20 hours' time, and was getting 70 cents an hour. He said the actual time that he worked in the 7 days was 70 hours, and he was given 92 hours' time, and received for that time something like \$64 a week. Not only is that a waste of money on the part of the Government, but it has the effect of taking from private business the men who are working along those lines, and requiring those who need men in their own business to pay double what ought to be paid. I join the Senator from Utah in condemning that sort of thing, but I hardly think it is fair to condemn Col. Sterrett for it, because I doubt if he is responsible directly for the management of the work of construction.

Mr. McCUMBER. The thing to be condemned is the whole system and the seeming complacency with which the administration views this enormous waste without taking any steps whatever to correct it. It has been stated in the press generally that the great waste in our shipyards is a thing of the past. Only a few days ago an overseer of labor in one of the principal shipyards in the United States saw me at my office and, without giving the name of the shipyard or the name of the individual, he said, "This claim of present efficiency in our shipyards sounds all right in the press, but I want to tell you frankly that we are not getting 50 per cent efficiency in the work of our shipyards." While all this is going on, this enormous extravagance, scandalous beyond anything that has ever happened in the history of the Government, we are sending soldiers over to Europe to fight our battles and we are not able to supply them because we have not the ships, we have not the munitions, we have not the force there that we ought to have been able to put there long before this time.

Mr. President, when we spend \$20,000,000,000 to accomplish that which ought to have been accomplished with \$5,000,000,000 we are asked to excuse it on the ground that we were unprepared and we must pay 75 per cent of our war taxes for experience. Of course we have got to pay for experience; but when you tell me that we have got to pay 75 per cent for our experience you are telling me of men in charge who are 75 per cent inefficient and unequal to the task imposed upon them.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

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

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

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from North Dakota is calling attention to this misuse of the

public funds. I have made a good deal of investigation along that line myself, and in every investigation that I have made the same slimy trail of the serpent of greed has been found. The Senator ought to, and I trust he will, pursue the inquiry until the Government official shall be discovered who is condoning or conniving at this species of thievery. The graft and profiteering is in the land and all that is necessary to reveal it in all of its nakedness is to turn on the light. It is all right to condemn the individual contractor who is profiting by this system, but the man primarily responsible to Congress and to the people is the Government official who knows about it and fails to stop it. I hope the Senator will continue his investigation and, if possible, discover the public officer who is betraying the Government and who is a party to this preposterous plundering of the Treasury. We made such a discovery at Hog Island, and ever since we made the discovery certain miserable, lying newspapers have been intimating that those of us who uncovered it were sympathizing with the enemy and that which we did was done for the purpose of delaying the building of ships. A more infamous, unfounded slander was never perpetrated by a hired liar. I think the time has come when the Congress should direct its attention to just such matters as the able Senator is now talking about, and if possible bring to justice the miserable traitors to the Government who are responsible for this robbery of the Public Treasury. The crime of which they are guilty is not less reprehensible because they do it under the guise of patriotism.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, Congress can do really but one thing. Congress appropriates the money, but Congress makes no appointments in the administrative departments of the Government. That is done by the President. We must rely upon him to make appointments of men who are competent to perform their duties. If he fails to secure men of that character Congress is without any redress. All it can do, no matter how great the extravagance may be, is to raise the money by taxation and to vote it by way of appropriations, and do the little kicking on the side, as we are doing in the Senate now, against the extravagance, with the hope that it will at some time have some effect.

The Senator has been down in the departments. Go into any one of them and you will find clerks so closely packed that they are in each others' way, and you will probably find that at least one-fifth of them are idle or semi-idle. We simply have more men at work than we need in all of these places. We have more clerks than we actually need. We could put an army of 10,000,000 men in France to-day, and the remainder of those at home could perform as much physical service for the benefit of the Government as is being performed to-day.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator, of course, recognizes that the Congress can investigate these matters and call them to the attention of the people and the country, just such matters as he is now calling attention to. There ought not to be any trouble to locate the cause of the neglect of duty in the character of work the Senator has just spoken of. The contractor can be found and the man who is supervising the construction can be found. That is a matter that a committee of Congress could look after and discover, and I think it ought to be done. I repeat, I am glad the Senator is calling attention to this matter. He is doing a real service to his country.

Mr. McCUMBER. We tried at one time to create a committee which was to look into the question of war expenditures, but we were unable to put it through. We did not have the votes in the Senate. It would have been the function of that committee to ascertain what was being done with this \$640,000,000 that we now find has gone out of existence, and we perhaps could have seen that some of it was efficiently expended at the time.

Mr. VARDAMAN and Mr. CURTIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield; and if so, to whom?

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

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not think that Justice Hughes will discover that?

Mr. McCUMBER. I hope he will.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I hope so.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is a very fine thing to discover that your horse is stolen after it is gone, even though you did not take precautionary measures to lock the stable before; but it would have been wiser to guard the animal in the first instance. I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. I merely wish to correct a statement made by the Senator in reference to the committee to which he has referred. The item providing for that committee, as I recall, passed the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. I said we did not get it through. Mr. President, it seems to me, in short, that incompetency and extravagance and graft and slacking, everything abominable and censurable, must be expected in this war, and the only patriotism that we have a right to expect is the patriotism of the soldiers at the front, of the buyers of liberty bonds, and the farmers of the country, who are expected to raise wheat at 40 per cent below its market value. All of the rest can be looked on and excused upon the ground that we were not prepared for this conflict and consequently we expect great extravagance. But, Mr. President, if we can spend and squander billions of dollars more than are necessary in this great conflict, if we can be so wildly extravagant along every line, I confess that we can afford a little \$40,000,000 to ease into the grave the old soldiers whose sacrifices gave us this country. I want to give it to them, and I want to give it to them without any strings tied to it, and to say to them, "This is a gift on the part of your Government, the Government which you saved, and this is an expression of gratitude on the part of the Government. It is a gratuity freed from the stigma of pauperism." I hope, Mr. President, that the bill will be passed just as reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GUYON in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL].

Mr. KING. I ask the Secretary to state the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

The SECRETARY. On page 4, line 7—

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bankhead	Hardwick	McNary	Shields
Beckham	Henderson	Martin	Simmons
Calder	Johnson, Cal.	Myers	Smith, Md.
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Smoot
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Swanson
Fall	Kellogg	Page	Thompson
Fernald	Kenyon	Phelan	Townsend
France	King	Polindexter	Underwood
Gronna	Lenroot	Pomerene	Vardaman
Gulon	Lewis	Saulsbury	Warren
Hale	Lodge	Shafroth	Wolcott
Harding	McCumber	Sheppard	

Mr. KING. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] was unexpectedly called from the city. I desire to make that announcement, and will allow it to stand for the day.

Mr. SHIELDS. I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. McKELLAR] on official business.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. THOMAS] on official business.

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] are detained on official business. I wish also to announce that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] is detained by illness, and that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is detained by illness in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-one Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk, in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida, it is proposed to insert at the end of the bill the following:

That no pensioner shall be entitled to receive any benefits under the provisions of this act for any period during which he shall be an inmate of any State or National soldiers' home; and the provisions of this act shall not apply to any pensioner whose net annual income from all sources, including his pension, is \$1,000 or more, to be determined by the income-tax reports on file in the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who shall annually on the 1st day of July transmit to the Commissioner of Pensions a list of all pensioners having an income, as shown by such reports, in excess of the said sum of \$1,000.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, if it will not interfere with the Senator's discussion of his amendment, while I have no authority to do this from the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL], I notice that he is absent from the Chamber; and I will ask that that amendment be passed over for the time until the Senator from Florida can be present.

Mr. KING. I shall be very glad if my colleague will accede to that.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator in charge of the bill consent that the amendment be passed over temporarily?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] desires to address the Senate, and if that is the case I suggest that he proceed now; and then, if there is time after he has finished, we can take up this matter.

INSTALLMENT PAYMENTS OF INCOME AND EXCESS PROFITS TAXES.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I am taking the liberty of addressing the Senate on a subject which is very near to my heart.

On the 26th of February, 1918, I introduced a bill (S. 3963) to permit the payment of income and excess-profits taxes in six monthly installments, beginning July 15, 1918, deferred payments to draw interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum and to be secured. This bill was referred to the Finance Committee, and up to date we have had no report upon it. I understand that two objections are raised to it:

First. The formal objection that legislation of this character should originate in the House if there is to be any legislation upon the subject.

Assuming, without admitting, that this objection is technically well founded, it could be waived, as the provision in the Constitution that "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives," even if comprehensive enough to cover the change of time of payment of the revenue, is purely directory and not mandatory.

Second. The Treasury Department is opposed to it because, they say, we need the money. In a recent statement authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury he says: "The agitation in favor of legislation to authorize the payment of income and excess-profits taxes in deferred installments is doing much harm." With all due respect and with all kindness, permit me to say that it is not the agitation of this question that is doing harm; but, if harm is resulting, it is because of the unreasonable opposition of the Treasury Department to a very reasonable request. I ask the indulgence of the Senate while I discuss it for a few moments.

Senators will agree with me that the money with which to carry on this war must come from the pockets of our people. We can get it by taxation or by the sale of bonds, or by a combination of the two methods. In any event the people furnish the money. In each of the liberty loan campaigns it was thought wise to have the bonds payable in installments.

FIRST LIBERTY LOAN.

The first liberty loan was offered May 14, 1917. The amount offered was \$2,000,000,000. It was closed June 15, 1917. There were nearly 4,000,000 subscribers. The aggregate subscriptions were \$3,035,000,000. Two billion dollars were accepted. They were payable as follows:

Two per cent, or \$40,000,000, payable on application for loan.
Eighteen per cent, or \$360,000,000, payable June 28, 1917.
Twenty per cent, or \$400,000,000, payable July 30, 1917.
Thirty per cent, or \$600,000,000, payable August 15, 1917.
Thirty per cent, or \$600,000,000, payable August 30, 1917.

SECOND LIBERTY LOAN.

Early in October, 1917, the second liberty loan, amounting to \$3,000,000,000, was offered. The loan closed October 29, 1917. There were nearly 3,500,000 subscribers. The subscriptions aggregated \$4,617,532,200. The Secretary of the Treasury accepted one-half of the amount which was oversubscribed in excess of the \$3,000,000,000. In other words, there was allotted to subscribers on account of this loan \$3,808,766,150. But these bonds were not required to be paid at one time, but in installments, as follows:

Two per cent, or \$76,175,323, payable October 27, 1917.
Eighteen per cent, or \$685,577,907, payable November 15, 1917.
Forty per cent, or \$1,523,506,460, payable December 15, 1917.
Forty per cent, or \$1,523,506,460, payable January 15, 1918.

THIRD LIBERTY LOAN.

When the recent drive for the third liberty loan was begun those in charge appreciated the unwisdom of calling for a loan of \$3,000,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000 and require all the money to be paid into the Treasury at one time, and therefore it was provided that these bonds should be paid for in installments. The total subscriptions amounted to \$4,170,019,650. This sum, by the terms of the loan, to be paid as follows:

Five per cent, or \$208,500,982.50, before May 4, 1918.
Twenty per cent, or \$834,003,930, before May 28, 1918.
Thirty-five per cent, or \$1,459,506,877.50, before July 18, 1918.
Forty per cent, or \$1,668,007,860, before August 15, 1918.

This arrangement was made for the convenience of the people who subscribed for the bonds. I think I can safely state that very few subscribed for bonds unless they either had the money in hand with which to pay or had a reasonable prospect of securing it. Suffice it to say, no one, whether he had money or not, was compelled to subscribe for bonds, except out of a pure spirit of patriotism, and we are delighted to record that more than 17,000,000 of our people were ready and willing to come, and did come, to the aid of the Government in the third liberty loan.

In view of this and the earlier prompt responses by the people to the calls of the Government for war funds, does not prudence suggest that whatever may be our plan or plans for raising money, they should be so framed as to reduce to a minimum the burdens upon business.

PAYMENT OF TAXES.

When it comes to the payment of taxes, what do we require? I am glad to testify to the fine spirit which has been shown by the business men of the country. Rarely has anyone heard complaint about the amount of tax. The only favor the taxpayers ask is a little indulgence as to the time when the taxes shall be paid and they have strong reasons for asking this favor at the hands of both the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

While many of us felt for many long months that the war clouds were lowering, it was not until April 6, 1917, that the Congress passed the resolution declaring a state of war with the Imperial Government of Germany.

The revenue law providing for the taxes upon incomes and war profits was not passed until October 3, 1917. The taxes on incomes and excess earnings for the calendar year expiring December 31, 1917, were made payable on or before June 15, 1918. In other words, these taxes for 10 months and 3 days were retroactive in character and the business world had no notice thereof until the revenue bill became a law on October 3, 1917.

Most of the manufacturing, mining, and commercial enterprises of the country during the calendar year of 1917 made great profits, but the demands of the Government as well as of private enterprise were of such a character that in order to meet them business men were required to reinvest their net earnings as they accrued either in increased capacity of their plants or in new stocks of raw material at highly advanced prices. Their greatest task was to get money with which to carry on their business and what would have been the state of our preparations, either from a military or industrial viewpoint, if they had not thus reinvested their profits as earned in their business?

But this is not all. As autumn approached and during the months of winter the great transportation system of this country broke down under the strain and stress of increased traffic and most of our manufacturers and other producers were unable to market their products. Their business enterprises were handicapped. Their warehouses were filled to the bursting point. They could not convert their goods into cash with which to meet their maturing obligations, much less pay their revenue taxes either in advance or as they became due.

It is urged by the Treasury Department that the Congress did afford relief by providing that these taxes could be paid in whole or in part in advance of their maturity. But these taxes were not made payable in advance for the benefit of the taxpayer. It was for the benefit of the Government. I only need to suggest in answer to this argument if men do not have the money to meet their obligations when they mature they probably do not have the money with which to cancel these obligations before maturity. In my judgment it would have been much better not to attempt to assign a reason for opposition to this bill than to assign such a reason. I am not pleading for extension of time for men who have the cash with which to pay. I am pleading for those who do not have it.

Again, it is suggested by the Treasury Department that short-time certificates to the amount of \$1,500,000,000 have been issued, which will mature between June 1 and 15, and these must be paid. It is said that the taxpayers had the right to buy these short-time certificates from time to time and turn them into the Treasury in payment of their taxes.

Of course, they had this right of purchase, and they can use these certificates for that purpose if they have them. But I doubt if many business men bought short-time certificates unless they had the cash with which to pay for them; and if, because of industrial and transportation conditions, the producers could not market their wares they probably did not have the money with which to buy them. I think I can safely assert that the Treasury Department went into the markets where money was to be found and sold these short-time certificates to those who had the money, not to the producers who may have had property but did not have money. And, again, I must add that an argument to the effect that men who have no money with which to pay their taxes could go into the market and, out of their lack of money, buy short-time certificates with which to pay their obligations is not very convincing.

Surely, if taxpayers had the money with which to buy short-time certificates, would not business prudence suggest that instead of thus investing their money they would take advantage of the discount of 3 per cent provided in the revenue law and

pay their taxes before maturity or discharge other obligations? Careful business men always discount their bills when they can. Would they not by the same token discount their taxes when permitted, if they had the money with which to do it?

It is no doubt true that the class of taxpayers who had money to invest in short-time certificates will use them in the payment of their taxes pro tanto, and to that extent it will relieve the strain on the cash of the country and thereby indirectly help those who have taxes to pay by increasing the amount of available cash which may be loaned by the banks of the country to those who are required to borrow.

But we must not forget that at least 90 per cent of the business men of the country are borrowers. Other things being equal, the larger the volume of business conducted the greater the amount of borrowed capital required. National banks and most State banks can not loan to an individual borrower in excess of 10 per cent of their capital and surplus. Many business men have been compelled to borrow, and have borrowed from their banks to this limit. This is not a special condition which applies to scattered communities; it applies to nearly all of the industrial cities and towns of the country. No matter what collateral borrowers may have to present to the banks, many of them do not have the funds to loan. The banks of the country have been acting very patriotically in accommodating their clients wherever and whenever they could, but they have been taxed to the limit in caring for the current necessities of their respective communities, and it is going to be a serious proposition, not only with the business men but with the banks themselves, to arrange to accommodate the taxpayers of the country and advance \$2,775,185,000, the estimated income and excess-profits taxes to be paid on June 15, in addition to the normal demands made upon banks by the commerce of the country. The communication of the Secretary of the Treasury to the President of the Senate indicates that this amount will be largely increased, and I feel justified in expressing the opinion that when the Treasury Department receives full returns the total income and excess-profits taxes will amount to not less than \$3,000,000,000.

PER CAPITA CIRCULATION.

Let me present another phase of this question. May 1, 1918, the total circulating medium of the country was \$5,318,546,717. Estimating the population of continental United States at 105,581,000—and these are the figures given by the Secretary of the Treasury—the circulation per capita was, on that date, \$50.37. The total income and excess-profits taxes to be paid on June 15, according to the estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury, amount to \$2,755,185,000. In other words, if these taxes are to be paid in cash or its equivalent, and presumably they must be, it will require 52.17 per cent of the circulating medium of the country to make the payment. If these taxes amount to \$3,000,000,000, as I verily believe they will, it will require 56.40 per cent of the circulating medium to pay them—and this to be raised in one day. I do not believe it will be said the circulating medium of the country is very much in excess of our commercial requirements under normal conditions.

I have just presented this subject as if all the circulating medium was available. Let me present the same thought in another way. The cash in all of the banks on June 20, 1917, was \$1,502,502,000. I have not been able to get figures for a later date. The estimated population May 1, 1917, was 103,859,000, making the per capita in bank \$14.46. Dividing the total estimated income and excess-profits taxes to be paid June 15, 1918, \$2,775,185,000, by the estimated population, 105,581,000—and these are the figures of the Treasury Department—the per capita income and excess-profits taxes to be paid on June 15, 1918, will amount to \$26.28, or, in other words, they will be \$11.82 in excess of the per capita cash in the banks of the country. Assuming the revenue from this source will reach \$3,000,000,000, the per capita taxes to be paid will be \$28.14, or \$13.95 in excess of the per capita cash in the banks.

Should not these facts give us pause for thought? Even if it were not going to prove a serious inconvenience to the bankers and business men of the country, ought not the Government to hesitate before it throws this burden upon the circulating medium of the country in one day's time?

The Treasury Department realizes the force of this argument, and they hope to relieve against it to some degree by permitting, and I quote the words of the Secretary, "qualified depositories, banks, and trust companies to make payment of taxes for themselves and their customers by credit, in the same way as subscriptions for bonds and Treasury certificates are paid."

This method will help banks and trust companies, but it will not help the taxpayers generally, except by indirection. It does not increase their line of credit at their banks; it will not authorize the banks to loan in excess of 10 per cent of their

capital and surplus, and it is going to seriously embarrass the industrial communities for the ready cash with which to conduct current business.

I have been referring to the suggestion of the Secretary of the Treasury that some of these taxes might be paid "by credit," but since that suggestion was made there has been issued, under date of May 29, 1918, a supplement to Department Circular No. 92, in which it is expressly provided that "payment of income and excess-profit taxes can not be made by credit."

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KELLOGG. If it will not interrupt the Senator, I should like to ask him one question.

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. I am in sympathy with the views of the Senator on this question, and it is not from a want of sympathy that I ask the question. The last Treasury statement which I saw, however—that of May 17, 1918—showed to the credit of the disbursing officers of the Government only \$932,000,000, in round figures. I will not read the fractions.

Mr. POMERENE. What is the date of that statement?

Mr. KELLOGG. May 17, 1918. That was the amount which the disbursing officers of the Government could draw upon to pay the obligations of the Government. Now, as I am informed, the expenditures of the Government to-day amount to a billion and a half a month, and are increasing at the rate of \$100,000,000 a month; and if that is true, by the 1st of January, 1919, those expenditures will equal \$2,000,000,000 a month, or \$24,000,000,000 a year. Is it not quite probable that the Treasury must have the money with which to meet those expenditures?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the question of the Senator from Minnesota anticipates my argument.

Mr. KELLOGG. I beg the Senator's pardon, then, for interrupting him.

Mr. POMERENE. I think I shall explain that matter to the entire satisfaction of the Senator or anybody else who has studied this question, except the Treasury Department.

My belief is that this is a method of financing which under ordinary circumstances would not be approved. It may be added further that the mere fact that the Treasury Department suggests this plan is a sufficient demonstration that it does not need the cash on that particular date.

CAN THE BANKS MEET THESE DEMANDS ON JUNE 15?

That the payment of these taxes on one date will be a serious drain on the banks is quite evident.

Under date April 1, 1918, I was advised that the cash in the banks of Cleveland, exclusive of the Federal reserve bank, amounted to \$17,500,000. The cash in the Federal reserve bank and other depositories amounted to \$75,000,000, a total of \$92,500,000. The aggregate income and excess-profits taxes to be paid in that city was estimated at from \$75,000,000 to \$100,000,000. In other words, the taxes to be paid by the business people of Cleveland were approximately equal to, if not in excess of, the cash in the Cleveland banks, their depositories, and the reserve bank. All the figures given as to taxes are estimated, but I may say that later information indicates that they are not very far from right.

The Treasury Department, as I am informed, does not keep separate accounts for each city and town or locality, but for the several districts, and it is therefore not possible to find the exact amount of taxes payable in each city without a vast deal of clerical labor. I believe these figures, however, to be substantially correct.

On March 28, 1918, in the city of Columbus the total cash in the banks of that city amounted to \$3,320,000; the total due from banks amounted to \$11,100,000, or a total of \$14,420,000. At the same time they owed for bills payable and bills discounted \$2,450,000, leaving a balance of cash in the vaults and amounts due from banks of \$11,970,000. The income and excess-profits taxes to be paid by the people of that city were variously estimated at from \$12,000,000 to \$15,000,000. Or, in other words, the taxes to be paid are more than the available cash in the banks.

In the little, but thriving, city of Ironton there are four banks with a total capital of \$575,000. The income and excess-profits taxes to be paid by her industries reach the astounding figure of \$1,500,000, or nearly three times the total bank capital of that little city.

In the State of Ohio there are one or more important industrial cities, towns, or communities in nearly every one of her 88 counties.

I could, if time permitted, give similar data with respect to many other localities, but I do not conceive this to be necessary. The conditions prevailing in Cleveland, Columbus, and Ironton

are not exceptions. They are typical of conditions throughout the State.

I hope the Senate will indulge me while I read brief extracts from some letters received by me from chambers of commerce, clearing house associations, commercial and financial organizations, as well as from bankers, merchants, and manufacturers.

CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at its annual meeting held in Chicago, April 10, 11, and 12, 1918, adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of the United States again recommends and urges the passage by Congress of a law providing for the payment of income, excess profits, and other special war taxes in installments so arranged as to give adequate protection to the commercial, industrial, and financial interests of the country.

Under date of February 28, 1918, the chamber of commerce of the city of Columbus writes, in part, as follows:

Should the Government fail to permit a distribution of these payments over a period of time * * * the result might be very disastrous. In Columbus alone it would be necessary for very many prosperous businesses either to withdraw money from working capital and reduce operations or to borrow large amounts from the banks. It is estimated that the total payments of Columbus taxes would aggregate more than one-half of the total deposits of Columbus banks.

CLEARING HOUSE ASSOCIATIONS.

Under date February 21, 1918, the Cleveland Clearing House Association passed the following resolution:

Whereas it is conservatively estimated that the income and excess-profits taxes due from individuals and corporations of this city will amount to \$150,000,000; and

Whereas the time of payment of income taxes will be coincident with the payments on the next issue of liberty bonds; and

Whereas the payment of this large amount will seriously affect the resources of the banks of Cleveland: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge upon the honorable Secretary of the Treasury that action be taken to distribute the payment of income and excess-profits taxes over the balance of the calendar year.

In a letter to me, under date February 23, 1918, Mr. C. A. Paine, president of the Cleveland Clearing House Association, writes:

As you know, we are a large manufacturing city, and all of our banks have been called upon to extend larger loans to our customers than usual, on account of the large business which they are doing, the increased cost of material, labor, and the delay on account of the railroad congestion. This has necessitated our rediscounting at the Federal reserve bank to a considerable extent.

We all feel that unless this situation is relieved by the time the income and excess-profits taxes are due, the strain on the banks will be almost more than they are able to meet.

The President of the Akron Clearing House Association on April 17, 1918, stated that a careful survey showed that the income and excess-profits tax due from individuals and corporations of that city will amount to somewhere between \$15,000,000 and \$20,000,000, and expressed the opinion that in order to relieve the strain on the banks it is absolutely necessary that these payments be distributed over the balance of the year.

ASSOCIATIONS OF CREDIT MEN.

On March 19, 1918, "the Ohio conference of the National Association of Credit Men, representing 2,000 Ohio manufacturers, wholesalers, and jobbers in convention assembled at Cleveland, unanimously indorsed a plan for the extension of time of payment of Federal income tax and recommend that such payment be made in installments over a period of months."

The Cincinnati Association of Credit Men, under date April 11, 1918, writes:

As an organization of Cincinnati business men, representing 500 manufacturers and wholesalers, we are firmly of the opinion that it is vital in maintaining stable conditions in credits throughout the country, that some legislation be passed permitting the payment of war income and excess-profits taxes in installments over a period of months.

Such legislation meets with the approval of not only the local organization but the State organization, as evidenced by the resolution to this effect adopted at Cleveland, March 19, 1918.

ASSOCIATIONS.

The officers of the Bankers' Association in the following States—Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, Nebraska, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin—in a conference passed certain resolutions in which they used in part the following language:

In our opinion the payment of the entire amount at any fixed date may cause an unnecessary and undesirable contraction of credit.

The Ohio Manufacturers' Association, Columbus, in a statement issued to the manufacturers of that State, several weeks ago, said:

The banking deposits of Columbus on January 1, 1918, were \$50,000,000. The reserves on the same date were \$12,000,000. From careful estimates made by bankers and others the total tax, individual and corporate, which the city will have to pay to the Government on or before June 15, 1918, will be from \$18,000,000 to \$20,000,000.

This is a burden which the banks of the city can not assume without great difficulty, and which will necessarily result in the calling of loans and in the curtailing of necessary business. Of course, eventually much of the money will return to the city through the ordinary channels of trade, but it will be a long time before this happens and the immediate strain will be very great.

The Industrial Association of Cincinnati recently passed resolutions declaring that—

In our opinion the payment of the entire amount at any fixed date may cause an unnecessary and undesirable contraction of credit.

RETAIL ASSOCIATIONS.

The Ohio Retail Dry Goods Association, after urging legislation permitting the payment of these taxes in installments, say:

In the opinion of this association, unless such extension is granted, it will necessarily curtail business operations and cripple business enterprises and banking facilities to such an extent that it will be almost impossible for the banks to finance the tax, if the whole tax is to be paid on or before June 15.

In a note accompanying this resolution the secretary of the association says:

The first installment can be in circulation by the time the other installments fall due, thereby maintaining an equilibrium.

This is a patriotic move, as stability of business is essential to the successful prosecution of the war.

The Retail Merchants' Association of Columbus, under date March 27, sent me copy of resolution adopted by them, in which they express the opinion that—

Unless such extension is granted it will necessarily curtail business operations and cripple business enterprises and banking facilities to such an extent that it will be almost impossible for the banks to finance the tax, if the whole is to be paid on or before June 15.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to an interruption?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to ask the Senator, in view of the very seriousness of the situation which he describes, which all communities will suffer equally with his own, whether he has ever taken this matter up with the Secretary of the Treasury and has used the data which he has collected, evidently with some care, and which is so full of meaning, and whether there is any prospect of getting the cooperation of the executive department of the Government in the very praiseworthy attempt which the Senator is making to get relief from this situation?

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator's question is very pertinent and very proper. I did take it up with him some weeks ago, prior to his starting on the third liberty-loan campaign, and since that time I have taken it up probably three or four times with one of the Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury, who has had the matter in charge. Without going into the details of these conferences, I think I may say that their contention has been that they need the money. But I think, if the Senator will do me the honor to listen until I have completed my statement, I shall be able to show that they do not need all this money at one time.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the Senator will pardon me, are we going now to fail to act because of the lack of sympathy of the Treasury Department with our plan, or are we failing to act because of the legislative situation in which we find ourselves?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I introduced this bill February 26. I have had several conferences with individual members of the Finance Committee. I have taken it up and discussed it with Senators and with certain Representatives in Congress, and I find that practically everybody agrees with me save and except the Secretary of the Treasury and his assistants; that is, everyone with whom I have come in contact. I may say that in my humble judgment the business men of the country, who are to finance this war, have some knowledge of public finances.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And some rights.

Mr. POMERENE. I am quite sure that the business men of the country are going to yield to additional taxes and they are going to subscribe for additional bonds, and they will do it with a patriotic purpose. Knowing their disposition in that behalf, we ought to make these burdens as light as possible.

BUSINESS MEN'S CLUB.

The Business Men's Club of Cincinnati, under date of March 1, 1918, wires:

The extension of time beyond June 15 for paying part of the excess-profits tax we believe is absolutely essential to the business interests and welfare of the country, and we heartily indorse the above-suggested extension and respectfully recommend same be given most earnest and careful consideration.

MANUFACTURERS.

On March 2 a prominent firm in Akron wrote concerning the payment of these taxes in a lump sum on or before June 15, 1918, as follows:

Unless modified, I think this requirement is going to bring on the most serious financial disturbance the country has experienced since the panic of 1903.

Without upsetting our entire scheme of financing, it is impossible to withdraw from our banking institutions at one time the amount of money required to pay the income and excess-profits tax.

Another manufacturing concern of the same city, under date of March 28, writes concerning the payment of these taxes at one time as follows:

The financial shock will be tremendous if the entire income tax must be paid on one day, and I sincerely trust that your bill may pass Congress and thereby prevent an injury to the Nation that can easily be avoided without interfering with the needs of the Government.

One of the leading manufacturing concerns of my home city, Canton, writes under date of March 18, 1918:

If all corporations and all individuals are called upon to pay this huge sum of money by June 15, I can't for the life of me see where the cash will come from.

Another firm from the same city writes:

From inquiries made at the banks and financial institutions with which we have come in contact, as well as manufacturers and other business interests, we have had our opinion confirmed, that due to the expansion in business it has been necessary to transfer a large portion of our working capital into equipment and buildings in order to meet the demand for increased output, which we have been called upon to produce for the past two years.

The present conditions make it necessary for us to secure additional funds from banks in order to meet the demands for increased price of material and labor, and is taking a large amount of additional capital. These conditions have led to the inquiry of a number of our friends as to how the current business is to be taken care of when we are compelled to pay over to the Government in one sum the amount of income which will be called in this vicinity.

We certainly feel that it will work as a hardship upon all of us if there is no change in the date of payment.

Another large firm writes:

It will undoubtedly work a great hardship on a great many concerns to pay the entire amount in one payment, and the total amount to be made by all the payees, if taken at one time, can not help, as I see it, being a disturbing factor in the financial and industrial world. Just how this should be done, I am, of course, not prepared to say; but that it should be done, I am quite thoroughly convinced.

A prominent firm of Toledo, Ohio, writes in part as follows:

The payment of the excess-profits taxes on last year's business, which will be due on June 15, as well as the necessary payment of the income tax for the same period, together with State, county, and city taxes, all of which are due about the same time of the year, is, in our judgment, going to create a crisis in the affairs of many businesses, that will not have been able by that time to adjust themselves to this extra and unusual expenditure.

And after urging the payment of these taxes in monthly installments, this firm adds:

This extension would act as a cushion, to let many concerns down a little easier, and by another year, perhaps, everybody will be more used to these extraordinary payments and will have arranged their affairs to take care of them.

Another Toledo firm, on March 28, 1918, writes:

Something should be done by Congress to enable corporations to pay the income and excess-profits tax in three or four installments.

Speaking of my own companies, most of which have made money and all of whom are carrying greatly increased inventories (due entirely to the high level of values) and too many liberty bonds, I want you to know that we can not pay all of our tax in June without selling the bonds and declining to subscribe to the next issue, neither of which we wish to do.

The 4 per cents net us exactly 1.6 per cent after paying the excess tax on same. Of course, we did not purchase them as money makers, but when Mr. McAdoo thinks we are getting 4 per cent, less income tax, he is very much mistaken, for after paying 6 per cent for the money to buy them we are out just 3.40 per cent upon the transaction.

In closing his letter, this writer, whom I know personally and very favorably, says:

Do not, I beg of you, think for a moment that we are wanting in patriotism; the Government can have our shops, talents, and money, but they can not have more money than we possess.

One of the large firms of Cincinnati writes:

We subscribed for \$200,000 of the second liberty loan and borrowed the money to do so, as we needed the capital we have in the business to take care of our regular business. We were able to carry these bonds for three months on a basis of 4 per cent. We asked for a renewal of one-half of them and are paying 4½ per cent interest on those. We do not object to this, because it is for the Government, and we want to do our "bit."

On account of the railroad situation and delay in delivery of material, a great many of our customers are asking for extra time, saying they have not been able to ship their material and get their money and they can not pay us the amounts due and want to give us notes.

The furnaces have been hard hit by the lack of coke and an exceptional winter, and they are asking us to advance them against their shipments.

We shall have to pay a pretty large excess-profits tax, and the members of our firm will also pay a larger amount of income tax, and it looks now like they would have to borrow the money to do it, and this is brought about through no fault of theirs, but on account of the railroad troubles. We feel there is nothing else to be done except to hope for Congress to help the business interests by extension of payment of income tax. If this is not done, the Government will find a great many manufacturers and business men who will be unwilling to take any more bonds except those they can absolutely pay for.

A large manufacturing concern of Cincinnati, under date March 12, writes, in part, as follows:

We feel the interests of the country at large would be far better served if the payment of this tax could be distributed over a period of 90 days or 4 months. If we are forced to make payment of this tax in one lump sum, it undoubtedly will result in a very serious situation, causing a decided slump in business.

Another prominent business man of Cincinnati writes with regard to the payment of income and excess-profits taxes:

It is really necessary for credit and safety of many individuals and firms that payment of such taxes be permitted to extend over a few months rather than on one day, June 15.

Another large concern, under date March 1, 1918, writes:

The present law will at one time take from the channels of trade such a huge sum of money that commercial institutions are likely to be seriously handicapped; particularly manufacturing enterprises, which require, under present conditions, a much larger percentage of operating capital to output than ever before. In many cases the severity of the burden may interfere with the output of manufactured products which directly or indirectly contribute to the winning of the war.

These taxes, which have been loyally accepted by the business interests of the country as a necessary war sacrifice, would be much less burdensome if paid in installments, and this would, in our opinion, avoid the curtailing of production likely to result under the present plan.

Another large firm writes, under date March 2, in reference to the payment of war excess-profits taxes under the law of October 3, 1917, as follows:

It will impose a burden on our corporation to pay our taxes in a single payment so shortly after they are assessed. It will mean a hardship to us, for the reason that we will have to withdraw, if we are obliged to pay these taxes in one payment according to the law, a large amount of capital which we could employ to good advantage in our business, and can hardly withdraw the amount in so short a space of time.

We believe other corporations, merchants, and manufacturers in general are all meeting the same conditions, and wish to have this tax collected through installment payments, say, two or three payments to be spread out over a period of three to six months, first installment to start as specified by the law, and the others to be extended as seem best for the interests of both the Government and taxpayers.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I have listened to the Senator with a great deal of interest, yet I have not heard him say what I think should be said with reference to the excess-profits tax. The excess-profits tax is the amount in excess of the preceding period which these business concerns earned. If they have invested that money in new machinery and extension of plant, if they have invested it in brick and mortar and labor for the extension of their plant, they are assessed exactly as though it were cash in their vaults, and they can not realize on this machinery nor brick nor mortar nor labor expended.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the Senator's question suggests this further fact: It is true that these profits have been invested in additions to their plants, and it happens that these manufacturers, from whose letters I am now reading, are many of them engaged in the manufacture of machine tools, and they were urged to make these additions to their plants through the press by the Government.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am glad that I called the Senator's attention to that aspect of the situation. I gathered as much from what I have seen myself in the State of Ohio, where in steel and in iron so much of their money is invested. It seems to me that the Secretary of the Treasury, who has in many respects shown a very broad and commendable view of the business necessities of the country, should give heed to this desire upon the part of business men not to be penalized all at one moment for what is really a semigovernmental function which they are following.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have very great admiration for the very great ability and patriotism of the Secretary of the Treasury, and I commend nearly everything that he has done, but I think that he has made a mistake in this matter, and I am calling this to the attention of the Senate because I believe it to be my duty to my constituents and the people at large to do it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to ask the Senator if he does not think that much of the hardship which he has enumerated will be relieved if the Secretary of the Treasury follows out the plan which he suggested to the Finance Committee, of a re-deposit of all sums in the particular district from which collected in the banks of that district to be drawn by the Government only as needed, so that the same sum can be loaned and reloaned to those who pay out the taxes?

Mr. POMERENE. Of course, that is going to aid the communities very materially, but I want Senators to bear this fact in mind. I said before in my argument, in the early part of it, that 90 per cent of the manufacturers of this country are borrowers, and it requires more capital to do a given quantum of business now than it did two or three years ago. Many of these manufacturers have borrowed up to the very limit, not so much the limit of their borrowing capacity, if they had a place to which they could go; but under the restrictions which are wisely placed around the national-bank system and the State-bank system, limiting the amount of money which can be loaned to an individual borrower to 10 per cent of the paid in capital and surplus, they are not able to get this money.

Mr. McCUMBER. But the Secretary intimated in his testimony before the committee that a considerable proportion of that which would be paid, if paid in full, would be needed very shortly after the date set for payment by the law itself, and of course the Senator will agree that the Government must have the funds in some way as rapidly as the Government needs to expend it. If all the balance except that which the Government needs to pay out is left in the banks in the vicinity from which it was collected, why have we not secured about the same results that we would secure if these parties were allowed to pay interest to the Government for the difference, because they would be paying the same interest if they borrowed the same amount of money from the bank?

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator's question and statement in part anticipates my argument, and with his permission I will postpone my reply to it until a little later.

Of course, the depositing of these funds in certain localities will to a certain extent relieve the financial situation; yet it is not going to relieve the inability of many men to borrow, since they have already borrowed up to their limit.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

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

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KELLOGG. I should like to mention one fact which I think the Senator has overlooked in his argument. As I understood the Senator from Ohio, he was comparing for some purpose the cash on hand in various banking centers. In Ohio—and the same condition exists elsewhere—with the amount of the excess-profits and income tax to be paid, as a matter of fact, as those taxes will be paid in credits—

Mr. POMERENE. No; Mr. President, they will not be paid in credits.

Mr. KELLOGG. But checks will be accepted on a man's bank account.

Mr. POMERENE. But those checks must be drawn against cash.

Mr. KELLOGG. They will be drawn against credit in the bank which a man has on deposit.

Mr. POMERENE. Let me call the Senator's attention to this: Under date of May 29, 1918, the Treasury Department issued a statement supplemental to Department Circular No. 92, dated October 6, 1917, and the supplement thereto, dated April 10, 1918, in which they say:

Payment of income and excess-profits taxes can not be made by credit.

Mr. KELLOGG. They may be paid with checks.

Mr. POMERENE. Certainly.

Mr. KELLOGG. And checks are drawn on bank deposits. The comparison which, it seems to me, should be made is between the total excess-profits and income taxes and the amount of bank deposits in the country. The amount of deposits in the country in national banks on March 4 was \$14,438,000,000, and on the last report of all other banks they were \$17,671,000,000.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, of course we all understand this to be the fact—

Mr. KELLOGG. Well—

Mr. POMERENE. Pardon me a minute.

Mr. KELLOGG. Let me complete the question.

Mr. POMERENE. Very well.

Mr. KELLOGG. As those are the deposits which must be drawn on by checks to pay the taxes, it is equivalent to paying them by the credits of the country, is it not?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the resources of the banks are in part credits, but I have called attention to the strain it is going to be upon the circulating medium, and it was for that reason I made the comparison between the taxes to be paid and the cash in the country or in the banks; and I think I will demonstrate before I get through with the argument that the Government does not need all this money at one time.

Another large concern in Cincinnati writes:

As a manufacturer I can freely state that although we have made a reasonable amount of money in the past four or five years, the great bulk of it has been put back into our business in order to increase our output, and this is especially true in the last year since our own Government has been at war. This is done at the request of the Government, as they have repeatedly requested through the public press that all manufacturers engaged in work for the Government should use their utmost effort to increase their production. Production can only be increased by increased investments. Our stock of raw and finished material to-day is many times larger than ever before in the history of our company, and I think the same is true of most manufacturing concerns—I know it is true as to the metal industries.

If the manufacturers are forced to pay this money between now and June, they will either have to curtail their buying or dispose of their holdings in bonds and stock, which, under present market conditions, will mean a terrible loss.

Another large concern, under date of February 26, writes, after suggesting that the taxes be paid in installments "every three or every four months from June 15 to the end of the year":

If you could get along with payments made in that way it would be, in our opinion, a wonderful relief to the country, and we know it would be to ourselves. In our little business, if the banks refuse to accommodate us we do not see how in the world the money could be raised. Whether the banks will do this or not we do not know, but in large concerns it must be still worse.

In talking to many others, they feel the same way that we do, that this amount of money demanded on one day is going to make a terrible hardship on the majority of the manufacturers throughout the country.

Another large concern writes:

We fear that not sufficient thought has been given to the fact that it will probably mean disaster and great hardship to have all the money raised under this law taken from the ordinary channels of trade in one day, when it is remembered that the collection of this tax will be preceded or followed very shortly by the collection of the ordinary taxes—Federal, State, county, and municipal—and that another issue of liberty bonds is proposed, while the extraordinary demands for contributions to the Red Cross, Young Men's Christian Association, and other patriotic and worthy causes, which are very worthy, must be met.

Another large manufacturing concern writes:

During 1916 the profits from our business were mostly divided between subscriptions to the first and second liberty loans and for payments for raw material and stock which we are compelled to carry and for which we pay now almost treble the old prices. Therefore our surplus money has been invested and a lump payment of our tax in June will be a big problem for us and necessitates great hardship in curtailing our business and in borrowing additional funds.

Freight conditions cause us to carry a larger stock than usual, both on account of our fear of not receiving raw materials and also on account of not being able at times to ship finished goods, and with the fact mentioned above that this stock is worth much more to-day than in normal times, and we see no relief from this condition during the coming months, our money will remain tied up in our business.

We therefore respectfully suggest that you consider the change in date set for payment of the tax, either postponing same or allowing it to be paid in installments throughout the balance of the year.

Another large manufacturing concern writes:

The manufacturers and business men in general feel the effects of the war, even at this time, very keenly. They have gone through an unusually hard winter and through the railroad embargoes, which shut off shipping; their funds are tied up. It surely will border on the impossible for many of them to raise this money in one sum by June 15.

It must be remembered in the meantime that the business men are also called upon for the very many other war activities, such as the Red Cross, the Young Men's Christian Association, not to mention the many demands from cantonments for community houses, smileage books, and all manner of things of a similar nature. Finally, it must be remembered that the business men will surely be expected to again subscribe liberally for the third issue of the liberty bonds, and the majority of them, we believe, and we are among the number, have not yet been able to in full take care of our 4 per cent liberty bonds, to which we subscribed very heavily, indeed.

Another large concern writes:

In the case of our own company, as well as individuals connected therewith, we have bought very heavily of Government bonds and would like to continue to take our share of forthcoming issues. We still have heavy payments to make on our commitments for bonds.

In ordinary times we could go to our banks for large loans. Financial conditions, however, are such to-day—and there is no relief promised for the immediate future—that we can not count on our usual accommodations from the banks.

Although we have been very conservative in the management of our business, the needs of the Government have forced us to make considerable extensions.

We think our concern is typical of many others who will encounter serious difficulty if the taxes for the year must be paid not later than June 15.

Another firm writes:

We affirm that our business was very profitable in the years 1915, 1916, and 1917, after some seven years of practically no profits. Desirous of expanding our business we contracted for a new building and other improvements some nine months before the passage of the excess-profits tax law, which has more than taken our available cash and profits of 1917 and previous years, and making us a borrower. The tightening of the money market prevents our borrowing a single dollar on our real estate by mortgage or otherwise (which under normal conditions we could easily do); and as our line of open credit at the bank has already been exhausted we are facing the serious problem of how we are to raise additional funds to meet these June taxes. Understand, we made no new contracts after the passage of the law; in fact, for some three months before the act, but contracts let months previous we had to carry out.

I could spend hours reading letters to the same effect, and with them fill many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I do not care to consume the time of the Senate. I have had similar communications from more than 21 States in the Union. On the other hand, I have received but one letter in the last six months suggesting that efforts to extend the time of payment perhaps should be stopped, in view of the opposition of the Secretary of the Treasury to them.

These letters from which I have read to the Senate, as well as others which I have in my possession, are but the outpouring of the convictions of intelligent, broad-gauged, patriotic business men who not only understand financing their own business propositions but have a comprehension of national finances as well. Whatever the Congress may see fit to do toward granting them relief I know they will submit to and do the best they can. But if some relief is not granted them they will never cease to feel that when the Government had its opportunity to help them it failed to do so.

But I have been asked several questions touching the financial condition of the Treasury, and I wish to dwell upon that for a few minutes.

FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE TREASURY.

I am advised that it will require on an average about \$1,000,000,000 per month to finance our own obligations and to meet the promises which we have made to our allies. In other words, at the present rate of current expenditures, the war will require \$12,000,000,000 per year. I am not taking into consideration increased expenditures, which are to be expected.

Of course, they are going to increase, but they are not going to be met by this tax, which is to be paid by June 15.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

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

Mr. POMERENE. I do.

Mr. KELLOGG. I may be wrongly advised, but I have been informed that the expenditures now are a billion and a half dollars a month.

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I will refer to that in a moment. It is true that our expenses during the month of May were a billion and a half dollars, but I am speaking of the average during the current year. They will probably be larger later on.

Mr. KELLOGG. But I am advised that they are increasing at the rate of a hundred million dollars a month.

Mr. POMERENE. Be that as it may, that does not meet the situation.

On May 14, 1918, according to the daily statement issued by the United States Treasury Department, there was a balance in the Treasury of \$1,647,962,823.94.

On the same day, according to the estimates submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury in response to a resolution of the Senate, we were advised that the aggregate collections from all sources for the fiscal year of 1918 would amount to \$4,095,699,000.

The total subscriptions for the third liberty-loan sale amounted to \$4,170,019,650.

Making a total revenue from these three sources of \$9,913,681,473.94.

In addition to this amount there are several thousands outstanding returns of income and excess profits, and my belief is that they will be sufficient to increase the revenue from this source from \$2,775,185,000, reported by the Secretary of the Treasury, to \$3,000,000,000, and adding this estimated increase to the total as above stated will bring the amount of the funds to \$10,138,496,473.92.

With this amount added, estimating that the expense will not be in excess of \$1,000,000,000 per month, the revenue from these three sources would be sufficient to pay the expenses of the Government from May 14, 1918, until after March 1, 1919.

It develops, however, that the Treasury Department issued short-time certificates, in anticipation of the third liberty loan, to the amount of \$3,012,085,500.

Of this amount there has already been paid \$900,000,000; certificates turned in as payment on the above subscriptions maturing May 28, \$120,474,500; maturing June 18, \$123,311,000; maturing July 9, \$144,741,000; maturing July 18, \$103,023,000; making a total of \$1,391,549,500; leaving balance unpaid, which will mature May 28, June 18, July 9, and July 18, \$1,620,536,000.

The Treasury Department has also issued short-time certificates maturing July 25 amounting to \$1,500,604,000.

This leaves a total of outstanding unpaid certificates amounting to \$3,121,140,000.

I am unable to state what proportion of the certificates already redeemed have been paid out of the revenue for the current calendar year, but if the total issue, aggregating \$4,512,689,500, has been or is to be paid out of the funds in the Treasury, or to be derived from the taxes to be paid June 15, 1918, or the third liberty loan, there would still remain a balance of \$5,625,806,973.94. If the expenses of the Government amount to \$1,000,000,000 per month, there will be sufficient funds to carry the Government through until after November 1, 1918, even if there were no revenues derivable from any other source whatsoever.

But we have revenues coming in from the customs, from the post office, and from many other sources of internal revenue which are not taken into consideration in this calculation I have made, and which will substantially add to the Government's revenues.

One of the Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury advises me the disbursements for the months of May and June may aggregate \$3,000,000,000, or for these two months \$1,000,000,000 in excess of the rate of expenditures above stated. Assuming this to be true, under the calculations just made all of the

short-time certificates will be paid and the funds arranged for will meet the demands of the Government until October 1. All of this money is furnished by the public. Under the plan of the Treasury Department, if no extension of the time of payment is granted, much of this money will be in the Treasury months before it is needed. As bearing upon the ability of the Government to grant an extension of the time of the payment for a part of these taxes it will be interesting for Senators to remember that the third liberty loan is being paid much more rapidly than is required by the terms of sale. The New York Times on May 19, 1918, informed us that out of a total subscription in the Federal reserve bank district of New York, amounting to \$1,114,930,700, it has received payment to the amount of \$812,489,904, or nearly 73 per cent of its entire subscription.

On May 20, 1918, I was advised by the Treasury Department that out of the total subscription of the third liberty loan \$2,500,000,000 had already been paid. Or, in other words, there had already been paid on May 20, 1918, an amount equal to the payments becoming due May 4, May 28, and July 18. How much has been paid since May 20 I do not know. The fact that these payments have thus been made in advance is all the more reason why it is not necessary to be so insistent upon the payment of all of these taxes upon June 15.

It is expected that a new loan will be called in October or November.

If the Government was able during the past few months to arrange for a loan in the form of short-time certificates aggregating \$4,512,689,500 in anticipation of the collection of the taxes, the payment of which was not secured, and of the third liberty loan, at a time when the loan was not yet arranged for, can it not issue short-time certificates, if necessary, in anticipation of the collection of a part of the taxes if their payment is secured and deferred as the proposed legislation contemplates?

Ought we not to do this little bit for the business public? If the Government in the past few months has issued this large number of short-time certificates and has paid all or the most of them off, can it not issue other short-time certificates if necessary? Surely the Government can not take the position that it has exhausted its ability to make loans on short-time certificates. Surely those who have money and have accommodated the Government in the past by buying these certificates will continue to accommodate the Government by buying short-time certificates in the future.

I am making this appeal for those who have their all invested in their business and who do not have the ready cash. I beg of the Congress to pause and think what will be the effect of compelling the business men to pay into the Treasury \$3,000,000,000 in one day.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

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

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. The issuance of the certificates of which the Senator speaks would not increase the circulating medium; they would not increase the amount of cash.

Mr. POMERENE. No; that is true.

Mr. GRONNA. Those who would buy these certificates would have to utilize whatever cash they might have in the bank; so that it really would not make any difference whether they pay their money for certificates or whether they pay it for taxes.

Mr. POMERENE. That is true, so far as they are concerned; but it is interesting to note that only those people invest in short-time certificates who have the money. The taxpayer who has no money does not invest in them.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator is making a very logical argument. Of course, I admit that if we have the necessary cash in the Treasury there is no reason why we should not permit these people to meet their taxes on the partial-payment plan; but, as I understand, the Secretary of the Treasury has said that the Treasury does need the money.

The Senator, I think, has painted a very gloomy picture. He has compared the tremendous amount of taxes with the cash of the country. I think that the comparison should be made, as suggested by the Senator from Minnesota, with deposits.

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, Mr. President, I recognize the fact, of course, that deposits are made in the banks, and that there are more deposits there than there is cash on hand. I understand that thoroughly.

Mr. GRONNA. I know the Senator does.

Mr. POMERENE. And I am not disputing the Senator's position, but I am comparing the amount of this tax with the amount of the cash, in order to show the additional drain upon this cash and the strain upon it. That is all I am seeking to do by the argument.

Mr. GRONNA. I am listening to the Senator with a great deal of interest, and I realize fully that the payment of the tax is going to be a serious drain upon the banks of the country and upon the business people.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, this subject is not a new one to me. Out in my State, for instance, we require all taxes—State, municipal, county, township, and school—to be paid in June and December; but up to 15 years ago all of that money was locked up in the county treasury. It could not be placed upon deposit, and for several weeks before the tax-paying period began and for a number of weeks after the tax-paying period had ended the tax money was in the vaults of the county; the public could not have it, and business was being constantly crippled.

Mr. GRONNA. But the point I wish to make, if it does not disturb the Senator, is this: If the Secretary of the Treasury does insist upon the payment of these taxes at one time, it will not seriously disturb the condition of the banks, because, after all, it will only be a transfer of credits.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, that may be the Senator's view, and I recognize his experience and have great respect for his opinion, but the fact of the matter is that the bankers of my own State think that it is going very seriously to curtail their ability to meet the situation. It must be borne in mind that I am not concerning myself so much for those men who have the money; it is that class of men who have property and business but do not have the money and perhaps have borrowed up to their limit that concern me, and I do not want to see the business of the country unnecessarily embarrassed.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

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

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I approve entirely what the Senator has said. The Senator has dealt with this question in a broad, patriotic, and thorough manner, and here is a case where Senators on both sides of the Chamber are agreed that relief ought to be afforded, and yet we can not get it. Cloture would not help us to get it. The Senator has spoken now for about an hour and 40 minutes, and he has not told all he knows, by any manner of means, upon this question, and yet we can not get action.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, my colleagues have been contributing very much to the interest of this subject, and perhaps if I had not permitted interruptions I would have been through and could have told what I knew.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; I am sure the Senator could not possibly have gotten through in an hour and said all the wise things he has said.

Mr. POMERENE. I have such profound respect for my distinguished friend from Michigan that I do not care to get into a controversy with him on the subject of cloture.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

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

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. KING. I hope that when the new rule proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] comes up for consideration the Senator from Ohio will remember the splendid speech he is making and the length of time which he has necessarily consumed and vote against the proposed rule.

Mr. POMERENE. My good friend from Utah can not embarrass me by that question, because whether that cloture hits me or anybody else, I am for it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, my!

Mr. POMERENE. Nothing could be more gratifying to our people than to pass a joint resolution which will permit the payment of a portion of their taxes on June 15, 1918, and give them a little time within which to get the necessary funds for the balance.

In view of present conditions, I believe the plan I proposed of making these payments in monthly installments should be changed. Permit me to suggest that one-half of the taxes be paid on June 15 and the balance in two and three or two and four months from June 15. In this way the money that is first paid will find its way back into the commerce of the country, help to relieve the tightness of the money market, enable the business men to finance their enterprises, and prepare themselves to pay the balance of their taxes and provide for the fourth liberty loan which will come. It will do neither the Government nor the business public any good to have idle money in the Treasury for a period of time when there are constant demands for all of our circulating medium. If by chance the needs of the Government during the next four or five months shall prove greater than we anticipate, they no doubt will be met by issuing other short-time certificates or by mak-

ing the fourth liberty loan at an earlier date than now contemplated. Although the Government had outstanding these short-term certificates to the amount of \$4,513,689,500, it only called for from \$3,000,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000 in the third liberty loan, and it divided this loan into four payments. The largest payment to be made at one time was only 40 per cent, or \$1,668,700,800. As stated before, this loan to the Government was made by men who either had the money or had prospects of getting it, and the largest amount required to be paid by them in one day was \$1,668,700,800. And notwithstanding the care which was taken to distribute these payments upon liberty loans in such a way as at the same time to both serve the Government and interfere as little as possible with the current business of the country, it is proposed under the present law to require all taxpayers of the country to pay \$3,000,000,000 in one day, or nearly twice the amount of any one payment upon the liberty loans, whether they have the money or not.

I am not an alarmist. I think I have clearly shown that the business public is very much disturbed because of the insistence of the Treasury Department that this money shall all be paid on one day. They feel that it is not necessary. I believe I have shown that it is not necessary. I think those Members of the Congress who have kept in touch with their constituents back home know that the country wants to pay their taxes in installments, not because they do not have the property out of which the taxes can be collected, but because they are now having serious trouble to finance their business, and they are not able to borrow the necessary funds at their banks. Bankers in many localities have loaned to their clients to the very limit. They are not disturbed because of the quality of the securities offered for new loans, but because under the law they can not extend the amount of their loans, or because they do not have the money in bank to take care of them. Let me give you a concrete case, which is typical:

A contractor of my acquaintance who had to meet a small pay roll of \$1,900, who is a man of some property and in good credit, went to every bank in the city where he was putting up a public building, with his note indorsed by several responsible sureties. He was denied the loan because they were not making any new loans in anticipation of the expected drain upon the banks by the payment of these taxes on June 15, at the same time assuring him that under normal conditions they would have been glad to have loaned \$100,000 to him with the same sureties.

Within three weeks a prominent citizen of Ohio, who is in a position to be familiar with the financial conditions of the State, told me that several of the largest taxpayers in his section of the State had said that if the Government did not grant an extension of time for the payment of a portion of these taxes they knew they could not get the money to pay them all, and if an attempt was made to distraint their property for the payment of the taxes they would make application to the courts for the appointment of a receiver in order to prevent unnecessary sacrifice of their property and get a little time in which to convert it into cash.

I recognize the fact that I shall be criticized in certain quarters for making these observations, but I have been in touch with this subject for more than six months. I know that the views I have expressed meet the approval of nearly all the responsible chambers of commerce, clearing-house associations, organizations of bankers, merchants, manufacturers, mine operators, as well as most of the business men, firms, and corporations of the country.

Congress will be asked to provide for increased taxation. Business will respond with the same patriotism to these increased taxes and future loans that it has in the past, but let us not add to its burdens unnecessarily. I hope, though the day is late, that Congress and the Treasury Department will see their way clear to grant a reasonable extension for the payment of a portion of these taxes. Any extension will be better than none at all.

INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9959) increasing rates of pensions of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it is quite evident that it will be impossible to secure a vote upon this bill to-night. As I understand, there are one or two other Senators who desire to speak. I therefore send to the desk a request for unanimous consent for a vote upon the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah submits a request for unanimous consent, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 4 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Tuesday, June 4, 1918, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that

may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill H. R. 9959, a bill to increase pensions of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 2 o'clock p. m. on said calendar day no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill or more than once or longer than 5 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before the roll is called I desire to say that it is understood that the Senate will recess to-day if this unanimous-consent agreement is entered into.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a question. The Senator, in his request for unanimous consent, limits the speeches to 10 minutes upon the bill and 5 minutes upon amendments. Is not the bill now, as it has been reported from the committee, in the nature of an amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that it is in the nature of a substitute, which is always treated as a bill.

Mr. GRONNA. On a former occasion that question came up, and I think those of us who anticipated that we would be given 10 minutes were disappointed, and found that we had only 5 minutes.

Mr. SMOOT. We have from 12 o'clock to 2 for general discussion, and that is not limited. After 2 o'clock the discussion upon the bill itself can be either on the House bill or on the Senate bill, and five-minute speeches can be made on amendments.

Mr. GRONNA. I am not criticizing the request at all from a personal standpoint, because I think I consume less time in debate than any other Member of this body, but I think we might just as well have it understood that only 5 minutes will be given to anyone under the unanimous-consent agreement asked for by the Senator from Utah. There is no need of putting in a provision for 10-minute speeches, because no Senator will be given 10 minutes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think under the unanimous-consent agreement the bill itself could be discussed for 10 minutes by any Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. Then why not provide that only five minutes shall be given? I think every Senator here understands that this is a substitute reported by the committee, which is the same as an amendment, and no Senator will be given more than five minutes' time.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that my idea is that any Senator who desired to speak on the bill after 2 o'clock could speak upon the bill itself, and refer to either the House provision or the Senate provision; but when it came to a specific amendment to the Senate provision or the House provision, of course he could only speak for 5 minutes. He could talk upon the bill, however, for 10 minutes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Utah that when a Senator does not exercise his privilege of discussing the bill, and the consideration of amendments begins, he gets no opportunity whatever of discussing the bill except upon an amendment, and that discussion is limited to 5 minutes. That is the difficulty we have encountered several times. It seems to me that in order to obviate that objection the Senator might provide for 10-minute speeches on amendments, and then it would be satisfactory all around, I think.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing to modify the proposal so as to provide for speeches of 10 minutes upon the bill and 10 minutes upon amendments.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I think there are only two amendments that will be offered, so far as I am advised. Those two amendments are provisions that were a part of the House bill, and they will be offered to perfect the Senate substitute.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Probably the complication will not arise, but a number of complications have arisen in the past by reason of having the distinction between 10-minute and 5-minute speeches. As soon as amendments are offered and the consideration of one has begun, it seems that the Chair has ruled that you can not go back and discuss the bill at large. I think that difficulty would be obviated by the proposition I have made.

Mr. SMOOT. I will modify the proposed agreement, then, by making the time allowed on amendments 10 minutes instead of 5.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I should like to hear the proposed agreement read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement as modified.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 4 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Tuesday, June 4, 1918, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill H. R. 9959, a bill to increase pensions of soldiers and sailors

of the Civil War, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 2 o'clock p. m. on said calendar day, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill, or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I note that after 4 o'clock there is to be no debate on the bill or on any amendment. If this were any other bill than a pension bill I would not consent to a proposal of that kind, but while I have an amendment that I hope to have an opportunity of offering to this bill, I think I shall not object to the proposal in this case. As I have said before, however, upon legislative matters of a general character I will not consent to fixing a definite time to vote after which amendments that are proposed must be voted upon without any discussion whatever.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Jones, N. Mex.	Martin	Shields
Brandegee	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Simmons
Cummins	Kellogg	Nugent	Smith, Mich.
Curtis	Kenyon	Owen	Smoot
France	King	Page	Sutherland
Gronna	Lenroot	Pomeroy	Swanson
Gulion	Lewis	Pomeroy	Vardaman
Harding	McCumber	Saulsbury	Warren
Hardwick	McKellar	Shafroth	Wolcott
Henderson	McNary	Sheppard	

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. My colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] is unavoidably detained from the Chamber on public business.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. THOMAS] is detained on official business.

Mr. McNARY. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. KIRBY, Mr. NORRIS, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. UNDERWOOD answered to their names when called.

Mr. HALE, Mr. DILLINGHAM, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] offers a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary again read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KING. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 3799. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 12280. An act making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT (S. DOC. NO. 230).

Mr. RANDELL. I submit the conference report on House bill 10069, known as the river and harbor appropriation bill, which I ask to lie on the table and be printed. I ask also that the report be printed in the RECORD.

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

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10069) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 11, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the language in the proposed amendment; also strike out the period at the end of line 20, page 18, insert in lieu thereof a colon, and add the following words: "Provided, That in estimating the cost of doing the work by Government plant, including the cost of labor and materials, there shall also be taken into account proper charges for depreciation of plant and all supervising and overhead expenses and interest on the capital invested in the Government plant, but the rate of interest shall not exceed the maximum prevailing rate being paid by the United States on current issues of bonds or other evidences of indebtedness"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed insert the following:

"Sec. 5. That the Secretary of War shall cause an investigation to be made regarding the discharge or deposit into any of the navigable waterways of the United States of free acid or acid waste in any form, or any other deleterious substances, and the extent to which the same exists and the sources thereof, together with any injurious results therefrom affecting the navigability of such waters or any works of improvement made thereon by the United States or any other uses of said navigable waters, and submit a report to Congress which shall include a summary of the evidence obtained and any recommendations regarding same which may be deemed appropriate, and any necessary expenses connected therewith shall be paid out of the available funds herein or hereafter appropriated for examinations, surveys, and contingencies. If in the course of such investigation it should be considered desirable to obtain any existing data or expert evidence or service from any of the other departments of the Government, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to make application therefor, and such departments are hereby directed to furnish such data or evidence or service as may be so required and which may be considered pertinent or appropriate."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the proposed amendment strike out the word "be," at the beginning of the twentieth line, and insert in lieu thereof the word "being"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2.

DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

JOS. E. RANDELL,

KNUTE NELSON,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

JNO. H. SMALL,

CHAS. F. BOOHER,

C. A. KENNEDY,

Managers on the part of the House.

RECESS.

Mr. KING. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 4, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 3, 1918.

SURVEYOR GENERAL.

Henry Gerharz, of Montana, to be surveyor general of Montana, his present term expiring June 23, 1918. (Reappointment.)

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

John B. Sanford, of California, to be register of the land office at San Francisco. (Reappointment.)

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONIES.

Mrs. Grace B. Caukin, of California, to be receiver of public moneys at San Francisco. (Reappointment.)

Alexander Mitchell, of California, to be receiver of public moneys at Los Angeles. (Reappointment.)

Adelbert B. Gray, of Carson City, Nev., to be receiver of public moneys at Carson City, Nev., vice Edmund James, term expired.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Roger A. Sanford, Field Artillery, to be first Lieutenant with rank from May 13, 1918.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

VETERINARY CORPS.

Veterinarian Henry L. Sommer, Ninth Cavalry, to be assistant veterinarian, United States Army, with rank from May 25, 1918.

TRANSFER TO THE ACTIVE LIST OF THE ARMY.

INFANTRY.

Capt. William M. Goodale, retired, to be captain with rank from July 12, 1911.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. William C. I. Stiles to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 18th day of January, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1918:

Webb Trammell,
Frank J. Lowry,
Walter A. Riedel,
Jay K. Esler, and
Bushrod B. Howard.

The following-named assistant surgeons of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 19th day of January, 1918:

Hiram B. Duncan,
Elmer J. Morrison,
Robert H. Scott,
Robert K. Rewalt,
Harry V. Sims,
Melvin S. Stover,
Dana M. Collier,
Walter M. Brunet,
Samuel P. Bartley,
Richard P. Bell,
Arthur D. Burnett,
Charles F. Carter,
William S. Kerlin,
Ernest R. Schilling,
Herbert L. Arnold,
Walter E. Hennerich,
Lyle D. McMillan,
Harry B. Jablow,
John Pennington,
Enoch Calloway,
Grove Baldwin,
William A. Epstein,
Robert C. Hannigen,
John A. Cloyd,
Charles T. McGregor,
Alfred M. Kahn,
William H. Schellhamer,
Philip Levey,
Harry J. Noble,
Dudley D. Schoenfeld,
Charles C. Wolcott,
Paul W. Bloxson,
Elmer C. Texter,
Malcolm L. Pratt,
Walter J. Muellenhager,
Alfred C. Labine,
Royal K. Joslin,
Arthur H. Pierson,
Thomas H. Sharp,
Cecil G. Sutherland,
Hadley H. Teter,
Calvin N. Caldwell,
David H. McCall,
James A. Fountain,
Alfred G. Tinney,
Charles A. Cullen,
William F. Krone,
John S. Von Winkle,
Lawrence C. Chisholm,
George W. Ruger,
Herman C. Petterson,
Howard Rouse,
Nelson A. Bryan,
Henry P. Merrill,
Warwick T. Brown,
James L. Pierce,

Avery H. Sarno,
David W. Register,
Harrison L. Wyatt,
Myron L. Curtner,
Rolfe Tainter,
Gustaf A. Larson,
John A. Judy,
Grover C. Freeman,
Frederick W. Muller,
Harry E. Kaplan,
John J. Blue,
William R. Leahy,
Houston B. Fite,
John L. Cremens,
Carlyle J. Edwards,
Gilbert H. Larson,
Carl O. Fischer,
Edwin G. Stork,
Ralph E. Duncan,
Henry C. Mahnken,
John R. Frank,
Everett K. Gear,
Adolph G. Sund,
Alfred L. Arnold,
Jared E. Clarke,
Hillard L. Weer,
Charles M. Glassmire,
Bryant E. Moulton,
Randall Clifford,
John B. Craig,
Willis D. Hall,
Samuel E. Johnson,
Bathune F. McDonald,
Marvin M. Gould,
Robert F. Zeiss,
Arthur C. Dean,
Robert S. Wood,
Thomas H. Russell,
Henry D. Stewart,
Alva G. Thomas,
Waldemar R. Metz,
Daniel P. Platt,
Gardner N. Cobb,
Kirk B. Bard,
Jacob S. Rosenthal,
William A. Frascolla,
Henry DeW. Hubbard,
Kenneth D. Legge,
John A. Marsh,
Roy L. Felder,
Arthur Goettsch,
Reuben H. Hunt,
Earl H. Mitchell,
William A. Morgan,
Russell C. Ryan,
Thomas Soltz,
Grover C. Todd,
Paul B. Welch,
James B. Bert,
Robert E. Henderson,
Warren A. Van Derveer,
Ralph A. Gowdy,
Calvin H. Childress,
Clement J. Friedman,
James K. Gordon,
Paul P. Maher,
Lance E. Briscoe,
Alvin O. Sibila,
John B. Healy,
Julian P. Johnson,
Harry B. Krummes,
Howard H. Montgomery,
Philip H. Decker,
Lafayette T. Miller,
Frank L. Hubbard,
Jose A. Perez,
Ray E. A. Pomeroy,
Grady R. Roberts,
Leighton A. Smith,
Charles B. Wade,
Charles F. Graham,
John M. Emmett,
Wendell P. Blake,
Frank E. Sayers,
Woodhull L. Condict,

Charles L. Fackler,
 Mervin C. Myerson,
 Harry M. Biffar,
 Ivan M. Proctor,
 Richard Owen,
 William H. Olds,
 Joseph M. Archibald,
 Henry A. Bruckshaw,
 Joseph C. Brugman,
 William P. Mull,
 Anthony Stadtherr,
 Gordon A. Grimland,
 Bronson E. Summers,
 William E. Costolow,
 Charles Lieber,
 Jesse W. Smith,
 John C. Wieters,
 J. Hart Toland,
 William R. Turner,
 George A. Enlon,
 Carl H. Fornell,
 Charles M. Hatcher,
 William B. James,
 W. Iden King,
 George M. Richards,
 Alexander S. Walker,
 Richard D. Anderson,
 Max Shaweker,
 Talmadge Weatherly,
 Paul L. Holliday,
 John E. Linden,
 Richard W. Vaughan,
 Walter R. Parker,
 Robert V. Williams,
 Winthrop Adams,
 Vernon E. Babington,
 William A. Reese,
 John A. Salb,
 Harry J. Dooley,
 Howard L. Dovey,
 William F. Kennedy,
 Edgar F. McCall,
 Clarence S. McKee,
 Eugene Torrey,
 John M. Walker,
 Charles J. V. Fries,
 Eugene T. Morrison,
 McClure Scott,
 Harvey L. Bassinger,
 Thomas L. Carter,
 James C. Walker,
 Clarence P. Curley,
 Mercer C. Parrott,
 Karl McC. Scott,
 Joseph P. Israel,
 Albert G. Wenzell,
 Joseph J. Mundell,
 Mendel L. Cohn,
 Paul J. Flory,
 Edwin C. Thomas,
 Clarence A. Whitecomb,
 Francis D. Walker,
 Louis F. Garben,
 Royal A. McCune,
 Edward L. McDermott,
 Alfredo DeYoanna,
 Saverio DeYoanna,
 John G. Downey,
 Joseph F. Montague,
 Thomas C. Redfern,
 John T. Short,
 John Casagrande,
 George E. McLaughlin,
 Russell S. Boles,
 Arnold E. Saverien,
 Joseph J. Toland,
 Theodore Warner,
 Robert L. McMahon,
 Thomas A. Ratliffe,
 Franklin C. Hill,
 Glaister H. Ashley,
 Arthur Wildman,
 Walter A. Bacon,
 George T. Polk,
 Lyell C. Kinney,

Raymond Lewis,
 Philip D. Werum,
 William H. Wynn,
 Stanley Nichols,
 Cyrus C. Brown,
 James M. Nichols,
 William F. Crouse,
 Robert C. Leddy,
 Charles R. Tatum,
 Benjamin H. Viau,
 Charles W. Brown,
 Harry D. Conley,
 Harris B. Corey,
 Paul G. Parker,
 Claude Timberlake,
 Harry L. Howell,
 Jacob Applebaum,
 Tema L. Eyerly,
 Charles L. Warner,
 John C. Clayton,
 Robert D. Hostetter,
 Leo B. Norris,
 Abraham Jablons, and
 Bertie T. Larson.

The following-named assistant surgeons of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 1st day of March, 1918:

James F. Finnegan,
 Glenn J. Parker,
 Christopher C. Gardner,
 Charles W. Lane,
 Robert S. Irvine,
 Irving Gray,
 John J. Keegan,
 Edwin Peterson,
 Samuel Eisler,
 Carl J. Bucher,
 Samuel Z. Myers,
 Richard T. Powers,
 Mynor W. Beach,
 Verner B. Callomon,
 Fred J. Eakins,
 Robert M. Entwisle,
 Joseph B. Helm,
 Charles Koenigsberger,
 Francis H. Lee,
 John A. McLain,
 Leo T. McNichols,
 Albert M. Mitchell,
 Trygve Oftedal,
 George U. Pillmore,
 Earl B. Rinker,
 Louis H. Segar,
 Edward S. Smith,
 James C. Doughty,
 Louis H. Douglass,
 Howell C. Johnston,
 Arthur S. Judy,
 Linwood H. Justis,
 Horace G. Longaker,
 Sterling N. Pierce,
 Robert G. Reaves,
 Charles B. Bleasby,
 John W. Gainey,
 Edward R. Messer,
 James F. Churchill,
 Gaetano De Yoanna,
 Robert H. Donnell,
 Joseph Visalli,
 Maurice T. Briggs,
 Carroll H. Fowlkes,
 Henry L. Holzberg,
 Henry L. Marshall,
 Charles J. C. Gillon,
 Byron M. Harman,
 Walter C. Payne,
 Jarrett F. Runner,
 Henry B. Conrad,
 Earl S. Pomeroy,
 Benjamin Thane,
 William R. Redden,
 Francis B. Galbraith,
 Frank S. Johns,
 Hiram F. Leshin,

Will L. Brown,
 Horace S. Craigin,
 William R. Lightbody,
 Arthur A. Neubauer,
 Robert E. Cleary,
 Raymond D. Fear,
 Maurice A. Aaronson,
 Harry J. Vaughan,
 Arthur L. Gaetani,
 Bruno J. W. Glaubitz,
 Raymond R. Simmons,
 Gurdon S. Allyn,
 Thomas H. Cherry,
 Lewis G. Avery,
 William W. Davies,
 Andrew J. Hedgcock,
 Maurice Jose,
 Fred N. Pugsley,
 James B. Latimer,
 John H. Morrissey,
 Floyd W. Rice,
 Ellis M. Spoot,
 Ardmore A. Stott,
 Samuel S. Watkins,
 Thomas F. Duldgg,
 Lloyd A. Kennell,
 Conrad O. Rogné,
 Ronald B. Rogers,
 Corydon M. Ryon,
 Bernard J. O'Neill,
 Fred H. Gebhardt,
 Joseph F. Rowe,
 John C. Lindsay,
 John R. Lynch,
 Edward D. Lette,
 Cope M. Blackford,
 Fred C. Smith,
 James O. Walker,
 Jesse C. Horton,
 Thomas C. Little,
 Solomon Schneider,
 Edwin Janss,
 Isaac N. Ratchford,
 Charles C. Richards,
 Claude D. Roop,
 Arthur Van Dusen,
 Camille M. Shaar,
 Benjamin W. Gaines,
 Thomas G. McDonald,
 Ian D. Tiedmann,
 Milton H. Schutz,
 Howard T. Child,
 Robert A. Schless,
 William F. Broadhead,
 Edward L. Lingeman,
 Samuel Cline,
 James D. Benjamin,
 Hugh F. Lena,
 Jules Magnette,
 Reuben G. McCall,
 William K. Otis,
 Edward D. Archibald,
 Enoch G. Brian,
 Charles R. Hughes,
 Harry E. Kleinschmidt,
 Fred A. Rieckhoff,
 Craig Worth,
 Emmett J. Brady,
 Fremont Cummins,
 Harry A. Keener, and
 Edward J. Cummings.

Pay Clerk Ransom C. Wall to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1918.

The following-named citizens to be acting chaplains in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 15th day of May, 1918:

Robert H. Blackshear, citizen of Georgia,
 Joseph A. Perkins, citizen of Illinois,
 William P. Reagor, citizen of Kentucky, and
 Reuben W. Shrum, citizen of New Jersey.

John F. B. Carruthers, citizen of the District of Columbia, to be an acting chaplain in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 16th day of May, 1918.

Frank Halford, assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps with the rank of major, to be major in the Marine Corps from the 20th day of August, 1916.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 3, 1918.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Vene Bloomer to be register of the land office at El Centro, Cal.

POSTMASTERS.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Myra G. Jordan, West Upton.

MISSISSIPPI.

Ansel W. Quin, Columbia.

WYOMING.

Herbert M. Brown, Sundance.

Florence S. Heitz, Superior.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, June 3, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Father in Heaven, help us to concentrate all our energy and strength, physically, mentally, morally, upon the prosecution of the damnable war which has been forced upon us with a faith that makes for patience, a hope that makes for confidence, a patriotism that makes for sacrifice, a courage that makes for endurance, that we may do and dare, fight and pray.

For right is right, since God is God;
 And right the day must win;
 To doubt would be disloyalty,
 To falter would be sin.

In the name of right we pray. In the name of humanity we pray. In the name of Christ we pray. In the name of God we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 31, 1918, was read and approved.

DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES LIABLE TO MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. KING rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] rise?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of privileged resolutions which I send to the Clerk's desk. There are a number of them, perfected in accordance with the understanding of a day or two ago.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first one.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 372.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Navy Department between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been made and allowed by such department, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department, and the length of time he has been in such service.

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

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MADDEN. We had those things up on Friday, and it was understood—

Mr. RAYBURN. It seems to me from the reading of the resolution that the gentleman is asking for something the department can not give. He asks for the number of exemptions asked and the number allowed by that department. That department or any other department has no right to allow exemptions.

Mr. MADDEN. They asked somebody else to allow them.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be again reported.

Mr. MADDEN. This resolution has been reported in accordance with the understanding of the House on Friday.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the resolution. The resolution was again reported.

Mr. MADDEN. That is, "asked by the department and allowed."

Mr. RAYBURN. It says "asked and allowed" by the department. The department has no power whatever to allow an exemption.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have it corrected.
The SPEAKER. How does the gentleman wish it corrected?
Mr. MADDEN. To have it read "asked by the department and allowed." Have each one of them read in that way.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker—
The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?
Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?
Mr. MADDEN. Yes.
Mr. DOWELL. Is there any deferred classification?
Mr. MADDEN. This asks for deferred classification.
Mr. DOWELL. Asks for deferred classification also?
Mr. MADDEN. Yes.
Mr. DOWELL. I did not understand that.
The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. May we have it reported as it would read as amended?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it again. This makes the third time.

Mr. STAFFORD. It has not been reported as amended by the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution as proposed to be amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Navy Department between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. WALSH. That does not convey the impression the gentleman seeks by his amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. It says "asked by the department and allowed." I suggested it be changed.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Speaker, asked to strike out the words "by such department," as I understand it.

Mr. MADDEN. Everybody here asked to have it changed Friday, and it was changed to meet everybody's views.

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. 2374. An act to relieve the estate of Thomas H. Hall, deceased, late postmaster at Panacea, Fla., and the bondsmen of said Thomas H. Hall of the payment of money alleged to have been misappropriated by a clerk in said office.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment the bill (H. R. 9864) to amend section 111 of the Judicial Code, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 10852) to provide for the appointment of a commission to standardize screw threads, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives, and had appointed Mr. KENYON, Mr. HARDING, and Mr. SHIELDS as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following order:

Ordered, That Mr. NUGENT be appointed an additional conferee on the part of the Senate on the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 4482) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

On May 31, 1918:

S. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia.

On June 1, 1918:

H. R. 8764. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Illinois into the Union.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 2374. An act to relieve the estate of Thomas H. Hall, deceased, late postmaster at Panacea, Fla., and the bondsmen of said Thomas H. Hall, of the payment of money alleged to have been misappropriated by a clerk in said office; to the Committee on Claims.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?
Mr. KING. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of agricultural or farm-risk insurance.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of agricultural and farm-risk insurance. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES LIABLE TO MILITARY SERVICE.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report this resolution as modified:

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 372.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Navy Department between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

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

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment: After the word "years" insert "July 1, 1917."

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no. Well, all right. The gentleman can offer it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. RAKER. After the word "years" insert the words "July 1, 1917."

Mr. MADDEN. Between 21 and 31 on July 1?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

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

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the other resolutions in the hands of the Clerk be amended in accordance with the amendment of this one.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks that the other 10 resolutions be amended in the same way that that one was.

Mr. FOSTER. They are going to be read?

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one with that language in.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 377.

Resolved, That the Attorney General be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of Justice between the ages of 21 and 31 years July 1, 1917, for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

Mr. WALSH rose.

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

Mr. WALSH. I want to direct the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that I think that the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] nullifies the effect of the resolution. It simply calls for the names of those who were in the service of the department on July 1, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31.

Mr. MADDEN. That is not what we want.

Mr. WALSH. If you will read the resolution, you will find that that is what you will get.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment is to get those who are in the service 21 years of age.

Mr. WALSH. Putting the language in where he does, he confines the information to the number of men who were of that age in the service July 1, 1917.

Mr. RAKER. I think not.

Mr. MADDEN. We do not want to do that.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Attorney General be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of Justice between the ages of 21 and 31 years July 1, 1917, for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

Mr. MADDEN. I am afraid that that does exactly what the gentleman from Massachusetts says it does, and I hope the amendment will not be adopted. I move to strike it out of the other resolution now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves—

Mr. MADDEN. I move to reconsider.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to reconsider the action of the House in passing the resolution about the Navy Department. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. I move to strike the amendment out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOWELL. No; Mr. Speaker, that is not in order.

Mr. MADDEN. It is in order. We are reconsidering it.

Mr. DOWELL. The proper way is to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment was adopted.

The SPEAKER. That is what we have done.

Mr. DOWELL. He is making a motion to strike out.

The SPEAKER. He is making the motion to strike out now.

Mr. DOWELL. The proper motion is to reconsider the question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows; but the motion to reconsider has already passed.

Mr. DOWELL. I understand; but the motion should be to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment was adopted, and not by striking it out. We have reconsidered the vote, but we ought now to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment was adopted and refuse to adopt the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the question reverts on the motion of the gentleman from California without any motion to reconsider or anything else. We have reconsidered the vote whereby we passed the resolution, and now the question reverts to the motion of the gentleman from California.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey rose.

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

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. My proposition is that if you put in the words "who were between the ages of 21 and 31" on that day you will have no trouble about the resolution. I move to insert "who were."

Mr. DOWELL. There was a motion made to reconsider the vote which adopted the resolution. That was carried.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Now, when we had the resolution here the amendment of the gentleman from California was adopted. That now stands as adopted by the House. The question now should be to reconsider the vote whereby that amendment was adopted. Then we have brought it back to the question of voting on the amendment, but until the vote by which the amendment was adopted is reconsidered you can not consider any other question with reference to that amendment. The vote should now be to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment to the resolution was adopted.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make that motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment of the gentleman from California was adopted. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. RAKER rose.

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

Mr. RAKER. To get unanimous consent to speak for a minute or two minutes before the next resolution is taken up.

Mr. MADDEN. We have a lot of them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois controls the time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. DOWELL. The question now recurs on the adoption of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that just as well as the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman was moving the adoption of the resolution when I raised the question.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman allow me a minute?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, we shall not get anywhere with this matter if you do that.

Mr. RAKER. There is a resolution here to try to get information. But you will not get the names of all of these men who are over 30 years of age under this resolution. Since the date the law went into effect there have been hundreds who have passed the age of 30 years, and you ought to get all of those who are in that service that are over 30 years of age. That is what we want in the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. DOWELL rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Would it not cover this case to provide for the names of those within the draft age, as provided by law?

Mr. MADDEN. A point of order was made and sustained against that language on Friday last.

Mr. DOWELL. It would seem to me that by unanimous consent that ought to be inserted.

Mr. WALSH. The draft age is specified here by giving the ages.

Mr. DOWELL. There could be no question about it if the resolution said "of draft age," and that would include those that have gone beyond 31 years of age.

Mr. MADDEN. The use of that language on last Friday was objected to on a point of order, and the point of order was sustained.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

NEGRO SOLDIERS.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a booklet entitled "A Tribute for the Negro Soldier," by John E. Bruce, a distinguished author and the American representative of the African Times and Oriental Review, London, England.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article on the colored soldier. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES LIABLE TO MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, there is another resolution, which I call up.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 371.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of War between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been made and allowed by such department; the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department, and the length of time he has been in such service.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me for a moment.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not know that it is important, but I venture to direct the gentleman's attention to the amendment offered by our friend from California [Mr. RAKER], and suggest that such an amendment, not in the language offered, but somewhat modified, ought to be adopted, so as to include those who on June 5, the day of registration, are of that age, and I suggest that for this reason: There might be someone in the service who would not come within the terms of the resolution as the gentleman now provides. I do not like to take up the time of the House, but I can see where this situation might arise. When the Secretary of War sends down that information, if he sends it literally, according to the terms of the resolution, he would probably exclude from it—

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

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have not the floor.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARNER. Does not the gentleman from Tennessee believe that a Cabinet officer would interpret this language according to its intent, to ascertain the number of men subject to draft who have been excused on account of service in the Government. If I thought that a member of the Cabinet would construe it any other way, I would certainly insist that it be drawn with more accuracy, but I can not conceive that a member of the Cabinet would undertake to excuse himself from not sending the information that evidently this resolution is intended to bring forth.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Here is the point, let me say in answer to the gentleman from Texas. We know what we have in our minds, but if we do not say what we have in our minds in the resolution as we pass it, how is the Secretary of War to construe the resolution other than by its terms? So far as its terms are concerned, it says those who are in the service who are between the ages of 21 and 31 years at this time, and it does not say between the ages of 21 and 31 on the 5th of June last. That is the way I would put it, in order to avoid any possibility of misunderstanding between the department and the Congress, and in order to avoid any criticism that might arise in the future. I venture to bring that to the attention of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I suggest to the gentleman that he offer such an amendment, and I would yield for that purpose.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I suggest an amendment to insert the words "on the 5th of June, 1917, or who became 21 years of age thereafter," and that would include all of them.

Mr. RAKER. I want to make this suggestion to the gentleman, that if, after the word "war" you would insert the words "who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31," it would answer the purpose.

Mr. DOWELL. And who became 21 years of age.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am not yielding the floor for this purpose.

Mr. RAKER. I know what the gentleman wants to get at, and that is all of the men who are liable to service, but you leave out of the resolution all of the men who went into the service between June 5 and the present date, and there will be no record of that, and we ought to have a record of all of those men.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that he temporarily withdraw his resolution until he can get time to put it in shape.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee to offer an amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: After the word "war," insert the words "who were on June 5, 1917," so that the resolution will read:

"House resolution 371.

"Resolved, That the Secretary of War be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of War who were, on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years, for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed; the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department, and the length of time he has been in such service."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I accept that amendment. It is perfectly agreeable to me and is exactly what I want to reach.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to insert those words in each of the other resolutions, including the one that has been passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to insert the words of the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] in all of these resolutions that are to be offered and also in those that have already been passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 383.

Resolved, That the United States Shipping Board be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of that board who were, on June 5, 1917, between the ages of

21 and 31 years, for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such board and allowed; the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 377.

Resolved, That the Attorney General be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of Justice who were, on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years, for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed; the name and home address of each such person and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes when these resolutions have been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes when these resolutions are disposed of. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKER. I ask unanimous consent, following the gentleman from Michigan—

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, let us get through with these resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Certainly; but the gentleman from Missouri has a right to submit a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. GARNER. I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER] is asking unanimous consent.

Mr. MEEKER. I ask unanimous consent that following the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on the result of the correspondence with the several nations of the world as to the status of alien soldiers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks for 10 minutes following the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] to talk about alien soldiers. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 378.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Labor be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of Labor who were, on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years, for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 379.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of Agriculture who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years, for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department, and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 380.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of Commerce who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department, and the length of time he has been in such service.

Mr. McKENZIE. I should like to ask my colleague one question. If I understand the reading of these resolutions, this will only give us a line on the men who have been excused and who are now employed in the particular departments to which this inquiry is directed.

Mr. MADDEN. And in all the bureaus of each department.

Mr. McKENZIE. Now, if my colleague will permit one other question, will these resolutions reach a case where the head of a department has asked that the man be deferred on account of the necessity of having his services in the department, and after that has been done the man has been given a commission in either the Army or the Navy?

Mr. MADDEN. Then, if it does not do that, we will try and reach it.

Mr. McKENZIE. It ought to be reached.
 The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.
 The resolution was agreed to.
 The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.
 The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 381.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Treasury Department who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military service or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department, and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

House resolution 382.

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Interstate Commerce Commission who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such commission and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the commission, and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

House resolution 376.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of the Interior who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department, and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

House resolution 375.

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Post Office Department who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

House resolution 374.

Resolved, That the Federal Trade Commission be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of that commission who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years, for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such commission and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the commission, and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

House resolution 373.

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of State who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. WELTY, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for two weeks, on account of official business.

THE RED CROSS AND THE Y. M. C. A.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I have a letter here which I am going to ask the Clerk to read, received by me on Saturday last from a young man, a lieutenant in the Engineer Corps, now in France. It is so interesting and complimentary to the Red Cross and the Y. M. C. A. that I thought the House would like to hear it.

The Clerk read as follows:

WITH THE COLORS,
 France, May 4, 1918.

Hon. J. W. FORDNEY,
 Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: Your most welcome letter came to me to-day, and I sure was glad to hear from you. Letters are letters in this country, and to get news from home certainly makes one feel fine.

I can not say much about what we are doing, but will tell you that we are doing some interesting work and are very busy all the time; and when I return to the States I will be able to tell you some interesting things that will interest you, too.

I am having a great time getting my tongue twisted into shape, but an Irishman was not made in a day, and you can not change him in a day, either.

I have seen some of the finest roads that are in existence anywhere; really they surpass most country roads in the States by 100 per cent; fine grades and permanent construction everywhere, but I guess that labor has been plentiful and cheap, so they could well afford it. Drainage is the solution of all road construction, either railroad or highway, and

they have well taken care of that. The railroads are rock ballasted because they have nothing else, but we have it over them on transportation and equipment, surpassing in every detail.

The country is not as level as it might be, and all the time that I spent studying about these great plateaus is thrown away, because the ground is like some of the ranches in the Palouse country in eastern Washington, where a rancher buys a ranch, stands it on edge, and farms both sides.

They talk in the States about this country being very immoral, but it is a mistake, because I believe they are better as a whole than the States along that line. They seem to be a clean, industrious people as far as they are personally concerned, but they have some peculiar ideas about taking care of their stock, that they all enter the same door and sleep under the same roof.

They can say what they want to about the Red Cross and the Y. M. C. A., but I will say that they are the "daddies" to us all over here, and a person that dares say a word against them should be shot at sunrise, and if cloudy should be shot in bed.

I am getting along dandy, feel fine, and am doing my bit every day and late at night, and any time that you can spare a moment to drop a line to an appreciative friend, then that's me; because I will be back some day, and I will go back in the old field again, and I do not want to forget or be forgotten in the lumber field at home.

Kindest regards to Mrs. Egerer and to your good family, and allow me to remain,

A sincere friend,

DAN MCGILLICUDDY.

Mr. FORDNEY. The boy goes further and gives a description of the forests and tells the kind of timber and flowers, and says it is a very beautiful country, quite like Paradise Valley in the Cascade Mountains. Paradise Valley is a valley at the foot of the great Rainier Mountain, in the State of Washington, with most magnificent scenery. I thought it would be of interest especially to those who have an interest in the Young Men's Christian Association and the Red Cross, because he states that they are doing such good work.

THE PROPOSED NEW REVENUE BILL.

Mr. FORDNEY. Gentlemen, the object of my few remarks this morning is in reference to the proposed new revenue bill. It is one of great importance to the people of the country, and I feel it timely for me to make a few remarks in reference to that bill, which it is proposed will raise \$3,000,000,000 in addition to existing laws.

I have and will continue, as every loyal citizen will, to vote for the necessary money for the Government to carry on this great war. I do not agree with some of my colleagues as to the proportion of our expenditures that we must raise by taxes. It has been repeatedly stated by the administration and by the Secretary of the Treasury, to me only a few days ago, that we are not raising by taxes in proportion to our expenditures the amount of money raised by Great Britain. In that the Secretary is in error. I am in receipt of a letter addressed to me by our American ambassador at London, England, dated April 25, which I have here in my possession. He gives the amount of money spent in Great Britain since the beginning of that war. He gives the amount raised by direct taxation, and gives it in great detail, and the amount of borrowed money. In order to be brief, let me say that up to the end of this fiscal year, March 31, 1918, that date being the end of Great Britain's fiscal year, Great Britain since the beginning of the war has raised £6,454,034,000, or \$31,408,585,000. Of that sum there has been raised in Great Britain by taxes \$7,871,000,000, or 25.06 per cent. That is, in round numbers 25 per cent of all expenditures in Great Britain from the beginning of the war until March 31, 1918, has been by taxation.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. GARNER. Does that include the money loaned to the allies?

Mr. FORDNEY. I am not certain.

Mr. GARNER. I think that is the entire expenditure and includes the money loaned to the allies.

Mr. FORDNEY. Now, if it is true, so much the better for my side of the argument. Twenty-five per cent is all the money they are raising in Great Britain by taxes for their expenditures in this war. I have also obtained from our American consul at Ottawa, Canada, the amount of money that Canada is raising by taxes in proportion to her expenditures in this great war, and Canada has raised 18½ per cent by taxes. France has raised 11 per cent by taxes and borrowed 89 per cent. Italy has raised 9 per cent and borrowed 91 per cent.

Now, taking it for granted that our expenditures this year are far above the estimates made last year, which was \$12,000,000,000, the amount of money raised under existing revenue laws is going to exceed \$4,000,000,000, far exceeding the per cent raised by Great Britain in proportion to our expenditures. It is conceded by the Treasury Department that we will raise \$4,000,000,000, but I believe I am within bounds of correctness when I say that we will raise this year under existing laws in round numbers four and a half billion dollars from taxes. The Secretary of the Treasury stated to me one week ago that he

expected our expenditures this year, including our loans to the allies, would reach \$24,000,000,000; in round numbers that we would loan to our allies \$6,000,000,000. My good friend, Mr. KITCHIN, stated to me since that time that he understands that our loans will reach \$8,000,000,000 of this \$24,000,000,000 of our expenditures and our loans to our allies. I do not believe it is claimed by anybody that we should tax the people now for the money that we are loaning to the allies. We are selling bonds on which we are obtaining money to loan to the allies, and we expect our allies to pay the interest and the principal of those bonds when they come due, because their obligations to the Government of the United States fall due when our bonds come due on which we are borrowing this money. Therefore, my friends, I believe that the money we exact from the people at this time should be the proportion necessary for our own expenses of this war, not including our loans to the allies. I believe the President in his speech the other day, although I was not present, but I read it in the paper, fixed the total sum of our expenditures, including our loans, for the fiscal year of 1918-19, the next fiscal year, at \$20,000,000,000, \$4,000,000,000 below the sum stated to me by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will permit, the President did not submit figures in his statement.

Mr. FORDNEY. I saw that in the papers, and if it is not correct of course I stand corrected.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. PADGETT. I simply want to make a statement that perhaps the Members would be interested in as rumors are going around. I have just talked with the Secretary of the Navy, and he said that to-day some German submarines appeared off the Jersey coast about 40 miles southeast of Barnegat and had sunk three schooners. We have not heard of others. He said they had gotten information that they had sunk three schooners about 40 miles southeast of Barnegat Light.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The latest Associated Press report said that 14 vessels in all had been sunk, including one rather large vessel but quite a number of small vessels.

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary stated the only definite information they had was that they had sunk three.

Mr. FORDNEY. I thank the gentleman; that is very interesting and startling information that makes the situation far more serious than up to date. Now, Great Britain's expenditures for the coming fiscal year, which this letter states had been sanctioned and agreed upon on the night before this letter was written, are a great increase over the three or four previous years. The amount of money to be raised by taxes this coming fiscal year, beginning the 1st of April in Great Britain, is \$4,007,000,000, a total budget of \$14,467,000,000 for the coming fiscal year. The amount of money to be raised by direct taxes of that total expenditure for this next fiscal year is 23.33 per cent. Now, my friends, it is claimed by the Secretary of the Treasury that we should raise at least 40 per cent of our expenditures this year, not including our loans to the allies.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. If I can get a moment or so longer I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would like the attention of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. The gentleman from Michigan has just stated that the Secretary of the Treasury has requested the raising of 40 per cent of our expenses by taxation, including loans to the allies—

Mr. FORDNEY. Not including loans to the allies.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Excluding loans to the allies.

Mr. FORDNEY. Exclusive of our loans to the allies.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That would bring the total amount of the proportion of taxes down to about 25 per cent, would it not?

Mr. FORDNEY. If we are expected by this new revenue measure which is contemplated to raise \$3,000,000,000 in addition to the amount to be raised under existing law we will raise some \$7,500,000,000 next year by taxes. Now, if that is but 40 per cent of our expenditures during the next year, then our expenditures, not including our loans to the allies, will be from \$18,000,000,000 to \$20,000,000,000.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Not according to the understanding that we had in the committee. I want to say, because I think this is an important matter, my understanding was that there was estimated about \$24,000,000,000, and that included about \$8,000,000,000 of loans to the allies.

Mr. KITCHIN. No; it included \$6,000,000,000, and I stated in my opinion it would be at least \$8,000,000,000.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I understood that \$8,000,000,000 was the amount estimated—\$6,000,000,000 already loaned and two more to come.

Mr. GARNER. It never has been more than \$500,000,000 a month.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then the total amount, exclusive of the loans to the allies, was \$18,000,000,000?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit one question?

Mr. FORDNEY. I am going to ask for two or three minutes more, and I will yield now.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman has read, or he himself has stated, that our ambassador in England put the amount which England has raised by taxation to meet her war expenditures 25 per cent, approximately, of the total.

Mr. FORDNEY. Up to the end of this fiscal year, and 28 per cent for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is what I wanted to ask specifically. You made that 25 per cent. Does that mean the aggregate from the time the war began up to this time?

Mr. FORDNEY. The twenty-five per cent, my friend, that I mentioned includes the fiscal years of 1915-16, 1916-17, and 1917-18.

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

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes longer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Following that question, the gentleman says that includes the end of the fiscal year 1917-18. Now, has England levied any higher taxes for the fiscal year which is to end in 1918-1919?

Mr. FORDNEY. England for the fiscal year 1918-19 has added increases all along the line—and if I had time I would read the amounts—additional taxes from the various kinds of revenue she is raising, and there are many of them.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman answer one more question? What tax now does England levy on excess profits and also on war profits?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know the exact percentage that she is taxing upon war profits and excess profits; but the amount is given here as excess taxes, \$2,588,978,000, not in detail; neither is the percentage of her total tax given. I have not the latest addition to the laws of Great Britain that give the amount of excess-profit taxes which they are levying by percentages, but I do not believe that is in the possession of our State Department, because I made inquiry for it and could not obtain it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The excess profits, and especially war profits, in this country, were the profits to which President Wilson specifically attracted attention the other day in his message.

Mr. REAVIS. Under the present revenue law in England, do they not raise 25 per cent of the cost of the war?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; 28 per cent for the next fiscal year; 25 per cent up to the end of this fiscal year is the average amount of taxes raised by Great Britain.

Mr. REAVIS. For the next fiscal year the gentleman states it will be 28 per cent?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONGWORTH. In the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] I do not understand what distinction he makes between war profits and excess profits. England has no such taxes as we have. The only tax is war-profit tax, the difference between the profits before and during the war.

Mr. FORDNEY. Under the existing law England permits all her industries to make 10 per cent on the capital invested before imposing these taxes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There is a marked distinction between excess profits and war profits. A man in business may be making profits now very largely in excess of his antewar profits, and yet those may not come from anything in the way of manufacturing munitions and, therefore, are not war profits.

Mr. FORDNEY. It will be hard, my friend, for you and me to determine what is a war profit right now from the industries in this country. A farmer may be making large sums of money out of the products of his farm, we may say. Is it war profit or is it not? Take any industry, every industry, and what is the difference between an ordinary increase in profit and war profit? Now, let me go just a little further.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman permit one question?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. KITCHIN. How much are the estimated expenditures of Great Britain for what we call her fiscal year, now?

Mr. FORDNEY. They are \$14,462,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1918-19, which has just begun, April 1. England's fiscal year ends March 31.

Now, gentlemen, I believe it is a common rule and a common practice of every country in the world during the time of war that some of the money raised to carry on a great war has been raised from increased import duties. I want to call your attention to our situation here.

The Wilson bill, about which the Republicans of this country made so much fuss during the 1896 campaign, carried an average ad valorem rate of 21½ per cent on imports. Of course, the matter of imposing a tax under that law as compared with the tax imposed upon imports in the Dingley law and in the Payne law were entirely different. Some articles were placed upon the free list that were later changed back to the protective list. But mark what I say: Twenty-one and one-half per cent was the ad valorem rate under the Wilson law. Twenty-five and one-half per cent was the ad valorem rate under the Dingley law. Eighteen and one-half per cent was the ad valorem rate under the Payne law.

Although the demagogues of the country said there were no reductions in the Payne tariff law, it was 3 per cent below the rates in the Wilson bill, about which the Republicans made so much fuss. But under existing law last year our ad valorem rates were 6 per cent, gentlemen—getting mighty closs to free trade. The last year of the Payne tariff law yielded to our Treasury \$333,000,000 in revenue on imports of \$1,812,000,000. Taking an average of the first nine months of this fiscal year and for the months of April, May, and June this year, which would complete this fiscal year, the average rate is 6.06 per cent under the Underwood tariff law, which will yield for the 12 months \$168,000,000 on imports in round numbers in values of \$2,800,000,000. Or \$165,000,000 less will be collected on imports this year under the Underwood tariff law than was collected under the Payne tariff law, with an increase of \$1,000,000,000 of imports this year.

I say to you the time has come, if we must raise more revenue to help carry on this war, when we should raise a greater portion of it from our import taxes.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman will recall when the last bill was made up the House carried a provision for an ad valorem increase, which was struck out in the Senate.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Under the present conditions, with an embargo where you would have to have a license to import and export, does not the gentleman think it would be far-fetched to talk about levying any kind of duty at the customhouse?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I do not, because it is the easiest tax in the world for the people to pay, because when they pay it they do not know it. There is where the Republicans have the advantage over you Democrats in imposing taxes upon the people. [Laughter.] Under existing law, if we had the Payne rates of duty in effect to-day, our imports would yield \$518,000,000 of revenue instead of \$168,000,000.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. I thought the attitude of the gentleman always had been that the consumers do not pay the tax. The gentleman's attitude now is that they pay it, but do not know it. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I say that the consumer does pay it when the taxes are internal, and I will call your attention to why.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for two minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, the difference between an internal tax and an import tax is this: Suppose you and I are engaged in the same line of business in this country, anything that we may be producing, no matter what it is. We add to our cost of production our taxes and insurance and all overhead expenses. Your tax is the same as mine on the internal tax, or war-profits tax, or the consumption tax, or any other kind of internal tax that is imposed upon the article that you and I are producing. We must add it to our cost, and your cost is the same as mine, and consequently we both add it to the cost, and the consumer must and does pay that added cost. There is no argument against that. Now, then, suppose you are engaged in producing an article abroad similar to an article that I am producing

here in the United States, and your raw material and labor cost is below my cost. My good friend, we must impose an import tax on your product; otherwise you will undersell me and put me out of business; and the minute you put me out of business, up goes the price, and you control the market; and under such circumstances the consumer then pays the tax, and none other. There is no comparison between an import tax and an internal-revenue tax. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, I wish here to insert the letter and statistics received from our foreign embassy:

LONDON, April 25, 1918.

DEAR SIR: I am directed by the ambassador to acknowledge your letter of the 6th of April, asking him if he can advise you what portion of the cost of the war in England is raised by direct taxation and what portion is obtained from loans.

I find upon examination that in 1913-14 the revenue of the United Kingdom for the financial year was £198,243,000 and the expenditure £197,492,700. This will give you a rough idea of prewar revenue and expenditure.

For the financial year 1915-16 the revenue was £336,767,000; expenditure, £1,559,706,000; 1916-17 the revenue was £573,428,000; expenditure, £2,198,113,000; 1917-18 the revenue was £707,235,000; expenditure, £2,696,221,000.

The estimated revenue for 1918-19 is £842,050,000, of which £782,200,000 is to be obtained from taxes, and the estimated expenditure, £2,972,197,000; deficit, £2,130,147,000, as will be seen from the attached extract, to be obtained from loans.

I am, dear sir, your obedient servant,

BOYLSTON BEAL,
Special Attaché of Embassy.

The Hon. JOSEPH W. FORDNEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

THE COMING YEAR.

ESTIMATED REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE.

The following statement of revenue and expenditure for 1918-19 was issued as a white paper last night:

Estimated revenue, 1918-19.

Customs	£71,650,000	
Add proposed additional taxation	22,850,000	£94,500,000
Excise	35,350,000	
Add proposed additional taxation	17,850,000	53,200,000
		147,700,000
Estate, etc., duties		31,500,000
Stamps	8,500,000	
Add proposed additional taxation	750,000	9,250,000
Land tax		650,000
House duty		1,950,000
Income tax (including supertax)	267,500,000	
Add proposed additional taxation	22,950,000	290,450,000
Excess-profits duty, etc.		300,000,000
Land-value duties		700,000
		634,500,000
Total receipts from taxes		782,200,000
Postal service	24,600,000	
Add proposed increase in charges	3,400,000	28,000,000
Telegraph service		3,500,000
Telephone service		6,500,000
		38,000,000
Crown lands		650,000
Receipts from sundry loans, etc.		6,000,000
Miscellaneous		15,200,000
Total receipts from nontax revenue		59,850,000
Total revenue		842,050,000
Deficit		2,130,147,000
		2,972,197,000

Mr. MEEKER, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. SMALL rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER] is entitled to 10 minutes. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND] next. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] now.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit for printing under the rule the conference report on the river and harbor bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10069) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The conference report will be printed under the rule.

Following are the conference report and accompanying statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 615).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10069) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 11, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the language in the proposed amendment; also strike out the period at the end of line 20, page 18, insert in lieu thereof a colon, and add the following words: "Provided, That in estimating the cost of doing the work by Government plant, including the cost of labor and materials, there shall also be taken into account proper charges for depreciation of plant and all supervising and overhead expenses and interest on the capital invested in the Government plant, but the rate of interest shall not exceed the maximum prevailing rate being paid by the United States on current issues of bonds or other evidences of indebtedness"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed insert the following:

"Sec. 5. That the Secretary of War shall cause an investigation to be made regarding the discharge or deposit into any of the navigable waterways of the United States of free acid or acid waste in any form or any other deleterious substances, and the extent to which the same exists and the sources thereof, together with any injurious results therefrom affecting the navigability of such waters or any works of improvement made thereon by the United States or any other uses of said navigable waters, and submit a report to Congress which shall include a summary of the evidence obtained and any recommendations regarding same which may be deemed appropriate, and any necessary expenses connected therewith shall be paid out of the available funds herein or hereafter appropriated for examinations, surveys, and contingencies. If in the course of such investigation it should be considered desirable to obtain any existing data or expert evidence or service from any of the other departments of the Government, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to make application therefor, and such departments are hereby directed to furnish such data or evidence or service as may be so required and which may be considered pertinent or appropriate."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the proposed amendment strike out the word "be" at the beginning of the twentieth line, and insert in lieu thereof the word "being"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2.

JNO. H. SMALL,
CHAS. F. BOOHER,
C. A. KENNEDY,

Managers on the part of the House.

DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
JOS. E. RANSDELL,
KNUTE NELSON,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10069) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed upon:

The rivers and harbors bill as it passed the House carried cash appropriations in the sum of \$21,427,900 and one continuing contract authorization in the sum of \$82,700. The amount added by amendment in the Senate was \$2,344,000 in cash appropriations, making the total of the bill as it passed the Senate \$23,771,900 in cash appropriations and a continuing contract authorization for \$82,700. As a result of the conference the amount involved in the Senate amendments has not been changed.

One amendment, however (No. 1), involving an increase of \$140,000, has not as yet been agreed to.

The following statement shows the action taken by the conference on each of the Senate amendments:

ACTION OF CONFERENCE.

On amendments Nos. 1 and 2, page 8: Mobile Harbor and Bar, Ala. Items increase amount appropriated in House bill for improvement work from \$200,000 to \$340,000. The committee of conference have been unable to agree.

On amendment No. 3, page 13: Fox River, Wis. Item eliminates language in House bill appropriating \$22,500 for maintenance and improvement work, and provides that the funds shall be applied to maintenance work only. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 4, page 14: Los Angeles Harbor, Cal. Item adopts new project for the construction of a channel through the west basin into the southwestwardly arm to the site of a proposed large floating dry dock and appropriates the full estimated cost of said channel. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 5, page 18: Section 4, providing that no contracts for river and harbor work shall be entered into hereafter if the contract price is more than 25 per cent in excess of the estimated cost of doing the work by Government plant. Item provides that overhead expenses, depreciation, and interest on capital invested, properly chargeable to such work, shall be taken into consideration in estimating the cost of executing the work by Government plant. House conferees recede with an amendment changing the phraseology, and specifically setting forth that the rate of interest charged on the cost of Government plant shall not exceed the maximum prevailing rate being paid by the United States on current issues of bonds or other evidences of indebtedness.

On amendment No. 6, page 18: Pollution of navigable waters of the United States. Item adds new section making it unlawful to discharge or deposit from any source whatever any free acid or acid waste in any form into any navigable water of the United States or into any tributary of any navigable water above tidewater, and provides penalties to be applied on conviction for violation of the provisions of this section. House conferees recede with an amendment striking out the proposed language and inserting in lieu thereof a section providing for an investigation by the War Department regarding the discharge or deposit into navigable streams of free acid, acid waste, or other deleterious matter, and to report to Congress the extent to which the same exists and the sources thereof together with any injurious results therefrom affecting the navigability of such waters or any works of improvement made thereon by the United States or any other uses of said navigable waters, such report to contain recommendations regarding same which may be deemed appropriate.

On amendments Nos. 7, 8, and 9, pages 19, 20, and 21: Items renumbering sections of House bill. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 10, page 22: Modification and readjustment of terms of uncompleted contracts for work of river and harbor improvement. Item adds new section providing that if the Secretary of War shall determine that contracts for work of river and harbor improvement entered into prior to April 6, 1917, and uncompleted, have become inequitable and unjust on account of increased costs of material and labor and other unforeseen conditions arising out of the war, he is authorized to modify and readjust the terms of said contracts in a just and equitable manner, such modifications and readjustments to apply only to work under said contracts remaining to be done hereafter, and any such sum as may be necessary to provide for the increased cost of the contracts due to said modifications and readjustments, not exceeding the sum of \$2,000,000, is appropriated by the new section. It is also provided that as a condition of any such contract being so modified that the Secretary of War shall have the right, at the end of any fiscal year, until the contract is completed, to make such further modifications as in his judgment shall be advantageous to the United States and just to the contractor. House conferees recede with verbal amendment, substituting the word "being" for the word "be," in line 10, page 23.

On amendment No. 11, page 23: Item adopts the following section:

"Sec. 10. That hereafter when the expenses of persons engaged in field work or traveling on official business outside of the District of Columbia and away from their designated posts of duty are chargeable to appropriations of the Engineer Department, a per diem of not exceeding \$4 may be allowed in lieu of subsistence when not otherwise fixed by law."

House conferees recede.

JNO. H. SMALL,
CHAS. F. BOOHER,
C. A. KENNEDY,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina if this is a complete agreement?

Mr. SMALL. It is complete except as to one Senate amendment, for Mobile Harbor.

Mr. WALSH. And the gentleman expects to ask the House to insist upon its disagreement to that?

Mr. SMALL. Yes; I expect to ask the House to insist upon its disagreement upon that Senate amendment.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes next after the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia has no privilege to proceed as yet.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I understood that the gentleman from Virginia would be recognized after the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER].

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize him to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House after the gentleman from Missouri concludes, for not exceeding 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to address the House for not exceeding 10 minutes after the gentleman from Missouri concludes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes following the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes following the gentleman from Virginia. Is there objection to that request?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

STATUS OF ALIEN SOLDIERS IN THE ARMIES OF THE WORLD.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and I wish to assure the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that I will not put any applause in the extended remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago, after we had entered the war, we discovered that some 40,000 or 50,000 American citizens had entered the armies of England, France, and Canada. We learned at that time that the men who had taken the oath of allegiance to the British Crown had decitizenized themselves. Steps were taken to repatriate those men. That legislation has already been enacted. However, at the time that bill was under discussion in the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization the question came up as to the status of alien soldiers in the different nations throughout the world. I took up the question with the representatives of the several countries throughout the world, requesting that they provide me with the oath which an alien desiring to enter the military or naval service must take. I also requested that they supply me with information on the following subjects:

First, as to how the taking of this oath affects the citizenship in the nation whose army the alien enters.

Second, does the taking of the oath make him a citizen in whole or in part in that country?

Third, how does it affect him as regards the right of franchise, devolution of property, marriage and divorce, and receiving a pension from the Government?

Fourth, should an alien who has taken the oath of allegiance and served in the military or naval forces and for that service has been granted a pension become a citizen of another nation, would he thereby forfeit his pension?

There is one thing about which we need to be thinking: Under our present laws if an alien who, leaving his family in the United States, has joined the forces of one of our cobelligerents, is wounded there and comes back, under our present law, he can not be admitted to the United States, because he might become a public charge.

One of the questions which we are going to have to think about and to discuss also with our cobelligerents is this: Will these cobelligerents of ours permit the pensions to follow these wounded aliens who desire to return to the United States? If they do, then there is no danger whatever of their becoming public charges in the United States. The more you think on the status of soldiers in alien armies the more difficult and delicate you will see the situation will become as time goes on after the war.

The data which I have here this morning and which I am submitting is not complete. It is such a long task to get all the information on the subject that I felt it might be better to put in now the data which we have and add to it as we may be able to get further light on the subject. I do not have here a report from China or from Russia, and, of course, not from Germany. A few of the smaller nations are yet to be heard from. I have not yet been able to obtain copies of the oaths taken by aliens entering the service of some of these nations, but the data which has been collected thus far is sufficient to show that practically no two nations in the world have the same system of taking aliens into their service or the same rules for providing for the men after they have finished their military service. This correspondence has convinced me that the United States has gone far ahead of any other nation in providing and caring for the aliens who enter her military service. There is much work yet to be done looking toward the final adjustment of the relations that should be maintained between our Government and the aliens who have served under the colors of our cobelligerents who are returning to this country in the hope of once more being with their families.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman state the result of his investigation as to ascertaining what France has done and will do for those Americans who have been members of the Foreign Legion?

Mr. MEEKER. I can not offer any data on that subject. Of course, as I said, I think it will be absolutely necessary for us in a council of nations, which must inevitably come in the not far-distant future, to work out an entirely new system of caring for the alien soldiers who may pass from one country to another. At present we have not the data on the point the gentleman has raised.

The following information is compiled from reports received:

ARGENTINA.

Argentine military and naval forces are organized under the compulsory military law; therefore foreigners have nothing to do with that service and in peace times can not enter it.

There have been in other times what they called "foreign legions" fighting in time of war under the flag, but generally men serving in those legions have finished their services with the war without becoming citizens. If they have continued in the service, as has been the case several times, they have not been able to belong to the army or navy without being naturalized Argentinians in accordance with the laws of Argentina.

A naturalized citizen who enjoys a pension from the Argentine Government loses his pension if he resigns his citizenship.

BOLIVIA.

The fact of an alien taking military service in Bolivia does not make him a citizen and does not in any way affect his rights concerning property or his marriage obligations.

If pension is granted an alien, the right is not lost unless he should go to a country actually at war with Bolivia.

BRAZIL.

In both corps of the navy—national marines and naval battalions—foreigners are not admitted. Foreigners may only be accepted in the corps as extra firemen; are under contract for a fixed period, subject to military law, not required to give allegiance. In other words, they are civilians under military status while in the service of the navy.

Enlisted men do not lose original nationality, as the enlistment is not equivalent to naturalization.

Foreigners are placed in same class as natives in all that concerns acquisition and enjoyment of rights. It is understood that foreigners serving as soldiers have, with slight restrictions peculiar to their occupations, all civil rights which they enjoyed before enlisting, as follows: Contractual rights, marriage, raising family, divorce, property, disposal of property inter vivos or testamento, enjoyment of prizes, pensions, life insurance. Foreigners once admitted to the ranks as sailors shall not be entitled to political or electoral rights.

A pensioner of the State loses his pension if he goes to any foreign country without permission of the Government, but pensioner does not suffer any restriction if, before he leaves for foreign country, he obtains an official permit, even though he is a naturalized citizen.

BULGARIA.

No aliens can enter the military or naval service of Bulgaria unless he first becomes naturalized as a Bulgarian citizen, thereby acquiring all the rights and privileges of citizenship.

Alien civilians may be employed in offices which have no connection with active military service, such as clerks in the ministry of war, leaders of military bands, etc.

Should an alien who has taken the oath of allegiance and served in the military or naval forces, and for that service been granted a pension from the Bulgarian Government, become a citizen of another nation, he thereby forfeits his pension, and should he return to Bulgaria he would be liable in case of a general mobilization to be drafted into service.

CHILE.

Foreigners are admitted to the Chilean Army only under contracts when their services are indispensable or as attachés at the request of some friendly government; this also applies to the navy.

COLOMBIA.

No one can be admitted to the army without taking an oath to support and defend the constitution and to comply with all the obligations it imposes. This oath of itself does not make him a citizen of Colombia, and does not modify the statutes as to personal and real property of foreigners in Colombia, or to exercise the rights, natural and civil, that the laws of Colombia establish.

DENMARK.

Every man who is in possession of Danish citizenship is liable to military service, but only those aliens who have acquired a fixed residence in Denmark, and then only in so far as no treaty with a foreign State or the alien's duty toward such foreign State as a subject thereof would prevent the drafting of the alien into Danish military service. Neither the taking of the oath nor the military service would make an alien a Danish citizen or affect his status in civil life.

All officials and officers appointed by the King are entitled to a pension under certain conditions, but otherwise pension must be granted by special act. As a rule a pension can not, without special permission, be paid to a pensioner living outside of Denmark, but a mere change of citizenship would not affect the title to a pension.

ENGLAND.

The law forbids the giving of a commission to an alien, and an enlisted alien is not capable of being promoted to a commission. As regards other aliens, if a soldier is a negro or a person of color, by enlisting in His Majesty's regular forces he becomes entitled to all the privileges of a natural-born British subject. This will not give him any right of franchise unless he has a franchise qualification in some other way; and as regards devolution of property, marriage, and divorce, these depend generally on domicile and not on nationality. As regards other aliens enlisting, they do not by so doing get any civil rights of British subjects. They, therefore, get no right of franchise, and as regards devolution of property, marriage, and divorce, that depends generally on domicile and not on nationality; but so far as it may in any case depend on nationality, they would not be treated as British subjects.

As regards the right to receive a pension, an enlisted alien is in exactly the same position as any other soldier. In case of war between his country and Great Britain, his pension would not be paid to him during the war, and his pension ceases to be payable, except in special cases, if he ceases to reside in British dominions. If an alien or any other soldier becomes the subject of another nation, there is no provision to deprive him of his pension. Pension rights are not the creation of statutes but of royal warrants or orders in council, as the case may be, which provide for payment of pensions, if the money be provided by Parliament. There is no legal obligation on the State to pay any pension, but only an obligation of honor based on the fact that the State had pledged its credit. The above remarks apply generally to naval pensions.

The following oath is taken at the time of enlistment:

I, ———, do make oath that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty King George the Fifth, his heirs and successors, and that I will, as in duty bound, honestly and faithfully defend His Majesty, his heirs and successors, in person, crown, and dignity against all enemies, and will observe and obey all orders of His Majesty, his heirs and successors, and of all the generals and officers set over me. So help me God.

FRANCE.

An alien who desires to enter the military or naval service of France is not asked to take an oath. He has only, under the present circumstances, to sign a paper pledging himself to serve while the present war lasts.

GREECE.

As a rule, no one but a Greek subject is admitted to the military or naval service in Greece. Exception is made in special cases when foreigners are accepted as special instructors, in which case their status is determined in details by a special law. In such cases the foreigners do not acquire the Greek citizenship.

GUATEMALA.

The Government has, on occasions, employed aliens as instructors and professors for the artillery and military academy, and they have been employed under a contract, but at present there are no aliens in the army. These aliens have been obliged, of course, to take the oath to observe the laws of the country during their stay. All aliens take the oath on the Constitution of the Republic. An alien who serves either in the army or any other position in the Government has to become a citizen, thereby losing any other citizenship.

HAITI.

No foreigner can be admitted to the Haitian Army or marine before declaring his intention to settle in Haiti and swearing that he renounces all other countries. This rule admits of exceptions and does not apply to American citizens who, conformable to the convention between the Republic of Haiti and the United States of America, are named by the President of Haiti, of the proposal of the United States to organize and command the new organization of gendarmes of Haiti.

A naturalized foreigner who has obtained a military pension from the Government of Haiti can not be denationalized.

HONDURAS.

During the stay of an alien in military or naval service he must obey the laws and ordinances as well as any Honduran citizen. The taking of the oath does not make him a citizen.

If he has served in military or naval forces, and for that service is granted a pension from the Government, becomes a citizen of another nation, he thereby forfeits his pension.

HOLLAND.

No aliens are taken into the Dutch Home Army at any time, with the possible exception of surgeon officers. Aliens may enter the Dutch Colonial Army in peace times.

An enlisted man signs a promise that he will serve six years, or whatever the term may happen to be. An officer swears loyalty to the sovereign, obedience to the laws, and submission to military discipline. These obligations are not considered as expressing or implying renunciation of citizenship in any other be naturalization before either obligation can be taken. Neither country. To enter the Dutch home military service there must obligation affects devolution of property, marriage, or divorce.

A Dutch soldier receiving a pension will forfeit it if he becomes a citizen of another country.

A foreigner can enlist only in the colonial army of the Dutch East Indies; they can not enlist in the home army. By such enlistment and by the oath required therefor, he does not acquire the Dutch citizenship, but he is entitled to a pension according to the rules and regulations of the service.

ITALY.

Only Italian citizens have the privilege of serving in the Italian Army and Navy, and are therefore requested to take the oath.

Aliens may volunteer for service, and take the oath only if they were born in the Italian Kingdom, or if they were born from parents having resided there at least 10 years at the time of their birth. By so doing they acquire Italian citizenship. Italians who have lost their citizenship are admitted to serve and take the oath and thus resume the citizenship they had lost.

JAPAN.

There is no legal impediment against the entry of an alien into the service, provided the Government so desires or orders, but his foreign nationality will preclude him from enjoying or exercising rights and duties exclusively pertaining to a Japanese subject. However, were he so admitted, his citizenship would not be affected even partially, nor would he change his status at all in respect to the right of franchise, devolution of property, marriage, and divorce. The minister of home affairs may, with the sanction of the Emperor, permit the naturalization of an alien who has done specially meritorious service to Japan, without regard to ordinary requirements.

There is no statute covering the case of an alien in general in regard to pensions. It may be paid on the basis of the contract entered into between the Government and the party concerned, or, lacking that, by the special grant of the Government. The Japanese Government is actually paying pensions to a few German professors who used to be in its civil service.

NICARAGUA.

An alien may obtain employment in the militia, but he must previously resign the protection of his own Government. The taking of the oath does not affect the citizenship of an alien at all; either it affects him as regards the right of franchise, devolution of property, marriage and divorce, and receiving pension from the Government. In order that an alien may become a citizen of Nicaragua it is necessary that he reside in the country for at least two consecutive years, and after that

that he make a declaration to the bureau of naturalization, or that he obtain the charta of naturalization in conformity with the law. Foreigners in Nicaragua enjoy the same civil rights as those conferred by the constitution to the Nicaraguans. In very few cases the law establishes differences between a Nicaraguan and an alien.

An alien who has served in the army or navy of Nicaragua will enjoy the same privileges and pensions that a Nicaraguan would enjoy, and by the fact that he became a citizen of another nation he would not forfeit these privileges and pensions.

NORWAY.

With the exception of salaried officers, no soldier takes an oath. The conscription oath was abolished in 1891. Military duty has no effect upon citizenship in Norway. Persons other than native-born Norwegians may be taken for duty when they are domiciled in the land. The fact that a foreigner resides in Norway, however, does not mean that he must serve; neither does the law state that he shall have resided in Norway for a certain length of time, but his relations to Norway must be so firm that he must really be domiciled there. A foreigner who does military duty in Norway does not for that reason become a Norwegian subject.

Military duty has no influence upon the right to vote, nor upon the transfer of property, marriage, or divorce. Only subjects of Norway can vote, and foreigners may not acquire property lawfully except by permission of the King.

At present there are no fixed rules for pensions other than for salaried officers. A pensioner who resides out of Norway will not be paid his pension except by permission of the King, when drawing kroner 200 or over, and when drawing less permission must be obtained from the department. These rules apply to both civil and military pensioners.

PANAMA.

Panama has no army or navy, the national police corps being the only corporation in charge of the custody of public order. There is no objection to foreigners joining the police corps, and the oath consists in swearing to defend the constitution and laws of the country.

An alien joining the police corps does not lose his citizenship according to the Panama laws, and this loss depends only upon the laws of the country of which the alien is a citizen.

PERU.

No aliens are permitted to serve in the Peruvian Army. A few aliens are serving in the Peruvian Army as engineers and mechanics. Their condition is similar to that of individuals engaged by contract for a given period of time, and they do not thereby become Peruvian citizens. Citizenship is acquired after a residence in Peru of two years, without requiring an oath. Aliens in Peru possess the same rights affecting property and marriage as Peruvians. As regards divorce, their rights are governed by the laws of their country.

No pension has ever been granted by the Peruvian Government to any alien, and should a naturalized Peruvian citizen become a citizen of another country he would thereby forfeit his pension.

PORTUGAL.

There is no provision of law authorizing the enlistment of aliens in the Portuguese Army or Navy.

Naturalized citizens are subject to compulsory service.

SALVADOR.

The foreigner in Salvador who desires to enter the national army must swear loyalty to the country and absolute submission to the authorities.

When a foreigner joins the army simply as an instructor, he does not lose by that fact his citizenship, nor acquire that of Salvador.

The soldier, as well as the civilian, who adopts another nationality, naturally loses rights that belonged to his former citizenship.

SERBIA.

An alien desiring to enter the Serbian Army must take an oath of fidelity to his superiors and of submission to the military laws. Service in the army does not affect his citizenship without his express wish to that effect. The taking of the oath does not make him a citizen of Serbia if he does not wish so. The Serbian citizenship is obtained only by the written request of the alien.

Aliens serving in the Serbian Army do not change their civil status in respect to the rights of franchise, property, marriage, or divorce. They are considered as volunteers.

SIAM.

Aliens entering the Siamese Army do not take an oath, but sign a contract which varies according to the nature of the employment.

The only way in which Siamese citizenship may be acquired by an alien is through his naturalization by law or by special decree of the King.

SPAIN.

To enter the army of Spain one must be a Spanish subject or a naturalized Spaniard. The oath to the flag is sworn after having entered the army and after having received elementary instruction.

Spanish citizenship is obtained by acquiring a letter of naturalization or by acquiring residence in any municipality of the monarchy, the rights of Spanish citizens being acquired thereby.

If a person deriving a pension on account of services in the Spanish Army acquires foreign citizenship he loses his pension. The same laws apply to the navy.

SWEDEN.

No alien is admitted to the army or navy of Sweden.

An alien must have resided in the country for at least three years previous to his admission as a citizen, and before entering either army or navy must have been naturalized and been admitted to Swedish citizenship.

SWITZERLAND.

The Swiss constitution provides for a universal military service.

Subject to all such service are all male citizens from 20 to 44 years of age.

Aliens are exempt from service and can under no circumstances serve in the Swiss armed forces.

No pensions are paid by the Swiss Government.

TURKEY.

No oath is required from Turkish subjects nor aliens who desire to enter the military or naval forces of Turkey.

The enlistment in the Turkish Army or Navy does not make an alien a subject of the Ottoman Empire either in whole or in part.

It does not affect him as regards the right of franchise, devolution of property, marriage, or divorce.

The soldier and his family are entitled to receive a pension from the Government.

If an alien takes the oath of allegiance to the Turkish Empire and serves in the military and naval forces, and for that service is granted a pension, becomes a citizen of another nation, he forfeits his pension.

UNITED STATES.

The oath, when taken by an alien, does not affect his citizenship in the United States. It does not make him a citizen in whole or in part. It does not affect franchise, devolution of property, marriage and divorce, or a pension—except as to Indian wars.

In time of peace no person who is not a citizen of the United States or who has not made legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen, and so forth, shall be enlisted for the first enlistment in the Army.

Judge Advocate General E. H. Crowder says: "The statutes appear to contain no provision that a pension shall be forfeited by reason of becoming a citizen of another country. It seems improbable that an executive department would conceive itself to have the power to depart from the general theory of the pension laws, which is to the effect that when a person has become entitled to a pension he has become so by reason of service and not by reason of citizenship—whence it seems necessary to conclude that change of citizenship can not affect the pension."

At the time of his enlistment every soldier shall take the following oath or affirmation: "I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America; that I will serve them honestly and faithfully against all their enemies whomsoever; and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of the officers appointed over me according to the Rules and Articles of War."

VENEZUELA.

According to the Military Code of Venezuela only Venezuelans are permitted to serve in the army. Under the provisions of the Federal Constitution it is an attribute of Congress to permit or not the admission of foreigners to the service of the Republic.

The constitutional provision referred to indicates that a foreigner admitted to the service of the Republic does not lose his status as such, and that his services are considered as rendered under a mere contract.

The Venezuelan pension laws refer solely to Venezuelan citizens.

By unanimous consent, Mr. FORDNEY was given leave to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

NAVAL BASE AT HAMPTON ROADS.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I was not in the House last Friday when the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] made certain statements which, if true, would reflect on me, on the people of the district I have the honor to represent, on the Secretary of the Navy and several of his trusted advisers, and especially on the owners of the property recently acquired by the Government for a naval operating base on Hampton Roads. Usually I pay no attention to remarks based on mere idle gossip, but as this speech has been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and might accidentally be read by those who do not know the facts, I shall depart from my usual rule and ask that I may be given time to make a short reply.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman give the page of the RECORD where the remarks of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] are printed?

Mr. HOLLAND. Page 7253.

The gentleman repeats certain slanderous statements which he claims were made to him by certain citizens of Newport News and Norfolk in reference to the value of the naval-base property and the manner in which it was acquired, accuses the people of my district of indefensible profiteering, and then boastfully declares that his own people were good enough to buy and give to the Government for war purposes a great tract of land of 80,000 acres. "The two transactions," said he, "stand out in vivid contrast."

I shall not believe that such slanderous statements were made by reputable citizens until the gentleman has furnished me their names and I have had an opportunity to investigate their standing at home. Reputable citizens do not so willfully slander the people among whom they live. I know there are a number of sensational gossipers in every community, whose chief delight consists in running around and telling idle tales, and the men who expressed the opinions claimed were evidently men of this kind and not worthy and patriotic citizens. The very statements furnish the best evidence that they were not, and belie the good sense, the good judgment, and the patriotism of the men who made them. Men who stand idly by and silently and knowingly permit a fraud to be perpetrated on their Government which by their own statements they might have prevented are almost as criminal as the men who actually perpetrate it. I have no patience with men who have evidence of wrongdoing and then deliberately fail or refuse to disclose it. I would never make the statements of such men the basis of slanderous speech in this House. I would never offer their utterances as proof of the accuracy of my own statements. But some people love to repeat gossip and without investigating its truth or falsity.

I advocated the purchase of this property at the price at which it was offered by the owners, and to that extent I am responsible for its acquisition by the Government. Before advocating its purchase I ascertained that Secretary Daniels, following the example of Secretaries Meyer and Bonaparte and the advice of every expert in his department, had recommended its purchase or condemnation. It was declared by them to be the only available, satisfactory site on Hampton Roads that could be developed and equipped as a fleet-operating base and that its acquisition was essential for war purposes. If the Secretary of the Navy and his advisers, the men responsible, especially in time of war, for keeping the Navy in a proper and efficient condition, can not be safely trusted to determine what property is urgently needed for "war purposes," then, in God's name, who can be trusted? I reached no hurried or biased conclusion as to its value. I read the statements of the Secretary of the Navy and his expert advisers, who recommended its purchase at the price named by the owners, and I then advised with hundreds of the most representative business men of Norfolk, men fully acquainted with real-estate values in that section and having no interest in the property, before I reached the conclusion that the price was fair and just. I had absolutely no interest in the property. My constituents were able to hold it and had no need or inclination to resort to improper methods to dispose of it. And I brand as slanderous and as absolutely untrue even an indirect intimation that I would aid or abet one or a number of my constituents in any scheme to impose upon the Government. I would brand it in still stronger language if the rules of this House would permit. When I can not render the Government, as well as my constituents, honest and patriotic service, I shall then become unworthy to be a Member of this great body. But why did not these patriots at least furnish me the information which it is claimed was given to the gentleman from Washington?

Nor do the facts justify the statements said to have been made by these gentlemen that the owners of this property are unpatriotic and have imposed on the Government. Such statements are also slanderous and untrue. The owners offered to sell the property to the Government for the sum of \$1,400,000,

and we have the statement of the Secretary of the Navy that this was a just and fair price. We have also the statements of Capt. McKean and other naval experts who were appointed to make a special investigation of the subject matter to the same effect. Do you question their honesty or their judgment? Do you not at least believe that they had sense enough to discover an attempt to impose on the Government, if any such attempt had been made? When this proposition was under discussion in the House and some question was raised as to the value of the property, I made the offer, on the part of the owners, to have its value determined by condemnation or by any other fair method. I was willing to trust the courts to determine its value. But subsequently the House, upon the recommendation of the Committee on Naval Affairs, authorized its condemnation and directed that its value should be determined by a board or commission appointed for that purpose. This board was appointed by order of July 21, 1917, and after a careful and painstaking investigation, made on the premises, with opportunity to every one who desired it to be heard, submitted its award on the 5th day of December, 1917. It awarded the owners the sum of \$1,422,935. This award was subsequently approved by the Secretary of the Navy and by the President. The gentleman from Washington evidently was not familiar with these facts. They refute, and beyond question, his indefensible statement, based on the weakest kind of evidence, that the owners "worked" the Government for a fancy price for their property. Did the Secretary of the Navy and his expert advisers and also the special board to determine its value corruptly collude with the owners in the perpetration of a fraud upon the Government? No one would believe this. And yet the owners, if they "worked" the Government, must have done so through these officials. But where were these patriots all this time? Why did not they appear before this board, which for four long months, and on the premises, was making diligent effort to ascertain the real value of this property, and testify that the Government was about to be "worked" for a fancy price? This would have been far more patriotic than to indulge now in unwarranted criticism.

The people of the district I have the honor to represent are with few exceptions native-born Americans. They are as loyal, as patriotic, as honest, and as severely condemn profiteering as the citizens of any other State. They have shown their courage and their patriotism in every crisis that has confronted this Government; and history will prove that this has been done by their deeds, not by their professions. I have no indictment to bring against the people of the great State of Washington. I would not bring an indictment against them upon the testimony of mere gossipers. The very name "Washington" is sacred to all Virginians. But I do most strongly resent the insinuations of its Representative in this body and his boastful intimation that his people are more honest, more loyal, or more patriotic than are the people of old Virginia. I recall the old story of the man who stood up in the temple and boastfully thanked God that he was better than other men and especially better than the poor man who at the same time was beseeching his Father to be merciful to him a sinner. That story has always impressed me, and I have made it a rule never to boast of my own good deeds and never to impugn the motives of men who may be just as honest and just as patriotic as I profess to be. I commend this story to the gentleman from Washington, and if he will read it I do not believe he will again wrongfully and unjustly condemn the people of an entire community. People are frequently better than we think they are. This is no time for crimination or recrimination. The boys from Washington and from Virginia are doubtless now standing side by side on the battle front, each vying with the other in a supreme effort to win this war. Why can not we, as the Representatives of the same great States, stop indulging in such unjust criticisms and stand side by side in united effort to accomplish the same great purpose? Such a course would furnish the best evidence of a more genuine patriotism.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in the few remarks made by me on Friday afternoon during the discussion of the Army appropriation bill I discussed the price paid by the Government for the site of the old Jamestown Exposition property in Virginia. I beg to assure the House that I had no thought in mind of reflecting upon the activities of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND], who represents that district. The gentleman has just stated that he wonders why people who said to me that the price was too high did not say so when certain men in that neighborhood were selling this site. Because I presume they knew that the price carried a large part of the losses of the Jamestown Exposition, and would

have been criticised by many of their own fellow citizens if they had so stated. I presume, too, that in many congressional districts the Members, while elected to come here and serve the Nation, are expected, each and every one, to bring home some bacon for his district. That has been the rule. Constituents rarely, if ever, blame a man for getting all that he can for his district. But the House is correcting that a little. But the point in what I said about the Jamestown sale was this: Having stated what the citizens told me about these sales, I said—

Here in the House we have stood by and let things like this go through under the guise of war necessities. We must not do it again. It is not too late to cut down these bills. It is time to quit throwing away money like water.

Mr. Speaker, I said that, and I stand by it. Now, the stories that I heard may have been gossip, told me during a pleasant visit to the National Soldiers' Home in that vicinity, but no one whom I met seemed to know the exact details of the transaction. Every Member of the House here was a party to it. Few Members know the exact details. We were dependent upon reports, and finally upon the conference report. I said Friday that I thought we had paid \$1,200,000. I now correct the figures, based on the statement of the gentleman from Virginia himself. We paid \$1,422,530, or \$200,000 odd more than I thought we paid. I said that they had demanded \$1,200,000, and after the thing had been voted down here in the House, the Members of the House not being willing to stand for it, that we had then paid \$1,000,000.

I ascertain now that we paid \$1,200,000, and I am told that citizens involved in the ownership of the property making that sale were asked to accept that sum, and if any of them were not satisfied with the proposed rate or proportion that they received they could accept 75 per cent in money and sue the Government.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not care to pursue that any further. It has gone by. It is an example of some high prices that have been paid. This House has been unable to help itself. When we did protest and vote against this, immediately there came statements that we could not controvert that it was an absolute war necessity. That statement was made in the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the statement was also made that the finger of God pointed to this as the place. These men who had it to sell received a price of \$1,400,000, when it had been hawked around town for sale at a greatly less price. I stated that the offered price was \$300,000, but I am told it was bought at a forced sale for \$400,000; that no outsiders bid at the auction, for the reason that they knew that if they bought it that it carried a lot of bills and liens of the collapsed Jamestown Exposition. So, as a matter of fact, after the Secretary of the Navy had recommended this and urged it after the House had turned it down, there were attached to the price paid for it the debts of the Jamestown Exposition. That and the fact the Government wanted it gave it its value.

I have no controversy with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND]. I know him to be a faithful, hard-working Member of this body, and I will not quarrel with him. His people got the money. Some of them rapped at me a little bit—said this Congress was "easy"—and I claimed I had a right to warn every Member, including myself, that we must scrutinize these bills in the future.

Mr. MAYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; certainly.

Mr. MAYS. Does the gentleman have the names of those men who said that this Congress was "easy"?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; I have two or three of the names.

Mr. MAYS. Will the gentleman give the names?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I can do it, but before I do give the names I wish to say that there is a distinguished gentleman from my State who is down there now, and if necessary I can wire him to investigate thoroughly this question.

Mr. MAYS. Will the gentleman give the names?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have not the names with me at this moment. Now, I find in this morning's New York Sun an editorial concerning another sudden increase in land values, and to show that I do not pick out any one place for criticism I want to say that this locality is near Los Angeles.

Congress appropriated \$80,000 for the acquisition of 12 acres of land at Point Vincent, Cal., 12 miles from the harbor, in which to place a new lighthouse. It was owned by a syndicate which demanded \$632,000 for the property, \$32,000 for the land itself and \$600,000 for the depreciation in value of the remaining property of the syndicate at and about Point Vincent, where it is proposed to establish a fine residence section.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. COX. Are these profiteers on the Pacific coast going to get that \$600,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; when the price was raised \$600,000 the lighthouse project was abandoned. Secretary Redfield declined to proceed further with it. The Sun criticizes Mr. Redfield, says he should not have quit, and says that if the Government were always frightened off by the exorbitant claim of landowners the country would have to get along without any more new public buildings, forts, or lighthouses. Then the Sun discusses the right of the Government to the property of its citizens, and in conclusion the editorial states what I think should have been done in the Jamestown case:

A judicial proceeding to condemn the necessary land in this case would settle once for all the vexed questions whether such a claim for the alleged depreciation of land not taken can properly be allowed to augment the award of the land taken.

Now, I think when the purchase price of land reaches such a discussion as this site at Jamestown did the United States Government would do well to have a judicial proceeding to determine the real value and not the value created by the fact that the Government wants it. I know, as every Member knows, that when we go back to our districts this fall and undertake to explain all of these tremendous expenditures of money each Member is likely to pick out for criticism the expenditure which looks to him the rankest, and for myself I am likely to pick out Jamestown and set that \$1,400,000 sale in time of war up against the \$2,000,000 gift of land by the citizens of Tacoma, in the district which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. Before the gentleman sits down will he tell the House what he means by each Member wanting to take home some bacon?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, the gentleman knows, surely. I think it has been well known for years past that when a man is elected to Congress and is sent here to help perform full service for this great Government, to participate in the making of laws, he is also expected to look out for the wants of his district—get post-office buildings, river and harbor improvements, nitrate plants, and all that—and if he gets them he will be considered as a good Representative of his district. Of course that does not always mean reelection, for let me say that the man who has taken home the most bacon in recent years was Judge Wickersham, of Alaska, who engineered an appropriation for a railroad in Alaska costing \$35,000,000.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman please say what he means? That does not say what he means by the word "bacon." Does the gentleman mean something that is dishonorable?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, no, no. What I tried to say—

Mr. CARAWAY. Let me finish my question. Will the gentleman say why he used that expression in talking about the Jamestown Exposition space, for which he said the Government pays too much?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, well—

Mr. CARAWAY. Was not the inference that way—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I used it as slang, as an expression of the street. I would not criticize the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND] here or elsewhere for trying to prove that the site was worth \$1,400,000. I have not criticized him. His people, most of them, no doubt believe that it was worth that. It had attached to it a part of the debt of the Jamestown Exposition. The criticism falls upon all the rest of us, as we failed to stand by our real judgment in the matter, which is the statement I made in the first place and which is all there is to it.

CALENDAR FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The SPEAKER. This is unanimous-consent day, and the Chair will ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] to take the chair.

Mr. FOSTER assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

SALARY OF DISTRICT ATTORNEY, RHODE ISLAND.

The first business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 3563) to increase the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Rhode Island.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, let us have the bill reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Rhode Island shall be at the rate of \$5,000 a year.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$3,500."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan objects, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. STINESS. Mr. Speaker, before that is done, will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. CRAMTON. I withhold the objection for a moment.

Mr. STINESS. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Michigan will not press his objection at this time. This bill has been here for two years. The recommendation of the United States district judge three years ago was that this salary be increased to \$4,000. I know something of the duties of the office, because I held the office just before the present incumbent. I know that during the last two years and since the war these duties have increased very much, and I think there is no reason why this salary should not be increased, on account of the increased duties of the office and on account of the increased cost of living. Because of the war various new duties have been thrust upon the present incumbent, and it seems to me that the salary ought to be increased.

Mr. SANFORD. What is the present salary?

Mr. STINESS. Two thousand five hundred dollars. That salary has been paid for a great many years. It used to be the custom that the person who held the office practiced law generally, but of late years that has changed, and the United States district attorney must now devote all of his time to the duties of the office. If the gentleman from Michigan were familiar with the duties of the office, I know that he would not make the objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I want also to appeal to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] not to object to this bill. It has received very careful consideration from the Committee on the Judiciary. We have had hearings upon it and have gone into it very carefully. The conclusion is that it is an outrage to ask a man of ability to be a district attorney of the United States for the salary that is now being paid in this case. It is far below that paid the district attorneys all over the United States as a general proposition. The Committee on the Judiciary considered this and unanimously reported the bill and urged that it be passed. I hope the gentleman from Michigan will not object to considering the bill upon its merits.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right further to object, I do not care to go into the merits of the bill further than to suggest this, that it is to be assumed that the Department of Justice is as familiar with the needs and merits of that official as any of us, and the report of the committee upon this bill proposes a larger salary than the Department of Justice recommends. Further than that, this same bill was before us in the last Congress, and the question was raised as to the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary to handle bills of this kind. There is no question about the jurisdiction under the rules, and it is a mystery to me why gentlemen should persist in having their bills referred to a committee that does not have jurisdiction of them. The rules provide that "the examination of the accounts and expenditures of the several departments of the Government and the manner of keeping the same," and so forth, "the abolishment of useless offices, the reduction or increase of the pay of officers, shall all be subjects within the jurisdiction" of the nine standing committees on the public expenditures of the several departments, and that expenditures in the Department of Justice shall be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice. Rather than raise the point of order on these bills I make objection at this time.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman state whether or not any of the committees on the expenditures to which he has referred has ever brought in a bill increasing the pay of a district attorney or a district judge of the United States?

Mr. CRAMTON. I shall answer the gentleman by stating that at this session of Congress the Committee on Expenditures of the Department of Justice, of which I am a member, has recommended a bill for the increase of the salary of a district attorney in the district of Connecticut, and that bill is now on the calendar.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. STINESS. I would suggest to the gentleman that the recommendation made here by the judge of the district court and also by the Department of Justice was made two years ago. Since that time we have been in war. About Narragansett Bay there are a dozen forts where there are a large

number of soldiers, and there are a great many prosecutions for the sale of liquor in the war zone, and other offenses.

There have been a great many prosecutions under the espionage act and other matters of that kind, so that there has been a very large increase in the duties of the office. Now, I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Michigan about what committee this should go to; I do not care. If it has gone to the wrong committee I am sorry, but the fact is that the man who performs the duties of the office at \$2,500 a year should be paid at least \$5,000, and it seems to me fair to consider this as a war measure, because these duties have increased on account of the war, and with all these forts and soldiers and new duties it seems to me this man should be paid more. Now, when I held that office, which was immediately before the present incumbent, when I first went into the office there was not so much to do. We had two terms of the grand jury a year, and it took four or five days for a term. The work increased after that, so that the grand jury is in almost continuous session and sits there three or four weeks at a time. I did not ask for an increase in my own salary because a different administration had come in, and I realized that it was not going to be long that I would remain in that office. This gentleman took my place. He is a good Democrat, he is a good official, he is capable, he is performing the duties with ability, and because this bill has gone to some committee to which the gentleman thinks it should not have gone, I hope he will not let that stand in the way of giving this man the salary to which he is entitled. He can not live on \$2,500, and there is no use talking about it. It is not a living salary, as the gentleman knows, and therefore I hope he will withdraw any objection that he has about its going from one committee to another and let the bill pass on its merits.

Mr. CRAMTON. I suggest to the gentleman that the consideration as to the cost of living, and so forth, will apply to all district attorneys, and it seems to me the logical way is to have the whole subject given consideration in an exhaustive way by the proper committee.

Mr. STINESS. I will say to the gentleman that this case is different from the ordinary cases of district attorneys, because on account of the war many activities are centered in the district. There is the naval training station, the torpedo station, and thousands and thousands of men are there who were not there before.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield? There has been more or less controversy over this matter and measures of a similar nature. There has been a contest on the floor of this House whether these small committees are doing work. There was a question whether or not they should have assistance when Congress met at the beginning of the session. Under the rules this committee has jurisdiction of this class of bills. The Judiciary Committee and the large committees of the House are flooded with business, and why do not you ask unanimous consent to have the bill stricken from the calendar and refer it to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, and the gentleman will get his bill reported out. It ought to be objected to, we ought not to let the bill go through.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a word to say. I am the man who introduced the bill, and I am very grateful to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. STINESS] for saying something in advocacy of it. Because I felt anything I might say to the gentleman from Michigan would be absolutely lost upon him. I kept quiet. Anything I might say would be absolutely lost on him. I have tried to save the time of the House. Whatever effort I made would be in vain, dealing, as I was, with that kind of intelligence.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, objection not having been made the second time to letting the bill go through in the last Congress in this shape, the gentleman did not appreciate the courtesy, but comes in this Congress and insists again on it after he had notice that I objected.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Speaker, let me say—

Mr. CRAMTON. I will object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. May I ask unanimous consent to address the House for a minute?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

[Mr. O'SHAUNESSY here used words which were subsequently stricken out.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order, and I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down.

[Mr. O'SHAUNESSY here used words which were subsequently stricken out.]

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the last remark of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] be taken down. The gentleman can not stand here and insult the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will withhold until the Chair can state the question.

Mr. CRAMTON. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] did not have the floor, and that his language can not appear in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It was by unanimous consent only, and anyone has a right to object. But the gentleman demands that the words be taken down.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the second remark be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks that the second remark of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] be taken down. It will be done.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Speaker, in order to let business proceed, I will withdraw the remark. Possibly we will find others at another time.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I object, unless he has the right under the rules to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When a request is made that the words be taken down, it can not be withdrawn except by unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I object. I insist that the words be taken down and that the House pass upon them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the language objected to.

The words objected to and afterwards ordered stricken from the RECORD were read by the Clerk.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the words be stricken from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Those in favor of the motion will say "aye," those opposed "no."

Mr. DYER. On that I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is no quorum present, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is an automatic call of the House.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to inquire of the Chair if we are in the House or not. If so, where is the mace?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. We are in the House.

The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of expunging the words from the RECORD will, as their names are called, answer "yea," and those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 269, answered "present" 6, not voting 155, as follows:

YEAS—269.

Alexander	Dewalt	Haugen	McKenzie
Almon	Dickinson	Hawley	McLemore
Anderson	Dill	Hayden	Madden
Ashbrook	Dillon	Heffin	Mansfield
Aswell	Dixon	Helm	Mapes
Ayres	Dominick	Helvering	Martin
Bankhead	Doolittle	Hensley	Mays
Barkley	Dupré	Hersey	Meeker
Barnhart	Dyer	Holland	Merritt
Benkes	Eagan	Huddleston	Miller, Minn.
Beshlin	Eagle	Hull, Iowa	Miller, Wash.
Black	Edmonds	Hull, Tenn.	Mondell
Blackmon	Elliott	Humphreys	Moore, Ind.
Blanton	Ellsworth	Igoe	Morgan
Borland	Elston	James	Mott
Brand	Esch	Johnson, Ky.	Mudd
Britten	Evans	Johnson, Wash.	Neely
Browne	Fairfield	Jones	Nelson
Buchanan	Farr	Juni	Nicholls, S. C.
Burnett	Ferris	Kearns	Nolan
Burroughs	Fess	Keating	Oldfield
Byrnes, S. C.	Fields	Kelly, Pa.	Oliver, Ala.
Byrnes, Tenn.	Focht	Kennedy, Iowa	Oliver, N. Y.
Campbell, Kans.	Fordney	Key, Ohio	Osborne
Campbell, Pa.	Foster	Kincheloe	O'Shaunessy
Candler, Miss.	Frear	King	Park
Cannon	Freeman	Kinkaid	Parker, N. J.
Cantrill	French	Knutson	Platt
Carlin	Fuller, Ill.	Kraus	Polk
Carter, Okla.	Gallivan	La Follette	Pon
Chandler, N. Y.	Gard	Larsen	Purnell
Chandler, Okla.	Garner	Lazaro	Quin
Church	Garrett, Tenn.	Lea, Cal.	Ragsdale
Claypool	Garrett, Tex.	Lee, Ga.	Raney, H. T.
Cleary	Glynn	Lehlbach	Raker
Coady	Godwin, N. C.	Linthicum	Randall
Collier	Good	Little	Rankin
Connally, Tex.	Goodall	Littlepage	Rayburn
Connolly, Kans.	Goodwin, Ark.	Lobeck	Reavis
Cooper, Wis.	Gould	London	Robbins
Cox	Graham, Ill.	Longworth	Roberts
Crosser	Gray, Ala.	Luffkin	Robinson
Curry, Cal.	Greene, Vt.	Lundeen	Rodenberg
Dallinger	Hadley	Lunn	Rogers
Davis	Hamilton, Mich.	McAndrews	Romjue
Decker	Hamlin	McArthur	Rouse
Delaney	Hardy	McClintic	Rubey
Dempsey	Harrison, Miss.	McCulloch	Rucker
Denison	Harrison, Va.		Russell
Dent	Haskell		
Denton			

Sanders, Ind.
Sanders, La.
Sanders, N. Y.
Sanford
Schall
Scott, Iowa
Scott, Mich.
Shallenberger
Sims
Slannott
Slayden
Slomp
Smith, Idaho
Smith, Mich.
Smith, C. B.
Snook
Stafford

Stengall
Stedman
Steele
Steenson
Stephens, Miss.
Sterling, Pa.
Strong
Summers
Switzer
Tague
Taylor, Ark.
Taylor, Colo.
Temple
Thomas
Thompson
Thilman
Timberlake

Towner
Van Dyke
Venable
Vestal
Vinson
Voigt
Volstead
Waldow
Walker
Walsh
Walton
Wason
Watkins
Watson, Va.
Welling
Whaley
Wheeler

White, Me.
White, Ohio
Williams
Wilson, Ill.
Wilson, La.
Wilson, Tex.
Wingo
Winslow
Wood, Ind.
Woodyard
Wright
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Tex.
Zihlman

Cramton
Dowell

Hastings
Jacoway

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

Stiness

NOT VOTING—155.

Anthony
Austin
Bacharach
Baer
Bell
Bland
Booher
Bowers
Brodbeck
Browning
Brumbaugh
Butler
Caldwell
Caraway
Carew
Carter, Mass.
Cary
Clark, Fla.
Clark, Pa.
Classon
Cooper, Ohio
Cooper, W. Va.
Copley
Costello
Crago
Crisp
Currie, Mich.
Dale, N. Y.
Dale, Vt.
Darrow
Davidson
Dies
Donovan
Dooling
Doremus
Doughton
Drane
Drukker
Dunn

Emerson
Estopinal
Fairchild, E. L.
Fairchild, G. W.
Fisher
Flood
Flynn
Foss
Francis
Gallagher
Gandy
Garland
Gillett
Glass
Gordon
Graham, Pa.
Gray, N. J.
Green, Iowa
Greene, Mass.
Gregg
Griest
Griffin
Hamill
Hamilton, N. Y.
Hayes
Heaton
Heintz
Hicks
Hilliard
Hollingsworth
Hood
Houston
Howard
Husted
Hutchinson
Ireland
Johnson, S. Dak.
Kahn
Kehoe

Kelley, Mich.
Kennedy, R. I.
Kless, Pa.
Kitchin
Kreider
LaGuardia
Leshner
Lever
McCormick
McFadden
McKinley
McLaughlin, Mich.
McLaughlin, Pa.
Magee
Maher
Mann
Mason
Montague
Moore, Pa.
Morin
Nichols, Mich.
Norton
Overmyer
Overstreet
Padgett
Paige
Parker, N. Y.
Peters
Phelan
Porter
Powers
Pratt
Price
Raney, J. W.
Ramsey
Ramseyer
Reed
Riordan
Rose

Rowe
Rowland
Sabath
Saunders, Va.
Scott, Pa.
Scully
Sears
Sells
Shackelford
Sherley
Sherwood
Shouse
Siegel
Sisson
Sloan
Small
Smith, T. F.
Snell
Snyder
Stephens, Nebr.
Sterling, Ill.
Stevenson
Sullivan
Sweet
Swift
Talbot
Templeton
Tilson
Tinkham
Treadway
Vare
Ward
Watson, Pa.
Weaver
Webb
Welty
Wise
Woods, Iowa

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. DALE of Vermont.
Mr. HILLIARD with Mr. MASON.
Mr. BELL with Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan.
Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. COOPER of West Virginia.
Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. IRELAND.
Mr. BOOHER with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.
Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. TINKHAM.
Mr. SEARS with Mr. DOWELL.
Mr. LEVER with Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan.
Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. DUNN.
Mr. HOOD with Mr. HEATON.
Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.
Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. AUSTIN.
Mr. SISSON with Mr. FOSS.
Mr. CAREW with Mr. ANTHONY.
Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. BACHARACH.
Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. BROWNING.
Mr. CRISP with Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts.
Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. BLAND.
Mr. DIES with Mr. BOWERS.
Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. BUTLER.
Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. COPLEY.
Mr. DRANE with Mr. CRAGO.
Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. CURRIE of Michigan.
Mr. FLOOD with Mr. DAVIDSON.
Mr. FLYNN with Mr. EMERSON.
Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD.
Mr. GANDY with Mr. NORTON.
Mr. GORDON with Mr. GARLAND.
Mr. GLASS with Mr. GILLETT.
Mr. GREGG with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
Mr. HAMILL with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.
Mr. HOWARD with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.
Mr. KEHOE with Mr. GRIEST.
Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. HAYES.
Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. HUSTED.

Mr. LESHAR with Mr. HUTCHINSON.
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. HICKS.
 Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. KAHN.
 Mr. OVERSTREET with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. PHELAN with Mr. KREIDER.
 Mr. PRICE with Mr. MCFADDEN.
 Mr. PADGETT with Mr. MCKINLEY.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. SIEGEL.
 Mr. SABATH with Mr. SLOAN.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. ROWE.
 Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia with Mr. SNELL.
 Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. STERLING of Illinois.
 Mr. SHOUSE with Mr. SWIFT.
 Mr. SHERWOOD with Mr. TILSON.
 Mr. SMALL with Mr. TREADWAY.
 Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. WARD.
 Mr. STEVENSON with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.
 Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. PRATT.
 Mr. WEBB with Mr. MAGEE.
 Mr. WEAVER with Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. WELTY with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. WISE with Mr. PAIGE.
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. MCCORMICK.
 Mr. FISHER with Mr. PETERS.
 Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. FRANCIS.
 Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY with Mr. REED.
 Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Florida, Mr. SEARS. I desire to withdraw my vote of "yea" and be recorded as voting "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. A quorum is present, and the Doorkeeper will open the doors. The Clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

MEDALS OR DECORATIONS RECEIVED FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 2796) to permit American citizens to wear medals or decorations received from certain foreign countries on entering the military or naval service of the United States, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, when this bill was last under consideration I understood the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] had some remarks to make about it. I do not see him here at the present time. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over at the present time without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over at the present time without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will call the next bill.

MEDALS OF HONOR AND DISTINGUISHED-SERVICE MEDALS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 1720) to provide for the award of medals of honor and distinguished-service medals.

The title of the bill was read.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the Committee on Military Affairs is about to report a bill that will have the full support of the War Department. Therefore I object to the present consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE CHEROKEE NATION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 4699) providing for the payment of certain interest on items 1 and 4 of the judgment of the Court of Claims of May 18, 1905, in favor of the Cherokee Nation.

The title of the bill was read.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I object to the consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CLAIMS OF CHEROKEE NATION AGAINST THE UNITED STATES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 357) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, consider, and determine certain claims of the Cherokee Nation against the United States.

The title of the bill was read.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. WALSH. I object.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects. The Clerk will call the next bill.

INJURIES TO GREEK NATIONALS IN SOUTH OMAHA, NEBR.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 69) to authorize the payment of indemnities to the Government of Austria-Hungary, Greece, and Turkey for injuries inflicted on its nationals during riots occurring in South Omaha, Nebr., February 21, 1909.

The title of the bill was read.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object, Mr. Speaker.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects. The bill is stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will call the next bill.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK, COLO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 171) to repeal the last proviso of section 4 of an act to establish the Rocky Mountain National Park, in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, approved January 26, 1915.

The title of the bill was read.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects. The Clerk will call the next bill.

SALARIES IN CUSTODIAN SERVICE, TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 344) for the regulation of salaries in the custodian service of the Treasury Department.

The title of the bill was read.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. COX. I object, Mr. Speaker.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana objects. The bill is stricken from the calendar.

DETERMINATION OF HEIRSHIP, FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 10590) to provide for a determination of heirship in cases of deceased members of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, conferring jurisdiction upon district courts to partition lands belonging to full-blood heirs of allottees of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think some explanation ought to be made as to the necessity for passing this bill before waiving the right of objection.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the reasons for the first section of the bill are set forth pretty clearly in the report, and especially in the brief of Mr. Semple, which, I am sure, the gentleman from Wisconsin has read.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.
 Mr. STAFFORD. I think the House will be interested in that phase of the bill which seeks to make retroactive proceedings as to the title of real estate of Indians, to which this bill relates. I think that is rather an objectionable feature of the bill.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and if unanimous consent is given to pass this bill I will then ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill 4151 for this bill. That bill has already passed the Senate, and it eliminates that part of the bill which is retroactive.

Mr. STAFFORD. So, then, the gentleman is in favor of striking out that provision of the bill which would make retroactive decisions as to realty?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman one further question, which relates to a different subject matter, and that is as to the provision authorizing the partition of real estate of Indians where an interest is owned by a restricted Indian.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The situation is about this: The act of Congress approved May 28, 1908, undertook to confer jurisdiction for a complete settlement of inherited estates on the Oklahoma State courts. Now, the county courts constitute the probate courts of our State, but the Oklahoma laws specifically vest jurisdiction for partition in the district courts. This leaves us with no tribunal competent to partition inherited estates where the rights of one restricted heir is involved.

Many of these estates descend to both restricted and unrestricted heirs. The unrestricted heirs may be held up indefinitely by one restricted heir, their interests jeopardized, and their part of the estate made almost worthless.

Land buyers sometimes get undivided interests for much less than actual value because no valid title can be made. The gentleman can understand how havoc can be played with titles, values, and legitimate development under such unsatisfactory and indefinite procedure as that existing now.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are there many instances where the land is owned exclusively by restricted Indians?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Where the inherited estates are owned exclusively by restricted Indians?

Mr. STAFFORD. Where the inherited estates descend to heirs who are exclusively, or a major portion of them, restricted Indians?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. That is true in some cases, but in many cases the inherited estate descends to both restricted and unrestricted heirs. An exception to that, of course, would be the immediate descendants, the children of the deceased persons, both of whom fall in the restricted class. Where there are no children, then the gentleman can see that the descent might go to unrestricted as well as restricted Indians. And in some cases you will find that the sons and daughters of a father may some of them be restricted and some unrestricted, because some are the children of an Indian mother and others the children of a white woman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the gentleman has no question that this provision will not work any injury to the rights of the restricted Indians, but will be beneficial to them?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. It will not be injurious to the restricted Indians and it will work great benefit to the unrestricted Indians.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can understand how it will work great benefit to the unrestricted Indians in case among the heirs at law there are but one or two restricted Indians, because the sale of the interest in the real estate in which he owns an undivided share is forbidden. Will the gentleman inform the House what is the present method of the determination of heirships among the Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Full-blood Indians?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. There is at present no procedure for the determination of heirship. There is no such thing as a final determination of the heirship of full-blooded Indian heirs in the Five Civilized Tribes.

Mr. STAFFORD. This first section of the bill endeavors to provide a method of the determination of that heirship?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if the Senate bill which he suggested he would offer as a substitute contains the language which Mr. Secretary Lane, in a letter of March 16, 1918, to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER], said he would like to see incorporated in House bill 10590?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes; if the gentleman will look at the report, he will see that the language is as follows:

Provided, That an appeal may be taken in the manner and to the court provided by law in cases of appeal in probate matters generally.

That is contained in the Senate bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes; but that other language, which I see is in the House bill in accordance with the suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior, is that in the Senate bill? This is the language to which I refer:

That the lands of full-blood members of any of the Five Civilized Tribes are hereby made subject to the laws of the State of Oklahoma providing for the partition of real estate. Any land allotted in such

proceedings to a full-blood Indian, or conveyed to him upon his election to take the same at the appraisal, shall remain subject to all restrictions upon alienation and taxation obtaining prior to such partition. In case of a sale under any decree or partition the conveyance thereunder shall operate to relieve the land described of all restrictions of every character.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. That is in the bill as passed by the Senate, which I will have read if we get unanimous consent for consideration.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice that is contained in the letter of the Secretary of the Interior to which I refer, and he says that he recommends the enactment of the House bill if it is amended in accordance with this particular suggestion.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The amendments are carried in the Senate bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is there any other language in the Senate bill which will at all contradict these amendments?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The only provision placed in the Senate bill which is not in the House bill is down in the middle of section 1, and is this language:

But this provision shall not be construed to reopen the question of the determination of an heirship already ascertained by competent legal authority under existing law.

That has been added in the Senate bill, I understand, at the suggestion of the department.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That particular clause would not in any way affect the two amendments suggested by the Secretary?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. No; it would not.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Which are incorporated in the bill?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. It would not affect them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Since I last addressed the gentleman my attention has been called by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] to a decision rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States to-day which passes upon the question of the heirship or title to lands of Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes. Of course, the gentleman can not be acquainted with the scope of that opinion, and I think perhaps in view of that decision it might be well to let this bill be passed over temporarily, to see just what the scope of the decision of the Supreme Court is.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will permit, this bill deals with procedure. I think the decision of the Supreme Court, from what I hear, only deals with the rights of the heirs. This bill, as the gentleman understands, deals with the method of determining the heirs and not what the rights of the heirs are. The decision of the Supreme Court did not deal with that question nor could it deal with section 2 giving the district courts of Oklahoma jurisdiction where, in the decision of Coleman against Battiest, it was held under existing law our Supreme Court did not have jurisdiction. So the passage of this bill could not possibly do any damage. Let me say to the gentleman, while I am on my feet, that this bill is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, it is recommended by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, and it has been passed by the Senate, and recommended by the House Committee on Indian Affairs, and there is no opposition to it.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. And it has been requested by the Federal land bank at Wichita, Kans.

Mr. STAFFORD. I know the influences back of the bill, and I recognize the need, but I thought it might be better to postpone it in order that we might get acquainted with the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. HASTINGS. I think, as I have said, that the decision of the Supreme Court only deals with the rights and not with the method of determining the heirs.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. And the question of there not being a procedure for the determination of the heirs has been passed upon by the Supreme Court long ago. We have no way of determining the heirs unless this bill is passed.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice as the bill was originally introduced it provided that in the determination of questions of fact as to who were the heirs the decision of the probate court in the State of Oklahoma conducted in the manner provided by the laws of the State for the determination of heirship should be conclusive of the question, and then I observe that the House committee inserted a proviso:

That an appeal may be taken in the manner and to the court provided by law, in cases of appeal in probate matters generally.

That is an exceedingly important proviso.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. That is in the Senate bill. The Senate placed it in this bill; and if the gentleman will permit me, the original bill from which the gentleman is reading was

introduced at the suggestion of the attorney for the Federal land bank at Wichita, Kans. He simply sent the bill to me, and I introduced it; it was sent in the regular course to the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary suggested certain changes, every one of which has been adopted in the bill reported and in the bill as passed by the Senate.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman will see that if Congress should enact a law and say that the decision of the probate court in Oklahoma shall bar any attempt at an appeal—

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I think what the gentleman says is very important, and I was glad the Secretary called my attention to it, so we put it in the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 4151 on the Speaker's table be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the Senate bill 4151 be substituted for the House bill. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, did I understand the gentleman to say that this bill was on the Speaker's table?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The Senate bill is on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to taking the Senate bill from the Speaker's table and substituting it for the House bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a determination of the question of fact as to who are the heirs of any deceased citizen allottee of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians who may die or may have heretofore died, leaving restricted heirs, by the probate court of the State of Oklahoma having jurisdiction to settle the estate of said deceased, conducted in the manner provided by the laws of said State for the determination of heirship in closing up the estates of deceased persons, shall be conclusive of said question: *Provided*, That an appeal may be taken in the manner and to the court provided by law in cases of appeal in probate matters generally: *Provided further*, That where the time limited by the laws of said State for the institution of administration proceedings has elapsed without their institution, as well as in cases where there exists no lawful ground for the institution of administration proceedings in said courts, a petition may be filed therein having for its object a determination of such heirship and the case shall proceed in all respects as if administration proceedings upon other proper grounds had been regularly begun, but this proviso shall not be construed to reopen the question of the determination of an heirship already ascertained by competent legal authority under existing laws: *Provided further*, That said petition shall be verified, and in all cases arising hereunder service by publication may be had on all unknown heirs, the service to be in accordance with the method of serving nonresident defendants in civil suits in the district courts of said State; and if any person so served by publication does not appear and move to be heard within six months from the date of the final order, he shall be concluded equally with parties personally served or voluntarily appearing.

Sec. 2. That the lands of full-blood members of any of the Five Civilized Tribes are hereby made subject to the laws of the State of Oklahoma providing for the partition of real estate. Any land allotted in such proceedings to a full-blood Indian, or conveyed to him upon his election to take the same at the appraisalment, shall remain subject to all restrictions upon alienation and taxation obtaining prior to such partition. In case of a sale under any decree, or partition, the conveyance thereunder shall operate to relieve the land described of all restrictions of every character.

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

On motion of Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The bill H. R. 10590, to provide for a determination of heirship in cases of deceased members of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, conferring jurisdiction upon district courts to partition lands belonging to full-blood heirs of allottees of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes, was laid on the table.

NUMBERING AND RECORDING OF UNDOCUMENTED VESSELS.

The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill S. 1549, an act to require numbering and recording of undocumented vessels.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman what is the necessity for the United States

taking jurisdiction of these motor-propelled boats, 16 feet in length and over, whether they have a permanent or a detachable motor, as this bill proposes to do?

Mr. ALEXANDER. We have two hundred and fifty or three hundred thousand motor boats plying in different waters, chiefly on the Atlantic coast, which are not numbered, and there are no means for identification. It is important to identify them, first, for the purposes of taxation, and, second, if they violate the rules of the road.

The statute of 1910 provides that all motor boats shall have lights, life preservers, whistles, means for extinguishing burning gasoline, and shall comply with the rules of the road for navigable waters. There is no lack of legislation to secure safety in respect of these boats. But it often happens that the parties operating craft of this character take advantage of the difficulty of detecting infractions of the statutes, and in defiance of the laws cross the bows of large steamers, greatly interfering thereby with the navigation of these vessels. Further, they cross the bows of other motor boats, and in still other ways violate the regulations of the police laws, to the very great danger of all concerned. Frequently they disregard the regulations relating to lighting after sunset, and leave their boats in dangerous places without anchor lights. The inspectors are continually confronted with violations of this character, but in many instances are unable to trace the guilty parties.

After we became involved in the war, as a military measure, the Navy Department undertook to enforce a rule of this kind as a protection to our naval vessels and merchant ships on the eastern coast, but they found they had no power to do so. This legislation is shown to be necessary in view of what has been stated on the floor to-day, that the German submarines are active in our waters. It will be a means of identifying the motor boat so that we may know the ownership and identify the boat, whether it is operated by an enemy alien or some other one inimical to our interests. That is a reason in addition to the reasons that have been assigned in the committee report.

The only objection ever made against numbering motor boats was because some of the owners of the high-class boats thought that to place numbers on them would disfigure them. But there is now no objection from any source whatever so far as I am advised.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman permit me to state an additional reason why this is proper legislation? In many sections of the country fishermen owning these boats leave the waters of their own State and fish in foreign jurisdictions and if they there violate the State laws there is no way of identifying or tracing them. This would permit that.

Mr. ALEXANDER. And oftentimes the boats are stolen, and it is impossible to identify them. It is just like letting automobiles go about the streets of our cities without any method of identifying them.

Mr. STAFFORD. When I read the bill and the report it occurred to me it was unnecessarily placing under Government regulation fishing motor boats and other larger craft and exacting from them a license tax of \$10 a year merely under the guise of regulation.

Mr. ALEXANDER. This does not carry any tax whatever.

Mr. WALSH. Ten dollars is the penalty.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The only expense is to put the numbers on the boats and the owner has to report to the collector of the port.

Mr. WALSH. That \$10 is the penalty.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; for violating the law.

Mr. STAFFORD. I gained the impression from reading the report, which was nearly a month ago, that all of these vessels would have to pay a license.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Oh, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. If they were enrolled as required by the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. No.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. Does this act apply to the inland waters of the United States?

Mr. ALEXANDER. All of the navigable waters of the United States where motor boats are used.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. I would like to say to the gentleman that the members of the Motorboat Club of Buffalo have written to me objecting to the bill. The club itself has not objected, but I wondered if there is any burden placed upon them that should not be put on motor boats in the Great Lakes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Not at all. There is no expense attached except in the placing of the numbers on the boats. It is simply a means of identification. It is of the utmost importance now, if never before, in view of the presence of enemy submarines off our coasts and for the reasons I have already given.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and the chairman of the committee say that this bill would not require any additional tax. I direct their attention to the report. Perhaps I read it erroneously. It says:

It will aid the Treasury Department in the collection of the taxes imposed on pleasure boats of a certain character by section 603 of the act of October 3, 1917. As it is, the department finds great difficulty in locating the boats subject to this tax.

Mr. WALSH. That is another tax altogether.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is another tax entirely. If the motor boats are liable to that tax under existing law, this simply helps to identify the boat and enables the Government to trace the owner.

Mr. STAFFORD. Personally I do not think we should try to regulate motor boats in all of our inland streams and on the Great Lakes. There may be necessity during the war to have a bill like this, especially in view of the present exigency of submarines appearing on the Atlantic coast, but for the National Government to take charge of the regulation of all motor boats on the inland streams, wherever navigable, I think it is going quite far.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The statute of 1910 provides that all motor boats shall have lights, life preservers, means of extinguishing burning gasoline, and so forth. We do not impose any additional burden upon them here except to say that they shall be numbered, and that is for the purpose of identification.

Mr. LEHLBACH. There is no objection to the numbering of these motor boats that can not with equal force be urged against the licensing and numbering of automobiles, and nothing can be said for licensing and numbering automobiles that can not with equal force be said for motor boats. The only reason the Federal Government has to do this is because it has control of all navigable waters of the United States.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman advances a good argument in favor of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That every undocumented vessel, operated in whole or in part by machinery, owned in the United States and found on the navigable waters thereof, except public vessels, and vessels not exceeding 16 feet in length measured from end to end over the deck, excluding sheer, temporarily equipped with detachable motors, shall be numbered. Such numbers shall be not less in size than 3 inches and painted or attached to each bow of the vessel in such manner and color as to be distinctly visible and legible.

Sec. 2. That the said numbers, on application of the owner or master, shall be awarded by the collector of customs of the district in which the vessel is owned and a record thereof kept in the customhouse of the district in which the owner or managing owner resides. No numbers not so awarded shall be carried on the bows of such vessel.

Sec. 3. That notice of destruction or abandonment of such vessels or change in their ownership shall be furnished within 10 days by the owners to the collectors of customs of the districts where such numbers were awarded. Such vessel sold into another customs district may be numbered anew in the latter district.

Sec. 4. That the penalty for violation of any provision of this act shall be \$10, for which the vessel shall be liable and may be seized and proceeded against in the district court of the United States in any district in which such vessel may be found. Such penalty on application may be mitigated or remitted by the Secretary of Commerce.

Sec. 5. That the Secretary of Commerce shall make such regulations as may be necessary to secure proper execution of this act by collectors of customs and other officers of the Government.

Sec. 6. That this act shall take effect six months after its passage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

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

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

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege in connection with an article published about me in the St. Louis Republic under date of May 25, 1918.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. It is because of the headlines placed over an article, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The shameful record of Congressman SHACKLEFORD.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Republic is waging against me and other Missouri Congressmen a campaign of such vindictiveness and falsehood that I feel I owe it to myself and to the public to make some reply.

It opened the assault of May 25 in an article entitled "The shameful record of Mr. SHACKLEFORD." To justify that malignant headline it set out numerous specifications, some of which are wholly untrue.

It charges that I did not vote for conscription. Technically that charge is true, but the publishers of the Republic knew that I favored conscription; that at the time the vote was taken I was absent from Washington for a week or so at the advice of my doctor on account of sickness; that I did not go away, however, until I had been assured by those having the conscription bill in charge that there was no doubt of its passage. One way to tell a falsehood is to conceal a part of the truth. The Republic chose that method.

It charges that before war had been declared I opposed administration measures of preparedness. That is another falsehood. I defy the Republic to point to a single vote cast by me against any measure of preparedness advocated by President Wilson.

It charges that I was sponsor for the McLeMore resolution warning Americans not to travel on armed ships of the warring nations. That charge is also false. I had a large part in framing the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs against the McLeMore resolution. When the resolution came up in the House I voted to lay it on the table and kill it. This is shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 7, 1916, on page 3720.

Why has the Republic resorted to the publication of these several false charges against me? There can be but one answer. It was moved by a wrongful desire to inflict injury.

The Republic having thus willfully misrepresented me it is fair to assume that it will continue its policy of falsification. The people, however, will doubtless judge its future utterances by its past record and not require me to follow up and expose every untruth it may publish from now until the election. They will probably keep in mind the instruction which the judge sometimes gives to the jury, that if they find any witness has testified falsely on any material matter they may disregard all of his testimony.

In further justification of its characterization of my record as "shameful," the Republic makes some other charges which may be briefly noticed.

It is charged that I voted for the Stone resolution, declaring a state of war with Austria-Hungary. That statement is not quite correct. It was not the Stone resolution for which I voted, but a resolution from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I was a member. I assisted in the preparation of that resolution and voted for it in the House. It went to the Senate and was there concurred in. The President had asked for the passage of this resolution and was satisfied with its form. What is there in my action on this measure to make my record "shameful"?

The Republic charges that I voted for the prohibition and woman suffrage amendments. I did vote for resolutions referring these proposed amendments to the States to be ratified or rejected by them as they may choose. What was there in either of these votes to render my record "shameful"?

The Republic charges that I voted against the bill which would have "forced" the President to send Col. Roosevelt to France in command of a division of the American Army. That charge is true. The President was Commander in Chief of the Army. It was his duty to appoint officers to command under him. He was responsible for the conduct of the war, and I felt it would be out of place for Congress to dictate to him in that matter. What was there in my action on that measure to render my record "shameful"?

The Republic says that I am an astute politician; that I rarely speak on the floor of the House; but that I play a prominent part in committee meetings and am regarded as an especially aggressive worker in cloakrooms, where many a bill has been put across or killed long before final action was taken on the floor. I should hardly claim that much for myself, but if it be true it simply shows that I have the friendship and the confidence of other Congressmen and that I am able to exercise influence with them. Would it be a good policy for the district to change a Congressman with such capacity and influence for a new and an untried man? Is there anything in this characterization of me to render my record "shameful"?

If the Republic sets itself up as a dictator of Missouri politics then we have a right to ask that it should be truthful and honest in its dictatorship.

On the morning of the last election the Republic had an editorial containing the following words:

Woodrow Wilson has given us the greatest administration since Lincoln, because the President and Congress have worked constructively together. Our lawmakers have had vision, conscience, insight. The election of a Congress prepared to continue this service to the Nation and to mankind is just as important as the election of the President himself.

Missouri expects every man to do his duty to-day by voting for Senator REED and the Democratic congressional ticket.

On November 6, the day before the last election, the Republic had another editorial from which I quote:

The Congress of the past four years has set a new mark in efficiency in legislation.

Missouri takes deep satisfaction in the highly honorable and conspicuously important part by the Missouri delegation at Washington in the new legislation enacted to meet new needs of a new day. No one can recount the history of this epochal period and leave out the achievements of Missourians in the high places of responsibility in the National Legislature.

These two editorials were words of high praise of me and the other Missourians. Both of these editorials were published more than eight months after the McLemore resolution incident of which the Republic now complains. Were these complimentary editorials honest expressions of the opinion of the Republic? If so, then its contrary expressions now are not honest.

The Republic claims that it is inspired to make these malevolent attacks on me and other Missouri Congressmen by a spirit of patriotism, but its record proves this to be untrue. Patriotism never inspired anybody to stir up strife and differences among the American people in an hour of danger like this. Patriotism never inspired anybody to utter falsehoods about any public man for the purpose of undermining the confidence of the public in him. What then has moved the Republic to its policy of vituperation? In my judgment there are three moving causes for it.

In the first place the Republic has never been as prosperous as its owners would like. It has not kept pace in circulation with the Globe-Democrat, its great rival. Consequently its advertising columns do not draw the volume of business nor command the prices therefor that is desired. The managers of the Republic, recognizing the splendid spirit of patriotism that pervades the country have undertaken to capitalize it for a larger circulation. They hope to do this by assuming a "holier-than-thou" attitude.

Again, the Republic and other large newspapers and magazines have for years been going through the mails at very much less than the cost of carriage. This loss to the Government now amounts to something like \$80,000,000 a year. When we came to make up the war-tax bill in the last Congress we took part of this subsidy away from the publishers. I and other Missouri Congressmen actively supported this measure. Its passage largely increased the amount of postage which the Republic has to pay the Government. Naturally, the Republic does not look kindly on any of us who increased its taxes. It wants to defeat us, but can not afford to state its real reason and so resorts to such subterfuges as the McLemore resolution, failure to support the bill to send Roosevelt to France, and so forth.

Then, too, the Republic is one of those papers, of which happily there are not many, that professes loyalty to one party and sells its columns to the other. [Applause.] To provide itself with a plausible excuse for such conduct it is probably now paving the way by attacking those Democrats who are likely to be nominated.

In the last campaign, when the Democratic Party had one of the hardest struggles of its existence, the Republic sold its columns to the support of Judge Hughes. On each of the last six days before the election there was carried in the Republic nearly a whole page statement of reasons why Wilson should be defeated and Hughes elected. The Republican campaign committee paid the Republic large sums for this service. The Republic sold its space to get money. The Republican committee bought it to get votes for Hughes. That committee was made up of wise men, who knew what they were doing. They were not throwing their money away, but were putting it where it would do the most good. Nobody can doubt that in Missouri Wilson's vote was made smaller and Hughes's larger by this shameful sale of the columns of this Democratic daily. Had Hughes carried Missouri, he would have won the election.

On those days of the campaign when this great Democratic paper was selling its space to the Hughes committee I and other Democratic Congressmen who are now being vilified and misrepresented by it were in the campaign holding up the flag of Democracy and rallying the voters to the support of Wilson. Is it not strange that in the face of that record the Republic should now in the house of our fathers challenge me and these other Missouri Democrats?

In the same issue of the Republic which carried the vituperation and the slanderous article to which I have referred there was an editorial, from which I quote:

There is probably not one man in this Congress who would now favor legislation intended to restrict the war activity of the country to a limit below the utmost that can be done.

If that statement be true, and it is, then why keep up a fight on these Congressmen? They are very busy with their country's business. Why disturb them and compel them to take the time

to look after their own affairs and defend their reputations against the false charges of sinister newspapers?

On May 28 the Republic had another editorial, from which I will quote:

This is no time for fights between American leaders. There is only one enemy, and if there is any American who is impairing his usefulness to the country as a whole by having a feud with any other American he falls short of the full duty of American citizenship.

I commend these words of the Republic to its managers. This is no time to stir up strife between Americans. We should all stand together and win the war. The Republic has said that there is not a man in Congress who would not go to the last limit for victory. Then why malign and harass them? Why not leave their minds free to give their country their best service? The situation is serious. Our boys are going by the hundreds of thousands. They should have, and should be made to feel that they have, a united country behind them. It must discourage them to know that people at home have lost sight of them in a struggle to put some men out of Congress simply to make room for others to get in.

I assure the Republic that everybody here is loyal and will do his best. Then why not forget past differences and stand together in supporting the flag which we all so dearly love?

Oh, the shame of the St. Louis Republic! [Applause.]

GEORGIA EXPERIMENT STATION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was House joint resolution 231, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment, and the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, the appropriation for the Georgia Experiment Station, of the State of Georgia, under act of March 4, 1917, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, to the board of trustees of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of the State of Georgia, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, provision for substantially the same purpose as this is carried in the Agricultural appropriation bill, which has been agreed to in a partial conference report. Therefore I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects, and the resolution is stricken from the calendar.

INDIANHEAD RAILROAD.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 6982) to authorize and empower the Secretary of the Navy to enter into and contract for the construction of a line of railway from a point in the District of Columbia to Indianhead, Md.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, this bill has already passed the House and is now on the Speaker's table, having been returned by the Senate with Senate amendments. This bill is erroneously on this calendar, and therefore I object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman has the wrong bill. The Speaker asks the Clerk to pass the one the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the Indianhead bill? Mr. Speaker, this bill has been substantially incorporated in the amendment in the naval appropriation bill, and under the circumstances I do not think we should act upon it here, but await the action of the conferees on that amendment. Therefore I object.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my recollection, which I am sure is accurate, that this bill here pending was inserted as a paragraph in the naval bill. Before the paragraph was reached during the consideration of that bill it was criticized here, and thereupon the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs [Mr. PADGETT], the gentleman from Tennessee, asked leave to withdraw the paragraph and it was withdrawn, he at the same time saying that he understood that the Pennsylvania Railroad was going to build this proposed line of track. I therefore object to its consideration at this time.

The SPEAKER. Both the gentlemen from Wisconsin object, and the bill is ordered stricken from the calendar.

PUBLIC-BUILDING SITE AT FARIBAULT, MINN.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 3332) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell and convey certain land to the city of Faribault, Minn.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to sell to the city of Faribault, Minn., at a proper price and upon such terms as he may deem to be to the best interests of the United States, that portion of the Federal building site in said city described as follows: The west 16 feet of lots 1 and 2 of block 46, of the original town (now city) of Faribault, Minn., for public alley purposes; to convey said land to said city by the usual quitclaim deed, and to deposit the proceeds of such sale in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. 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? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

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

PAYMENT FOR LEGAL SERVICES RENDERED TO THE CREEK NATION.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 906) making an appropriation to Stuart, Lewis, Gordon & Rutherford in payment of legal services rendered by them to the Creek Nation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The bill is stricken from the calendar.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman reserve his right to object for a moment?

Mr. WALSH. I will.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman agree that the bill go to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed without prejudice and go to the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks to pass the bill without prejudice and same to go to the foot of the calendar. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

BRIDGE ACROSS MAHONING RIVER, OHIO.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 10021) granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Trumbull County, Ohio, to construct, operate, and maintain a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River in the State of Ohio.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the county commissioners of Trumbull County, Ohio, to construct, maintain, and operate, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River, near the city of Niles, in the township of Weathersfield, in the county of Trumbull, State of Ohio, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, insert a new section, section 2, as follows:

"That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TENNESSEE RIVER NEAR LOUDON, TENN.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 10818) to authorize the county of Loudon, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River near Loudon, Tenn.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] is sick and sent the Chair word that he would like to have this bill passed without prejudice.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks that the bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that take it to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. STAFFORD. In view of the circumstances, I do not think it would, the gentleman from Tennessee being ill.

APPEALS FROM DECISIONS OF BOARDS OF LOCAL INSPECTORS OF VESSELS.

The next business in order on the Unanimous Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1544) to provide for appeals from decisions of boards of local inspectors of steam vessels, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think some explanation should be made as to the purpose to be accomplished by this bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the language of this bill in the form in which it was reported from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries is identical, I think, with the bill that passed the House in the last Congress but failed to pass the Senate. It was framed with a view of meeting conditions growing out of the *Eastland* disaster. Under existing law there is no appeal provided by law from the decision of local inspectors. This bill does no more than provide that appeal may be made either by officers named or by some one directly interested from the local inspector to the supervising inspector and from the supervising inspector to the Supervising Inspector General, and it is better to enforce our navigation laws and fix the responsibility to the public of those who may be negligent in the discharge of their duties and jeopardize or cause the loss of human life and at the same time protect those who may be unjustly convicted of an offense by providing for appeal. On page 3 of the report the Secretary of Commerce sets out a number of cases where there were accidents and where the masters of the vessels were convicted before the board of local inspectors but punished nominally, although the offense was very grave, and yet there was no appeal from their decision.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, do I understand this permits the Department of Commerce to appeal also from the decision of its own inspectors?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes. Now, it says:

That whenever any person directly interested in or affected by any decision or action by any board of local inspectors of vessels shall feel aggrieved by such decision or action he may appeal therefrom to the supervising inspector of the district, and a like appeal shall be allowed from any decision or action of a supervising inspector to the Supervising Inspector General, whose decision, when approved by the Secretary of Commerce, shall be final.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I noticed the language to which the gentleman has directed my attention, but the gentleman cited cases where accidents had occurred or disasters and parties in charge of vessels had had the case investigated by local boards of inspectors and the sentence inflicted was very light, although the offense was great.

Now, if this bill becomes a law, as I read that language, the navigation department of the Department of Commerce—

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Steamboat-Inspection Service.

Mr. WALSH. The Steamboat-Inspection Service could not appeal from that decision, with a view of having the case reviewed and a more severe penalty being imposed.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I call the gentleman's attention to the second section, that says:

That whenever there shall be a disagreement between the local inspectors in regard to any matter before them for decision they shall report the case to the supervising inspector of the district, who shall investigate and decide the same; and any supervising inspector may within 30 days thereafter, upon his own motion, review any decision or action of any board of local inspectors within his district, and in like manner the Supervising Inspector General may within 30 days thereafter review any decision or action of any supervising inspector or board of local inspectors, and the decision of the Supervising Inspector General in such case shall, when approved by the Secretary of Commerce, be final.

Mr. WALSH. That is only in case there is a dissenting opinion, so to speak, filed by one of the local inspectors.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Not only where there is a difference of opinion, but from any decision of the local inspectors.

Mr. WALSH. Now, there may be cases, and are cases, I have no doubt, where the local inspectors impose nominal penalties upon persons who are responsible for accidents, and it is done unanimously, and yet something may occur later to show that a more severe penalty should have been imposed. The only way it can be imposed, if this bill should become a law, is in case there is a disagreement between the local inspectors. Now, does not the gentleman think, with this measure, which is urged to perfect the navigation laws, with the right of review on the part of the Steamboat-Inspection Service of the Department of Commerce, that they ought to have the right to reopen and investigate these cases without the necessity of their being a disagreement amongst the local inspectors?

Mr. EDMONDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think the language will do that. I call the gentleman's attention to the language beginning in line 13 on page 2:

Any supervising inspector may within 30 days thereafter, upon his own motion, review any decision or action of any board of local inspectors within his district.

That is so, whether it is a unanimous or divided opinion.

Mr. WALSH. That seems to be hooked up with the early part of the section.

Mr. ALEXANDER. And then again it says:

The Supervising Inspector General may within 30 days thereafter review any decision or action of any supervising inspector or board of local inspectors.

Mr. WALSH. That all seems to be hooked up with the first part of the section.

Mr. EDMONDS. I would like to call attention to the fact that it is upon his own motion.

Mr. LEHLBACH. There are two propositions. One is that in case of disagreement they shall report it. And it goes on to say that on his own motion the supervising inspector may.

Mr. WALSH. The language is clear, I will admit, but it is hooked up with the earlier part of the section by a semicolon, and it would seem to depend upon the disagreement.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think it is quite clear that the supervising inspector in the first instance, and later on the Supervising Inspector General, on his own motion, may review any action of the local inspectors. The Supervising Inspector General may review any decision or action of the supervising inspector or board of local inspectors.

Mr. HARDY. The purpose of the framing of the language in the form in which it was to make it absolutely compulsory that if there was a division it should go up to higher authority. If there was no division, still the right of review existed in the higher authority.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, there would be no question—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Still further reserving the right to object, if this was started out as a new sentence then it would be clearer.

Mr. HARDY. The committee had it in mind, and they thought the semicolon would be sufficient to distinguish between the two.

Mr. WALSH. In view of the explanation of the gentlemen of the committee, who have given this careful attention, and in view of the great importance of the measure, I am willing to waive any doubt for the present I have as to the language, and I will not object.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] asks unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 1544) to provide for appeals from decisions of boards of local inspectors of steam vessels, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever any person peculiarly interested in any decision or action of any board of local inspectors of steam vessels shall feel himself aggrieved by such decision or action, he may appeal therefrom to the supervising inspector of the district, and a like appeal shall be allowed from any decision or action of a supervising inspector to the Supervising Inspector General, whose decision, when approved by the Secretary of Commerce, shall be final: *Provided, however,* That application for such reexamination of the case by a supervising inspector or by the Supervising Inspector General shall be made within 30 days after the decision or action appealed from shall have been rendered or taken: *And provided further,* That in all cases reviewed under the provisions of this act where the issue is the suspension or revocation of the license of a licensed officer, such officer shall be allowed to be represented by counsel and to testify in his own behalf.

SEC. 2. That whenever there shall be a disagreement between the local inspectors in regard to any matter before them for decision, they shall report the case to the supervising inspector of the district, who shall investigate and decide the same, and any supervising inspector may, upon his own motion, review any decision or action of any board of local inspectors within his district, and in like manner the Supervising Inspector General may review any decision or action of any supervising inspector or board of local inspectors, and the decision of the Supervising Inspector General in such case shall, when approved by the Secretary of Commerce, be final.

SEC. 3. That any decision or action reviewed by the Supervising Inspector General or by any supervising inspector, as provided in section 1 of this act, may be revoked, changed, or modified by such reviewing officer, who shall have power to administer oaths, and to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses by a similar process as in the district courts of the United States; and the disbursing clerk, Department of Commerce, shall pay, on properly certified vouchers, such fees to any witness, so summoned, for his actual travel and attendance, as shall be officially certified to by the officer reviewing the case, not exceeding the rate allowed for fees to witnesses for travel and attendance in the district courts of the United States.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of Commerce shall make such regulations as may be necessary to secure a proper enforcement of the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. That section 4452 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 6 of the act of March 3, 1905, is hereby repealed.

Also, the following committee amendments were read:

Amend, line 3, page 1, by striking out the word "peculiarly" and inserting in lieu of the same the word "directly"; and after the word "in" insert the words "or affected by."

Amend, line 5, page 1, by striking out the word "himself."

Amend, line 7, page 1, by striking out the comma and inserting a semicolon after the word "district."

Amend, line 6, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "officer."

Amend, line 11, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "decision."

Amend, line 13, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "same" and insert in lieu of the same a semicolon; and by striking out the comma after the word "may" and inserting thereafter the words "within 30 days thereafter."

Amend, line 15, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "district."

Amend, line 17, page 2, by inserting after the word "may" the words "within 30 days thereafter."

Amend, line 24, page 2, by striking out the word "section" and inserting in lieu of the same the word "sections"; and after the word "one" insert the words "and two."

Amend, line 11, page 3, by striking out the comma after the word "oaths."

Amend, line 5, page 3, by striking out the comma after the word "witness" and by striking out the comma after the word "summoned."

Amend, line 5, page 3, by striking out the comma after the word "attendance."

Mr. WALSH. In reporting this amendment on page 2, line 13, the Clerk reported striking out the comma. There has been inserted there a semicolon, which, I assume, is the committee amendment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The comma is stricken out and the semicolon placed there.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman just yield for a moment? I wish to ask his attention to the point raised a moment ago. Will the gentleman state when this 30 days begins to run or expire? It says:

And any supervising inspector may within 30 days thereafter.

Does that mean 30 days after they have reported the case to the supervising inspector of the district, or does it mean 30 days after they have investigated and decided the same?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is after any decision by the board of local inspectors. They report those decisions.

Mr. WALSH. Then, of course, if it is after any decision by the supervising inspector, it would seem to me that the contention which I raised earlier is correct, that the supervising inspector can only open these cases on his own motion in case there is a disagreement in the local board, because that is the only time that it is reported to the supervising inspector.

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; they are reported, as I understand.

Mr. WALSH. I know; but it is the only time it is reported, when there is investigation and further report.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The decisions of the local inspectors, in any event, whether there is a disagreement or not, are reported to the supervising inspector.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but the gentleman says that the 30 days begins after the supervising inspector has investigated and reported the case, as the result of the disagreement by the local board.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Of course, every decision calls for an investigation, but it is after the decision of the local board.

Mr. WALSH. I do not think the gentleman is correct there.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is our intent. I think it is clear.

Mr. WALSH. I understood the gentleman to say it was 30 days after the investigation and decision of the supervising inspector of the district, then after the decision the supervising inspector of the district might reopen it on his own motion.

Mr. ALEXANDER. There is no appeal under the existing law from the decision of the local inspectors, and now we have undertaken to make it so. Not only in a case where there is a disagreement may their action be reviewed but also when they are in agreement. When the decision of the local inspectors is reported to the supervising inspector he may review that decision and reverse it if he thinks the facts warrant it, and although he may affirm it the Supervising Inspector General may himself review and reverse that decision. The purpose is to place the responsibility all along the line, from the Supervising Inspector General down to the local inspector, to avoid just such accidents as the *Eastland* disaster.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I think it is important that we should do what the committee intends. Will the gentleman tell me when the "30 days thereafter" begins, that is set forth in line 17?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It reads, "may within 30 days thereafter review any decision or any action of any supervising inspector

or board of local inspectors." He does not have to wait for the action of the supervising inspector of the district. He may review the action of the local inspectors himself.

Mr. WALSH. Yes. But when does that 30 days expire?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Either after the decision of the local board of inspectors or in the other instance after the decision by the supervising inspector.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman give me five minutes more?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there for a suggestion?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. I think there is a little misapprehension. I do not think the local inspectors make reports to the supervising inspector of the district of all their decisions. They make their decision, and it stands unless there is a division. If there is a division they are by this law required to report their action to the district supervising inspector. If not, their decision stands. But under this bill any supervisor can visit all these local boards and review all their decisions.

He can take it up on his own motion any time within 30 days after the rendering of any decision by the local board. Whether there is a division or not, the supervising inspector has the right to do it.

There are three different conditions provided for. One is where there is a division. In that case, they are required to report to the supervising inspector of the district. Then, if there is no division and the decision is unanimous, the district supervising inspector has the right of his own motion to review the decision and action of the local board. And, again, the Supervising Inspector General may, within 30 days thereafter, review any decision or action of the district supervising inspector. So that it provides for the taking up of these decisions, whether they are done by unanimous agreement or not, first by the supervising inspector of the district, and then, if the inspector general is dissatisfied with that, he goes on on his own motion. There is not much formality of appeal or report. This bill was intended to give to the supervising inspector of the district the right to go into the action of these local boards and see what they were doing and investigate and examine any decisions they might make.

Mr. WALSH. And a like right is given to the Inspector General?

Mr. HARDY. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. The point I make here is that under the language of the section, as framed, any supervising inspector may, within 30 days thereafter—

Mr. HARDY. What does that "thereafter" mean? "Upon his own motion he may review any decision or action of the board." Take that sentence by itself. "Any supervising inspector may within 30 days thereafter upon his own motion review any decision or action of any board of local inspectors within his district." We were attempting to make this grammatically correct and at the same time not very much alter the language that came to us from the Senate and also the language that was incorporated in the bill that the House passed last session and that went to the Senate and died by inaction there. I do not see but that "thereafter" can refer to but one predicate. It refers to any decision or action of the local board of inspectors.

Mr. WALSH. But it says when they are divided they shall report the case to the supervising inspector of the district, who shall investigate and decide the same; and then it says, "Any supervising inspector may within 30 days thereafter." Now, the natural inference given to that language would be that it would be 30 days after this supervising inspector had investigated and decided the case.

Mr. HARDY. I am as anxious as the gentleman from Massachusetts is to get it perfectly clear, and if we can find any words that will relieve any doubt, I shall be glad to adopt them.

Mr. WALSH. I do not desire to delay the passage of this important measure for the purpose of putting in any language which I propose. I do want to get the opinion of the members of the committee as to whether or not this language is susceptible of the meaning which they intend to convey, and if it would not be clearer to change the semicolon into a period and strike out the word "and" and capitalize the word "any" in line 13.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HARDY. I ask that the gentleman may have five minutes longer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Why not eliminate the period and semicolon and put an end to this controversy?

Mr. HARDY. I am trying to find what will make it clearer than it is. I think it might be made to read:

And any supervising inspector may, upon his own motion, review any decision or action of any board of local inspectors within his district within 30 days after the same is rendered or taken.

Mr. WALSH. Of course there would not be any doubt about that language.

Mr. HARDY. If he will offer that amendment we will accept it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee amendments are first in order.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to offer this amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment when it is reached.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "pecuniarily" and insert in lieu thereof the word "directly."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, at the beginning of the line insert the words "or affected by."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all the committee amendments except the one in lines 13 and 14, on page 2, be acted upon in gross.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that all the committee amendments to the bill, with the exception of the one in lines 13 and 14, on page 2, be agreed to in gross. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The other committee amendments were agreed to, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, insert "or affected by."

Amend, line 5, page 1, by striking out the word "himself."

Amend, line 7, page 1, by striking out the comma and inserting a semicolon after the word "district."

Amend, line 3, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "officer."

Amend, line 8, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "decision."

Amend, line 10, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "same" and insert in lieu of the same a semicolon; and by striking out the comma after the word "may" and inserting thereafter the words "within 30 days thereafter."

Amend, line 12, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "district."

Amend, line 20, page 2, by striking out the word "section" and inserting in lieu of the same the word "sections"; and after the word "one" insert the words "and two."

Amend, line 22, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "oaths."

Amend, line 1, page 3, by striking out the comma after the word "witness"; and by striking out the comma after the word "summoned."

Amend, line 2, page 3, by striking out the comma after the word "attendance."

Mr. WALSH. Now, Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment: On page 2, in line 13, strike out the semicolon and insert a period. Strike out the word "and" following the period and capitalize the word "any"; and then strike out the words in that line and in line 14, "within 30 days thereafter"; and after the word "district," in line 15, insert "within 30 days after the said decision or action has been rendered or taken," so that the language will read as follows:

Any supervising inspector may upon his own motion review any decision or action of any board of local inspectors within his district within 30 days after the said decision or action has been rendered or taken.

Mr. HARDY. Let me suggest to the gentleman that if he strikes out the semicolon, inserts a period, strikes out the word "and," and puts in a capital "A" for the word "any" the sentence will be plain. Then it could not refer back to the question of the report and would be perfectly clear. We will make no objection to it.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will offer that as a substitute for my amendment, I will accept it.

Mr. HARDY. I offer as a substitute instead of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, to strike out the semicolon after the word "same" and insert a period, strike out the word "and," and then begin the word "any" with a capital "A," so that it will read:

Any supervising inspector may, within 30 days thereafter, upon his own motion, review any decision or action of any board of local inspectors within his district.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: Page 2, line 13, after the word "same," strike out the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof a period. Strike out the word "and" and capitalize the letter "A" in "any."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I will accept that substitute for the amendment which I offered.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the gentleman from Massachusetts offered a substitute for the committee amendment. Now, he suggests that the gentleman from Texas offer a substitute for his substitute. I do not know of any parliamentary rule which makes that in order.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts desires to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw my amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws his amendment. The question is on the amendment which has been reported by the Clerk.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

By unanimous consent, the title of the bill was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for appeals from decisions of boards of local inspectors of vessels, and for other purposes."

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

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN HAWAII.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2380) granting to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii additional powers relative to elections and qualification of electors.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Miss RANKIN. I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the lady from Montana opposed to this bill?

Miss RANKIN. No; I am in favor of it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize somebody who is opposed to it, if there is anybody, in accordance with the rule; otherwise the Chair will recognize the lady from Montana.

Mr. RAKER. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is entitled to 20 minutes and the lady from Montana [Miss RANKIN] is entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this bill passed the Senate on September 13, 1917, unanimously. I want to state that hearings on this bill were had before the Committee on Woman Suffrage of the House. A number of parties appeared, particularly Mrs. Benjamin F. Pittman, of Boston, who has been in Hawaii and is familiar with the situation there; also Mrs. Maud Wood Park, Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, and others.

After such hearings and full consideration by the committee the bill was reported out of the committee unanimously. There was and is no opposition in the committee to the bill. It simply gives the Hawaiian Legislature the power and the right to enact a law, if they see fit, or they may submit it to the citizens by the way of referendum, to say whether or not female suffrage shall be granted to the women of Hawaii. At this time I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, what is the use of reprinting this report?

Mr. RAKER. Because it is valuable and there is no other way of getting it into the RECORD. It contains valuable statements.

Mr. WALSH. The statements of Mrs. Maud Wood Park and Dr. Anna Howard Shaw and Mrs. Benjamin F. Pittman?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; and I think the statement of Mrs. Pittman is remarkable.

Mr. WALSH. Those statements are printed in full in the report, and it is a little unusual to reprint the reports in the RECORD.

Mr. RAKER. I was trying to save time instead of recapitulating them in my remarks. I want them to go to the House and to the country for the benefit of the country.

Mr. WALSH. I do not think the gentleman ought to reprint the reports in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. Was the Delegate from the Hawaiian Islands in favor of the bill?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; he wrote a letter to me personally and asked a meeting of the committee, and he sent a written statement, as he was called away on a subpoena to testify as a witness in an important case in Hawaii and could not be personally present.

Mr. GARNER. And the Delegate is in favor of the bill?

Mr. RAKER. He is not only in favor of it but he is anxious for its passage.

Under the organic act creating the Territory of Hawaii suffrage was confined to male citizens. This bill proposes to vest in the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii the "power to provide that in all elections authorized to be held by the organic act of the Territory of Hawaii female citizens possessing the same qualifications as male citizens shall be entitled to vote."

The bill also provides that the legislature "is further hereby vested with the power to have submitted to the voters of the Territory of Hawaii the question of whether or not the female citizens of the Territory shall be empowered to vote at elections held under the laws of the Territory of Hawaii." The proposal comes to the Congress of the United States from the people of Hawaii through the action of their Territorial legislature.

The measure is favored by both political parties of the islands, and there is indicated a large measure of popular interest in the granting of suffrage to the women of the Territory.

Since the organic law can only be changed by an act of Congress, the power necessary to make the needful changes so as to allow women to take part with men in the exercise of suffrage is by the bill vested in the Legislature of Hawaii, which can either of its own motion grant the rights of equal suffrage to all its citizens, subject to the other limitations of the organic act, or can provide for a referendum on the subject, or can do both. This statement of the facts of the case relieves the question from the suggestion that the Congress of the United States is forcing upon the people of the Territory of Hawaii a suffrage system which may be unwelcome to them. The request comes in the form of a petition from the representative body of the Territory, and further provision is made for a referendum vote. All that Congress is asked to do is to permit the legislature to grant the privilege of equal suffrage to the women of the Territory in the discretion of the legislative body itself.

The question of equal suffrage for the territory of Hawaii should be disassociated from the question as it affects the United States of America. Nevertheless it is pertinent to observe that the alternative method here recommended empowering the legislature to grant equal suffrage or submitting the matter to a referendum of the people are methods already in force in the States of the Union.

During the present year the Legislatures of North Dakota, Ohio, Rhode Island, Michigan, Nebraska, and Indiana have voted to grant presidential suffrage to the women of these States, while in Maine, Iowa, South Dakota, and Oklahoma the legislatures have referred the question of woman suffrage to the people.

Congress simply grants in this bill to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii the power granted the State legislatures in the various State constitutions and by Congress in acts granting Territorial government. Porto Rico was granted that power in the recent bill providing for civil government in that island.

It is also proper to observe that the cause of woman suffrage has been tremendously advanced on account of the war conditions which now prevail over so large a part of the world. The women of England, for example, patriotically enlisting in every form of service except that of actual combat on the fields of battle, have so deeply impressed members of Parliament that

this long-deferred measure of justice has recently passed the House of Commons by an overwhelming majority. It then passed the House of Lords, and was approved by the King. The women of England now have full rights of suffrage, for which they have been struggling for so many years.

In other parts of the British Empire, in Australia, New Zealand, the six Provinces of Canada, and British Columbia, women possess equal rights with men; while in India, Burma, and British Honduras women have been granted municipal suffrage by the British Parliament. Finland, Norway, Denmark, and Iceland have granted equal suffrage, and Sweden every suffrage right except the vote for Parliament. Republican France has pledged to extend municipal suffrage to women in the immediate future. One of the States of Mexico, Yucatan, has granted suffrage to its women. As Mr. Asquith recently remarked:

"I no longer regard this question from the standpoint we occupied before the war. Women have worked out their own salvation. I am ready to give them the vote."

It has been deemed advisable to remove the source of discontent and disunion by rewarding the tremendous share of women in the labors and sacrifices incident to a state of war.

An act of Congress, therefore, empowering the Legislature of Hawaii to remove one restriction of the organic act or to submit the question to a referendum of the voters will be in line with many precedents that have been established during the period of the great war.

Ever since Jefferson declared as the foundation of our liberties the principle that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," it has become apparent that equal suffrage is inevitable not only in America but throughout the world.

It is worthy of note that the House of Representatives on January 10, 1918, by the constitutional two-thirds vote passed H. J. Res. 200.

The premier of Italy, last week, said that he feels the time has come for the extension of full suffrage to the women of Italy, and that he trusts that the Italian Parliament will immediately pass the measure granting woman suffrage in Italy.

Within the last two months the great Lone Star State of Texas has given primary suffrage to the women of Texas. The bill should pass without a dissenting vote.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everyone in the House who voted for woman suffrage on January 10 last is in favor of this bill. It merely gives the Legislature of Hawaii the right to decide whether or not they shall give woman suffrage to the women of Hawaii, or submit it to the voters. I believe that the women in Hawaii are just as anxious for another step in democracy as are the women all over America and every country in the world. We are fighting this war for democracy, and democracy does not come in any one step; it comes by all the people taking the steps that are before them, and this is one of the steps toward a fuller democracy. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

PENSIONS.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 3547, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3547) to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, to the officers and enlisted men of all State militia and other State organizations that rendered service to the Union cause during the Civil War for a period of 90 days or more, and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted etc., That the provisions, limitations, and benefits of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912, be and the same are hereby extended to include any person not an enlisted soldier in the Army, serving for the time being as a member of the militia of any State, or as a member of any other State organization, under orders of an officer of the United States, or who volunteered for the time being to serve with any regularly organized military or naval force of the United States, and who actually rendered a service of 90 days or more in any of the said military organizations during said war, and who were honorably discharged therefrom or otherwise honorably relieved from duty under the order of proper military authority.

Sec. 2. That the widows, minor children, and dependent parents of those provided for in section 1 of this act shall be entitled to the same pensions as are now provided by law for the widows, minor children, and dependent parents of the soldiers who were in the regular service during the Civil War.

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe rules and regulations governing the character of evidence necessary to prove the service herein set forth: *Provided*, That a certificate of the adjutant general of the State to which the military organizations belonged, showing the date of honorable discharge therefrom, shall be accepted

in lieu of the honorable discharge required by the provisions of the act referred to in section 1: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall not extend to the case of any person wherein the evidence discloses any fact that would have barred him from an honorable discharge had he been in the military service of the United States.

Sec. 4. That title to pension under this act shall commence from the date of filing application therefor in the Bureau of Pensions after the passage and approval of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. STAFFORD. I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. From what I have heard of it I think I shall be, although I am not positive.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin to 20 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to very briefly state the purpose of this bill. This is the second time that this bill has been reported to the House by the unanimous vote of the Invalid Pensions Committee. When it was reported to the House before, for some reason we were not able to get it up for consideration. By this bill we hope to do to-day what ought to have been done, in my opinion, many years ago; that is, to recognize and to pension the State troops who rendered the same services in defense of the Government during the Civil War that was rendered by the Regular troops, all of whom have long since been granted pensions. I can speak with more information about Missouri troops, because I have given them more attention, but there were State militia in Kentucky, Indiana, and other States that rendered the same character of service. The Missouri Militia was recognized by President Lincoln as a part of his army, and he asked the governor of that State not to disband the militia, because they were rendering a service which, if they were discontinued, would compel him to send his Regular troops to take their places. It is true that the State of Missouri paid its militia during the Civil War, but after the war was over Congress reimbursed the State for every dollar that it had paid out to sustain its militia. They fought side by side with the Regular troops. Some of them were wounded and many of them were killed in the battles that were fought in defense of the Union at that time. They fought with Government arms and ammunition, lived upon Government provisions, and were commanded by Federal officers.

Mr. LANGLEY. And if the gentleman will permit me to suggest, the troops of Kentucky and some of the other States did the same thing.

Mr. RUSSELL. Kentucky's militia was in exactly the same attitude. She had some State troops that rendered similar service, sometimes for six months and sometimes for a year, fighting side by side with the Regular troops in the battles of the Civil War, using the ammunition of the Government, and fighting under the command of Federal officers. After the war was over Congress returned to Kentucky, as it did to Missouri, every dollar paid out by that State to sustain the militia during the war.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WALSH. What are the other States that are interested? I notice from the report that Kentucky and Missouri are mentioned, and other States, and on page 2 mention is made of Indiana and Pennsylvania.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are four States that will have the principal part of men who will be benefited by this legislation—Missouri, Indiana, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania. There were some in Kansas, I think some in Arkansas, and perhaps some in Nebraska.

Mr. LANGLEY. And also in West Virginia.

Mr. RUSSELL. And some in West Virginia.

Mr. WALSH. How much will these various companies from these various States add to the pension rolls?

Mr. RUSSELL. It will be very slight, because there were very few in those States, even during the war, and nearly all of them have died. I think the estimate in the report of the probable expense of this bill is far beyond what will be true. It is stated that Missouri would probably add 5,000 soldiers to the rolls. I do not believe there are 2,000 of these militiamen alive to-day, and the few left are old and feeble. A great many of them afterwards went into the regular service, and that diminished the number; they are getting pensions now, and four-fifths of the balance of them have died. This was the best estimate that I have been able to get from the adjutant generals of the several States. I do not believe the bill, if passed, will cost the Government \$3,000,000 the first year, and the amount will rapidly decrease as the old soldiers pass away.

Mr. WALSH. Have some of these been pensioned under special acts of Congress?

Mr. RUSSELL. None of them, unless they were wounded in battle. We have tried in some cases to get through special bills, and while some of them have passed in the House they have usually, if not always, been defeated in the Senate.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I will.

Mr. FESS. I am ignorant of the facts in the case, but how does it come that the other States are not in the same situation as the four mentioned?

Mr. RUSSELL. The chief part of the State troops were in the border States that did not secede, such as Kentucky and Missouri. There were a few State troops raised in some of the other States; but the great body of these troops were in Kentucky and Missouri, the two border States during the war, and they fought with the Union troops, and were paid by the States at the time; but Congress has paid back the money, recognizing that they rendered necessary and valuable services for the Union.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Just for a moment.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It may enlighten the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] to state that the troops from Indiana that are included in this bill served principally in resisting the Morgan raid and they saved Cincinnati, the One hundred and eighth Indiana especially. I know that regiment was intrenched under command of Gen. Lew Wallace at the time that the Morgan raid was threatening the States.

Mr. LANGLEY. They rendered a valuable service.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have set out here in the report documents which I wish the Members would read, letters and orders written and signed by President Lincoln, saying that the Missouri Militia was a valuable part of his Army and that they were rendering an important and a beneficial service.

Mr. FESS. Could the gentleman tell me who were the Squirrel Hunters in connection with the Civil War?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not know.

Mr. LANGLEY. Those are organizations, I think, drawn in the service.

Mr. RUSSELL. This bill does not include anybody except State troops who fought during the Civil War to put down the rebellion in cooperation with Federal troops and under the command of Federal officers. In Missouri our militia were commanded for a time by Gen. Schofield, a Federal officer.

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman will permit, the designation, I think, applies to the group that defended Cincinnati on the occasion of the Morgan riot, and I wondered whether that was a Federal or a State organization.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I taken?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Were they not troops that enlisted for service for 100 days?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has used eight minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]. How much time does he wish?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I want about three or four minutes after some one who is opposed to the bill has used some time. Let the gentleman reserve the remainder of his time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I think we are going rather fast at this time when we are so pressed for revenue to consider a bill that has been rejected in prior Congresses to pension not only the soldiers of those who were connected with the State militia, but also their widows and children. Obviously this very proposal has met with opposition in the Senate, otherwise the special bills included in the omnibus pension bills which have gone to the Senate to pension soldiers connected with State militia who had performed real service in real battle would have passed. This bill seeks to open up the floodgates of the Treasury to State militia organizations whether they saw service or not.

Mr. LANGLEY. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is that limitation?

Mr. LANGLEY. He must have rendered actual service for 90 days.

Mr. STAFFORD. Just like the home guards to-day are rendering actual service in the present emergency by police duty. This bill is not limited to those who smelled powder and really saw actual fighting. There may be instances where there were State militiamen who were identified with actual fighting,

but there is no such limitation in this bill. Furthermore, there is nothing in this bill that prevents claim agents from obtaining returns. Who knows—I do not know—but who knows there may not have been and have been for years a lobby seeking to have this bill passed, with large fees to come as a result of it—

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield, in fairness, of course, to the gentleman from Missouri after that statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is an amendment to the Sherwood bill, and it provides that attorneys can not get any fees, and this appropriates that as a part of the law.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will stand corrected as to that, and I am glad the gentleman corrected me.

Mr. IGOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will.

Mr. IGOE. As I understand the bill, it is limited to those soldiers who served under Federal officers armed and equipped by the—

Mr. STAFFORD. I know Missouri is interested in this; and if we may establish this precedent, and especially now, when the Treasury is in such need of funds, why, we will have the precedent also for the home guards after this great war is over. They, too, will claim to have a pensionable status. I think of all times this bill should not be now considered. We have heard from time to time—at least, I have—of the pressure brought by Missouri Representatives for giving the Missouri militia a pensionable status. The Senate of the United States, from the admission of the gentleman from Missouri, has refused to recognize that they were entitled to any pensionable status.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IGOE. The reason the Senate has refused is that it says that it ought to be done in a general bill; that is the reason.

Mr. LANGLEY. The Senate took the position there ought to be general legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. I believe, so far as I am concerned, there ought to be special legislation which applies only to those who saw real service.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the gentleman know most of those men were in a large number of small, hot, bitter fights in Missouri, and were fighting all over the State?

Mr. STAFFORD. There might have been local engagements.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They were local engagements, and they were for blood, too.

Mr. FARR. In Pennsylvania they were engaged in bitter fights.

Mr. KINKAID. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska to speak for the home guards of that State.

Mr. KINKAID. Does the gentleman know that the survivors of these militiamen who fought in the Civil War are not now confined to the States they were chosen from, but are scattered over the States of the Union?

Mr. STAFFORD. Why did not they join the Federal forces in the regular way? Why did they stay back at home and why did not they yield themselves to command of the military authorities to defend the Union just as to-day those connected with the National Army are yielding themselves for the national purpose? They were under the State militia to do home duty as home guards are now doing. I reserve the remainder of my time. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I used?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used five minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it is too late to talk about taking money out of the Treasury to pay for wars. This is to pay for a war that is past, a debt that has long been due to soldiers in the service of the United States in the sixties. Few rendered better service to the country than did the men who are included within the provisions of this bill. They were from Missouri, they were from Kansas, they were from Nebraska, they were from New York, Pennsylvania, and from many other States of the Union. They fought in some of the hardest-fought battles of the war, including Gettysburg. Why has not this thing been done before? Simply because the legislation was attempted by special bills. It was said, "Why do you not include them all in one bill?" No one can explain why this was not done. It is just a question of rendering justice to men who performed a great service to their country. Men from Kansas went to Missouri, fought down in Arkansas; they remained in the service until the war was over. They did not take the time to enlist in the regular service. They were not

thinking about the organization they were with. They were thinking about rendering service to the country at the time, and they were taking no chances on anything except rendering the quickest and best service they could to their country. It is the purpose of this bill to give them a pensionable status. They rendered exactly the same kind of service in the field as the men they fought side by side with. They fought under Union commanders and beside the men in the regular service who have been pensioned for years. I know some of them. I always thought they had been in the regular service. They belong to the Grand Army of the Republic. They have suffered every hardship that any other soldier suffered—

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have in mind an old man, about 80 years of age now, who had 250 days of actual service during the Civil War in Missouri, and yet he has no pensionable status.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have one in my home town who served in Missouri, and a better citizen never lived anywhere, and until he became old a few years ago he never suggested such a thing as a pension. I introduced a special bill for him, but it could not pass, because the committees of Congress said that they wanted to include him along with all the other men who served in similar organizations. And so it is. The only way to do justice to these men is to pass this bill, and I sincerely hope that further objection on the ground that it takes money out of the Treasury will not be made. These men have this due them, not as a gratuity, but as a matter of absolute justice. We agreed to provide for them just as we agreed to provide for the others who fought the battles of that great war. They were included among those whom Lincoln said at the close of the war should be provided for, as well as their dependents.

Mr. WALSH. When was that agreement made?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. When Lincoln said that those who fought the battles of the war, and their dependents, should be taken care of in their declining years.

Mr. WALSH. He did not refer to the militia.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. He referred to those who fought the battles of the war.

Mr. WALSH. He referred to those who were in the Federal service.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. He did not confine his statement to the regular troops and recognized all who fought in the battles of the war, without regard to where they came from or the organization in which they served. I hope this bill will pass. It does justice long delayed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, it is not a popular thing to-day to refuse or decline approval of pension legislation which attempts to do justice to those who in the troublesome days of 1861 engaged in defending various sections of this country. But I submit that after the great Commonwealth of Missouri has received from the Federal Treasury at least the sum of \$7,456,000 in one payment and various other payments from time to time, for the use of its militia in doing guard duty or repelling invasion, or engaging in skirmishes within its borders or across the borders, for the protection of its own homes and firesides, that the State of Missouri is in a position to do something for these men. The report here does not set forth whether it has ever attempted to come to their relief or make provision for them or not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, does the gentleman know that this sum of \$7,000,000 and these other odd sums were given to Missouri to recoup that State for money that it actually spent in fitting those troops, and arming them, and in giving them uniforms? It was not in the nature of a compensation. It was paying back the money that the State of Missouri patriotically put into the war because it could not get the Federal administration out there to put in enough.

Mr. WALSH. This sum was paid to reimburse the State on account of money expended, and then there were various other sums paid to the State of Missouri to reimburse it. But we have not heard of the other States where the State militia went into the Union service and faced the enemy being paid or reimbursed. The truth is that there are three or four States—Indiana, Pennsylvania, Kansas, Kentucky, and Missouri—that are known. Some other States are referred to, but no statistics are given, whose troops did valuable service. There is no question about their repelling invasion perhaps, and about their defending the States, and if facing the enemy in actual service they deserve consideration. But they were not part of the Regular Army, and I doubt whether the great Lincoln in his

reference, at the close of the war, to what would be done for the people at the close of the war, contemplated making provision for militiamen who saw no fighting.

Now, a great many of them, of course, it will be said, did not come within the 90-day provision. But many who will come within that limitation did no actual fighting. They simply comprised a home guard and were not fighting men in the true sense.

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

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would the gentleman let me read just about two lines from this report, instead of answering the question?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is what President Lincoln said at the conclusion of his remarks when the Government was about to disband the militia. He said:

I, therefore, as at present advised, can not attempt the destruction of the enrolled militia in Missouri.

That was after stating their valuable service.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Missouri if there is not a precedent for the payment of this money, at least a precedent embodying the principle contained in this bill? Some years ago I recall distinctly that Congress passed a bill reimbursing the State of Pennsylvania for money which it paid, or which it had reimbursed to the business men of Philadelphia, for money which they had paid to the militiamen of Pennsylvania who went down to help Meade in that battle.

Mr. RUSSELL. They returned the money, you know, to Kentucky and to Missouri; money advanced to sustain these militiamen. Congress reimbursed them for the money on the ground that they had rendered a Federal service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me three or four minutes more?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman four minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for four minutes more.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, of course Pennsylvania has been reimbursed, and Missouri has been reimbursed. I imagine that Indiana has also been reimbursed from the Federal Treasury, and possibly Kentucky. But it seems to me that before we embark upon this general legislation to make these militiamen the beneficiaries at this particular time we ought to know how much it is going to cost, and to know in such case that actual fighting service was rendered. Now, here is a report, voluminous, with many extracts, and conveying the information that legislation similar to this now proposed, not quite so general in character, has been attempted before and failed.

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

Mr. WALSH. The first time this was attempted—

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the gentleman think that those people who rendered that faithful service to this Government 55 years ago have waited long enough?

Mr. WALSH. Of course, that question can be asked with reference to any legislation in the nature of pension legislation. In fact, I think I may have asked the question myself of the gentleman as a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, but it was in reference to volunteers who had served as a part of the Regular Establishment and who had not remained subject to the State call and only State jurisdiction and who were fighting. These volunteers, these militia, could have become a part of the Regular Establishment very easily. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] stated that they did not do it; they did not take the time to do it. Of course, they did not; they remained as a State militia, and they remained for the most part near their own firesides, and the character of the service which they rendered was local, and it was under State command, and some never saw the enemy.

Mr. FARR. The Pennsylvanians were not members of the State militia. They were called out on account of the invasion of Pennsylvania. A great many of them served at Gettysburg.

Mr. WALSH. What were they?

Mr. FARR. They were emergency men. They volunteered to protect the Union.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman think that the Pennsylvanians come under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. FARR. That is my understanding.

Mr. WALSH. They were not State militiamen.

Mr. RUSSELL. Any State organization that served for 90 days in cooperation with the Federal troops and under the com-

mand of Federal officers in putting down the rebellion will come under this bill.

Mr. WALSH. That would be within the provision of the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of the bill also.

Mr. WALSH. The amendment opens the door still wider. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] states that his troops were not State militia.

Mr. FARR. They were emergency men.

Mr. WALSH. He states that they were emergency men. By whom were they raised?

Mr. RUSSELL. By the governor of the State.

Mr. FARR. The governor of the State called for volunteers, because Pennsylvania was being invaded.

Mr. FOCHT. I would like to ask the gentleman how he interprets the word "militia," for the simple reason that it has been suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] that Pennsylvania, during the invasion of that State, raised a large number of emergency men.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOCHT. I should like to have unanimous consent to speak for five minutes on this important question. We will get right down to where Pennsylvania stands, or ought to stand.

Mr. RUSSELL. This includes any State organization. If I had the time I would be glad to yield it to the gentleman.

Mr. FOCHT. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time for this debate is limited.

Mr. FOCHT. I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the time of this debate be extended 10 minutes, and that 5 minutes of that time be given to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] and 5 minutes to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the time of this debate be extended 10 minutes, 5 minutes to go to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I have demands for time in opposition that I can not meet. I ask unanimous consent to make it 15 minutes, giving those in favor of the proposition 10 minutes and those opposed to it 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to extending the time 15 minutes, 5 minutes to go to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT], and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that with the rapidity with which we are passing pension bills now I think the militia will be taken care of at this session, and the emergency men will probably be taken care of just before the next election.

Mr. FARR. They are included in this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FOCHT. I yield first to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this bill ought to have been passed 50 years ago. [Applause.] If it had not been for the 111,000 men that Missouri sent to the Union Army, when that State had only 160,000 voters in 1860, and if it had not been for the 75,000 Kentuckians that Kentucky sent to the Union Army, the Confederate flag would be waving in Richmond this minute. Now, it is true that a good many of these men never went out of the State of Missouri, but they took the place of the men who did go. Missourians and Kentuckians did not need any great amount of drilling to know how to use a rifle or a double-barreled shotgun. They went from their homes and fought innumerable battles in Missouri, in squads, companies, regiments, brigades, and armies. Of course, Pennsylvania sent her emergency men to Gettysburg when Pennsylvania was invaded. Missouri was invaded every two or three months during those four years, and so was Kentucky, and some of those men fought the most bloody battles that were fought during the entire Civil War. They were shot to pieces; cut to pieces; they died. The State was overrun by both armies.

There is no prejudice left in the State of Missouri growing out of the Civil War; and I will tell you what happens: When a Union soldier writes to me to get him a pension or to get his pension increased, his Confederate neighbor writes a letter

right along in the same mail asking that it be done. [Applause.]

Talk about these men not fighting! I will tell you what I saw with my own eyes when I was a small boy. I saw seven Kentucky home guards charge the whole of Morgan's cavalry—the flower of Kentucky chivalry—down a broad gravel road without any ambush about it. The Kentuckians and the Missourians would fight the devil. [Laughter and applause.]

There has always been a discrimination against the border State men. It was easy to be a Union man in Massachusetts, it was easy to be a Confederate in Mississippi, but in Kentucky and Missouri, in that border land, it was perilous to be either or to sit on the fence; a fellow had to feel of his topknot every morning to see if, like the flag of his country, it was still there. [Laughter.] It was father against son, brother against brother, neighbor against neighbor, and frequently husband against wife. If there ever was a set of men worthy and fit to be put on the pension roll, it is the Kentuckians and the Missourians. They followed Frank Blair, who did more than any other one man in the United States, except Abraham Lincoln, to save the Union. If monuments were built in this town to soldiers in proportion to the services they rendered, Blair's would tower among the tallest. He kept Missouri from seceding. That prevented Kentucky from seceding; and if you had given the 111,000 Union soldiers of Missouri and 75,000 from Kentucky, and those two great agricultural States to feed on, they never could have starved Lee's army into surrender. This bill ought to have been passed long ago. It has been frequently reported. Judge Henry W. Gibson, of Tennessee, offered in a bill like this to put them all on the pension roll, but they did not serve long enough. You had to have a length of service of 90 days. It was fixed accidentally. There was an entire battalion in my district that served 89 days, which shut them out of the general pension law. There is no man on the top of the earth with good sense enough—Solomon would not have had sense enough with his wonderful headpiece—to tell why a man who served 89 days ought not to be put on a pensionable basis as well as a man who had served 90 days. If the House wants to do justice long deferred, it ought to pass this bill with a whoop. [Applause.]

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I fully realize the embarrassment of following the eloquent and distinguished Speaker, a statesman and logician. He has spoken well and with conviction with respect to the border States, and while Pennsylvania occupied a position of somewhat different relation from that of the border States, nevertheless the question of the invasion of Pennsylvania in 1863 by Gen. Lee and his army is interesting historically and of vast importance. The fact of the matter is that during the whole period from the outbreak of the war until after the battle of Gettysburg, nearly all of the conflicts and raids were within 50 or 75 miles of Washington. The reason for that was that the Union troops were massed about the Capital to protect it, always being in fear and apprehension that the Confederates would attack in force the Federal Capital.

Now, in relation to what was suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] as establishing a precedent for a bill like this: The business men of Philadelphia furnished the clothing for the emergency men of Pennsylvania who were called in 1863 by Abraham Lincoln through Gov. Curtin. The State of Pennsylvania later reimbursed the business men, paying them interest on their loan, and later the United States Government reimbursed Pennsylvania without interest on the loan. That is the way that came about and was concluded.

Now, as to the justice of this bill, the facts apply to Pennsylvania as elsewhere. But to these emergency men it does not apply, as I understand, since it relates to only militiamen who must have been in the service 90 days. A gentleman on this side in all generosity and spirit of chivalry and justice told me that he understood what I meant when I referred to the emergency men, and that just as certain as the men of Missouri and Kentucky or any other border State who served a week or a month or three months or longer are favorably regarded, so will all be considered as having been Federal soldiers and will come within the interpretation of the pension laws. Certainly, if Missouri and Kentucky militiamen are entitled to the consideration that will be given them in this bill, it should extend to the emergency men of Pennsylvania, who answered when Lee marched triumphantly up the great Cumberland Valley, creating alarm among the people lest the invasion of the State be extended to Harrisburg and Philadelphia. Thousands of emergency men answered the call and resisted the advance. My own father, a minister of the gospel, left the pulpit and went out with them, and by reason of exposure lost his life when I was a year old. I know that there were emergency men there who are entitled to consideration

because they protected the State and to a great extent interfered with if they did not intercept a portion of Lee's army beyond the Susquehanna. Senator Daniels, a brave, chivalrous gentleman from Virginia, told me all about how he reached the Susquehanna River and there saw the bridge in flames, the torch having been applied by one of these emergency men to prevent him from crossing the river and invading Lancaster County. None of those men were out 90 days, but they did perform a great service. The force of these emergency men broke the advance of Lee and his army, and instead of having the great battle at a place somewhere farther east, at a point which might have been selected by Lee, Meade and his generals selected the place to deliver the blow at Gettysburg, and they chose Round Top, Culps Hill, and the heights south of Gettysburg, and there rolled back the tide that broke against them. Some of us may think that it is pretty long after the war to do this, but the very fact that it is so long after the war, and the very fact that there are only a few yet living who participated even in the border States of Missouri and Kentucky, make these men no less entitled to the passage of this bill, and I am anxious that we also pass a bill when it comes along for the emergency men of Pennsylvania who went down and resisted the great advance of Lee and his armies.

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

Mr. FOCHT. Yes.

Mr. FARR. The emergency men of Pennsylvania are included in this bill.

Mr. FOCHT. Yes; but they must have served three months, and they did not serve that long. Let us amend the bill and include them all along the line.

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

Mr. FOCHT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. When Morgan made his famous charge there was a group of men called out at Cincinnati to protect that city, and they served for a certain time. They were nicknamed the squirrel hunters. Those men are not included.

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

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute longer in order to answer the question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Those men are not included in this measure, because this limits it to those who served 90 days.

Mr. FOCHT. It ought to be amended to include them all and make it a clean-up along the border and elsewhere of all that collection of loyal men who did serve their country but who have heretofore been barred from participating in pensions and honors due them. The bill should be so amended as to include them all, thus finally recognizing patriotism in whatever measure exhibited.

Mr. FESS. I think so, because these men came out at the call and offered their lives in a very emergent case in the Civil War.

Mr. FOCHT. There can be only a very few of them. I would say scarcely 200 in Pennsylvania, many less than 500, and I doubt whether there are anything like 5,000 in the entire country. But Lincoln called, and they responded, so let us give them this honored place in the sun along with the veterans who gave longer and greater service and whose valor is always cherished and ever near our hearts.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the exact status of these soldiers ought to be understood, and when it is I think there will be no question about the House voting for this bill. They have been denied pensions on a mere technicality. President Lincoln recognized them as a part of his Army. They have failed to be accorded a pensionable status by the ruling of former Secretary of War Root, whose ability as a lawyer is beyond question. Here are his declarations with reference to the question of whether they are entitled to pensions. He said:

The Missouri Militia did not constitute a part of the Army of the United States, but were a force acting from time to time in cooperation with it; that the order disbanding such troops can not be construed as equivalent to an honorable discharge in the sense in which these words are used in section 2304, Revised Statutes.

They were recognized by competent authority as a part of the United States Army. They fought and received wounds, they served in cooperation with the Army, and were denied pensions simply because their discharge was not quite technical. As the Speaker of the House well said, they participated in a number of battles. The most prominent battle in Missouri in which they participated was the battle of Springfield, and their defense under Holland at that time against the largely outnumbering force of the Confederates under Marmaduke constitutes a very bright page in the history of the State troops.

My State is only slightly interested in this measure. There are a few members of the Enrolled Missouri Militia in my district. They fought in the battles mentioned in this report, and fought gallantly. Now, if the policy of the country is to pension men who fought in the Union Armies and cooperated with them, this bill ought to pass. [Applause.] I call to mind a few members of the Enrolled Missouri Militia now honored citizens of my district, which borders on the State of Missouri, Mr. R. H. Hamilton, of Keener, Boone County, and Mr. Willis Russell, of Green Forest, both high-type men, men of high character, and men who deserve a reasonable pension to make easier their lot now that they are entering upon the final march that is soon to end at the portals of the great hereafter. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have 11 minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will be very glad to answer the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Is it a fact men who belonged to these organizations of the State militia of Missouri, Kentucky, Indiana, and Pennsylvania, if wounded in battle, can secure a pension?

Mr. RUSSELL. Some of them, yes. They had a rule in the committee, or there was an act that permitted soldiers in the State organizations who were actually wounded in battle to be granted pensions.

Mr. WALSH. Is that by general law?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will be very glad to permit me to correct him there, there was a statute, which expired by limitation in 1873. They had to apply before that date.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe that is a fact. That law is now out of existence.

Mr. WALSH. Up until 1873 those men who were wounded could procure pensions under the general law?

Mr. RUSSELL. I know there was such an act at one time.

Mr. WALSH. Have they been securing pensions since that time, where they were wounded, by special act?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think since I have been in Congress, nearly 10 years, that any man has ever gotten a pension as a Missouri enrolled militiaman. The House has passed some such bills, but the Senate has, I think, in all cases refused to do so. Has the gentleman a minute remaining? If so, I would like to read two or three lines from a letter written by one of the Speaker's constituents, a man whom he knows very well, Jesse F. Trower. Somebody said something about these soldiers rendering no service. He says:

I gave 511 days of actual military services in this State. That was more arduous and dangerous than many of these drawing pensions for years. In the battle at Ashley, Pettis County, Mo., one of my brothers was killed, another brother was badly wounded. I was by the side of the one killed.

That is the kind of service that he rendered in Missouri, and thousands of other militiamen rendered the same faithful service. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, many will remember that the southern part of the State of Indiana was in open revolt for quite a period during the Civil War; that had it not been for the State militia organization under the command of Federal officers there is no telling what would have happened along the border between Indiana and Kentucky. Oliver P. Morton, governor not only of the State of Indiana but acting as the Union governor of the State of Kentucky, was commended time and time again by President Lincoln for his ceaseless vigilance in keeping in repression the southern sympathizers along the Ohio River. The One hundred and eighth Indiana did signal service, not only in keeping down rebellion within the borders of the State of Indiana but likewise in resisting attacks and repeated raids by Morgan in the State of Indiana and in the State of Ohio. Yet this regiment was never mustered into the United States service. At the suggestion of Abraham Lincoln, Gen. Lew Wallace, one of the greatest volunteer generals to give his service in the Civil War, went to the city of Cincinnati and took the One hundred and eighth Indiana with him; also two or three other companies and parts of Indiana regiments. He also organized an army out of the citizenship of the city of Cincinnati, threw up breastworks, and saved the city of Cincinnati from being destroyed by Gen. Morgan.

This is but a sample of the service that was rendered by these men in the State of Indiana along the border, and not only in Indiana but across in Kentucky, where they fought side by side with the Kentuckians, and also across the border in the State of Illinois. The southern part of Illinois was in open

rebellion against the North, or a considerable portion of it was for a time, and these men rendered signal service there along with the militia of that State. I indorse the statement of the Speaker of the House that it is a duty the Government owes these men. It is not a charity that we are giving them, but it is paying them for services rendered and recognizing them as we have recognized those who served as members of the United States Army. We are giving them a chance to have their names placed upon the scroll of honor—the United States pension roll—to which they are justly entitled for patriotic service rendered.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, while I am in sympathy with the legislation, I have asked for this time in order to call a matter to the attention of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL].

In response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] as to attorney fees, it was the opinion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] that, due to the fact that the act of 1912 had a prohibition of attorney fees none was necessary in this act. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that while section 1 does extend the provisions of the act of 1912 to this class of men, this is not strictly an amendment of that act and there might be a question as to whether attorneys could secure fees under section 1. But section 2, as to widows, minor children, and dependent parents, certainly would open the way for pension attorneys to get fees. While I am in sympathy with the legislation I am not in sympathy with a lot of fees being opened up here to Washington pension agents. I want to ask the gentleman whether, in order to remove all possible question, he would be willing to accept an amendment such as was placed in similar legislation to the effect that no attorney shall be recognized and no attorney fee shall be paid for the presentation or prosecution of any claim under the provisions of this act?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that I would have no objection in the world, but he understands it would have to be done by unanimous consent. But I take it, this being an extension of the Sherwood Act, which has that provision—

Mr. CRAMTON. Section 2 refers to persons who do not come under the Sherwood Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Sherwood Act does not include widows—

Mr. CRAMTON. Or children.

Mr. RUSSELL. Well, I have no objection—

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, if this is the proper place, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to offer an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. CRAMTON. It will stand as a new section, to be numbered as section 5.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: At the end of the bill, on page 3, insert the following as a new section:

"Sec. 5. That no attorney shall be recognized and no attorney fees shall be paid for the presentation or prosecution of any claim under the provisions of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The section is inserted at the end of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman use the balance of his time. I have but one more speech.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I shall not indulge in prophecy as to what the status of the Union would have been if there had been no State militia to protect the border States from invasion of the Southern forces. It is certain, however, that this bill in its amended form seeks to give pensionable status to men in the militia forces and other forces that never were in battle, and its purpose is to include all and give them a pensionable status, and by so doing cast reflection upon the hundreds of thousands of Union soldiers who volunteered in defense of their country. They were slackers to stay at their firesides and repel some temporary invasion. They were merely members of the State militia acting, in a way, as policemen, to give protection to their localities but not obligated for service outside at the command of the military officers of the Nation.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. DEWALT. Do you call the Battle of Gettysburg a temporary invasion?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I well recall what was done at the Battle of Gettysburg, because my mother has told me how Philadelphia was alarmed and how all were called upon to go to the rescue, if need be, to prevent an invasion; but that was a temporary affair. These men did not volunteer as my mother's brothers volunteered in the service from the beginning of the war to the end of the war. They were merely called upon to protect their homes, fearful that Lee's army coming up from the South would go on to Philadelphia and New York. If they are on a par with the men who volunteered for three years, if they had the mettle in them to offer their service and their lives for the entire war, why did they not volunteer?

You are seeking now by this legislation to minimize the effect of the service and the valor of the true guardians of the Union, those who volunteered for the duration of the war, ready to go wherever their commanding officers would direct them. You are asking here by this amendment which is offered to include all who were members of State militia, who chanced to be members of the State militia and other organizations and had served 90 days, whether they had smelled powder or not. A few instances are cited—and we know how often a few instances are cited to justify a general bill which, if considered in its entirety, could not be justified—a few instances are cited where some men had engaged in battle; but this discussion shows that these men in the State militia did not leave the State.

I read to you what the official records show, as stated by Secretary of War Root, when he passed upon this question:

It will be seen from the foregoing that the enrolled Missouri Militia was a State force, organized under the militia law of the State for State service; that portions of it served—

Yes; that is the argument made here to justify this general bill extending to all a pensionable status—

that portions of it served at various times and at short periods under United States officers and informally with United States troops in defense of the State.

We have declined up to the present moment to pension the old soldiers who enlisted for the duration of the war and longer if they had not served 90 days. If they had served only 85 days, you can not get a special bill through here, even though they had enlisted for two years or during the duration of the war. But now you are going to pension those who were members of the State militia, who joined that honorable body to protect their own firesides, who acted as police officers in a little larger sense, but who were unwilling to go to the front in company with the regular forces.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what you are doing, and you are minimizing by this action the character of service of those who volunteered for the duration of the war. You are placing on a parity with those men who enlisted in the regular organizations those who declined to enlist and respond to the call to service. You are placing those men on a parity with the valiant soldiers who enlisted in the Federal forces under the direction of the commanding officers of the national army. I again repeat that the organizations covered by this bill are nothing more than on a par with the home guards who are now being organized throughout the country to do police duty. Occasion might have arisen when these home guards might have been called upon to put down sedition, but as I see the country manifesting its national spirit in waging this war they will not be called upon for that service. Are you going to ask that they, too, when this war is over, shall be put on the same status as those valiant boys who are going abroad to fight our battles? That is what you are doing. You are putting on the same plane, on a par, the State militiamen with those who volunteered to go to the front and fight for the Union.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. FOCHT. Differentiating between the man who stayed at home and the man who went to the front, did not the feeling on the whole pension question reflect itself in the act of 1912—a service pension—and did not the gentleman vote for that?

Mr. STAFFORD. Unfortunately I was out of Congress at that time and did not have the privilege of voting on that question.

We have not up to the present time recognized the pensionable status of a soldier who had not served 90 days. You could not get a bill through Congress for such a man, even if he had rendered service for 85 days. Now you propose to pass a general law for those who stayed at home and were not involved in any battle whatever.

Mr. FOCHT. If we did those men an injustice before, we want now to correct that injustice. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. You want to do an injustice to the soldiers of the Civil War and pension these men who declined to enlist in the Federal service. You say that these men should have the same pensionable status as those who enlisted in the Federal service.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not my friend overlook this part of the bill showing what sort of service they rendered under orders of an officer of the United States, or who volunteered for the time being to serve with a regularly organized military or naval force?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; under orders; but some of those men never saw service. They were merely doing police duty to protect their own homes, and you are citing a few instances of musket battles in Missouri, or down in Kentucky, when three-fourths of them never saw a battle at all, but remained at their firesides as members of the State militia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, three minutes, to my colleague from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have sat here for several years and watched the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] perform, and he is always interesting and usually fair, but this is the first time I have ever seen him assume the rôle of the defender of the old soldier on the doubtful grounds that to pass this bill would be a reproach to the old Union soldier. The men who are taken care of in this bill fought for the Union side by side with those who now draw a pension, and many of whom have drawn pensions for years. I submit to do justice to anyone has never been and can not be a reflection on anyone else. All that we are asking in this bill is to do justice to a class of men who were not only loyal to the Union but who proved their loyalty by their action during the trying days of the Civil War.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there is a lamentable lack of right information in regard to the men affected by this measure. The men whom the gentleman from Wisconsin designates as "having done police duty" out in the State of Missouri thought they were rendering service to the Federal Government in the same way and under the same authority as those who happened to have been recognized afterwards as Federal troops. I know that the Seventy-second Enrolled Missouri Militia, to which reference has been made by my friend from Arkansas, Judge TILLMAN, did render effective service at the battle of Springfield in 1864. I also know that these men were under the control and subject to the orders of a Federal officer. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] refers to them as home guards. In our State the home-guard organizations have had a pensionable status for years. Shortly after the war closed a commission, known as the Taylor-Hawkins Commission, were sent out into our State. They reported on these different military organizations, and in that report they recognized the Missouri Home Guards, the Provisional Enrolled Militia, Missouri Cavalry, and certain other State militia organizations, but there were a number of certain other State militia organizations which they reported were not to be regarded as Federal troops. I have never been able to find out any reason why that distinction was made. I have inquired at the War Department, I have their report, I have investigated records, and I have never been able to find out the standard that commission used in reaching their conclusion. Now, gentlemen, here are the facts: These so-called militia organizations of the State were under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. They were under the jurisdiction of a Federal officer. The Federal Government has recognized them by reimbursing the State for the money expended by it in their support. Gen. Schofield, a Federal general, had control of these organizations in our State during the war. They fought side by side with the men in the Missouri Cavalry, who have been recognized as a Federal organization. They fought side by side with the home-guard organizations, which have also been recognized as Federal troops. In my own county, in which the Battle of Springfield was fought, the Seventy-second Enrolled Missouri Militia went to the front and successfully defended the city of Springfield, drove Marmaduke and his forces away, fought side by side with Federal troops, were under the command of a Federal officer, underwent all the hardships and took all the dangers of regular Federal troops and other home organizations that have been recognized as Federal troops. But for some reason, as I stated, which I can not explain, under the Taylor-Hawkins Commission report, they have never been recognized as Government troops. It is but common justice and common honesty that these men be given a pensionable status, and thereby put

them on an equality with the men who are now drawing pensions; that is all that we ask.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired. The question is on suspending the rules and passing this bill with the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STAFFORD) there were—ayes 53, noes 10.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of suspending the rules and passing this bill with the amendment will, as their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 176, nays 62, answered "present" 1, not voting 191, as follows:

YEAS—176.

Alexander	Ellsworth	Knudson	Rodenberg
Ashbrook	Esch	Kraus	Romjue
Ayres	Evans	La Follette	Rose
Barkley	Fairfield	Langley	Rubey
Barnhart	Farr	Lazaro	Rucker
Beakes	Ferris	Lea, Cal.	Russell
Beshlin	Fess	Lehlbach	Sanders, Ind.
Bland	Fields	Little	Sanders, N. Y.
Bowers	Flood	Littlepage	Schall
Britten	Focht	Lobeck	Scott, Iowa
Browne	Fordney	London	Scott, Mich.
Browning	Forster	Loneragan	Shackelford
Burroughs	Frear	Lufkin	Shallenberger
Butler	French	Lundeen	Sinnott
Campbell, Kans.	Fuller, Ill.	McAndrews	Slayden
Campbell, Pa.	Gandy	McArthur	Smith, Idaho
Cannon	Glynn	McClintic	Smith, Mich.
Carter, Okla.	Gould	McCulloch	Steele
Chandler, Okla.	Graham, Ill.	McKeown	Steenerson
Church	Gray, N. J.	McLemore	Stemler, Ill.
Claypool	Greene, Vi.	Magee	Strong
Clary	Hadley	Mapes	Switzer
Connelly, Kans.	Hamilton, Mich.	Martin	Tague
Cox	Hamlin	Mays	Taylor, Colo.
Crago	Harrison, Va.	Miller, Minn.	Temple
Cramton	Hawley	Miller, Wash.	Thomas
Crosser	Hayden	Mondell	Thompson
Dallinger	Hayes	Moon	Tillman
Davis	Helvering	Morgan	Timberlake
Decker	Hensley	Mott	Van Dyke
Delaney	Hersey	Mudd	Vestal
Dempsey	Hull, Iowa	Oldfield	Voigt
Denton	Humphreys	Olney	Volstead
Dewalt	Igoe	Osborne	Waldow
Dickinson	Johnson, Ky.	Parker, N. J.	Walton
Dill	Juhl	Platt	Wason
Dillon	Kearns	Polk	Wheeler
Dixon	Keating	Purnell	Wilson, Ill.
Doolittle	Kelly, Pa.	Raker	Wingo
Dowell	Kettner	Randall	Winslow
Dyer	Key, Ohio	Rankin	Wood, Ind.
Eagan	Kiess, Pa.	Reavis	Woodward
Elliott	King	Robbins	Young, N. Dak.
	Kinkaid	Roberts	Zihlman

NAYS—62.

Almon	Edmonds	Kincheloe	Stephens, Miss.
Anderson	Garner	Kitchin	Stevenson
Aswell	Garrett, Tenn.	Larsen	Summers
Bankhead	Garrett, Tex.	Lee, Ga.	Taylor, Ark.
Bell	Goodwin, Ark.	Mansfield	Venable
Black	Gray, A. A.	Montague	Vinson
Blackmon	Hardy	Nicholls, S. C.	Walsh
Blanton	Harrison, Miss.	Park	Watkins
Buchanan	Heflin	Price	Whaley
Byrnes, S. C.	Helm	Ragsdale	White, Ohio
Byrns, Tenn.	Holland	Rafney, H. T.	Wilson, La.
Candler, Miss.	Huddleston	Rayburn	Wilson, Tex.
Caraway	Hull, Tenn.	Robinson	Wright
Connally, Tex.	Jacoway	Rogers	Young, Tex.
Dominick	James	Sanford	
Eagle	Jones	Stafford	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Cooper, Wis.

NOT VOTING—191.

Anthony	Collier	Dupré	Gordon
Austin	Cooper, Ohio	Elston	Graham, Pa.
Bacharach	Cooper, W. Va.	Emerson	Green, Iowa
Baer	Copley	Estopinal	Greene, Mass.
Boehrer	Costello	Fairchild, B. L.	Gregg
Borland	Crisp	Fairchild, G. W.	Griest
Brand	Currie, Mich.	Fisher	Griffin
Brodbeck	Curry, Cal.	Flynn	Hamill
Brumbaugh	Dale, N. Y.	Foss	Hamilton, N. Y.
Burnett	Dale, Vi.	Francis	Haskell
Cadwell	Darrow	Freeman	Hastings
Cantrill	Davidson	Fuller, Mass.	Haugen
Carew	Dent	Gallagher	Heaton
Carlin	Dies	Gallivan	Heintz
Carter, Mass.	Donovan	Gard	Hicks
Cary	Dooling	Garland	Hillard
Chandler, N. Y.	Doremus	Gillett	Hollingsworth
Clark, Fla.	Doughton	Glass	Hood
Clark, Pa.	Drane	Godwin, N. C.	Houston
Classon	Drukker	Good	Howard
Coady	Dunn	Goodall	Husted

Hutchinson	Merritt	Reed	Stedman
Ireland	Moore, Pa.	Riordan	Stephens, Nebr.
Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Ind.	Rouse	Sterling, Pa.
Johnson, Wash.	Morin	Rowe	Stiness
Kahn	Neely	Rowland	Sullivan
Kehoe	Nelson	Sabbath	Sweet
Kelley, Mich.	Nichols, Mich.	Sanders, La.	Swift
Kennedy, Iowa	Nolan	Saunders, Va.	Talbott
Kennedy, R. I.	Norton	Scott, Pa.	Templeton
Kreider	Oliver, Ala.	Scully	Tilson
LaGuardia	Oliver, N. Y.	Sears	Tinkham
Lasher	O'Shaunessy	Sells	Towner
Lever	Overmyer	Sherley	Treadway
Linthicum	Overstreet	Sherwood	Vare
Longworth	Padgett	Shouse	Walker
Lunn	Paige	Siegel	Ward
McCormick	Parker, N. Y.	Sims	Watson, Pa.
McFadden	Peters	Sisson	Watson, Va.
McKenzie	Phelan	Slemp	Weaver
McKinley	Porter	Sloan	Webb
McLaughlin, Mich.	Pou	Small	Welling
McLaughlin, Pa.	Powers	Smith, C. B.	Welty
Madden	Pratt	Smith, T. F.	White, Me.
Maher	Quin	Snell	Williams
Mann	Ralney, J. W.	Snook	Wise
Mason	Ramsey	Snyder	Woods, Iowa
Meeker	Ramseyer	Steagall	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. BORLAND with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.
 Mr. BRAND with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.
 Mr. BURNETT with Mr. ELSTON.
 Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. FREEMAN.
 Mr. CARLIN with Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts.
 Mr. COADY with Mr. GOOD.
 Mr. COLLIER with Mr. GOODALL.
 Mr. DENT with Mr. GREEN of Iowa.
 Mr. DUPRE with Mr. HASKELL.
 Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. HAUGEN.
 Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
 Mr. HASTINGS with Mr. JOHNSON of Washington.
 Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa.
 Mr. LUNN with Mr. LONGWORTH.
 Mr. OLIVER of Alabama with Mr. MCKENZIE.
 Mr. PARK with Mr. MADDEN.
 Mr. POU with Mr. MEEKER.
 Mr. ROUSE with Mr. MERRITT.
 Mr. NEELY with Mr. MOORES of Indiana.
 Mr. OLIVER of New York with Mr. MORIN.
 Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana with Mr. NELSON.
 Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. NOLAN.
 Mr. SIMS with Mr. RAMSEY.
 Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH with Mr. RAMSEYER.
 Mr. SNOOK with Mr. PARKER of New York.
 Mr. STEAGALL with Mr. STINESS.
 Mr. STEDMAN with Mr. SWEET.
 Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. TOWNER.
 Mr. WATSON of Virginia with Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. WELLING with Mr. SLEMP.
 Mr. SEARS with Mr. WILLIAMS.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin.
 Mr. ——— with Mr. AUSTIN.
 Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan.
 Mr. DIES with Mr. HUSTED.
 Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. DAVIDSON.
 Mr. DRANE with Mr. NORTON.
 Mr. HAMILL with Mr. MCFADDEN.
 Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.
 Mr. OVERSTREET with Mr. ROWE.
 Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. KAHN.
 Mr. WEBB with Mr. SELLS.
 Mr. WALKER with Mr. DARROW.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 12100 and the bill H. R. 12099 be given a privileged status, not to interfere with the consideration of conference reports or appropriation bills.

One of the bills amends the shipping act, the purpose being to make it clear that vessel property may not pass under foreign ownership without the consent of the Shipping Board, and also broadens the definition of "vessel" so as to include a vessel in the course of construction and before it is launched. The other bill is a bill to confer on the President power to prescribe charter rates and freight rates and to requisition vessels, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to give a privileged status to the two bills named,

not to interfere with conference reports and appropriation bills. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman to withdraw his request until morning, so as to give opportunity to Members of the House to examine these bills.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have no objection to that. They are important bills, and one is strictly a war measure.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, on Decoration Day I heard a very useful and patriotic address delivered by the Hon. FREDERICK ZIEHLMAN, a Member of this House, on the Antietam battle field. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting it therein.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

VALIDATING CERTAIN PUBLIC-LAND ENTRIES.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 78, to validate certain public-land entries.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 4, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting a supplemental estimate for the services of a clerk stenographer and typist, Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 1143); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a proposed clause of legislation authorizing and directing allowance and credit in accounts of Lieut. Col. Charles J. Nelson, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army (H. Doc. No. 1144); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation required by the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1145); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH, from the Committee on Patents, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8763) to amend the act entitled "An act to extend temporarily the time for filing applications and fees and taking action in the United States Patent Office in favor of nations granting reciprocal rights to United States citizens," approved August 17, 1916, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 616), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 12352) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 12353) to authorize the Secretary of War to provide and issue distinctive buttons or badges to men who, since April 6, 1917, have been honorably discharged from the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 12354) to authorize the Secretary of War to exchange certain lands owned by the United States in Monroe County, Pa., for certain other adjacent lands owned by the Monroe Water Supply Co.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 12355) to regulate the interstate use of automobiles and all self-propelled vehicles which use the public highways in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 12356) to amend section 801 of public act No. 50 of the Sixty-fifth Congress, 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. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 12357) to increase rates of pensions for permanent specific disabilities incurred while in the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 12358) to extend the franking privilege to such officials of the several States as are charged with the administration of the State Confederate pension laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. POU: Resolution (H. Res. 370) urging the immediate consideration of Senate bill 1553; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ASWELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 299) authorizing the Postmaster General to expend not more than 50 per cent of the gross earnings of motor-truck parcel-post routes for the construction and maintenance of the highways on which the service is or may be established; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 12359) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 12360) granting a pension to William P. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 12361) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Shane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 12362) granting a pension to Frank Shaw; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12363) granting a pension to George Matson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 12364) granting a pension to James W. Ledford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLK: A bill (H. R. 12365) granting an increase of pension to Job W. Conoway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 12366) for the relief of John H. Kidd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12367) granting a pension to Patrick Lehan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12368) granting an increase of pension to James F. Dickey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: A bill (H. R. 12369) granting an increase of pension to Philip H. Anschutz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGUE: A bill (H. R. 12370) granting an increase of pension to Honora Thompson, widow of James M. Thompson, alias James Mieberg; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 12371) granting a pension to Cora Goddard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12372) granting a pension to Thanie Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12373) granting a pension to Louisa C. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of members of the First Congregational Church of Janesville, Wis., urging immediate prohibition of the manufacture of alcoholic beverages as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of members of Henry Dretliott Post, No. 141, Grand Army of the Republic, of Hillsboro, Wis., favoring the Smoot pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Chicago Union Ministers' Association, for prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor during the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of J. D. Hollingshead Co., of Chicago, against repeal or postponement of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of the International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Local No. 2, Minneapolis, Minn., Thomas

P. Hughes, secretary, against premium and bonus systems on Government work; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Boilermakers' Lodge No. 510, Minneapolis, Minn., Dave Swanson, secretary, against premium and bonus systems on Government work; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Machinists' Union No. 827, Minneapolis, Minn., J. F. Tritz, secretary, against premium and bonus systems on Government work; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Electrical Workers' Union No. 292, Minneapolis, Minn., Charles A. Anderson, secretary, against premium and bonus systems on Government work; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Blacksmiths' Union, Local 73, Minneapolis, Minn., A. R. Gisslen, secretary, against premium and bonus systems on Government work; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: Resolutions passed by Unity Grange, No. 1710, Galilee, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution adopted by the Oak Park Baptist Church, Sacramento, Cal., protesting against the zone system and urging its repeal; also letters from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Sacramento, Cal.; from the Agricultural Extension Club of Nevada County, Cal.; and from the American Federation of Labor, protesting against the zone system and urging its repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution indorsing the military highway defense system on the Pacific coast adopted by the Mendocino Chamber of Commerce, the Pomeroy (Wash.) Commercial Club, and the Greenwood Civic Club, of Elk, Cal.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of members of the Episcopal Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Baptist Church, and the Methodist (Methodist Episcopal) Church, of Gouverneur, N. Y., for the passage of a bill to effectively prohibit the use of any kind of foodstuffs during the war for the manufacture of intoxicating beverages, and to limit liquors on hand to nonbeverage uses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of the woman's committee of the Minnesota Council of National Defense and Public Safety Commission, in favor of House bills 7736 and 5716; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of the City Councils of Philadelphia, urging the construction of dry docks for commercial shipping at that port; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, June 4, 1918.

(Legislative day of Monday, June 3, 1918.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Brandegee	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Smoot
Curtis	Kellogg	Page	Sterling
Fall	Kendrick	Penrose	Thompson
Fernald	Kenyon	Poindexter	Townsend
Gronna	King	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Hale	Kirby	Sheppard	Warren
Harding	Lenroot	Shields	Watson
Hardwick	Lodge	Simmons	Wolcott
Hitchcock	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.	
Johnson, Cal.	McNary	Smith, Ga.	
Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Smith, Md.	

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] on official business. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

I wish also to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] on official business. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. KIRBY. I was requested to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] on official business.

I wish also to announce that the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] is detained on official business.

Mr. KENDRICK. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] is detained by death in his family.